Social and physical processes in production of urban public spaces case: Development of RPTRAs in East Jakarta
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Abstract. Public spaces in the big city of Jakarta are decreasing from year to year due to the ever expanding physical development. However, since 2015 until October 2019 290 RPTRA units had been built in DKI Jakarta where previously public spaces have not been paid much attention to and have always been defeated by more commercial developments. The objectives of this study are to find what structuring forces affect, who actors were involved in the production of those public spaces, and how they affect physical public spaces at all stages of physical life cycle in different RPTRAs. For those objectives this study used an analytical framework of institutionalist understanding and used descriptive qualitative descriptive approach and chose 4 RPTRAs in East Jakarta as case studies. The results of case studies show there are the structuring forces and the different actors operating in each RPTRA but what are structuring forces and who are the actors are relatively the same in each RPTRA. The results of this study suggest that urban design practitioners need to have greater understanding of the social processes guiding the production of public spaces and need to incorporate such understanding into their practice.

1. Introduction
Public spaces in the big city of Jakarta are decreasing from year to year. Physical development for various functions such as offices, shopping centers, and housing which continues to increase over time causes less land for public space. However, in recent years the provincial government of Jakarta under the Governor Basuki Tjahaya Purnama have been developed the public spaces named Child Friendly Integrated Public Spaces or RPTRA. This RPTRA is specifically built in densely populated areas. The RPTRA was built since 2015 and at the beginning of 2017 there were 180 RPTRAs built in various areas in Jakarta [1], and 290 in 2019 [2]. Those show that public spaces are built in large numbers in last four years in the Jakarta areas, where previously public spaces have not been paid much attention to and have always been defeated by more commercial developments.

Public space is the result of complex social processes from a broader socio-political context or from multiple, contrasting, overlapping ways in which many different kinds of forces and actors interact, combine, conflict, and oppressive, in order to determine how urban space should develop [3]. There has been many studies of public spaces as the result of interactions or struggles between different forces and actors [4-6]. The complexity of the social processes influencing the production of public spaces and their implications for urban design practice are seldom discussed or analyzed.

In their study Calderon and Chelleri [7] sought to understand how different forces and actors influence the production of public spaces and to illustrate such understanding in the case study of the renewal of a deprived neighborhood of Barcelona’s metropolitan area. Referring to Healey’s model [8],
Calderon and Chelleri [7] introduces an institutionalist understanding as an analytical framework to the production of public spaces. Their study gives emphasis to the analysis of structuring forces and actors as a way to apprehend the complexity of the social processes guiding and influencing the planning, design and management of public spaces and their study uses the case study of an urban renewal project in Barcelona.

This study uses Calderon and Chelleri’s analytical framework to know how different forces and actors influence the production of public space in a case of the development of the public spaces named Child Friendly Integrated Public Space or RPTRA in East Jakarta. The study also gives emphasis to the analysis of structuring forces and actors of the social processes guiding and influencing each phase of life cycle of RPTRAs namely the pre-design, design, construction, and operation of RPTRAs. What was analyzed in this study has not been done in existing studies of RPTRAs [9-13].

2. Methods
This study uses a descriptive qualitative research approach. Two source data are primary data and secondary data. Primary data was collected in ways of interview with representatives of government officials, and field observation of each of RPTRA locations. Secondary data are archives or recorded information (table 1).

| Data Types | Data Sources | Techniques of Data Collecting |
|------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Structuring forces and actors affecting or being involved in the production of the RPTRAs | An Official of East Jakarta Municipality; Official Heads of Sub-districts of Areas; Facility Administrators of RPTRAs | Regulations; Interview; Archives, Books, Journals |
| The effects of the structuring forces and the roles of Actors | An Official of East Jakarta Municipality; Official Heads of Sub-districts of Areas; Facility Administrators of RPTRAs | Designers; Regulations; Sketching; Archives |
| | | Designs; Taking photos |

Four RPTRAs in East Jakarta Municipality were selected to study namely Cilititan RPTRA, Kebon Pala RPTRA, Permata Intan RPTRA and Citra Permata RPTRA. In each of RPTRAs the needed data were collected. Cilititan RPTRAs was chosen to represent the project characters of phase I (the first RPTRA built in East Jakarta) and CSR fund, and large land; Kebon Pala RPTRA phase II, CSR fund, and small land but more than 1.000 m² (standard land); Permata Intan RPTRA of phase II, APBD fund, and small land but less than 1.000 m²; and Citra Permata RPTRA of phase III, APBD fund, and large land.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Condition of four RPTRAs
The four RPTRAs locate in East Jakarta Municipality and location of each of them are shown in figure 1. The RPTRA has phases of development, determined by the budgeting year. Phase I is in 2015, and phase V in 2018. The RPTRA has two development fund sources namely Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), and regional revenue and expenditure budget or APBD. CSR fund was used in development phase I and II when regional government did not be planned yet in APBD. Data about sub-
districts/districts, land areas, development phases, fund sources, and construction dates of the four RPTRAs are shown in table 2.
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Legend:
1. Cililitan RPTA
2. Kebon Pala Berseri RPTRA
3. Citra Permata RPTRA
4. Permata Intan RPTRA

