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Abstract

This thesis has investigated the process by which urban area-based conservation is managed in the Malaysian context and has reassessed the present practices in line with current and foreseeable requirements of the country. Specifically, the study seeks to evaluate the benefits of designating urban heritage zones as conservation areas and to assess the impact of changes caused by redevelopment within the towns. The aim is to see a better balance of redevelopment and conservation within a more democratic and inclusive approach to city building. The study has investigated the existing infrastructure for conservation in Malaysia. It has addressed the problems experienced by a country with a colonial past, an issue relevant to other countries.

The thesis is divided into two parts. Part I, consisting of Chapters One to Four, sets out the context to the study. These chapters, introduce the study; explore the historical development of Malaysia in relation to its cultural built heritage; study the country’s administrative institutions; and trace the development of its heritage conservation. Chapter Four outlines and compares urban area-based conservation management and processes in other developed countries in order to learn from their experiences. Part II consists of the field study works carried out in Malaysia and the analysis leading to the defined recommendations and conclusions of the study.

The study has operated at two levels: by reviewing national practice and selecting a case study. An opinion survey/interview was held with several prominent public figures and government officials who are stakeholders in the process of conserving Malaysia's built heritage. A questionnaire survey of Malaysian local authorities' conservation practices was also carried out. In the case study of Taiping, interviews with Taiping town residents and a quick listing survey of the built forms of Taiping town were carried out.

The discovery arising from the case study in Taiping was that the main threat to the pre-war shop house buildings surveyed was not the risk of natural dilapidation. Rather, the permitted development changes to their facades were a greater threat to these properties than natural dilapidation. These changes in turn have caused the deterioration of the character and appearance of the historic heritage areas and consequently have changed the historic value of the townscape. In addition, the Control of Rent Act, which previously was able to protect these pre-war shop house
and row house buildings, is no longer in force. There are already tell-tale signs, physically, that the 'decontrol process' of the Act is posing a threat to the survival of these pre-war buildings.

Existing legislation, which was not really meant to address urban conservation issues, can be viewed as 'outdated' as it no longer supports the complex and sophisticated process demanded by urban conservation. Therefore, there is a pressing requirement for more specific legislation and new guidelines to safeguard the country's built heritage and to direct Malaysia's future conservation movement.

Malaysia's urban conservation process is found to be ambiguous, with no specific organisation that is entirely responsible for its management or administration. The Museum Department is entrusted by the Ministry of Culture, Art, and Tourism to care for the nation's cultural heritage. However, it finds it difficult to administer urban conservation works as these are the responsibility of local authority architects and town planners. The local authorities on the other hand do not have sufficient trained personnel and the necessary resources effectively to undertake the responsibilities of administering and managing conservation work. They are more committed towards the upgrading and maintaining of the town's infrastructure and amenity facilities.

The main conclusions of the study are that the urban conservation process in Malaysia has reached a point of conflict and dilemma. Its management is embroiled in layers and tiers of Government bureaucracy leaving no organisation totally responsible. The Malaysian public still has much to learn about the benefits of conserving and preserving the country's built heritage and they also need to accept the colonial and immigrants' structures as part of the nation's heritage. It has often been said that 'time is a healer', but built heritage once destroyed is gone.

The findings of this study and the comparative study of other countries' experiences suggest several principles that can be applied to Malaysia's approach to urban conservation and redevelopment in the twenty-first century.
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Glossary of terms commonly used in the study:

The terms 'preservation' and 'conservation' have been used interchangeably across the globe. They mean quite different thing to different people and different countries. It is therefore necessary to make the distinction between these two terms and their usage in this study. Confusion in definition could have a disastrous effect on the decision taken about an historic and architecturally significant buildings or sites.

**Conservation:**
...conservation means all the process of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance.

(Burra Charter, article 1.4.)

...those activities directed to the protection of the character and special qualities of buildings and places, specifically architectural or historic.

...conservation is a dynamic management of change in order to reduce the rate of decay whereby scientific and natural cultural heritage must be preserved as authentic document.

(Feilden, B.M. 1979)

...to conserve have a wider meaning which can include the sensible use, re-use, adaptation, extension and enhancement of scarce assets. Conservation, then, seek to slow down change and to bring it under more purposeful and creative control.

(Middleton, 1987, p. 94).

**Preservation:**
...preservation means maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.

(Burra Charter, Article 1.6.)

...to preserve may be taken to mean as far as possible to retain intact the total integrity of the structure, with its original finishes, decorations, its setting and so on.

(Middleton, quoted in Young, 1977: 68).

Preservation, then, seek to retain, as far as possible intact and without replacement, the original fabric of a monument, (Middleton, 1987, p.93), or in this case historical buildings.

**Gazetting:**
...to gazette (M'sian term), means to legally protect through statutory means, the objects (in this case , buildings which is 100 years old) as monuments of cultural values (a process closer to the scheduling of monument as used in the UK conservation process. Gazetting is also to "list" buildings that are not ancient monuments.
Conservation areas: The Civic Amenities Act (1967, U.K.), defined Conservation areas as "Areas of Special Architectural or Historic Interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance (DoE, 1987). Other countries also use similar definition terms to this.

Setting: Setting is an area surrounding a place whose limits may be determined by the sensory criteria: for example, visual (enclosing ridgelines, roof scapes or plantations), auditory (adjacent waterfalls or gravel quarries) and olfactory (tannery districts).

The terms 'historic towns', 'historic urban centres', 'historic settlements' and 'protected urban areas' have been treated as synonyms for the purpose of this study. They all denote living, i.e. inhabited settlements of considerable aesthetic or historic importance.

Cultural Built Heritage: relates to that part of the man-made general heritage which express some indefinable but recognisable element that current society values especially, and wish to pass on to posterity. (Lichfield, 1996, p. 260).

...group of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the view of history, art or science. (World Heritage Convention 1972)

Fabric: in building conservation, fabric means all physical material of a place that is the product of human activity.

Built Fabric: refers to the buildings or the architectural built structures.

Facades: a façade is the face of a building towards the street or space from which it is normally viewed. It is also the outer wall of the inner spaces of the building and therefore has a dual function as an essential part of the building and a townscape element. Both roles should be recognized in conservation and development projects, an it is particularly important that decisions on the future of a place should be based on considerations and methods of the sort.

Facadism: is a process of maintaining the front elevation of a building while the body of the building behind is demolished and replaced by new structure.
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Cultural Built Heritage: relates to that part of the man-made general heritage which express some indefinable but recognisable element that current society values especially, and wish to pass on to posterity. (Lichfield, 1996, p. 260).

...group of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the view of history, art or science. (World Heritage Convention 1972)
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Facadism: is a process of maintaining the front elevation of a building while the body of the building behind is demolished and replaced by new structure.
Processes of Conservation of the Cultural Built Heritage

**Designation:** a statutory process of protection of *areas* of special architectural and historical interest. Changes within the areas require Conservation Area Consent (CAC).

**Listing:** a statutory process of protecting *buildings* of special architectural and historical interest. Changes in the building structures or fabric require Listed Building Consent (LBC).

**Scheduling:** a statutory process of protecting *monuments, archaeological sites, buried remains and ruins.*
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Understanding the value of urban conservation and area based
"...the dividing and the ruling power of heritage is particularly strong in urban areas. It is here that the economic stakes are often highest, in terms of land and commercial values, that political symbolism is at its most potent in regional, state and national capitals, often the cherished locations of allegedly significant historic events, and also where cultural diversity tends to be greatest, as cities attract an ever widening range of migrant groups."

Jones & Shaw (1996, p.2)

1 Introduction

1.1 The Importance of the Urban Heritage

Development and modernisation, for all their benefits, also cause major changes to the fabric and life of historic towns and cities, often destroying much that is of social, cultural and, ironically, of economic value. Where development is unchecked, or is allowed to continue without regulation, there is a danger that all links with the past will be lost and that every town or city will look the same.

Much has been written on the importance of maintaining the character and uniqueness of the urban heritage and the need to link the individual and society through built forms to a living historic environment\(^1\). Roy Worskett, for example, (1969:12) makes the point that, "...society needs both cultural and physical roots and a town's visual and historic qualities can satisfy at least part of this need." Much of Kevin Lynch's work (1972:241) has been devoted to analysing the 'time-deep areas' of historic towns and cities. Lynch frequently draws attention to the importance of 'both new stimuli and familiar reassurances' which are

---

\(^1\) For example see Cullen, (1961), 'Townscapes'; Worskett, (1970), 'Great Britain: Progress in Conservation', Mynors, (1984), 'Conservation Areas-Protecting the Familiar Local Scene'; Dix, (1990), 'Conservation and Change in the City'.

created in well managed historic urban areas. Conservation has a vital role to play in safeguarding the 'time depth' of urban areas and the tangible link with the past through buildings, spaces, landscapes and the 'total personality' of a place, (Shankland 1968:73). Urban conservation is not, however, just about 'preservation' nor is it about turning historic towns into museum pieces. Change and development are essential elements in the ongoing life of historic towns and cities and urban conservation is a complex process which involves managing change. At its best, urban conservation also encompasses the notion of historic urban fabric as a public good which should be enhanced by appropriate public policies and financial support (Kammeier, 1986:2). It is this dynamic management of change governed by flexible strategies within a defined framework adapted to current economic and social needs that will ensure the future of historic towns and cities (Feilden, 1979).

This study will investigate how urban conservation is currently managed in Malaysia and how existing strategies might be developed to enhance the quality of historic towns and cities whilst balancing the conflicting aims of conservation and economic growth in a fast developing multi-cultural society. By assessing the situation in Malaysia it is hoped to develop a model for urban conservation which will be of value to other Third World countries, particularly those of the Asia Pacific region.

The Context of Urban Conservation

Urban conservation is in part the extension of what Ruskin called the 'proper care' of buildings and monuments by good, periodic maintenance and repair to the wider urban environment (Madsen, 1976:46 and Feilden, 1979:55). In developed countries (especially Western countries), urban conservation is now also part of a more general concern with unchecked development and the destruction of the natural and human environment. Since the 1960s there has been mounting concern about the destruction of many of the world's cultural landscapes, of which historic towns form an important part. Concerns about the management of the environment were expressed at international level both at the

---

2 See for example the work of Conzen, (1975); Burke, (1976); Ashworth, 1984; Barret, (1996).

3 Pandit Nehru's definition of Third World, the First World was older, industrialised West, the Second the (now reoriented) communist block of Eastern Europe: all the rest was the Third World. Thus Third World includes economies from the very rich to the abysmally poor and cities of all types and sizes, including almost all the biggest as well as most of the poorest (Dix, 1990: 405).

In developed Western countries the concern for urban conservation, and the wider environment, is supported by a long tradition of building conservation, legislation and local authority infrastructure. In the U.K., for example, the concept of urban conservation was sparked off by the wholesale demolition and insensitive redevelopment of large parts of historic cities such as Leicester and Nottingham after the Second World War. The powerful conservation movement and associated local amenity societies tended to be led by dedicated and articulate people who supported protective legislation and simply could not be ignored (Shankland, 1975:28). In addition, sustained growth in income and a steadily improving standard of living created a demand for a better quality of life which, in turn, has supported the conservation movement. More recently, the positive link between conservation and urban regeneration has been recognised and major projects have lead to the revitalisation of formerly decaying urban areas.

In Third World developing countries however, the idea of urban conservation is a recent phenomenon (Lee, 1997:43). In most ex-colonial countries, for example, the focus in the period immediately after independence was on economic growth. Rapid urbanisation was a declaration of economic vigour and independence and conservation was seen negatively as an antiquarian passion, an unaffordable luxury or even anti-development.

The Malaysian Context

Like many formerly colonised countries, Malaysia is striving to achieve the status of a Newly Industrialised Country (NIC). The implementation of the Government economic policy 'VISION 2020', designed to transform Malaysia into an industrialised nation by the year 2020 (Sarji, 1995:404), has generated rapid economic growth and urban development. New
towns have developed almost overnight (Putra Jaya, Multi-media super corridor and Cyber City) and old ones have been substantially modernised (Melaka, Penang). 'VISION 2020' also includes provision of cultural richness and diversity (Min. of Info., 1997:8, Mahathir, 1995) but in the enthusiasm for development this has often been overlooked and rapid growth has caused great damage to the fabric of historic towns. There is, therefore, a great need for active urban conservation in Malaysia, although, at the moment, this is a much neglected issue (Konig, 1985:32).

Although there were some moves towards conservation in the 1970s, it was not until the conference on the "Search for a National Identity in Art Forms", June 1981 which highlighted the loss of historic property, that Malaysians really became aware of the need for conservation. Until then historic buildings and fabric had been looked on as a burden (Lim, 1986:2). Even so, it was not until after the scandal of the demolition of the Eastern Hotel, K.L (NST, Feb. 1991) followed by that of The Metropole Hotel in 1994 (NST, Jan. 1994), that architectural conservation was taken seriously. However, this concern has not always been fully appreciated by the Malaysian public and they have not been able to make fully the connection between the need to conserve and the need to progress.

The Malaysian conservation movement is new and it does not yet have clear and defined policies or a clear direction. Even though there is legislation in place to protect historic buildings (see Chapter 3, Guidelines and Legislations and Appendix 3.1) it is often either ignored or not strictly enforced, Figure 1.1.

The legislative framework which does exist is insufficiently defined to protect the built environment and is mainly concerned with antiquities or individual monuments such as temples or palaces rather than vernacular buildings or urban areas. There is, at present, nothing in the existing legislation which can give protection to whole areas or to an ensemble of buildings in an historic town or city. The idea of designating conservation areas is being discussed in Malaysia but is rarely implemented and the findings of this

---

6 The Eastern Hotel, Kuala Lumpur was demolished without notice. The Metropole Hotel, Penang also suffered the same fate in a 'lightning operation' as reported in the paper article. Its demolished rubbles was dumped into the sea making it difficult to reconstruct the building with the original materials, even though this was demanded by the Penang Municipal Authority, using Section 27 of TCP Act, 1976.

7 This issue will be more fully discussed in Chapter Two.
study show that only four major urban authorities were intending to designate conservation areas in their revised structure plans.8

Figure 1.1 Gian Seng Building on the corner of Jalan Tun Perak and Jalan Benteng.

This building was gazetted for its architectural merits but the owners left it dilapidated hoping it would collapse so that they could redevelop the site. The local authority personnel did not use their powers under the Local Government Act 171 to ensure its repair and maintenance and at one time it was gutted by fire. Conservation work has now started after long negotiations between City Hall and the owners.

Also, because of the way in which the conservation profession has developed in Malaysia, most local authorities do not have designated conservation officers and there are no technical personnel specialising in built heritage conservation in the Department of Museum and Antiquities (DoMA), part of the Ministry of Culture, Art and Tourism (MoCAT) and the main agency for implementing conservation policy in the country. In Malaysia there is no dedicated training for 'conservation architects' and there is no real appreciation of the need for a multi-disciplinary approach to major conservation projects. The distinct roles of those trained as museum curators and those involved in architectural conservation differ and complement each other, as do those of other professions and disciplines, but these distinctions are not yet fully realised in Malaysian conservation practice. This often leads to different interpretations and conflicts in practice.

In addition to these problems, there are other tensions encountered in the process of conservation. Malaysia is a multi-cultural society and in the course of defining its national identity has to assimilate the built heritage of a number of sometimes-conflicting religious and ethnic groups. Malaysia also has to define its position in relation to its post-colonial past, conserving the buildings of the British, Dutch and Portuguese periods is not always a politically popular decision.

8 For further details see Chapter Four under Guidelines and Legislation.
There are, however, signs of a positive change in the public and professional view of urban conservation. The conservation lobby, for example, is becoming more organised. The *Badan Warisan Malaysia* (BWM) or "the Badan", an active non-government organisation was formed in 1983. It is modelled and based on the UK's National Trust and bases its conservation approach on the principles of the Burra Charter. The main objective of the Badan is to act as a facilitator for conservation projects although it has recently become much more actively involved in the management of actual conservation work. The public perception of architectural conservation in Malaysia has been much more positive since the completion of the first successful adaptive reuse project, the "Pasar Seni or Central Market" (Malaysia's equivalent to Covent Garden) and the surrounding market area, a project championed by the Badan. This and other regeneration projects in the Federal Capital have sparked the realisation that adaptive re-use can be economically viable and is sometimes a much better option than large scale redevelopment (A. Nizam 1988:37; Tan, 1988:10-14). The public has now begun to realise the value of conserving older, heritage buildings.

It is now an appropriate time to develop a more coherent strategy to guide the process of urban conservation in Malaysia.

1.2 Urban Conservation and the Current State of Research

The literature on conservation of the built heritage and environment is vast and continues to grow rapidly. Much that has been written about the conservation of the built heritage and its environment relates to the conservation of individual buildings as pertinent to their listing process or to the technical aspects of the repair of fabric.