**Figure 1.** The Locations of the 4 RPTRAs in East Jakarta Municipality Area.

**Table 2.** Data of location, area, source of budget, phase and construction date.

| Names of RPTRA | Sub-districts/Districts | Areas occupied | Phases of Development | Source of Funds | Construction Dates |
|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Cililitan      | Cililitan/K. Jati       | 3.600 m²       | I                     | CSR            | Mei 2015 – Oct. 2015 |
| Keb. Pala Berseri | Keb. Pala/Makassar   | 1.100 m²       | II                    | CSR            | Oct- Jan. 2016     |
| Permata Intan  | Jatinegara/Jatinegara  | 900 m²         | II                    | APBD           | Sep. 2016 – Feb. 2017 |
| Citra Permata  | Rawa Bunga/Jatinegara  | 2.830 m²       | III                   | APBD           | Sep.2016 – Feb. 2017 |

3.2. Structuring forces and physical development processes

Structuring forces are grouped into three sections, namely system of meaning, authoritative structures, and allocative structures [3]. Referring to it, according to Cancellieri and Ostanel [5] in urban planning and design, first, allocative structures relates to the way material resources (finance, land, labor) are allocated. Secondly, authoritative structures deal with norms, values, procedures that direct the development of urban areas. Lastly, systems of meaning relate to ideology and discourse that informs what development path is right for urban areas. The structuring forces influencing the development processes of four RPTRAs and how they influences them are briefly shown in table 3.
The system of meaning of RPTRA development is linked to the concept of a Child Friendly District / City (KLA) initiated by the Central Government since 2006 to be implemented in Indonesia [14]. Then this became one of the flagship programs of the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (KPPPA) which is legally based on the Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and World Fit for Children at the international level, as well as the National Constitution [15]. Then this discourse is realized into four regulations of the State Ministry for Women's Empowerment and Child Protection so that a Child Friendly District / City can be implemented.

Authoritative structures that drive RPTRA development are governor regulations. The five governor regulations are a very determining factor in how these RPTRAs are prepared, designed and operated. There are four governor regulations and one governor instruction that are issued by Governor of DKI Jakarta Province Basuki Tjahaja Purnama. The first is the Regulation of the Governor of DKI Jakarta Province Number 196 Year 2015, being about guidelines of management of Child-Friendly Integrated Public Space, setting out the definitions, duties, functions, services and facilities of the RPTRA. The second is the Regulation of the Governor of DKI Jakarta Province Number 349 Year 2015, determining how to define Child-Friendly City. The third is the Regulation of the Governor of DKI Jakarta Province Number 54 Year 2015, revision of administrator teams from the levels of province, municipality, district, sub-district who are responsible to development and maintenance of RPTRA. The third is the Regulation of the Governor of DKI Jakarta Province Number 40 Year 2016, being about revision of the Regulation of the Governor of DKI Jakarta Province Number 349 Year 2015, revision of administrator teams from the levels of province. The fourth is the Regulation of the Governor of DKI Jakarta Province Number 213 Year 2016, being about standard of infrastructure and facilities needs and quality of RPTRA. There is one more law issued by the Governor of DKI Jakarta Basuki Tjahaja Purnama, namely the Instruction of the Governor of DKI Jakarta Province Number 54 Year 2016. In this instruction, special tasks are assigned to agencies, offices and bureaus within the DKI Jakarta provincial government to accelerate the development of the RPTRA.

Allocative structures include development land and fund. Land and funds available also determine what facilities of each RPTRA should be provided and designed. Land area of Permata Intan RPTRA is only 900m², so the playground and sports field provided are very limited. The RPTRA Ciliat area is quite large, namely 3,800 m² so that they have many outdoor facilities.