However, literature specifically on the conservation of areas is surprisingly limited (Larkham and Jones, 1993). It is largely outside standard bibliographies and is very elusive (Larkham and Larkham, 1996). Despite information technology, finding out about what is occurring within conservation areas, in particular, is not an easy task. Most

---

9 For more recent work see all of Larkham in the bibliography.
10 For more recent works see for example, Mills, (1994); Feilden, (1976) and (1996); Marks, (1996); Earl, (1997); Delafons, (1997); Jokilehto, (1999).
literature about conservation areas is to be found in planning journals (such as RTPI, The Planner), legal (JPEL, JEPM)\textsuperscript{12} and professional journals such as the English Heritage's \textit{Conservation Bulletin} and \textit{Context}, the professional journal of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation. English Heritage notes on 'Conservation Area Practice: Guidance notes on the management of Conservation Areas' (English Heritage, 1995) and the note on 'Conservation Area Appraisals: Defining the special architectural or historic interest of conservation areas' (English Heritage, 1997), have been extensively referred to by many workers researching in this field.

These papers are 'limited' in that their discussions are directed at readers or audiences of a particular profession. They generally lack the holistic approach that multi-disciplinary conservation practice demands.

Issues relating particularly to the designation and management of conservation areas are increasingly becoming an area of special study in university departments. One such department, which specialises in architectural conservation research, is the Centre for Heritage Policy, York University. The Department of Geography, University of Birmingham, has conducted research into the practice of urban conservation\textsuperscript{13}. More recently the University of Central England in Birmingham, Faculty of Built Environment hosted the conference 'Conservation Areas -Issues And Management' to promote a more general discussion of the issues of appraising, designating and managing conservation areas and the relationship of conservation areas to local plans (Larkham, 1994). The question being addressed here is the potential conflict between conservation area designation and planning for development and growth.

The English Historic Town Forum (EHTF) is also active in promoting area-based conservation. Its conference, 'Townscape in Trouble: Conservation Area-The Case For Change' in 1991, debated the declining appearance of historic towns ruined by ugly alterations, all permitted development. The debate concluded that unless town-planning regulations are strengthened rapid deterioration will continue. The 1995 Bath Conference 'Making Historic Towns Sustainable' has highlighted the huge issues confronting all towns and cities. These include transport congestion and pollution, dereliction, inequality and

\textsuperscript{12} Journal of Planning Environmental and Law, Journal of Environmental Planning and Management.
\textsuperscript{13} For detail see bibliography for the series of articles, papers and research report by Larkham and others.
disenfranchisement. Social, economic and environmental factors and their interrelationship in the specific context of the historic city and its sustainability were discussed at length. The 1998 conference, 'Conservation Area Management: A practical guide', produced guidelines for the management of conservation areas.

The Civic Trust, for example, has suggested that "...the creation of conservation areas has done much to ensure that there is a heritage to build upon" (Civic Trust, 1988). Despite that success, however, there is a growing concern over the concept of conservation area designation and the management of conservation areas (Larkham, 1994). Reads' study of upper Bangor sharply criticises the British designation system and its management (Read, 1991, 1992a, 1992b). Reads questioned the principle of designation, whether an area is special before it is designated or whether it is designation that made it special. He also questioned the local authority's role and efforts in the enhancement programmes of the areas which have been designated.

The concept of built heritage conservation is now an accepted part of urban planning. This is a reflection of the widespread interest of the past, and how it is viewed, used, and changed (Lowenthal, 1985). There now exists a conserver society that creates its own landscapes (Relph, 1982), and which is made evident by the rapid growth of the conservation movement (Cherry, 1975) and local amenity groups (Lowe, 1977). One view is that 'almost everything that could possibly be said about conservation must surely, by now, have been said' (Chapman, 1975:365). The bulk of this literature however is in the form of case studies of specific cities or developments. There are comparative studies on conservation such as Gamston, (1975) that looked at the management of conservation areas following their designation. Oliver, (1982), on the other hand discussed the cultural issues in conservation implementation and how they affected the society concerned. McQuillan, (1990), discussed the impact of preservation planning in post-colonial cities. Larkham and Jones, (1993) and Barret, (1996) further discussed the growing problem of conservation areas in city centres and the changes in townscapes in relation to local planning management. All these studies, however, were undertaken from a western viewpoint to solve or address site specific problems.

There are a number of bibliographies of conservation literature on a world basis, for example that produced by Smith (1978), although they are still lacking in literature on conservation areas.

In the context of Malaysia there has been very little academic research undertaken in the field of built heritage conservation. There been some work undertaken by institutions of higher learning in Melaka, Penang and Taiping, mainly on a consultancy basis. The outcome of this research is not, however, readily available to the general public and is usually kept by the commissioning authority. Many of these studies tend to be superficial.

Similarly there have been various conferences (Urban Conservation, Penang, 1986) seminars and workshops (Heritage Conservation-NOW, Melaka, 1990), that have addressed the problems of conserving the urban heritage. Various proposals have been made on matters pertaining to the care and protection of the heritage but the implementation is yet to be seen. Most of the studies understood the importance of conserving the cultural heritage but their solutions, if any, were always inclined to Western methods of solving the problems without proper reference to the regional context. It is safe to say that the Malaysian studies to date have not been able to address the basic problems of conserving the diversified multicultural and post-colonial urban heritage that Malaysia has. The studies undertaken are too localised in nature and not wide enough to address the national problems. There are still gaps in this area of research and this study hopes to contribute by addressing the problem at national level.

1.3 Research Aims and Objectives

The aim of this study is to investigate how urban conservation is handled in Malaysia and to reassess current practices in line with the circumstances and requirements of the country as a whole. Specifically the study seeks to promote the designation of urban heritage areas as conservation areas, and as part of this exercise, to identify the type of developmental changes that threatens the integrity of historic towns. The study will also investigate existing conservation infrastructure and management in Malaysia as an example of the experience of post-colonial and Third World countries in general.
An important objective of the study is to achieve a general understanding of the rich history of Malaysia and its diverse cultural background and to establish the political, economic and social context within which conservation is practiced.

The study aims:

- *to understand* the purpose of, and approach to, area based conservation in an international context

and

- *to understand* the process, benefits and problems of designating specific areas of historic towns for conservation purposes.

In the context of Malaysia, the specific objectives are:

- *to examine* through interviews, the attitudes of politicians, policy makers, administrators and other influential groups to the conservation of the built environment at local and national levels;

- *to examine* current and potential threats to the built fabric of historic towns. Here the study will focus on the town of Taiping as representative of historic towns in many regions of Malaysia;

- *to assess* the capacity of Malaysian society to accept area based conservation as an integral part of its political, social, cultural and economic life.

Finally, the study will devise and propose a framework for an area-based designation and management of urban conservation areas appropriate to the future needs of Malaysia.

1.4 Research Design and Method of Study

The research programme was organised in the following stages (refer to Figure 1.2):

Stage One: Understanding the Concept

A review of the current conservation policies and legislation in the international context. Particular attention was paid to the management of urban conservation in the U.K. since, for historic reasons, this has had a great influence on the development of conservation
philosophy and practice generally in Malaysia. This review of policies is linked with an overview of the historical, institutional and administrative frameworks within which they operate.

Stage Two: Literature Search and Policy Evaluation

An analysis of published literature and policy documents in order to:

- to develop a theoretical and practical understanding of the major issues of urban conservation in Malaysia and the United Kingdom;

- to evaluate the present policies, legislation and administrative structures in Malaysian as they relate to urban conservation.

The reasons for focusing on the UK model of built heritage conservation was due to the historical links that Malaysia has had with the United Kingdom and the fact that many professionals, especially those in the government sectors who are at present employed in the senior administrative and management levels in Malaysia, were trained in the UK. This has made their understanding and the acceptance of the British approaches in conservation much easier. However, this is only a starting point for Malaysia needs to develop her own approaches to the conservation of her built heritage.

Stage Three: Field Study

During the field study in Malaysia, priority was placed on a single, comprehensive case study, carried out in the historic town of Taiping. Visual evidence from this town provided the basis for analysis of the developmental threats. (see Chapter 6: Case Study of Taiping). The field study was designed to make maximum use of the time available for fieldwork (eight weeks).

As part of the field study a quick listing survey of the built forms in Taiping town was carried out. The survey was carried out on selected properties within two threatened areas. One area selected is in the central business district and the other is in the residential corner of the town.
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Figure 1.2 Research Flow Chart: Research Framework.

1. Understanding the concept of Area Based Conservation
2. Identification of Research problems
3. Formulation of Aims & Objectives
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Stage Three
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Stage Four: Data Analysis

There were three data collection exercises in this study. One questionnaire was sent to Local Authorities and was designed to gauge the extent to which policies had been implemented.

Another questionnaire was designed to establish the views of local residents. The third exercise was a 'quick listing' of buildings in Taiping old town in order to assess their condition and determine the protection which could be offered to them through an area based conservation approach.

All questionnaire data collected was input into the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) computer programme. Initial frequency bar graphs were generated in order to gauge the tendencies of the respondent towards the questions asked. A cross tabulation was made against some of the more important results in order to find out the relationship between the various variables tested in the surveys and questionnaire.

The triangulation method was employed in the analysis of the data to reduce or eliminate the disadvantages of each individual approach, whether qualitative or quantitative, whilst gaining the advantages of the other, and of the combination and multi-dimensional view of the subject, gained through synergy. The triangulation method is useful in order to check all data and information that is acquired during the study. By executing the triangulation process all analysis results could be counter checked against one another. Whatever is lacking or weak in one set of information is supported and supplemented by others in the triangle chain (see Figure 1.3 ).
1.5 Access to Research Material in Malaysia

Access to Malaysia's published material on conservation issues is difficult to obtain. Some documents have been destroyed, and most of the published documents have not been catalogued.

Important Government documents are often classified, or many constraints are imposed before information can be made accessible, either to the general public, or bona-fide researcher. Access to such documents has to be approved by the highest appropriate authority and advance notification must be made. These documents, such as current Government policy-decision documents and culturally sensitive working papers, are usually only accessible to the public twenty-five to thirty years, after they have ceased to be active, and after they have been lodged in the National Archives. Recent and active
policy documents regarding the redevelopment of sensitive historic areas are treated with utmost confidence and are very difficult to access, especially if they involve the rights and privileges of local residents. This is due mainly to the sensitivity of issues involving the pluralist society of Malaysia. Also, the culture of research has not been ingrained in the mind of the Malaysian public nor in those administrating the government agencies.

Topographic maps and aerial photography are highly restricted documents. Copies of these documents are very difficult to obtain and require prior consent and approval from the Federal Police Headquarters in Kuala Lumpur before they can be released to the general public, even if it is for the purpose of research and academic study.

Members of the public on the other hand are also sceptical in divulging information regarding their property or in expressing their feelings about government policies, such as the reappraisal of the Control of Rent Act that affects their property, for fear of being reprimanded.

### 1.6 Significance of the Findings

The local authority questionnaire uncovered some interesting information about the conservation processes as managed by local authorities.

The quick listing survey on the other hand identified those areas suitable for conservation designation. The interviews with tenants and property owners enabled one to gauge their acceptance, awareness and understanding as regards protection of the cultural built heritage, which is a product of the country's post colonial history, generally, and urban conservation specifically.

It is hoped that the findings of this research will help pave the way for others, especially Malaysians, who are interested in the field of area-based conservation to understand the crucial issues that underlie the conservation processes in urban areas. Recommendations and proposals resulting from the case study and questionnaires survey as well as the stake-holders interviews, will also be useful in formulating an area-based conservation approach to future management of historic towns.
One practical outcome of this work is the proposed establishment of a Technical Conservation Unit in the Department of Public Works in order to undertake and execute the recommendations made here.

With a framework identified it is anticipated that conservation works and programmes will be better managed and that local authorities will be able to guide development in conservation zones and maintain the character and appearance of historic heritage towns. This will then ensure that Malaysia's built heritage is preserved for the enjoyment of future generations.

1.7 Structure of Study

Chapter One introduces the context and process of urban conservation in Malaysia. Research aims and methodology are discussed and the relevant literature is reviewed.

Chapter Two discusses Malaysia's rich and diverse culture and heritage as the wider context for urban conservation. The slow but important process of integration in its multi-ethnic and multi-cultural society is also discussed. Exploring and understanding the nature and characteristics of the country is important in understanding the actions, attitudes and perception of the society towards issues relating to redevelopment and conservation of the architectural built heritage and areas.

Chapter Three reviews the current issues and practices of cultural heritage conservation in Malaysia. The management of the conservation process and its relationship with the government administration and bureaucracy are discussed and constraints and problems are identified. The legal instruments pertaining to the conservation processes are discussed in relation to the responsibility and accountability of the various government departments and other related organisations.

Chapter Four reviews approaches to urban conservation internationally. Models used to identify and designate urban conservation areas are analysed as are the practices used to manage change and development in these areas. This analysis focuses primarily on urban conservation practices in the developed world. The aim of this analysis is to identify successful and appropriate practices which can be adapted as a basis for a coherent strategy for urban conservation in Malaysia.
Chapter Five focuses on the case study of a 'typical town', Taiping. The survey of shop houses and row houses undertaken in Taiping was designed to assess the condition of the buildings and identify changing local attitudes to urban conservation. This case study serves as an illustration of attitudes in similar historic towns in other areas in Malaysia.

Chapter Six analyses the outcome of Local Authority surveys and residents interviews. The results of the statistical analysis of the responses to the questionnaires are discussed and particular attention is paid to the attitudes and working practices of the authorities responsible for protecting the built heritage of historic towns.

The residents' responses to the questionnaires were also discussed in relation to the conservation efforts of the local authority.

Chapter Seven draws conclusions and recommends fresh approaches for the management of urban conservation in Malaysia at national and local level. Potential areas of further research are identified.

Chapter Eight recommends initiatives for future action.
CHAPTER 2

Malaysia: History, Government and Cultural Heritage

Understanding its history, government and cultural heritage
2 Introduction

In order to provide the reader with a context for the research, this chapter reviews the historical background, the present institutional and administrative framework and the cultural and architectural heritage of Malaysia. This review is important because, before one can understand why certain decisions, policies and measures are made or taken by the various authorities, one needs to understand the make up of Malaysia, a Federation of various small states, and its three-tier governmental system which favours the indigenous bumiputras'. Most of all, one needs to understand Malaysia's plural society with its multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and multi-religious population, which has contributed to the richness of her culture. All these factors mentioned above will influence the built heritage conservation processes in the country.

This chapter will thus introduce and explain the background to the development of conservation in Malaysia. In order to do this, the history of the country, especially that relating to the colonial periods, will be discussed in some detail. This is due to the fact that history and the colonialists have left some monumental buildings and urban forms that, together with a considerable amount of common everyday buildings, are now the subjects of conservation programmes in the country.

\[^{1}\text{Bumiputra is literally 'sons of the soil' or indigenous peoples, the Malays are synonymous with it and the indigenous population of the Borneo Island, the Kadazan, Bajaus, Muruts, Dayak etcs.}\]
In particular the British colonial period will be highlighted and discussed in some detail since it is the one which has chiefly influenced the legislative and conservation framework of the country and the way in which conservation movements are directed. This inclination towards British experiences and practices is not only peculiar to Malaysia but is also common and shared by other post-colonial countries, like India (Menon, 1989, 1993, 1994, & 1998) Australia (Freestone, 1995) and South Africa (Binckes, 1998), and Singapore (Lee, 1996 & 1997), who shared her historical beginning with Malaysia. The Malaysian experience also illustrates a number of problems faced by other new developing countries, especially those in the Third World, in adopting Western conservation ideals and methodology. At present there is also a debate about the need for a conservation charter for the Asian region - the Asian Charter, which would provide a new and more specific approach in conservation practices in these regions.

2.1 The Foundation of a Modern State

Location and Climate

Malaysia is one of the fastest-growing countries in South East Asia. It is situated almost in the centre of the South East Asian region. The Federation of Malaysia consists of The Malayan Peninsula which forms the southern part of the Kra Peninsula (Thailand in the north and the Island State of Singapore to the south) and the two Borneo states of Sabah (formerly British North Borneo) and Sarawak (formerly a territory of the Sultanate of Brunei) (see Figure 2.1). Modern Malaysia is a federation of thirteen states. Eleven of these states are in West Malaysia (Peninsular Malaya). The other two states, Sabah and Sarawak, separated by the South China Sea, are on the North coast of the island of Borneo, bordering Kalimantan, Indonesia and the oil-rich State of Brunei.

Lying between the Tropic of Cancer and the Equator and being in the South East Asian monsoon region, Malaysia has an equatorial maritime type of climate. This climate has a profound effect on the traditional timber vernacular architecture and the built environment. Building forms, materials and construction have evolved in response to the climatic condition.
West Malaysia receives rainfall in all seasons and the humidity is high (about 80%) due to the high temperature and high rate of evaporation, and rainfall is heavy (2500 mm/100 inches). Rainfall is seasonal in nature with varying amounts, and usually torrential.

Figure 2.1 Map above showing the location of Malaysia in South-East Asia and map below showing the component States of the Federation: 11 States in Peninsular Malaysia and two states in East Malaysia (Sabah and Sarawak).
This equatorial climate has a destructive effect upon the natural and traditional building materials of which much of the Malaysian traditional vernacular architecture is made.

**Historical Background of Malaysia**

The nation of Malaysia has a very recent history. Her recorded history only began in the early 15th Century (1400 or 1402) with the founding of Melaka, the coastal trading town, which became a great entrepot port and a trading centre for spices in that region of the world. The Sultanate of Melaka, which once ruled the whole of the peninsula and the land beyond the Straits, was a great empire, and at its peak 80 languages were spoken in the port of Melaka. With its expansion through conquest, and the spices that were traded in her port, Melaka not only became a major trading centre but was also a centre of culture and a meeting place, linking the people from East and West (Andaya, 1982).

It is internationally recognised that the history of modern Malaysia began here in Melaka. Melaka became one of the first British Straits Settlements (others being Penang and Singapore), when the British Colonial Administration (British Malaya), intervened in the local administration after the signing of the Pangkor Treaty in 1874. Melaka was also the place where news of an independent Malaya was first announced.

Malaysia gained her peaceful independence from the British in August 1957, and the Federation of Malaysia (Peninsular Malaya, Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak) was formed in 1963 with a Federal Capital Territory of Kuala Lumpur. Singapore left the Federation in 1965, while the two Borneo States (East Malaysia) retained special rights, which were granted, when they joined the Federation (for logistical reasons, they have been excluded in this study). Before independence, Malaysia was colonised by various Western powers (Portuguese 1511-1641, Dutch 1641-1795, British 1795-1957) and Asian powers (Indonesian 18th Century and the Japanese during the 2nd World War) who have contributed to the present richness of its cultural heritage.
Population and People

The country's population is multi-racial. The predominantly Malay population is indigenous. Of the 21 million 59% are Bumiputras ("sons of the soil"), Malays and other indigenous groups, 32% are Chinese, 9% are Indians & others. Just over half (54%) of the population are urban dwellers (World Bank, 1998). Malaysia has a very colourful culture as a result of her history and the multi-ethnic presence of the population. In addition Malaysia has a mixture of religious faiths. Malaysia's official religion is Islam, which is followed by most Malays, though other religions like Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity, Taoism and the Sikh religion are practiced freely.

A number of ethnic groups are officially recognised in the country, and combined for government reference into three major races: 'the Bumiputras' (Malays and indigenous people); the Chinese and the Indians (both non-Bumiputras). The dominant Malay ethnic group is largely involved in the bureaucracy or agriculture. Both the Chinese and Indian people are largely descendants from migrants who arrived after the mid-nineteenth century to work in the colonial economy, rubber estates and tea plantations. The Chinese are mainly urban dwellers (this is particularly important in later discussion of urban conservation areas), being particularly active in the professions and commercial sectors; Indians are prominent on the rubber estates, in the railway department, and also in the bureaucracy and professions (Andaya, 1982).

In general, Malaysia has successfully held the balance between its different ethnic communities while maintaining an economic growth which is the envy of many of its neighbours. Reconciling the often competing demands of ethnicity, culture and the sharing of economic resources will make conserving her cultural heritage a challenging problem. There has been only one substantial racial riot, on May 13th 1969. This however prompted the government to take drastic action, which resulted in the formulation of 'Dasar Ekonomi Baru', DEB (NEP-New Economic Policy) which tried to distribute the nation's wealth more evenly across the ethnic population and to restructure the balance of society (Sarji, 1996:405). Malaysia's racial composition has contributed to a political structure which seeks to combine all the various demands of ethnicity but with special privileges for the indigenous Bumiputras.
Malaysia's government is a federal democracy with a constitutional monarchy. The head of State, the Yang di Pertuan Agong, is a position, which is rotated among the nine hereditary Sultans in the peninsula states. Two of the states, Melaka and Penang, have Yang di Pertua Negeri or Governors as their head, appointed by the Prime Minister. Malaysia practices the three-tier system of government: the Federal Government, the State Governments and the Local Governments (see Figure 2.2). This practice poses some interesting problems pertaining to ownership of land and property, which in turn relate to conservation works pertaining to the built heritage. It also has a bearing upon the legislation and law governing the country.

**Figure 2.2 The Three Levels of Government in Malaysia**

- **The Federal Government** makes the entire Federal Bill and is enforceable through the whole Country.
- **The State Governments** make their own 'Enactment', which is tabled, in the State Legislative Assembly. All Federal Bills need to be adopted in the State Legislative Assembly, before they become enforceable in the State.
- **The Local Government** administration is under the jurisdiction of the State Governments; however they also answer to the Ministry of Housing & Local Government via the National Council of Local Government.

The State Governments, although they take their instructions from the Federal Government, are autonomous with exception only to defence, education, culture and to a certain extent religion. Land and matters incidental to land, is the prerogative of the States. The Federal Government however can legislate on State matters in order to promote uniformity of policy throughout Malaysia. This self-autonomy has caused some difficulties in implementing some of the Federal instructions down through the administration.

**Cultural Built Heritage**

Unlike her immediate neighbours, Malaysia does not have great monuments such as Indonesia's Borobudur, Cambodia's Angkor Wat, India's Taj Mahal or the Thai Royal Grand Palace (Chakri Maha Prasat). This is due partly to the fact that Malaysia's early built heritage was not constructed of stone or other non-perishable building materials.
Grand Palace (Chakri Maha Prasat). This is due partly to the fact that Malaysia's early built heritage was not constructed of stone or other non-perishable building materials. The tradition of constructing in solid building materials, brick and plaster, was only introduced during the western colonisation period. Even the great timber palace of Melaka Sultanate (1404-1511), which oversaw the administration of the once great empire, is nowhere to be seen at the present time. Recent discoveries however have uncovered some ancient relics in the Bujang Valley that date back to the 4th century BC but little is known about this monument of history. The only conclusive evidence was its relationship to the Hindu Kingdom (Buddhist/Brahmanic), that was once very widespread in this region. Thus, what Malaysia has in terms of urban built heritage is only the familiar everyday masonry domestic buildings built during the time of the western colonisation, and also some timber structures dating back to the pre-independence period, which still exist as the vernacular built heritage of the country.

Though Malaysia has long been independent from colonial administration, the relics of colonial architecture, Portuguese, Dutch and British, can still be seen in major administration centres, government buildings and institutions in the country. The British Colonial administration has largely contributed to the development of urban architectural style and town planning of the country. Other than the large government and administration buildings, which dominate the administrative capital cities, another dominant feature of the built heritage, which evolved during the British administration, is the "Malaysian shop-houses". Even though the idea and design of shop houses might have originated from Southern China, the planning and construction of these shop houses was related to rulings laid down by Sir Stamford Raffles, in Singapore in 1882 (Khol, 1984). Raffles was then the British Governor General of Singapore and the founder of Penang (Prince of Wales Island).

The "shop houses", as the name denotes, are the typical business-cum-dwelling premises of the urban Chinese mainly, though some Indians and Malays do occupy them. A related building type, the "row houses", is similar to English terraced houses and was first introduced by the Dutch in Melaka during their occupation there. These row houses, whether they are in Melaka or in Penang, are inhabited mainly by the Babas and Nyonyas (Straits-born Chinese men and women). Some of these row houses are very smart and elegant, with western style façades, denoting the status and wealth of their owners (Figure 2.3).
The Typical Malaysian (Chinese) shop house

There are some variations in the length of the building although there is a basic design code consisting of arcades, standard bay widths, building heights and roof structures. This has achieved a uniformity of space and scale, and the eclectic architectural detail creates the vivid and varied urban environment.

(Source: Gurstein, P. (1985), Malaysian architectural heritage survey, K.L., p. 95)
The shop-houses, which typify the urban built fabric and urban scene of many urban centres of Malaysian towns, are thus synonymous with the minority Chinese population of the country, hence the typology "Chinese Shop Houses". However, these shop houses are not really Chinese in origin even though their layout and decorations may have similarities with those of southern Chinese style in China. The shop house/row house main façade is typically Malaysian in features and it is easily identifiable as such.

The evolution of this house is localised in this part of South East Asia and the cultural mix of the population at the time they were built has influenced its design. As such the later design of these buildings have also included the Europeanised taste of their owners, who may have been lucky enough to have travelled overseas and experienced the architecture of the Europeans themselves. These variations are discussed in detail in a later chapter on the Case Study of Taiping.

Early History

The Malay Peninsula has a long history of occupation and settlement but not of permanent urban structures. The change occurs with the emergence of Melaka as a major trading port. Andaya, (1982:7), wrote that until the beginning of the fifteenth century AD, the history of what is now Malaysia is difficult to reconstruct with any real certainty due to lack of information. However, it is known that in prehistoric times aboriginal people inhabited the region. By the 2nd century BC settlers arrived from south of China to trade with settlements in the east coast of the Peninsula.

Hinduism and Buddhism were introduced during this early period. Buddhist states were developed in the north eastern parts of the peninsula. Indian traders began settling in the northern states of Kedah (Hindu Kingdom towns) and along the west coasts of the peninsula around the beginning of the 1st century AD. Old Kedah ('Kedah Tua' 5th – 14th C) is the only significant ancient Kingdom to precede that of Melaka. Its location is confirmed by Buddhist and Hindu temple ruins (brick and laterite block) in the Bujang Valley Archaeological Reserves (little was known about it until very recently). Later the Javanese also had their share of control over the Malay Peninsula around the period of the 14th century (1330-1350). As a result, Andaya went on further to conclude that there is a consequent inclination to consider the centuries before
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1400, the ‘pre-Melakan period’, as being of relatively little importance in the evolution of modern Malaysia.

Historians have tended to regard the rise of a great entrepot port, Melaka, on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, as an identifiable starting point for the Malay history. It is from this tiny former fishing village that the history of modern Malaysia was created. In fact the motto of the town is "Melaka where it all began". Melaka's favourable position on the Straits of Malaba makes it a potential trading entrepot port. The powerful trading Kingdom of Melaka (1402-1511) was established in 1402, by Parameswara, an exiled Sumatran Prince. The Malay Peninsula consisted of a few modest principalities, and was first subjected to the authority of the Sumatran Sri Vijayan Dynasty (670-1350). Later the Javanese (Majapahit Dynasty c.950-1478); and lastly the Siamese (Ayuthya Dynasty c.1368-1757) in turn took control of the Kingdom (Andaya, 1982:7).

In return for favourable trading rights, the Chinese Emperors extended their protection to the embryonic kingdom, allowing it to flourish. In time, the Empire of the Melaka Sultanate became the supreme maritime power in South East Asia and was world-renowned. In the West, because of the spice trade, it came to be known as the 'Venice of the East'. However Melaka's increasing prosperity attracted the interest of the European sea powers. The first of these powers was the Portuguese. On the 15th of August 1511 the Portuguese eventually captured the City of Melaka after a fierce sea and coastal battle. A century later, the Dutch in alliance with the Sultan of Johore, a dependant of the Melaka Sultanate situated in the southern tip of the peninsula, drove out the Portuguese. The Peninsula then became a Malay kingdom ruled by the Johore Sultanate.

In 1786 the Sultan of Kedah (a Northern Peninsula state), was persuaded to cede the island of Penang to the British East India Company for use as a trading post. This transfer marks the change of history for the Malay Kingdom into a British-dominated colonial administrated territory. Less than a decade later (1795), the British took over Melaka from the Dutch. In 1819 the British also acquired Singapore from the Sultan of Johore. Penang, Province Wellesley (the coastal mainland province opposite), Melaka and Singapore were ceded to the British Colonial Administration, and these places later became known as the 'Straits Settlements' (see Figure 2.1). Under the British
colonial administration these settlements developed and flourished during the period known as 'British Malaya' with Penang Island as the base.

2.2 The Colonial Periods

The Portuguese Period

Before coming to the Malay Peninsula, the Portuguese had already established themselves in the town of Goa, India (c.1460's). It is from here that they collected much valuable information regarding the city-state of Melaka. As a result of the Portuguese conquest of Melaka, the Malay ruling family and many of the royal subjects, including the powerful Muslim traders, deserted the town. Further south in the peninsula a new centre of trade developed in Johore, forming part of the Johore Kingdom. Melaka under the entire period of colonial rule would never regain its glory as the world's 'richest sea port' that it once was (Moore, 1996:6).

The Portuguese intermarried and their offspring are called 'Casadoes'. These Casadoes live together in a well-guarded community on the coast of the Strait of Melaka, "Kampong Portuguese" (Portuguese Settlement), away from the original settlement where their forefathers used to be (Jalan Tun Tan Cheng Loke, see Figure 2.4). These Portuguese descendants adopted and practiced the Malay culture and language but maintained their original Old Portuguese language.

During 130 years of their rule, the Portuguese converted the town into a fortified entrepot of world renown, even though the trade in the port was declining compared to the days of the Sultanate. They constructed a beautiful town in Melaka containing magnificent palaces, hospitals, a town hall for the Portuguese Council of State, five churches and narrow streets with large houses of timber. The Portuguese built a fort called A Farmosa, within which most of them lived. They also built a church, on St Paul's Hill, naming it the Church of the Lady of the Annunciation (a gazetted, ruined monument where at one time the body of St Francis Xavier was buried before being exhumed and reburied in Goa). Thus this site has a religious and historical significance not only to Malaysia but also to the world Christian religion.
Figure 2.4 Map and Plate showing Melaka at the beginning of the 18th Century.

Malacca town and fort at the time of the British attack in 1795, redrawn from an undated MS map formerly in the possession of the Malacca Historical Society, prepared after 1732, the year of the British occupation of the town. Significant changes occurred during this period. Note, I-A are the Dutch hospitals in the town, in name:
1. Frederik Hermitage
2. Mauritius
3. Wilhelmus (or Bent Vierheven) 1650s
4. Hermito Lusaka
5. Erminia
6. Victoria
7. Amsterdam
8. Ernestus Caumer
9. Middelburg & Visningen
B.1, the road to Lambong & Tanjong Kling
B.2, the road inland to Bunga Raya, B.3, the road through Banda Hill to St. John’s Hill.

Malacca at the beginning of the 18th century detail from the plate published by Francis Visscher (1725).
Most if not all of these Portuguese structures were either destroyed or ruined during the constant state of war and attacked by the locals, Javanese and the Dutch, during their attempt to regain the township. The British destroyed the last remaining ancient stronghold, the 'A Farmosa', preventing anybody else from recapturing this great port. All of the fort walls with the exception of the Farmosa Gate (a gazetted monument) were spared.

The Dutch Period

Under the Dutch administration, the town developed with many new secular buildings being constructed. The Town Square, with the Dutch Stadthuys (Town Hall or administration centre) was after 1641. This central building complex exists to this day, a testimony to their presence in this part of the country.

After an eight-year siege that caused widespread destruction of much of the Portuguese section of the city, the Dutch captured Melaka City in 1641. The destruction included the city walls and the Santiago Gate, (built by the Portuguese Viceroy, Alfonso de Albuquerque, in 1511 after the fall of the Sultanate of Melaka) and St Paul's Church (built by Duarte Coelho in 1521) the site of religious observances and preaching by St. Francis Xavier.

The Dutch brought along with them their own technology in building construction. Bricks (known locally as Dutch bricks) made of local clay, were introduced, as was the use of roof tiles (Dutch pan-tiles) for roofing materials. Delft ceramic tiles were imported from Holland and were later extensively used for internal decoration in the houses of the affluent Babas and Nyonyas\(^2\) and later in the Straits Eclectics Style shop houses and row houses.

Residential and business development (the first permanent urban form, row houses and the shop houses) on the Melaka riverside was influenced by the canal architecture of the Dutch. Unlike the Portuguese, who mainly confined themselves to the fort, the Dutch were the first extensively to set up permanent residential premises outside the fort area, on the other side of the river bank. These later grew into the most

---

\(^2\) These are Straits-born Chinese, believe to be the descendants of inter-marriage between the Chinese community, who originally came to Melaka as entourage of China's Princess Hang Li Poh and the locals. They adopted the Malay cultures and language but kept their religion.
prestigious addresses for Melaka. Settlements set up by the Dutch were divided according to the trades that the owner held. There was a street designated for gentlemen (Hereen Street) with beautiful town houses (Row Houses) and the 'workers/laymen street' (Jonker Street) with shop houses where the owners worked and lived in the same building. Thus this was the very first permanent urban centre created in Malaysia by the Dutch. It was this area that the State of Melaka identified later in their Local Plan as the area for designation as a conservation zone. In fact due to the historical and cultural significance of the sites and these structures, the whole city of Melaka has been proposed by UNESCO representatives to be included in the world heritage listing (Star, 1998:18 & New Straits Time, 1998).

The British Period

A century and a half of British dominance succeeded the Dutch administration era. While Melaka was in the hands of the British, she was functionally transformed into a restricted region of cash crop production (rubber). She also became a dumping place for Indian convicts from the Indian sub-continent (earlier British colony) who were later to work the rubber plantations. This coupled with the fact that the British (English East India Co. c. 17th C.) chose Penang, due to its closeness to the more established British bases in India, as their new administrative and trading centre, led to the total decline of Melaka as a trading port.

When the British first arrived on the peninsula in 1786, with the landing of Captain Francis Light on the island of Penang, Melaka was still under the Dutch. In 1795 the Dutch temporarily transferred the administration of Melaka to British care, while they were fighting the Napoleonic War. Eventually, in 1824, Melaka was formally handed to the British by the Dutch through the Treaty of London (Anglo-Dutch Treaty) in exchange for Bencoolen, the Dutch stronghold in Indonesia. This marks the total dominance and the beginning of British influence and control in the Malay Peninsula.