The RPTRA development financing in the first phase of development fully relies on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), because it has not been budgeted in the APBD. In the second phase and the subsequent phases of development it is budgeted in the APBD, but it remains open for CSR. So the RPTRA development financing can come from either APBD and CSR. The difference between the two types of financing is that using CSR are easier in the development process.
### 3.3. Actors and physical development processes

For the four RPTTAs studied, the actors can be grouped into 5 categories: Government Agencies, Funding Agencies, Designers, Contractors, Facility Administrators, and Local Communities, and the actors play the certain roles in each phase, as seen table 4.

The main actor of the government agencies is the Governor Basuki Tjahaja Purnama who issued the regulations and controlled the development. The governor regulations that are signed all by Basuki Tjahaja Purnama are the only kind of regulation that regulates RPTRA development, no regional regulations are issued. The governor regulations stipulate the government agencies responsible for the development and operation of the RPTRAs.

Design of each RPTRA in first development phase were designed by one of 11 Architects that were appointed by the Regional Government. The designs in this phase become prototypes and are used by Local Government as references for designs of RPTRAs in second and third development phases. Those designs then are developed and detailed by contractors before they build RPTRAs.

The role of local community in designing RPTRAs is few, the RPTRA designs has already been fixed. The role of the 11 Architects is very big in determining the RPTRA design. Although the RPTRAs are relatively small in size, but the 11 Architects make them functional and aesthetic.

#### Table 4. Actor and their roles on the physical development processes

| Actors                  | Pre-design | Design                  | Construction | Operation              |
|-------------------------|------------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Government Agencies     | Who        | Governor and other official | Governor and other official | Governor and other official |
|                         | Role       | Issuing Regulation and managing implementation | Issuing Regulation and managing implementation | Issuing Regulation and managing implementation |
| Funding Agencies        | Who        | not involved | 11 Architects | Regional Govern. Company, Private Company |
|                         | Role       | no role               | Private Company | Financing |
| Designers               | Who        | not involved | 11 Architects | 11 Architects |
|                         | Role       | no role               | Designing | Consulting |
| Contractors             | Who        | no role               | Contractor | Contractor |
|                         | Role       | Developing design not involved | Not involved | Not involved |
| Facility Administrators  | Who        | not involved | not involved | Officers paid by the government |
|                         | Role       | no role               | no role | Managing the operation |
| Local Communities       | Who        | Illegal land users | community representatives | not involved |
|                         | Role       | handing over land occupied | Giving input | no role |

#### 3.4. Discussion

The knowledge of Child Friendly District / City (KLA) become knowledge that influences the production of new public spaces named RPTRA in DKI Jakarta Province. The knowledge is translated into concept and design of public space by several parties, among others, the Governor of the DKI Jakarta Province, Sociologist, and Designers.

The governor regulations are the determining factors for the realization of RPTRAs in Jakarta. Those guide how RPTRAs are prepared, designed, and operated. The existing regulations related to RPTRA are only the governor regulations. There are not regional regulations of the DKI Jakarta province issued
even until now after several years Basuki Tjahaja Purnama resigned. There are powers that have disagreement or conflict often arise [4,6]. The regional regulations are need for the sustainability of RPTRA in the future.

The land and fund of RPTRAs development are the factors that differentiate what facilities are provided in each RPTRA. Obtaining a plot of land that meets standards is the most difficult factor in RPTRA development in dense urban settlements in Jakarta.

There are many actors in producing RPTRAs, but the actor who is very influential in the RPTRA development is the Basuki Tjahaja Purnama, the Governor of the DKI Jakarta Province. He initiated the RPTRA built in Jakarta and for it he issued governor regulations of RPTRA. His big influence on RPTRA development is proven when Basuki Tjahaja Purnama is no longer being governor, new RPTRAs are no longer produced. RPTRA is replaced by another public space form with a different concept by new governor. It proves again that the power creates space [16] and influences production of public space [17].

4. Conclusion
This study shows that public spaces are the result of social processes, influenced and shaped by the interrelation between structuring forces and a wide variety of actors operating at different scales, at different times and through different means. What are structuring forces and who are the actors are relatively the same in each RPTRA. In this study cases the structuring forces involve child friendly city (system of meaning), governor regulations (authoritative structure), land and fund (allocative structure). The actors involve the Governor of the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government (government), 11 Architect (designers), contractors, private and local government companies (funding agencies).

The results of this study suggest that urban design practitioners need to have greater understanding of the social processes guiding the production of public spaces and need to incorporate such understanding into their practice. They also need to be more aware of the role they play in such processes, reflecting on how their values, ideas and actions, consciously or unconsciously, either reinforce the narrow interests of powerful actors or, on the contrary, challenge or balance them in order to achieve more just urban environments [7].
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