The British contribution to the development of the town was to reclaim the historic Shorefront (burying hundreds of years of history) and later they reclaimed the whole shoreline, northwest of the town (presently the Old Town conservation zone). This extensive land reclamation, which was only to provide Melaka with an open green, has not only destroyed the historical and cultural significance of the area, but also has
changed the character and drastically distorted the sense of place by pushing the coastline some distance away from the famous historical fort. This reclaimed site is the site where the famous historical sea battles between the locals and the Portuguese and later the Dutch (as can be seen in the illustration in Figure 2.4) took place.

The British were the first to introduce to the local urban residents (Chinese and Babas mainly) a 'new' Western style of architecture. The Classical and Palladian styles in particular became a status symbol for the then western-influenced and educated opulent Babas and wealthy Chinese families. They adopted the elaborate Greek and Roman orders and used ornately decorated window frames and details, such as columns, pediments, parapets and cornices in their house buildings. They thus transferred the style of the utilitarian shop houses and 'row houses' in which they lived, into what is known today as, the 'straits eclectic style'. This architectural style was to become the dominant feature in the urban architectural built form of most other urban centres in Malaysia.

By a series of treaties, between 1873 and 1930, the British colonial administrators took control of the foreign affairs of the nine Malay Sultanates on the peninsula. The Pangkor Treaty of 1784 marked the beginning of the British Residential administration in Malaya. The system of administering the newly occupied territories (see Figure 2.5), the Federated Malay States, using Malay administrators and British advisors, was encouraged and proposed to the country that was to become known as British Malaya. This was probably the reason why so much of the British administrative system, policy and legislation is embedded in the present Malaysian bureaucracy and this legacy is still being carried on.

It was during this period of British rule that many Chinese and Indians were brought in to work in the tin mines and in the rubber plantations respectively, which the British had just opened up. These developments facilitated the Peninsula's transition from a trading outpost to a commodity producer in line with the British Colonial Administration policies of 'British Malaya'. Due to this, Malaya became the jewel in the British Empire in the later years of the 19th century. The British employed a 'divide and rule' strategy, ensuring that the Chinese immigrants that they brought in to work the tin mines were encouraged to stay in commerce while the indigenous Malays were trained for government service. This strategy has not only led to the segregation of the society
but also had the significant effect of separating their dwelling places, the Chinese in the newly open urban centres, and the Malays in the rural villages. This segregation has also ingrained via colonial stamp of identifying races by their occupation, which was one of the issues in the formulation of the NEP and VISION 2020 policies (Chapter One).

Figure 2.5 Map showing the territories during the British Colonial Administration of the Malay Peninsula - ‘British Malaya 1786-1910’.

2.3 Malaysian Society, Culture and Heritage

As a result of its complex history, Malaysia is a multi-ethnic and multi-religious society, composed of peoples of very diverse origins and cultural traditions. It is important to explore this diversity a little further, because of its influence on urban development and the build up of the country's urban built heritage. In terms of urban conservation this issue is also related to the question of the nation's architectural identity and whose and which heritage is it priority to conserve. It is also important to have an understanding of the society's culture and heritage in order to comprehend the 'conservation dilemma' or 'the conservation-redevelopment conflicts' that Malaysia and many multi-racial Third World countries are experiencing today. This was further complicated by the plurality of the cultures within the city itself, with each ethnic group claiming its unique heritage, and the legacy of the colonial (especially the British) influences on the urban landscape (Kong & Yeoh, 1994).

As a result of freedom of worship guaranteed under the constitution, one can find mosque, temple, shrine and churches located almost side by side even on the same side of the street. For example in Jalan Kapitan Keling (Pitt Street) in Penang and Jalan Tokong in Melaka, all the four main religious houses of worship are located on the same street. A number of these structures are architecturally magnificent buildings and some of the 'old ones' have been gazetted as the Nation's architectural heritage.

The fact that Islam is Malaysia's national religion has had a profound effect on the conservation strategies and policies of the country. Conservation works that are contradictory and offensive to the practice of religion are avoided and not carried out. However, this does not mean that the government does not support the conservation of buildings of other religious faiths. Testimony to this was the gazetting of the Cheng Hoon Teng Chinese Temple in Melaka, the Armenian Church, and Sri Mahariamman, an Indian Temple in Penang, and various other places of worship of other religions.

The Multi-Cultural Society

The Bumiputra consist of highly differentiated groups. There are three broad categories: (i) the aborigines (orang asli), (ii) the Malay-related, (iii) the non-Malay related. The orang asli (indigenous people) are the oldest element of the population but survive only in small and scattered numbers, mainly in the peninsula. The Malays
form the predominant ethnic group in the Malay Peninsula, a substantial minority in Sarawak and a smaller group in Sabah. The third or non-Malay bumiputra category includes the ethnic groups found outside the Peninsula in Sarawak and Sabah. In Sarawak, the largest of these are Iban who also form the largest ethnic group in the state, while others include the Bidayuh, the Melanau, the Kenyah Kayan and Bisayah. In Sabah, the Kadazan form the largest single ethnic group, while the Murut, Kelabit, and Kedayan form the minorities. These groups represent people of the same stock who entered the country during the early migration. In the Nineties, when the National Economic Policy was launched, there were another two groups of people that were accorded bumiputra privileges; they are the Portuguese descendants and the Babas of Penang and Melaka.

In the Peninsula this third non-Bumiputra group also includes the Chinese and the Indians, with much smaller communities made up of Arabs, Sinhalese, Eurasians and Europeans. Chinese and Indian contacts with Malaysia go back a long way but there was no substantial permanent settlement in the country by these two groups until the nineteenth century. The Chinese Baba community of Melaka was an exception. They could trace their ancestry to sixteenth century Melaka and had built permanent masonry living accommodation in the old town area, which can still be seen to this day.

The Chinese population of Malaysia derived largely from South China, with the Cantonese and Hokkien forming the largest dialect groups. These Chinese are well known for their entrepreneurial aptitude and hard work. They were specialised and were well versed in trading and commercial activities and hence lived mainly in the new town centres created by the British administration. It was also the Colonial administration policy to keep the Chinese close to them, apart from their supervisory role on the plantations and tin mines, and away from the indigenous Malays who were considered the more permanent residents of Malaya (Noorizan, 1995:46). This segregation, coupled with the policy of encouraging new land settlement, introduced by the British, has led to the Chinese community living in the newly opened business districts, which later grew into the commercial hubs of the areas and eventually became the developed urban centres and towns. Consequently the Malays were held back in the villages or suburbs where they owned the land and on which they built their traditional homes and travelled to work and shop in the urban town centres.
Amongst the Indians in Malaysia the largest group are the Tamils from South India and Sri Lanka, with significant Sikh and Malayalee minorities. Originally mainly from Madras, the majority of them speak Tamil, Malayalee and Telegu. These variations make them a less homogeneous society due to the existence of distinct languages and customs among the various groups. With respect to the structure of the Indian society, one obvious situation indicated by Rao (et. el. 1977:44) is that there was not much interaction and communication between the small middle class (the higher paid professionals and entrepreneurs) and the large working class (plantation workers). This is also due to the "caste" system that they inherited in the homeland, which is still practised in this new land.

These Indian plantation labourers are generally contented with their isolation and homely environment, placed upon them by the British plantation owners, on the rubber plantations. Hence, they have tended not to seek a higher economic power. As a result, the vast majority of them has been, and still is, in low income and unskilled occupations. There is also the general perception, among the Indians themselves, which regards Malaysia as a temporary place of residence. Their intentions of returning to their country of origin after gathering enough wealth are inevitable. This accounts for the temporary nature of their settlements in the rubber plantations, moving as and when they are required by the plantation management. The middle class Indians are sometimes employed in the Government bureaucracy.

Other Minorities

Other minority races in Malaysia are the 'peranakan' Babas, Chittys and the Portuguese. The Babas (men) and Nyonyas (women) are basically Chinese in origin. Some claimed them to be the descendants from the intermarriage of the Chinese entourage (handmaidens), who accompanied the Chinese Princess Hang Li Poh when she married the Sultan of Melaka, with the locals. However Khoo, a Professor of Malaysian history, would like to think otherwise. He argues that the issue is of male Chinese and local women, rather than Chinese women and local men (Khoo, 1998:4). The difference between these Babas and the typical Chinese is that, unlike the pure Chinese races, true Babas and Nyonyas do not speak any of the Chinese dialects.

---

3 Peranakan is a term use to denote those born locally through mixed marriages, by the very early immigrants with the locals and these groups of people assimilated into the local culture.
They speak the 'peranakan Malay' (Malay language with Chinese slang words included) which typifies them. They practice the Malay culture and customs (food and dress, especially for the women) but have kept their choice of religion.

The ‘Chitty’ or Indian peranakan (born locally) are similar to the Babas and Nyonyas in their racial evolution (Khoo, 1998:4). They were the descendants of the Indian trader community which intermarried with the local women, adopted and practiced the Malay culture and customs, spoke the Malay language but remained Hindu in religion. However, they should not be mistaken with the Chettiar (Indian moneylenders), who live in the urban town centres and who are synonymous with the business of lending money with high interest charged. Differentiation should also be made with the Indian Muslim community in Melaka and those that came to Penang (the Mamaks), who have easily assimilated with the Malays.

The Portuguese Eurasians (Khoo, 1998:4) are another unique peranakan community of Malaysia. Initially these groups of people claim to be pure descendants of the Portuguese community who once lived in and stayed in the Malay Peninsula after the conquest. This group of people settled in a particular area, known as ‘Kampong Portugis’ (Portuguese village), especially reserved for them by the State Government. This close knit community also adopted and practiced the Malay culture and customs but not to the same degree as the Baba and Chitty. Due to their long association with the country this Portuguese community has been accorded some privileges similar to the Bumiputras.

Thus, historically, the different groups of people in Malaysia are not only divided by race, but also by religion, culture, customs, dress or even food (food is an important aspect of culture). In addition, occupation and living areas also divide them. These diversities are more prominent in rural areas, where each racial community lives in a world of its own. Assimilation into the mainstream community is still difficult. This situation is related to the strong sense of community spirit and the sense of kinship and belonging to the community that they still adhere to.

Due to the multi-racial and multi-religious make up of its people, one can expect to find a variety of places of culture and worship in every corner of Malaysia, mosques for Muslims and temples for Buddhists and Hindu, and churches for Christians. There are
also distinct variations in their domestic architectural styles, with the indigenous Malays living in traditional vernacular houses, which are built on stilts and of timber with perishable coverings, in the kampongs (villages), while the Chinese live in the double-storey masonry shop-houses in urban city centres. The Indians on the other hand mostly live in the 'barrack style' accommodation built by the 'British plantation Managers'.

Malaysian Cultural Heritage

With the diverse cultural background of its people, Malaysia has inherited a diverse culture and cultural heritage, which has made the conservation of its cultural artefacts very complicated. This is related to the fact that Malaysia aspires to find a common denominator that would combine or merge all these cultural traits into a single Malaysian cultural entity or 'National Culture'. In the efforts to search for this national cultural identity, the built heritage has been viewed as one dominant feature that would fulfil this ambition and an understanding of what constitutes cultural heritage is vital before one could sum up Malaysian cultural heritage. Restoring and conserving buildings and areas is one way of ensuring that the city does reflect our identity, this is the case of Singapore, Malaysia's nearest neighbour (URA, 1989:21), and will thus preserve the cultural heritage.

Cultural heritage, as defined by the Oxford dictionary is, "...all that it inherits from its forebears". This means that whatever things are handed down by the previous generation to us in the present will be classified as cultural heritage. Cultural heritage in the context of conservation consists primarily of "cultural goods", movable and immovable, be it a self-standing monument or a historic settlement (urban or rural), or an archaeological site. It also include "cultural landscape", and "human and natural environment", in so far as it is an integral part of "living culture" demonstrating various cultural values (Noguchi, 1994:7). Cultural heritage can also be tangible and intangible, and this study mainly deals with the tangible cultural heritage.

In conservation work there is also cultural built heritage. The World Heritage Convention (World Heritage convention, 1972), defined cultural built heritage as groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from
the view of history, art or science. Outstanding universal value in this context means that it must be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement which is representative of a culture and which has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change. It is one of the objectives of this study to understand and manage these changes in order to maintain the integrity and homogeneity of the settlements or towns concerned, preventing the loss of character and appearance and a sense of a place in history. In this respect Lichfield (1996:260) goes further to define cultural built heritage as that part of the man-made (built), immobile physical stock, which any particular society has deemed to be cultural. Lichfield has also included the whole conservation area in this definition. Thus the urban conservation area, which is the subject of this research, is also part of one’s cultural heritage that needs to be protected.

In comparison with its neighbours, Thailand and the other Indo-China countries of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, the size and extent of Malaysia’s early cultural heritage evidenced by historical monuments and archaeological sites is very small. The most important archaeological sites are located in an area loosely described as the 'Lembah Bujang' in the Northern state of Kedah, where remains of early Hindu shrines and temples dated from the Hindu-Buddhist period of the 14th and 15th centuries, were discovered by James Low, the British Resident. Generally most of these cultural artefacts, however, are hidden in dense tropical jungle or have been destroyed as a result of agrarian development or capital construction.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, mostly as a result of the different periods of colonisation mentioned above, there are numerous examples of built heritage and sites of considerable importance and worthy of conservation. These built heritage and other sites are closely related to the historical development of townships and of Malaysia as a nation. Even though they are only now being recognised as an important component of Malaysia’s cultural heritage, it is vital to plan their conservation straight away.

In pursuing this goal, the government, in August of 1971, formulated Malaysia’s National Cultural Principles (*Dasar Kebudayaan Kebangsaan*). This was done by the then Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sport (MoCYS, 1971), realising the need to provide guidelines upon which the basis of the Malaysian culture was to be based.
The criteria below were finally accepted as the criteria of Malaysian National Culture:

- must be based upon the indigenous culture of the people of the region;
- other cultural traits may be accepted to be incorporated in the national culture if it is found to be suitable and reasonable to do so;
- Islam is the important fundamental in the formulation of the National Culture.

In principle the government, through this Ministry, encourages and supports any culture that developed and expanded from within the country. It follows from this approach that 'imported cultures' are not welcome and are discouraged from assimilating into the national culture. However, the Malaysian government's moves to find Malaysian roots and national identity was perceived by some quarters from the Western World as an erasure of historical evidence. This was observed by Brian Shaw (1997:173), in his study of urban heritage, development and tourism in South East Asian cities. In this study Shaw, said that:

"...in prescribing the link between national identity and heritage as part of the ideology of modern nationhood, the Malaysian government has distanced the country's history from the colonial and immigrant dimensions of its past."

This is not true. The intention was to strike a balance between the indigenous architecture and the predominantly colonial architecture of the urban centres and areas. This process is also a part of the Government's efforts to focus on the indigenous Malay component of the built environment while balancing it against colonial elements. This is a complex process and is not always successful.

In May 1986 a national seminar, with the theme of "National Strategy for Conservation" was held in order to formulate the nation's strategy for the conservation of the nation's built heritage. In line with a recommendation of the seminar, "the Badan" (Badan Warisan Malaysia - Heritage of Malaysia Trust) submitted to the government a memorandum for the National Conservation strategy. Following from that memorandum the government then, in January 1987, set up a working committee to 'research' and propose principles for conserving old buildings, traditional architecture and historical sites. The working committee however was to be guided by the definitions as stated in the (outdated) Ancient Treasure Trove Ordinance 1976 (Antiquities Act), namely:
• having importance from historical or age value;

• the importance of a unique architecture depicting the development of the nation style;

• the importance from an economic or political perspective, such as the residences of the nation's leaders, and residential buildings that could attract the interest of the tourist.

Cultural Built Heritage (Architectural Heritage)

If the multi-ethnic and multi-religious factors are not enough to cause 'confusion' in the Malaysian culture, the diversity of Malaysian architectural styles compounds the problem. The Colonials and the immigrants alike not only brought trade and their culture, but they also introduced their building construction techniques and styles into the newly developed urban centres. The architecture developed through trial and error to accommodate their 'foreign' needs and requirements but at the same time adapting to local conditions and climate. As a result they created a colourful blend of architectural features and townscape. In short Malaysian urban built heritage consists of a variety of building forms which are in itself unique and beautiful (see Figure 2.6).

Malaysian architectural style can be categorised into two distinct types

• the traditional and vernacular: indigenous, located in the rural areas and the interior, basically constructed of perishable materials, timber, and the building is usually built on stilts.

• the modern and contemporary or colonial architecture: located in the developed urban areas and city centres, basically consisting of the public business buildings, shop and row-houses which are constructed of brick and mortar with clay tiled roof.

The traditional and vernacular architecture of Malaysia is based upon the architectural style of the Malays with slight variations in style as one moves up and down as well as east to west of the Peninsula (see Figure 2.8). As one moves up the Peninsula the style is influenced more by the Siamese architecture, which is very visible in the rural vernacular architecture, while as one moves down the peninsular the style is more inclined towards the Indonesian architecture. Some of these buildings are being preserved but because of their location and structural materials they are difficult to preserve.
The Straits Eclectic

The Straits Eclectic style can be seen in the traditional Chinese shophouses. This hybrid compradoric style often shows the opulence of ornamentation in their facade treatment.

The Anglo-Indian Influences

The local Anglo Indian style has an eclectic blend of Palladian motifs, with Sino-Malay influences in terms of unglazed half-round tiles and the scorah, which is sometimes eliminated in its use.

Chinese Clan and Association

Building

A clan temple built and used by many Chinese associations for ceremonial and social functions, with varied designs in terms of ornamentation and built form.

Figure 2.6 The Malaysian Building Archetypes.

From traditional to colonial to immigrant to the present day successful assimilation of the Straits Eclectic style.

The Malay Rural Vernacular

A typical Malay vernacular house of hip roof, timber panelling, raised above the ground level, provides an atmosphere of tranquility in its rural setting.

The Moorish-Influenced Institutional Building

The Islamic of the Malay Sultanate are, grander in scale and are often of masonry construction occasionally with European and Middle Eastern influences.

Dutch Influences

The most notable examples of Dutch influences can be seen in the Christian Church and Stadthuys building in Malaya.

The Malay Palace (Istana)
A Malay house with steeply pitched roof, deep overhangs, raised on stilts and entered by a ladder and sometimes manned steps. Materials, like war, bamboo, rattan, and timber are readily available from the luxuriant tropical jungle.

Despite the brief history of nation-building, Malaysian Architectural Heritage is a consequence of its trading and immigrants influx, it has a rich and complex multi-symbolic, cultural and religious context within the umbrella of a predominantly Islamic priority. Without a systematic survey and analysis, the heritage usefulness to contemporary society remains untapped.

The Mosque
An example of a mosque with onion-shaped domes and minarets, inspired by mosques in India and the Middle-East. They are oriented to face Mecca, as required by the Islamic religion.

The Chinese Shophouse
Six-storied plinth area of a terrace house with timber bars locked into the door head, windows with metal bars and lowered panels, ventilation openings and glazed wall tiles.

The Chinese Temple
A typical Chinese temple with covered overhanging eaves and adorned ridge, lantern, etc., apart from other symbolic ornamentations.

The Indian Temple
The entrance to an Indian temple where the various statues of deities and goddesses are arranged in a rich sculptural form of multiple colours.

The European Church
A typical example of a cathedral church with religious emblems, stained glass and lowered windows, arches, etc; all designed around a cross-plan.

(source: Yeang, K (Dr.), Tropical Urban Regionalism: Building in South East Asian city, a MIMAR Book, Concept Media, p.21).
These vernacular buildings include the palaces, religious buildings and residential buildings but the most prominent type is the dwelling house, which has many regional variations (see Figure 2.7 & Figure 2.8). These buildings constructed of 'perishable material', such as split bamboo wall panels, attap (woven sago plant leaves) roof covering and timber, are also fast disappearing especially when they are located in urban city centres, but if they are located in the interior they are very much better protected.

However, due to the rapid process of development and urbanisation there is great pressure to 'change' these traditional buildings to accommodate requirements of modern everyday life. However, this subject is beyond the scope of this study.

Figure 2.8
Map showing the regional variation of rural vernacular architecture: traditional built form.


On the other hand, most colonial and immigrant buildings that were built in the past reflected the current architectural style of Europe at the time, blending with the local tradition. As such there exist the Victorian, Mock Tudor, Dutch Renaissance, Euro-Islamic (Moorish), the well-known Straits Eclectic and others (see Figure 2.6). Most of the colonial-era buildings were grand buildings built as colonial administration offices, railway stations, or post, telegraph and land offices. When the colonial administrators and immigrants left these buildings, conditions began to deteriorate and eventually some of them were dilapidated. This situation has been highlighted by 'the Badan' (Malaysian Heritage Council), in their survey handbook Malaysian Architectural
Badan' (Malaysian Heritage Council), in their survey handbook Malaysian Architectural Heritage Survey' (BWM, 1985). The only consolation for the situation was that most of these grand buildings are now owned by the government. Although they are quite well cared for and maintained, they are not necessarily conserved. Sometimes the government departments are also the culprits in destroying the built heritage without even realising the destruction they have caused (e.g. Kelang Municipal Council constructing their eight-storey headquarters in the gazetted historical complex of Kota Raja Mahadi-a historical fort). Alteration and refitting in these buildings to suit modern requirements also results in much damage to the fragile building fabric.

The situation is, however, different for individual private buildings. The conservation of these types of property has not received sufficient attention. These structures are mostly unprotected and fall prey to the developer’s whims and fancies and more often than not they are demolished without a trace. In order to locate these buildings, local academic institutions undertook a preliminary survey of the heritage building stock in 1992/93. MoCAT via its Department of Museum and Antiquity, commissioned Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) and Institute Teknologi MARA (ITM), and with the co-operation of Majlis Warisan Malaysia (Malaysian Heritage Council-MHC) and the MoHLG, to undertake this momentous task. A total of 20,000 buildings located in 263 towns, which were divided into five zones (North, South, Central, East and West) in West Malaysia were surveyed (UTM, ITM & MWM, 1995: 3-4). This exercise was done to document and compile the pre-war building list and nothing further has happened. The lists still sit in the Museum Department waiting to be sorted out, selected, categorised and ‘gazetted’ (protected by legislation) in order to accord them the necessary protection. Table 2.1 shows the number of pre-war heritage buildings in the various towns that have been surveyed and Table 2.2 shows the ranking in terms of the number of these buildings existing in the capital towns of the various States.

Although the traditional rural architecture is at risk, what is more pressing at the moment is to preserve, conserve, restore and maintain the historic fabric of urban centres. These structures have been under economic development threats since Malaysia embarked on its massive and robust urban development and expansion programmes. Most of the urban built fabric is made up of pre-war shop-houses or row-houses (terrace houses), which were built of solid masonry materials (brick and plaster). They have been able to withstand the weather better and longer than the
traditional vernacular construction but without specific protection they will not stand the economic pressure.

Table 2.1 Total Number of pre-war buildings by States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johore</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedah</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelantan</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Territory (KL)</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaka</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negeri Sembilan</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahang</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perak</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>16.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perlis</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulau Pinang</td>
<td>5,057</td>
<td>24.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabah</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarawak</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selangor</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terengganu</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,876</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Syed Zainol, 1995a: 29).

Table 2.2 Ranking of Capital Towns having pre-war buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Town</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>4336</td>
<td>85.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandar Melaka</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>84.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuala Lumpur</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipoh</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>23.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuching</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>66.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seremban</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>44.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alor Setar</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>32.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johore Bahru</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>11.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuala Trengganu</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>58.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kota Bahru</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuantan</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangar</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kota Kinabalu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Syed Zainol, 1995b: 29).
This masonry shop-house building was the most common element of the urban scene or character in all Malaysian towns, the first indication of an urban settlement. Early Chinese immigrants, mainly, built these shop-houses and row-houses for their own use or contracted them to others. The basic shop-house form (Figure 2.9), built in all the small towns of pre-war Malaya, gave them the traditional appearance of continuous verandahways or 'five-foot ways' as they are locally called, with their regular rhythm of repeated pillar spacing and window grouping. Initially their façade and interior were utilitarian in nature but become more elaborate as the status of the owner increases.

It is this architectural form that gave the Malaysian town its familiar and unique character. The term shop-house describes their multi-purpose function, combining business/working areas on the front ground floor space with residential quarters at the rear and on the upper floors. Some of these buildings are very long in depth, with two or three internal courtyards in between, and are more than 100 feet in length. Others are more modest, perhaps only about 60 feet depth with at least one internal courtyard for ventilation. These shop-house buildings were built all over the urban centres of the country, almost identical in style and in their grid planning and layout. They are located in small as well as major urban centres where they form prominent townscape features, of which some are really historic, i.e. those in Melaka, Penang and Kuala Lumpur.

The historic town of Melaka, with its 'ancient' Dutch Town Hall (1641), its early Christian churches (St Paul's Church 1590, Christ Church 1753), its community of Portuguese population and its unique straits-born Chinese settlements, is one example of the few historic urban centres which has these buildings and is worthy of being designated as a conservation area. The Prince of Wales Island (Penang 1786) or Pulau Pinang's George Town was a more opulent township consisting of quality homogeneous and historic pre-war town houses and shop-houses built by members of the wealthy Chinese business community. Many of these buildings have very elaborate designs on their facades. Taiping (1874) formerly Klian (1840's) on the other hand is a more recent modern "planned town", with its grid system of road plan, shop-houses and planned public and private buildings, well distributed and placed in the planning of the town. Elsewhere there are also sites and places with prominent

---

4 The term shop-house or shophouse is based on the literal translation of a Chinese colloquial term. It has become common usage since 1950, Oxford Dictionary, 1979.
Figure 2.9 The Malaysian (Chinese) Shop Houses and Row Houses.

The traditional Malaysian shop houses are an important urban archetype in the early Malaysian town. Understanding their spatial morphology provides ideas for contemporary use making their conservation and reuse more meaningful and identifiable.

(Source: Yeang, Tropical Urban Regionalism: Building in south-east Asian City, mimar Book, Concept Media, p. 25.)
buildings of historical and architectural importance, some of which have been restored and rehabilitated and converted into museums and historical complexes.

The heritage properties mentioned above are located in a specific area of the town, usually in its central historical core. Due to their location and the demand for urban spaces these buildings or properties are vulnerable and are being threatened by economic development pressures; i.e. rapid process of development and urbanisation, thus making their conservation an issue to be discussed in this study.

2.4 Cultural Heritage and Cultural Tourism in Conservation

Tourism has always been a money-spinner in many of the world's growing economies and cultural tourism is one branch that is fast catching up. The revenue from tourism has also been able to support less productive industries and has also been able to support the building of infrastructure that is badly needed by many developing Third World countries. Although this is true, cultural tourism also has a negative effect on a country's fragile heritage, because most developing countries' systems of heritage management have not been well developed, to protect them from the accumulative slow erosion cause by the influx of tourists. Although more tourists means more money, they also mean more destruction and more loss of authenticity, value and character due to the haste to get things done quickly in order to bring the tourists.

In spite of this the tourism industry has also been given the main priority by the Malaysian Government since the term of the Fourth Malaysian Plan (RM-4: 1980-1985). This was done partly to balance the trade deficit of the country, since tourism does pay. It became the seventh main foreign exchange earner and has provided employment opportunities for the population. In the Sixth Malaysia Plan (1991-1995) tourism took second place in the foreign exchange earner, 2.7% of GDP (Peter & Fairclough, 1995:36), and some of this money has been allocated to conservation works.

Discussion with the secretary-general of MoCAT has revealed that cultural tourism was identified as the main tourism activity for the country's tourism industry. The major cultural tourism destinations for international tourists in West Malaysia are the old town centres like Penang and the historical city of Melaka. This is due to such towns 'colonial associations' and their early history of development in the country.
The tourism attractions in these places are actually the town centre itself, with its old townscape character and heritage buildings coupled with the historical settings in which these towns are located. However, due to the intense development in these areas in the past and at present tourists usually compete with the heavy daily traffic in the suffocated road networks. This problem needs to be addressed in the planning strategy of the local authority managing the area. In the context of Malaysia it would be pointless to protect and enhance this valuable cultural heritage if it cannot in return contribute to the economy of the area.

2.5 The Government and Administrative System

Before one can embark on any conservation work in Malaysia it is also important to know and understand the various strata of the government in order to comprehend the action taken and policy formulated by the various levels of government in securing the conservation process of the country. It is also important to understand the mechanism of authority of the government machinery, which affects and determines the conservation processes. This point needs to be discussed in some detail because it would affect whatever decision is taken to devise any conservation programmes for the country.

The Malaysian government is a government of federal parliamentary democracy, with a constitutional monarchy. The Federation of Malaysia is divided into two separate landmasses, West Malaysia or Peninsular Malaysia and East Malaysia. The special rights granted to East Malaysia means that they have their own special legislations pertaining to the cultural affairs of the state; for example the Sarawak’s Antiquities Ordinance (1954) and Sabah’s Ancient Treasure Trove Enactment (1977) respectively govern the conservation programmes in these States. These two States do not have to adhere to the Federal Antiquities Act of 1976 (Act 168), although they do try to accommodate the Federal Act when it concerns the national heritage.

Two States in West Malaysia (Melaka & Penang) together with the two East Malaysian territories are headed by Yang Di Pertua Negeri (YDPN), who are appointed by the Prime Minister, from among distinguished public figures. A hereditary Sultan heads the rest of the States. All these states have their equivalent governmental structure similar to the Federal Government, each with their own portfolio and executive
councillors (EXCO) and 'ministries'. Both the YDPNs and the Sultans are basically figureheads with mainly ceremonial functions. The Sultans have direct control only over the Islamic religion and Malay culture and customs within their territories. Depending on the States, the Chief Minister (CM - YDPN) or the Menteri Besar (MB - Sultan), who is a political figurehead, does the day-to-day running of the States via the State Secretary who heads the state civil service in the respective States. This system is again inherited from the British colonial administration service and modified over the years to take into account changes within the country's political structure.

The administration of the government itself is organised in three levels or tiers, the Federal Government (Appendix 2.1), the State Government, and the Local Government (Appendix 2.2). Each of these Governments has a different role to play in the administration of the country, details of which are described below, but they are all complementary to each other, with the Federal Government as the main co-ordinator and to a certain extent having the final persuasive say. In relation to conservation work and processes these three levels of governments contribute different degrees of control. The Local Government is the main implementing body under the (Federal) Local Government Act (Act 171:Pt.XII- refer Chapter Three) if the works are funded by the States, but the Public Works Department undertakes all projects that are funded by the Federal Government, refer to Chapter Three. Sometimes, the Museum Department executes some of the works, via appointed consultants.

Federal Government

The Federal Government through the Parliament controls external affairs, defence, internal security, civil and criminal law, citizenship, finance, commerce and industry, shipping, education, health and labour. The Federal Government may also make laws to promote uniformity of the laws of two or more States and it may also legislate on any subject at the request of a State Legislative Assembly.

The Prime Minister heads the Federal Government together with several other ministers in the various portfolio ministries. Even though the Federal Ministers deal basically with federal matters at the National level, sometimes they do have direct access to the State or Local Government level. One example is the situation whereby the Minister of Housing and Local Government has direct access to the Local
Government through the National Council of Local Government. This has enabled his office to pass on the aspiration and conservation programmes of the Federal Government, down to the Local Government directly. The Prime Minister on the other hand keeps a keen interest on what happens in the City Hall of Kuala Lumpur, where he has a strong interest in their policies pertaining to the development of the city (see Figure 2.10).

Figure 2.10 Diagram showing the hierarchy of three tier government administration.

*From 1997 the President's post, in some of the Municipal Councils should have been filled by an appointed person, which previously was designated to the Chief Ministers.

*In the District Council, the President (District Officers-DO) has the executive powers.
Both these situations have a bearing on the direction of conservation policy and what should and should not be conserved for the area. Many a time the Prime Minister's interventions have helped to save many valuable heritage properties in the area.

**The State Governments**

Historically the various States of Peninsular Malaysia were divided and partitioned as a result of the British Colonial Administration. The territories were divided into Straits Settlements, Federated and Unfederated Malay States and the British protectorate (see Figure 2.11). Because of the division each of these States have their own peculiar administrative systems, enact their own legislation and customary rights. After independence, the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur was added to the Federation and later Labuan Island, an offshore financial centre was also added to the Federal Territory. All Federal Bills or legislation need to be adopted in the State Legislative Assembly first, before they become enforceable in the State although the states are strongly advised to adopt this legislation.

*Figure 2.11 Illustrates the various divisions of State Government as a result of the British Colonial Administration in Malaya (British Malaya).*
Each State has an Executive Council, which deals with the non-federal matters, under their Chief Minister/Menteri Besar (CM/MB), who is answerable to the elected state assembly. The CMs are politically nominated by the Prime Minister, hold power in the State and run the State Government through a State Secretary (SS). In the past the CMs and the MBs by default headed the Municipal Council ('Majlis Perbandaran'), as the President ('Yang Di Pertua Majlis Perbandaran'). This situation is important because any decision taken at the Municipal Council is directly linked to the State Government and this not only hastens execution but will also be allocated the necessary support and funding from the State. This situation, however, will soon change when the Council President’s appointment becomes an elected post. In the District Council the District Officer holds the President post while for the City Councils like Ipoh and Johore Bahru and City Hall of Kuala Lumpur the head is called 'Datuk Bandar' (Lord Mayor), who is elected from among prominent public figures (Figure 2.10).

The Local Government

The Local Government consists of various District Councils, City Hall of Kuala Lumpur, the City Council of Ipoh and Johore Bahru and the Municipal Councils of the principal towns of the States (including those in East Malaysia; see Figure 2.12). These local authorities are State organisations but governed by the (Federal) Local Government Act. These local authorities who are also the Local Planning Authorities need to adopt appropriate clauses in the Federal TCP Act in order to enforce and execute planning applications, approval, and works pertaining to building conservation. The local authorities also use Act 133, 1976 (Federal Street, Drainage and Building Act) in their execution of duties, in which there are clauses complementary to building conservation.

Guidelines, pertaining to the execution of the proposed Bill, are also being prepared to complement the Act. These documents are the 'General guidelines for the Conservation of Building and Conservation Areas and the Technical Guidelines for the Conservation of Building and Conservation Areas'. Both these documents however are administrative documents serving as management guidelines to be read concurrently with the proposed Bill and should be used as a tool for implementing conservation works.
However if the "proposed Bill" fails to be made into law these guidelines have no legal backing. At the moment these guidelines have been introduced to the local authority officials via seminars and workshops and they are advised to follow them when executing built heritage conservation works.

Figure 2.12 The Local Government setup and related legislations governing the administration of conservation work.

(State setup and related legislations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>171, 1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Federal Law)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Source:- MoHLG, Dept. of Local Government, as of 25.08.1998).
Figure 2.13 The inter-relationship of government departments involved in the administration and management of built heritage conservation in Malaysia.

(1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (Parliament)
- Ministry of Housing & Local Government
- National Council for Local Government

(2) STATE GOVERNMENT
- WEST MALAYSIA
  - Perlis, Kedah, Pulau Pinang, Perak, Selangor, Melaka, Negeri Sembilan, Johore, Pahang, Trengganu Kelantan & Wilayah Persekutuan
- EAST MALAYSIA
  - Sabah and Sarawak

(3) LOCAL GOVERNMENT
- Local Government Act ACT 171 (1976)
- TCP Act
- SD&B Act 133
  - City Hall
  - City Council
  - Municipal Council
  - District Council

OTHER MINISTRIES
- Ministry of Culture, Art and Tourism
- Ministry of the Prime Minister's Department
- Dept. for Federal Buildings

FEDERAL TERRITORIES
- Federal Territory Act (ACT 267) & UDA Act
  - Kuala Lumpur City Hall (DBKL)
  - Labuan Island Develop. Authority (LADA)

STATE CONSERVATION ENACTMENTS
- (Melaka Enactment 6 & Johore Enactment 7)

Antiquities Act
- ACT 168 (1976)
- Department of Museums and Antiquities

Maintenance or contribute to the maintenance of historical buildings or sites & acquire any land, with or without building for purpose above.

Control and preservation of ancient and historical monuments, archaeological sites and remains, antiquities and historical objects.
2.6 Summary

From the brief explanation made in this chapter the reader can gather that the culture of Malaysia originated from an aboriginal animistic culture which has disappeared with little trace, after the population embraced Islam. Since Islam became the principal religion of the country there have been very few monumental structures. But, because of Malaysia's unique location as, the meeting point of trade between East and West, she has always been influenced by outside changes, which have created a multi-cultural blend of tradition and culture, brought in by traders and migrators. This has then been assimilated into the mainstream livelihood of the population and progresses into the present culture and customs of the Malaysian.

Although the indigenous Malay culture is still the dominant culture, other minority cultures are also respected and allowed to grow alongside the Malay culture. At present Malaysia is still trying to find a single 'National Culture' and architectural identity that will identify her multi-cultural population. Although this may not be the ideal solution to the present plural society, Malaysia needs to find her common roots to enable her to decide which part of her cultural heritage is worth conserving or deserves to be conserved at all.

When the Western colonialists occupied Malaysia, they not only brought peace and progress to the country but also developed the towns and villages. In the towns they built majestic and beautiful institutional buildings to house their colonial administration offices and headquarters which later became the architectural gems of the country. The colonialists also introduced masonry building construction for their living accommodation incorporating local design to suit the local weather. They also set building standards and rules for its construction and laid out the towns with infrastructure and amenities. Thus Malaysia's rich cultural urban fabric are in fact the products of centuries of trade, immigration and also colonialism, that were largely responsible for shaping the urban architectural heritage.

When the Western colonialists left, the locals took over these buildings. At first they began to demolish them, only to find out later that these built structures are culturally valuable and to an extent are 'Malaysian' in character and worth being conserved and acknowledged as part of the country's built heritage. This realisation was to spark the
beginning of the built heritage conservation movement in Malaysia, although there are still apprehensions against it. This is due to the fact that these structures were built, not by the indigenous people but by the colonialist, immigrant labourers and foreign settlers. Thus in the eyes of the indigenous locals these structures are alien and their demolition is inevitable in the process of nation building, an erasure of bitter memories.

Since the demolition of these pre-war buildings, or their neglect, would deprive the towns or urban areas of their essence, a policy approach for their treatment and protection needs to be established. Demolition of these structures would only erase a layer of the country's history, which is vital to the urban evolution of Malaysian towns. These structures not only have a visible surface value but there are also embedded values that lie beneath their visible surface which are culturally important to the history of the place. The importance of these embedded values of buildings that make up the fabric of historic towns, has also been expressed by Feilden and Jokilehto (1993, p.77).

"The value of a historic town is embodied in the material testimony of its stones and its structures, and often lies beneath their visible surface. This historical stratigraphy - the evidence and marks brought by changes in use over time, makes an individual building part of the urban context – constitutes the basis for establishing the criteria for its conservation".

The situation expressed above by Feilden and Jokilehto holds true for Malaysia today, but without a systematic survey and analysis it cannot be explained or understood. Time and alterations will no doubt eventually destroy these material testimonies, if nothing is done quickly to protect and save them from change.

Change in a developing urban environment is inevitable, but if the values, character and appearance of historic urban areas are to be maintained these changes need to be managed. Controlling the rate and nature of change in the urban system is one of the objectives of urban conservation. Thus, one therefore needs to understand the life forces of that system and the potential causes of its decay (Feilden and Jokilehto, 1993:82). An appreciation of an area-based conservation approach for the urban environment would help in the process of maintaining the existing scale of buildings, as well as their functional and cultural values.
Thus in highlighting the historical facts and development of Malaysia, the cultural background of her population, the built forms of her town or historical centres and the structure of her government organisation related to the conservation process, this Chapter has been able to determine the various deficiencies and limitations upon which one has to work in order to conserve Malaysian urban built heritage. These deficiencies and limitations are thus listed as follows:

- the plural society of Malaysia has produced a multi-talent culture and range of built forms that make up the architectural heritage of Malaysia;

- this diversity of cultural heritage belonging to the various multi-ethnic sector of the population brought about by the expansion and colonisation of the country poses a problem of selection and prioritisation for their conservation work;

- Malaysia urban built heritage does not consist of ancient monumental structures but consists mainly of ordinary domesticated buildings, built during the colonial period, which make up the urban townscapes;

- the urban architectural heritage of Malaysia was the result of town development shaped by the colonial administrators when they were constructing their colonial administration buildings and living accommodations;

- thus there are difficulties in identifying whose and which of these urban built heritage need to be conserved in relation to the colonial built form generated through the historical and urban development of town centres;

- combination of the three-tier governmental system of administration, Federal, State and Local Government, causes contradictions (priorities) and sometimes conflicts in the execution of conservation works, diminishing the responsibilities of local authorities;

- Malaysian built heritage conservation has an archaeological dimension rather than the protection of buildings in use.

These issues relating to the conservation of urban areas and the development of an area-based conservation approach will be examined and developed in the following chapters.
Conservation Issues and Processes in Malaysia

Understanding the processes & administrative framework
3 Introduction

In the last chapter, issues relating to the conservation process of the multi-cultural heritage of Malaysia were identified. This chapter will introduce the various organisations or institutions involved in the process of conserving Malaysia's built heritage and comment on the present state of the practice of conservation in the country. The chapter starts by describing the development of built heritage conservation in Malaysia and identifying some of the work that has already been undertaken. Subsequently, government programmes and policy will be discussed, together with the role of amenity societies and non-governmental organisations, in the management of the conservation process.

As mentioned earlier, the process of built heritage conservation is a relatively new subject in Malaysia, and not widely understood (Shah, 1988:vii). It is only in the last ten to fifteen years that a conscious appreciation of the subject has developed. Even then the term conservation has often been confused or associated with the conservation of the natural environment in terms of fauna, flora or endangered rare species of animals. Historically, steps for the conservation of monuments of cultural heritage were first realised after Malaysia's independence in 1957.

Most of Malaysia's early built heritage was destroyed, either during the besieging of the towns or through natural process of decay. Almost all of the earlier structures or
buildings were built of impermanent perishable natural materials. Thus natural weathering from the harsh equatorial climate left very little of the original structures or materials. Even the great timber palace of the once great Melaka Empire (discussed in Chapter 2) has disappeared without trace. The traditional culture of the indigenous Malaysian is another important factor.

Often reusable parts of the building, for example door & window panels, or carved screens, were dismantled and distributed by the original owners to family members to be incorporated as parts of the new dwellings, Figure 3.1. This practice is also associated with the age-old tradition of passing down heritage properties to the next generation, in order to keep family heirlooms. Preserving the ancestral maternal house by the youngest sibling of the family, has always been a part of Malay culture if not Malaysian society in general. For generations the ancestral home, be it in the town, even if it is not occupied, would still be maintained in a habitable condition for the family to come home to during ceremonial gatherings or religious festivals.

3.1 Conservation of the Malaysian Cultural Built Heritage

Developments in the field of cultural heritage conservation in Malaysia were very slow. They began with the establishment of a few Museums in the last quarter of the 19th century. The opening of the Perak Museum, in Taiping in 1886, Sarawak Museum in 1891 and Selangor Museum in 1907, placed conservation within a broader scope (Zakaria, 1994). However, it was not until 1953 that the need to preserve historical sites and monuments was really appreciated. This was brought about by the nationalistic sentiment for independence from the British that took place in Melaka and the search to find and re-establish national roots. The Melaka State Museum was established, primarily to monitor the conservation aspects of monuments in the State of Melaka (Zakaria, 1994) following these moves.

The slow process of heritage conservation was pointed out by the former Minister of Works, during his address at the seminar on ‘Heritage Conservation Now’, in October 1990. He said:

"Heritage conservation is relatively a new field in this country; we have limited technical expertise in conservation methods and techniques. This has resulted in slowness on the part, not only of the private sector but in some cases also among government and public agencies, in recognising the value and the need to protect and conserve our historic buildings" (Moggie, 1990:7).
Figure 3.1 Conservation Malaysian Style: Preserving building components for reuse elsewhere and maintaining them as family heritage and heirlooms is part of traditional Malaysian culture.

Gable end panels of a house (similar to the one in the photo (P1) on the right) being dismantled to be re-used again. Usually these components are given as gifts to next of kin (children) who are building new dwelling for themselves.

The dismantled timber tongue-and groove wall panel (P2) being re-erected in its new position in the new building.

Carved timber screens similar to the one in the photo (arrow-P3) on the right are dismantled carefully to be re-used in another location by others in another building.

(Source: Killmann, W., (et. al.), 1994, Restoration and Reconstructing the Malay Timber House, Forest Research Institute, Malaysia)
The Minister had thereby expressed his concerns over the indifferent attitude of the private sectors to conserving the nation’s built heritage. He urged the private sectors not only to strive for economic returns in all their development ventures but also to adopt a sense of public duty when carrying out work.

When Malaysia became independent in 1957, the first legislation concerning the protection of cultural heritage was introduced. This legislation was then known as the Antiquities and Treasure Trove Ordinance, 1957. ‘Muzium Negara’ or the National Museum, which was established in 1963, was later entrusted by the Government and empowered by the 1957 Act, to act as the official custodian of the Nation’s cultural treasures. The Department of Museums and Antiquities (DoMA) was then under the direct administration of the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sport (MoCYS). By the 1970's the Museum Department realised that there were considerable inadequacies pertaining to the previous act, and a new act, the Antiquities Act (Act 168), 1976, was passed as a replacement, (Zakaria, 1994:65). This Act is still the main legal document used to protect all cultural heritage in Malaysia.

Since the introduction of this Act, it is disappointing to note that there has been little accomplished in the field of built heritage conservation, particularly in the field of building and area conservation. The Act is basically concerned with 'Antiquities' rather than built environment or living cultural entities. Most conservation works have been concerned with museum preservation, museum artefacts or preservation of archaeological monuments and historical sites, i.e. uninhabited sites. Work on occupied buildings or structures targeted for conservation have generally only been carried out after premises are vacated (e.g. former PM’s residences). These buildings then end up as memorials, museums or museum pieces (e.g. Istana Satu in KL and Istana Seri Menanti in Seremban in Figure 3.2) usually within a Museum complex. The increase in enthusiasm in the 1970's was short lived due to the rapid urbanisation and economic growth of the country. The rapid urbanisation and redevelopment, which started in the early part of the 1970's, lasted until the late 1980's when global recession then halted most of the developments. Many urban sites identified for redevelopments were also put on hold (Loh, 1991:60-61). In retrospect this economic slowdown has given the industry time to rethink about the potential of reuse of available resources. It also led to the important National Seminar on Strategy for Conservation (Chapter Two).
This timber palace built without a single nail (using wooden pegs), was preserved and conserved and turned into a Royal Museum of Negeri Sembilan. This was after it had undergone several incompatible uses, i.e. Islamic school and religious institution.

Showing the massive development within the Kuala Lumpur's 'golden triangle'. This was the result of rapid urbanisation, which had caused the loss in character of the area, making KL looking similar to all other fast growing capital cities in the world.

(source: postcards, 1998)
It was not until the early 1990's that the issue of built heritage conservation started to gather momentum again. This was helped by media coverage on the rapid disappearance of heritage buildings and the loss of character to the traditional urban centres (e.g. NST-City Beat- 1993:2 & 1993:4). After the recession of the 1980's, development programmes in the urban centres of the country started to gather pace. Some examples are the development within 'The Golden Triangle' (Figure 3.2) in Kuala Lumpur (Ahmad, 1996:3), the redevelopment of Georgetown in Penang and Melaka's historical shorefront. Consequently, many heritage structures, buildings and sites have been lost due to pressure of redevelopment, exacerbated by shortage of staff in development control departments of the local authorities.

When conservation became fashionable in the early 1990's developers and designers together with the authorities were quick to cash in on the trend. In their eagerness to develop while at the same time trying to conserve the built heritage, façadism was adopted as a 'quick and simplistic solution' to the complex problem of area based conservation. Façadism was also the solution adopted in re-using old heritage properties for modern activities. However these works were not based on the accepted international conservation practices. The building was normally gutted of its interior, the façade was not even incorporated in the main development. Thus the new construction was often dislocated from the 'preserved' properties, Figure 3.3 (MBf building) and Figure 3.4 (UDAOCEAN Bldg.).

Even though conservation has become fashionable it has always been and still remains the prerogative of the museum community. Other Malaysians in general have the notion that conservation of cultural heritage is the responsibility of the authorities, and not a matter for the general public. The public is more concerned about issues like raising the standards of living and fulfilling basic personal needs and requirements.

The Professionals who should have been playing a vital role in protecting the built heritage in Malaysia are preoccupied fulfilling the demands of the developers.

The responsibility of protecting and maintaining the built heritage is thus left to the government, i.e. the Ministry of Culture, Art and Tourism. All conservation work is carried out by or through the monument section of the antiquities division of the Museum Department. Unfortunately the Museum Department does not have trained
Figure 3.3 Conservation Projects in Malaysia: "Facadism"—The MBf Finance Berhad Building (Jalan Tun Perak, Kuala Lumpur).

The preservation of the façade of the shop-houses (four units) for the new one block office and bank development in Jalan Tun Perak Kuala Lumpur.

The Third, Fourth and Fifth floor additions have done injustice to the preserved façade. To make matters worse the new elevated light transit rail network runs on the centre median of the road blocking this photographic view.

The new interior glass cladding, the 'preserved façade', and the former five-foot way on the ground floor which was retained as an internal passageway, but it is now two storeys in height.

Notice the window openings and unlatched window leaves, also new double-floor height corridor or 'five-foot' way along the new banking floor.

(Source: Majalah Arkitek, Journal of the Pertubuhan Arkitek Malaysia, Jan 1997)
Projects like this supermarket development in Jalan Tun H.S. Lee Kuala Lumpur has given urban conservation in Malaysia a bad start and this is what usually happens when a large conglomerate or property developer buys individual heritage shop lots. Based on the plot acreage, the local authority has allowed a higher plot ratio development for the property, resulting in high rise, high density and mixed development. It has altered the character and ambience of the area and later displaced the original occupants. Large scale development like this does not do justice to the urban historic character of the place.

This is one of the 'unsuccessful' façade conservation projects that was approved for development by the City Hall Kuala Lumpur. The result speaks for itself. The newly added structure is totally out of character and the high level pedestrian crossing surely disturbed the skyline!

In true conservation sense, a more sensitive use of the preserved skin of the building, i.e. directly incorporated into the development, would have been more justified in keeping the façade. The blunt treatment of this façade marked (X-arrow) is not acceptable. The overhead pedestrian footbridge (P2-arrow) is also not sympathetic to the development.

(Source Self: Aug. 1998)
personnel to oversee built heritage conservation work. They either used 'untrained consultants', contractors or the PWD to execute the work. Museum curators are being used to manage these works, taxing the Museum Department of valuable resources.

In a field study interview, a very senior official of the Museum Department was of the opinion that the Museum Department should concentrate on the work of conserving and preserving antiquities, and not buildings or the built environment, which form part of the urban living landscape.

He considered that others should deal with conservation of the built environment, especially agencies, working with the local authorities, and that the State Government or the Ministry of Local Authority of the Department of Town and Country planning could undertake responsibility for this (see Appendix 3.2).

Clearly the Museum Department is willing to shed the responsibility if others would be willing to undertake the job. However they have no objection to sharing the responsibility with any other professional organisation on key aspects where their spheres of interest overlap (New Straits Time-National, 1996).

This view was confirmed in 1996 during the Director-General's inaugural speech after taking over the office of the Museum Department. He also expressed his concerns about the lack of training and experience in conservation work when he said,

"...not all architects and town planners have an in-depth knowledge about restoration work" (NST-National, 1996).

The situation, however, also holds true for the staff of the Museum Department itself. Museum curators are not trained in the art of built heritage conservation, although by virtue of their vocation they do have an understanding of the subject of conservation. A very senior member of the management staff of the Culture and Tourism Ministry expressed the same concerns when he was interviewed during the fieldwork study. He said:

"... we have to think of the present setup, which means if the current municipality has got jurisdiction of a certain area, the area should be made responsible to the authority. ...and as such we feel that a kind of advisory technical expertise needs to be pooled in one agency. I think we have no choice, a Federal agency, being the Public Works or may be in the Ministry of Local Government. I was thinking that the conservation unit in the Museum be headed by the Public Works Department Architect or Engineer, because you relate (conservation works) to project development..."
He went on to say that, in using the existing framework, there were difficulties involved. His frank opinion was that the Museum Department simply does not have the capabilities or the technical know-how to administer projects. Although he initially thought it was the right Department in terms of knowledge and expertise in the field, experience had shown this not to be the case. Although technical issues received adequate attention it fell a long way short on its ability to manage.

Other than the Museum Department there is another department in the same Ministry that indirectly deals with conservation of the built heritage. Part of the Department of National Archives (DoNA) duties are to preserve and maintain historical buildings of national interest. Some of DoNA's work is based on reutilising existing heritage buildings, by converting them into memorials or museum. The 'Melaka Club' building, which is formerly a British expatriate society hockey and social club, and its surrounding area was one such scheme, restored and opened as a public memorial called the Independence Memorial (Figure 3.5). This was done in view of the historical significance of the site in relation to the declaration of the first news of Malaya achieving independence from the British. It was also the place where the first foreign power mounted their attack, landed, captured and colonised the country.

In terms of the private sector contributions to conservation programmes, the first well-known project was the conservation of the building which houses the Pertubuhan Arkitek Malaysia (PAM) headquarters (see Figure 3.6). This building, which is located right in the heart of Kuala Lumpur, formerly belonged to Loke Chow Kit, who was an early entrepreneur and tin merchant of Selangor. It was saved from being demolished to make way for another high-rise office building. 'The Badan,' PAM and the City Hall Kuala Lumpur have worked together to save the building. The completed conservation work on this building is a showpiece for the city and has demonstrated the potential for conserving and sustaining in use older dilapidated buildings.

Another distinguished effort by the private sector was the restoration of the private mansion of Loke Yew, better known as Wisma Loke or Loke House (1880-1885), see Figure 3.7. The dilapidated building was saved from dereliction and instead successfully restored into a museum, now known as 'The Artiqurium', which houses an art gallery and a music conservatory. The building, which was originally sited on an eleven-acre rubber and coconut grove, now sits on only one acre. Unfortunately the remainder of the original site has been developed into multi-storey car park, bank, hotels and offices. These new developments have engulfed the conservation scheme
leaving no room to experience the building in the manner in which it was designed. This emphasises the need to take a more complete view and look at area-based conservation rather than ad-hoc exercises.

The range of other conservation works carried out, up and down the country, by various other individual organisations, officially and unofficially, have not been co-ordinated by any organisation, formal or informal. Most of the major works are located in the Capital City of Kuala Lumpur or the capital city of the provincial states (e.g. Taiping, Georgetown, Melaka Johore Bahru etc.) (NST-National, 1997a & 1997b). In these urban areas the structures that usually deserve conserving are the shop-houses and row houses that form the unique townscape which typifies the early urban centre development in the making of modern Malaysia (see Chapter 5 -Case study on Taiping).

3.2 Government Policy on Conservation

Over the last few years (1994-1998) the Malaysian government have embarked on programmes to conserve the national built heritage. Several meetings and discussions have been held at national level, among related and associated agencies, to determine the direction and destination of the conservation activities of the country. One important document resulting from these meetings and discussions was the minutes from the committee meeting held on the 26th January 1987 in MoCYS. This document is called ‘Perancang Dasar Program Pemuliharaan KKBS (MoCYS, 1987)’, (Planning Principles on Conservation Programmes by the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sport).

In its context, the need for the conservation and preservation of historic buildings, traditional architecture and historical sites was identified and spelled out as follows:

- **to revive and redevelop** the construction technology of traditional architecture which is unique in its own right and represents the aspiration and creativity of local craftsmen;
- **to provide examples** and a source of reference for students, particularly those studying architecture and planning, and architects in the course of promoting traditional architecture within current practices;
- **to preserve a historical heritage** that reflects the rich historic past;
- **to establish physical evidences** of the country's architectural history.
A Farmosa

Illustration opposite shows the last remaining gate of the famous Portuguese/Dutch Fort which stands testimony of their presence in the port of Melaka in ancient times.

This last piece of historical evidence was saved by Raffles, the British Governor General from Singapore, who stopped the demolition of the fort walls during the earlier part of the British Colonial Administration in Malaysia who did not want Melaka to regain its glory and developed Singapore to take its place.

Independence Memorial

The former Melaka (British) Club which has been restored and converted into a museum, *The Independence Memorial*. This project was carried out in commemoration of the national independence celebration, held in Melaka for the first time in Malaysian History.

The Building was built in the 1940's with typical colonial architectural influence but on top of its tower is the golden dome which is typical of Anglo-Indian British Malaya.
Figure 3.6 Conservation Project in Malaysia: Restoration and Adaptive reuse-The PAM Headquarters Building (Jalan Tangsi Kuala Lumpur).

The PAM building, formerly known as Loke Hall, built by Loke Chow Kit, the founder of 'Modern Kuala Lumpur' in 1907. It is a town Mansion or Villa, designed in various hybrid style known as Sino-Malay Palladian or Anglo-Indian, 'incorporating Malay tradition of 'raised houses' (above ground) with Chinese tiled roof over Palladian façade', (Khol, p. 158).

The PAM building (P1) in a dilapidated state before it was saved by 'the Badan' and City Hall KL (DBKL), through the 'transfer of development rights' method.

This building housed the Malaysian Architect Association (PAM) since 1973, as their office, resource centre and headquarters. Notice the colours of the building have changed from above to the present day colour (P2). This is also part of the historical evolution of the building (colour or painting being reversible).

This building illustrates the classic confrontation of conservation against urban development. The transfer of development rights (TDR) method was used to save this building and in exchange, City Hall retained this property together with five other town houses annexed to it (see P3). Although the TDR method was used to save this property, it is constantly under threat of redevelopment since the property sits on prime location; right in the centre of Kuala Lumpur city.

(Source: Majalah Arkitek, (1995), various)
Figure 3.7 Conservation Project in Malaysia: Restoration and Adaptive Re-use—Wisma Loke, 1892 (The Artiquum) Kuala Lumpur. Loke Hall or Wisma Loke (1904). The building was not in use although the structure is intact and the architectural style unaltered, only a porch was added.

P1 showing the building before restoration work was carried out. There was no structural damage and the building was quite intact. The main problems were damp rot due to leakage in the roof and water seepage from the terrace.

P2 showing one of the side entrances to the restored building. Notice also the rich mixture of architectural styles, the mix of East and West, a pot-pourri of Chinese (gateway entrance) and European influences; with Classical and Renaissance (Dutch and Belgian) elements.

The restored front elevation of 'the Artiquum' (P3), plus the landscaped garden and the 'new porch' addition (arrow-B), for alighting from carriage. The earlier addition (photo (P1) above) was demolished.

(source: Malaysian Institute of Architects, Guide to Kuala Lumpur notable buildings, 1975)
As well as reaffirming the importance of the conservation agenda these statements implicitly define the need to focus on an ensemble or an area rather than the piecemeal approach to individual buildings considered to be of architectural significance. Landscape is thus also firmly established as an issue.

Even though a form of policy guideline was set up by the committee, built heritage conservation did not receive much attention. Officials failed to recognise the relationship between the National Cultural Policy and the conservation work that needed to be undertaken and this policy was too poorly circulated for it to be effective. Only in response to the aims outlined in the Sixth Malaysia Plan (1990-1995), whereby cultural tourism was identified as the second biggest revenue earner, did 'built heritage conservation works' start to be recognised.

When the Culture and Tourism Ministry devised the Malaysian Tourism Policy (1991-2000) (MoCAT, 1991:40), they recommended that specific monuments, sites and buildings should be declared as part of the National Heritage. Under the social-cultural impact assessment of the policy document above, the Ministry has identified three factors that need to be addressed in respect of the conservation issues. They are:

- A national policy with respect to the development, conservation and preservation of the cultural heritage should be established.
- The regulatory framework underlying the conservation of the historic and cultural heritage should be reviewed.
- An inventory of historical and cultural assets in each State should be drawn up and those that could be developed for presentation to tourist identified.

Thus a 'new' ministerial interest confirmed the urgent requirement to define the national policy on conservation and preservation of the cultural heritage, together with the regulatory framework to support it. Since, in theory, a preliminary heritage buildings inventory has already been compiled, it should be possible to make progress. However, this will only be possible if the inventory can be classified as soon as possible. At the time of writing there is little or no progress with this task.

3.3 Conservation Philosophy

Presently Malaysia has no defined philosophical concept of the conservation of its cultural heritage and especially its architectural built heritage. Similar to the Indian experience (Menon, 1989, p.22) Malaysia's conservation principles and practices were
derived largely from western attitudes and experiences. Malaysia is trying its best to “catch up” with the rest of the developed world in terms of its built heritage conservation programmes. In doing so, concepts and methodology currently formulated in the developed West, especially from the United Kingdom and sometimes from Australia, have been copied and adopted. Sometimes American conservation philosophies for creating conservation areas: -1930s Williamsburg museum area in the “United States of America period restoration style” (Jokilehto, 1999:18-23) were adopted (e.g. MINI Malaysia complex, Melaka and Seremban Cultural Village, Negeri Sembilan. The philosophical base is constantly being rethought.

Malaysian’s conservation practices also range from the 'stylistic restoration' of Viollet-le-Duc, to the purist preservation of William Morris, with the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) manifesto. In the stylistic restoration process, Viollet-le-Duc insisted that in restoration there is an essential principle, which must always be kept in mind. It is that every portion removed should be ‘replaced with better materials and in a stronger and more perfect way’ so that ‘the edifice should have a renewed lease of existence, longer than that which has already elapsed’ (Faulkner, 1978:456).

On the other hand, Morris’s manifesto put protection in place of restoration. He wrote,

It is for all building, therefore, of all times and styles, that we plead, and call upon those who have to do with them to put Protection in place of Restoration...to resist all tampering with either the fabric or the ornamentation of the building as it stands...in fine to treat our ancient buildings as monuments of a bygone age, created by bygone manners, that modern art cannot meddle with destroying... Thus and only thus can we protect our ancient buildings and hand them down instructive, and venerable to those that come before us. (Morris (SPAB), 1877)

While Viollet-le-Duc’s principle of stylistic restoration suits the Malaysian situation easily, Morris’s manifesto is quite difficult to adhere to. This is because Malaysia’s heritage buildings are not as old (ancient monument) as those existing in the more developed countries where Morris’s manifesto could be better applied. Thus where Morris’s philosophy was followed, whether consciously or unconsciously, it is never done in toto.

Since Malaysia has no officially defined philosophy in its conservation programmes control is very difficult. Even though most of the works have claimed to respond to the international standard on conservation, their interpretation seems to differ between each executor. Even the Museum authorities seem to have their own interpretation of the international Charters and standards. Whilst it is accepted that each country shall interpret the standards according to its own perception, "...it is essential that the
principle guiding the preservation and restoration of ancient buildings should be agreed and laid down on an international basis, with each country responsible for applying the plan within the framework of its own culture..." (ICOMOS, Venice Charter); cultural differences may conflict with the aspiration of the international charters. This probably is also related to one's understanding or interpretation of the cultural significance of the heritage structures being conserved.

The adopted western methods and standards are not very effective in preserving and protecting the country's diverse cultural heritage. Diversity in the ethnic communities, religion, cultures and the multi-hierarchical governmental system has also made management of conservation work very difficult. Priorities and preferences in the choices and selections of conservation projects are also related to the country's aspiration of forging a Malaysian identity as well as maintaining the rights and ownership of the indigenous Malay society as compared to the migrant society. Selection has to be in line with Malaysia's New Economic Policy of restructuring the society. (These difficulties have been discussed in Chapter 2). A close study and understanding of the policies of the present government is necessary in order to understand the direction of the conservation movement in Malaysia.

3.4 Gazetting

Gazetting, in the context of the Antiquity Act of Malaysia, is a process similar to the scheduling of ancient monuments as used in the United Kingdom, the Antiquity Act being a legacy of the British legal system. At present gazetting is done on a case by case basis, on monuments and historical sites, by the Museum authorities. Gazetting of habitable heritage areas does not fall under the ambit of this Act. Unlike the listing processes in the UK, gazetting in the Malaysian context does not accord the structures or buildings the necessary protection or maintenance process required to conserve or preserve them. It only affords protection from further adulteration by unscrupulous and ignorant individuals and not from the natural process of wear and tear.

The gazetting process is provided for under the Antiquity Act (Act 168) 1976. Under the Ancient Artefact Act (Akta Bendapurba, 1976), which was later called the Antiquity Act, 1976, a building or structure that is 100 years old "could" be gazetted by the government through the Museum Department in order to give to it protection, and preservation and promotion for conservation work. To date only 137 buildings and monuments (including wells, tombs, fortress, caves and monuments) have been
gazetted. Included in this list are fifty-one old buildings of which twenty-one are colonial British buildings (Ahmad, 1993). Most of these buildings are Government owned; and as such they have been accorded the necessary protection anyway, unlike private individual buildings which are often in a state of dilapidation. Based on the report by "Badan Warisan Malaysia" in the local newspaper (NST-City Extra, 1995), there are still about 39,000 buildings in 247 urban centres\(^1\), which are in urgent need of restoration and preservation. This figure however was reduced to 30,000 in 162 urban centres, after the inventory survey was completed and the findings published in a book (Idid, 1995:28). It is still not yet known how many of these buildings, which are mostly in use, are suitable for gazetting. What is needed now is a thorough study of these heritage buildings and at the same time affording them protection through the gazetting process, preferably by designating the whole areas in which they are located. Designating these areas as conservation areas would provide preliminary control over demolition. "Designating", with the support of the proposed Bill, however would only be a preliminary measure, but it would at least buy the authorities the vital time needed to study and gazette them.

Gazetting buildings and designating areas, is a very difficult process in Malaysia. This difficulty is related to the three-tier system of government in the country (discussed in Chapter 2) whereby certain matters or powers of decision are handed over to the State Government. One such matter, which is related to this study, is the issue of ownership of property, which is connected to the land on which it was built. Thus even though the Museum Department has listed a number of properties to be gazetted, permission or consent from the State Government is very slow to come. Without the concurrence of the State Government, the Minister concerned, under the present law, cannot gazette the property.

The difficulties in gazetting also apply to properties in private custody or ownership. The owner's or custodian's consent is needed before the property can be gazetted. This is because the Federal Constitution recognises the citizen's rights to the ownership of private property, and without their consent it is ultra vires to the constitution (Federal Constitution, 1997: sec13). Multiple ownership of properties (which is common in the plural society of Malaysia) poses even greater problems. This often further slows the process whilst the rightful owners is located.

---

\(^1\) **There is a conflicting numerical calculation (29,000), if this figure is compared with Syed Zainol's book, "Warisan Rupa Bandar, Badan Warisan Malaysia, 1995."**
Figure 3.8 Current situation in the administration of conservation works (cultural heritage) in Malaysia.
Further complications arise, if as in the case of Loke Yew Mansion the owner resides overseas. The first gazetting process took place, in 1968, of a Dutch Fort (Kota Lukut) in Lumut, Negeri Sembilan. However the famous ancient and historical (Portuguese/Dutch) Santiago Fort gate in Melaka was only gazetted in 1977. This structure was one of the earliest permanent masonry structures built in the country other than the Hindu/Brahmanic temple ruins in the Bujang Valley, Kedah. To date there are a number of buildings that have been gazetted and more are awaiting approval.

3.5 Current Status and Development of Built Heritage Conservation Works

It is only recently that the government has decided to render more efforts to safeguard the cultural integrity of heritage by allocating some funds, via the cultural programmes in the MoCAT, to be used for preservation works. This can be seen in the emphasis introduced in the Malaysian Five-Year Development Plan (Rancangan Malaysia). In the Sixth Malaysia Plan (RM 6 1991–1995), cultural heritage has also been identified as an important asset in the country’s tourism industry, while in the Malaysian Tourism Policy (1991-2000) documents, specific monuments, sites and buildings have been identified as tourism products which should be declared as national heritage (MoCAT, 1991: 35).

Conservation processes and works in Malaysia have yet to develop to an acceptable international standard. In the past, primitive methods have been employed to conserve these artefacts. Simple measures of protection like weather shedding, protective covering and security fencing have been installed in and around the sites to protect them from vandalism and further deterioration from human as well as natural causes. In most cases no major scientific research has been included or carried out, nor is any intensive preliminary survey implemented before restoration work is carried out. This is due to lack of funds as well as lack of expertise in the field.

In the execution of the works, ordinary contractors untrained in the field of conservation, are often engaged to undertake the implementation of work. These 'unskilled workers' normally use both traditional and modern methods and work under the guidance of museum curators and sometimes the supervision of private 'self taught' conservation architects. The latter, learn the trade while on the job. This has resulted in sub-standard finished work, thus contravening the stated requirements of international standards and guidelines for conservation. Departmental constraints and
the absence of technically trained staff in building conservation has hindered the smooth execution of the works.

The Museum Department is attempting to rectify this through in-house training of building contractors. This approach is well intentioned but is questionable in terms of its effectiveness. However the department, due to its long association with protecting and preserving cultural heritage, has been able to gather experts in various cultural fields to sit on a committee that looks after the interest of the heritage built environment. This committee\(^2\) sifts through development proposals involving works in conservation areas or development involving the reuse of existing heritage buildings. The working process of this committee is best described in the work flow chart in Figure 3.9 and is similar to any planning application approval process. The intended work is submitted to the local authority concerned, which then passes it to the Committee whose decision is recorded. This decision is then sent to the Culture and Tourism Ministry, for endorsement by the Minister concerned, before it passes out again to the owner, for amendments, and local authority for execution of work. This process is not a norm as yet and there is no legal or statutory force to support it. However it is being practised by the larger of the local authorities (urban authorities) who are concerned about their urban built heritage.

Sometimes the Public Works Department or the Municipal Authority undertakes conservation work without necessarily going through the process explained in Figure 3.9. Although these departments have the technical professionals in their organisation, none of them are formally trained in the field of built heritage conservation. The work executed is therefore without the expert advice of conservationist’s professionals. In some prestigious projects advice is given by local, self-proclaimed conservationists, especially those that have an architectural background. As a result, some of these completed works are unacceptable, if measured against prevailing international standards and norms. The situation has caused conflicts in the management of conservation works whereby the Museum department and the local authority are ‘unable to exercise’ their authority over these other government departments.

Some private projects, however, do engage the help of a foreign expert (e.g. Syed Al-Atas Mansion). Other projects only employed local architects, who are not formally

\(^2\) Jawatan Kuasa Pemuliharaan Bangunan Lama dan Warisan Negara, (National Committee for the Conservation and Preservation of the Nation’s Heritage), whose secretariat is in DoMA, chaired by the Director General of Museums.
trained, with some extended help from the museum curators. Thus it is amazing to
note that although there are many completed conservation projects in the country,
there is no institution which provides an appropriate training in the field. There are only
a handful (less than ten) of government personnel and academicians\(^3\) that have received relevant and formal conservation training, in the UK.

A few successful projects have been implemented by a number of appropriately
qualified academicians (professionals-architect especially) and professional
government servants have been able to advise upon the works, notwithstanding their
lack of practical experience. Prestigious projects such as the restoration of the first
Prime Minister's residence (NST-Home news, 1992) and the Loke Yew Mansion
(Majallah Arkitek, 1992:48), in Kuala Lumpur (Majallah Arkitek, 1992:50), Pengkalan
Kakap Mosque Figure 3.10 (Majallah Arkitek, 1997:101), Kuala Kedah Fort and Dr.
Mahathir's birth home, Figure 3.11 (Utusan Malaysia, 1992), in Kedah, the Stadthuys
(Dutch) Complex and the Independence Memorial in Malacca, Kellie's Castle in Ipoh,
Figure 3.12 (Anderson, 1991:10-13), Captain Speedy's House, Taiping, in Perak and
Fort Cornwallis on the Island of Penang, are all examples of successful built heritage
conservation work on nationally recognised structures.

Most of these works have been successfully promoted nationally and some
internationally, but more often, not so much for their conservation achievement or
values, but mainly for promotion of the tourism industry. Even though some of the
works have become landmarks, as far as a wider programme of architectural
conservation is concerned, there is still a lack of focus. Generally the public is not
conscious of the needs and reasons for conserving dilapidated older heritage buildings.
Their misguided perception is that conservation work is the sole duty of the government
and is basically undertaken to boost the cultural tourism industry. Conservation of run
down, dilapidated, colonial-influenced building is seen as the concern of the museum
authorities and the antiquarian and not the concern of the general public.

Noorizan (1995) in her study of conservation in Malaysia confirmed this notion. Her
study has identified that conservation work in Malaysia, similar to other developed and
developing countries, has been closely associated with the tourism industry, which is
the third major contributor to Malaysia's gross national product (GNP).

\(^3\) These personnel are at the moment located in these institutions; PWD-(1-HWU), TCP Dept-/(1-Oxford
Brookes), UTM-(2-HWU&NLPolytechnic), USM-(1-Sheffield University), UTM-(1-IoAAS York, 1-Local)
Figure 3.9 Existing Work Flow Chart for Conservation related works in the Malaysian Context (non-statutory)
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Tourism has become an important economic activity contributing to the overall socio-economic development of the country. According to ‘the plan’ (6th Malaysia Plan), p.242):

"...the main thrust will be on the preservation and enhancing existing natural and cultural assets...including the preservation and restoration of historical sites, enforcement of environmental conservation, and development of natural and cultural tourism products..."

Based on this common sense notion it is pertinent that cultural and economic (tourism) development be maintained in a mutual relationship. Each should complement the other in their processes. But like all other post-colonial countries, many Malaysians still resent the preservation of historical sites, which are usually associated with the colonial past. This was due to the painful memories that are embodied in these preserved relics and artefacts relating to colonial imperialism and the painful struggle for independence. This pattern of resentment has been acknowledged in conservation work all over the world. Thus a proper framework and educational programme is necessary to put conservation management practice in a proper perspective (refer to Figure 3.16), so that conservation work is viewed not only in the spirit of the nationalistic, aesthetic or even religious perspective. Full awareness is necessary in order to achieve the desired levels of successful conservation work. It is hoped that “time is a healer”, and that over time, the Malaysian public will be able to accept that it is inevitable that this post-colonial heritage will assimilate itself into their own culture. The move by the government to balance and develop the indigenous cultural heritage alongside those of the coloniser and the immigrants will eventually make them realise that all of these artefacts are important for progress and development of future generations of Malaysians.

3.6 Conservation Education and Public Awareness

Conservation education

Education can be in two forms, formal and informal. The Malaysian system of formal tertiary education puts a greater emphasis on science and technology compared to the appreciation of the arts. In order to develop and progress into an industrialised nation, Malaysia needed scientists and technologists. Art and history courses are less favoured to major in, often viewed as a last choice by students as well as parents.
Figure 3.10 Conservation Project in Malaysia: Restoration and Preservation - Pengkalan Kakap Mosque (Merbok Kedah)

Photo (P1) shows Pengkalan Kakap Mosque, before restoration/preservation work began. The building was in a bad state of repair, with leaking roof and structural stability problems and the roof tiles were also missing and badly broken.

Photo (P2) shows the finished work on the corridor tiles, the external supporting columns and new structural members for the roof and tiles.

Picture (P3) above shows the completed conservation work of the mosque with its new tile work and the structural columns aligned. The roof tiles were cleaned using chemical and replaced as much as possible. Some of the roof tiles and structural members had to be replaced anew, while others were reused. The new mosque is seen in the background. Underpinning process was carried out on the structural columns to realign the structures that were sinking. However this completed building has been left unused due to administrative problems between the various organisations involved in the mosque administration.

(source: Majallah Arkitek, 1997)
These photos show the Prime Minister’s birth home before (above) and after (below) preservation and conservation work. The Department of National Archives (DoNA) undertook the works, from its conservation to furnishing the interior with exhibition artefacts. The government also bought the adjacent piece of land in order to create a bigger compound for the museum complex. This project has been ‘compared to’ the Shakespeare’s house in Stratford-upon Avon.

Perched on a quiet knoll above a sleepy stream, near the town of Batu Gajah, Perak, is one of the country's most fascinating colonial relics—the unfinished folly house of William Kellie Smith (the Scottish rubber baron).

Designed in the Moorish-style, and built by a construction crew imported from Madras, India, this unfinished structure is eerily reminiscent of a Kipling tale. The construction stopped unexpectedly when Smith died in 1926 while on holiday in Europe.

This ruin (which is privately owned) has been identified to be gazetted by the Museum department.

'The Badan' has also been actively campaigning to save this structure, and to conserve it.

Below are some architectural details of the many types of window openings, which is similar to the Federal Court Building in Kuala Lumpur.

A distinguished Professor in Malaysian history (see Appendix 3.2) and an established educationist summed up the situation clearly when he said:

"...partly education is to blame, because our education system is a stereotyped one, again the emphasis is passing exams to scores "A's", and the belief that if you do well in your studies, if you can get first grade, if you can go to university, then you are in a position to make money. Which is why medicine is chosen as the number one profession, because people believe doctors make money. So don't do political philosophy for example. What for, how are you going to make money..."

Not getting into the science stream of education is often seen as a failure. Art or history education is perceived as leading to a second class profession. This largely explains why a majority of the Malaysian public still do not understand the reasons for protecting and preserving works of creative art that embody their culture and heritage. Concerns for economic and material development often supersede their public duty in conserving and protecting cultural heritage for future generation.

Fortunately the situation has now begun to change, as with progress and development, the public is beginning to realise that art and technology should not be separated. A balanced relationship between art, design and technology are vital for the country's development and progress towards a better future. This consciousness was also sparked off by the competition to design Malaysia's national car (Proton), where a combination of good artistic and sound technical knowledge was needed. The general public begun to value constructive art and creative technology and, with the advances in computer technology, art education has been seen in a new light. Multi-media education has done much to change perceptions towards art and cultural education.

Previously there has been no formal education in conservation of cultural heritage, except for those specialising in the particular field of archaeology. It was only in the early 1970's, with the establishment of the technical universities in Malaysia, that programmes in the built environment have included an appreciation of local vernacular and traditional architecture. The subject of 'measured drawings' in architectural study programmes prompted interest in documenting traditional vernacular architecture (this collection of measured drawings has formed the basis of the inventory collection mentioned in Chapter One). Universiti Teknologi Malaysia has recently introduced a post-graduate conservation course by research (M Phil.). Historical documentation (the American's Historic Architectural Building Survey-HABS) has now been included
as part of the syllabus in architectural courses taught at University Science Malaysia (USM), Institut Teknologi Mara (ITM)\(^4\) and Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM).

**Public Awareness in Conservation**

Conserving cultural heritage can strengthen the appreciation of one's roots and relationship to the nation. In the developed western countries and in the UK especially, there has been a conscious concern for the need to conserve one's own culture and more recently local distinctiveness. In Britain, however, there is a feeling in some quarters that, things have gone too far and that much designation and listing of buildings devalues the conservation movement. The question has also been posed as to whether saturation point has been reached in the process (Morton, 1991:6). There is also concern about the value and criteria for designating, which may be the major cause of over extensive designation (Jarman, 1992:16, Morton, 1996:35).

The conservation area designation process in the UK has allowed too many local values and criteria to be used and not enough emphasis to be given to the national criteria. This resulted from UK legislation, which made local authorities responsible for designating conservation areas. On the other hand historic conservation area designation in some other countries, for example the Netherlands, France and to a certain extent Japan, are centrally or nationally controlled with a nationally valued criteria (this will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four). For Malaysia, initially at least, it is best to start the designating process with nationally valued criteria. Eventually when local authorities become more confident in the processes, local designating criteria and values could be used.

When urban areas are designated and enhanced, they often result in the "gentrification" of the area concerned. The result of gentrification in the process of conservation work needs to be seen and understood by the public as an inevitable outcome of conservation. This is related to the fact that conservation and upgrading of old buildings and enhancement of designated areas cost money not only in the short term but also in the long term to maintain and sustain them. So if a conservation area is to be sustainable it needs to be patronised by those who can afford its upkeep. This need not necessarily be so with further government intervention and assistance. Gentrification should not however be viewed with negativity, for in certain circumstances it might be an essential part of the solution. (Griffins, 1995:245).

---

\(^4\) ITM (Institut Teknologi MARA) has since been upgraded to UiTM (Universiti Teknologi MARA).
In all respects conservation works need to be seen as bringing and generating more economic benefits to the general population (e.g. the Central Market project, K.L.), whether directly or indirectly, rather than for the privileged few. The subjective quality of "conserving" needs to be explained to the public, educating them through either formal or informal means. A public duty to conserve has not been instilled or ingrained in the mind set of the ordinary Malaysian public and this need has to be addressed quickly before Malaysia loses more of her built heritage to rapid and rigorous urbanisation programmes. Probably the recent economic slow down in (late 1998) will give the general public time to dwell on conservation matters so that by the next 'boom cycle' there will be enough protection installed within the administrative system.

Prior to the economic crisis in late1998/early 1999 in the South East Asia region, Malaysia was heavily geared towards economic development and growth, and conservation work had been getting less and less priority and support from the Government. The general public, especially the business community, perceived it as a stumbling block, which stifled socio-economic developments. The view was that works involved in the conservation of heritage buildings always took more resources, financial or otherwise, than new development. Often good conservation works carried out on heritage properties are not as visible as new work where the general public can see tangible benefit from the expenditure of resources. Work on conserving the cultural built heritage is difficult to justify and to be perceived in term of terms of progress.

The subjective perception of conservation work also needs to be changed and quantified. It is heartening to note that the Malaysian public is slowly responding to the notion of 'caring for their valuable cultural built heritage'. Recent success of conservation projects for example the Central Market Project (Figure 3.13) and the Museum of Telecommunication, (Figure 3.14), has helped to generate the public interest in built heritage conservation work. Government agencies related to this field of work are also working hard in trying to accommodate conservation programmes nation-wide. However, efforts to formulate the 'Conservation Bill' (Preservation of Building and Conservation Area Act, 1998)\(^5\), has now been delayed for various administrative reasons. One of the reasons is pressure concerning the full repeal of the Control of Rent Act\(^6\). Property owners and the business community, who see

---

\(^5\) The title of the Bill has changed several times since DoMA and DoLG first mooted it out.

\(^6\) The Act has since been repealed with a transition period of three years starting from 01/09/1996 to 31/12/1999.
opportunities in redeveloping urban pre-war properties, have been campaigning to bring about changes to 'the old and obsolete Act'.

Together with the proposed Conservation Act there will also be two new administrative guidelines, ('the Technical Conservation Guidelines' and 'the General Conservation Guidelines'). These guidelines, hopefully, will be enforced by administrative means, through the National Council of Local Government, which meets regularly and is being co-ordinated by the Department of Local Government. Training for would be conservators and conservation administrators has also been carried out by the respective Government agencies (MoCAT, 1994, INTAN, 1993) and active participation from academics and the non-governmental organisations has been most encouraging.

3.7 Non-Governmental Organisation (Amenity Societies)

At present there are a number of non-governmental organisations, quite actively involved in the propagation of conservation ideas and philosophy. 'Badan Warisan Malaysia' (BWM or 'the Badan'), Penang Heritage Trust, Warisan Melayu Lebuh Acheh and Yayasan Warisan Johore are among those best known. The Melaka Museum Corporation is a semi-governmental organisation that promotes and administers built heritage conservation project and programmes in the states of Melaka.

The Badan, which assumed the role of a national body, is a non-profit organisation that is actively committed to preserving Malaysia's built heritage. 'The Badan' is based in the Federal Capital, Kuala Lumpur, and also has a branch in the historic city of Melaka. 'The Badan' and other amenity societies have become watchdog and pressure groups, for the country's conservation enthusiasts (refer to Figure 3.15). Their members actively promote conservation and identify buildings and areas worthy of protection. The government has also taken on board their suggestions, views and proposals on conservation issues. To date a number of projects carried out by the Badan, using local and foreign experts, have been recognised by the conservation community within the region.

The Penang Heritage Trust (PHT) is a more localised society looking after built heritage conservation works in the State of Penang. Other than PHT, there is also another smaller conservation group in the State called Warisan Melayu Lebuh Acheh which has campaigned to save the Lebuh Acheh Malay Mosque. The work of this group is limited to the conservation of this particular Mosque.
The Central Market 'adaptive re-use' building project was the first major successful conservation work that has embodied the spirit of co-operation between development and conservation. The project, which is dubbed as the 'Covent Garden' of Malaysia has been able to immortalise and preserve the character of the place. To quote Tan (1998:11) "... the wonderful chaos that characterised the Central Market offered a slice of life about which is easy to romanticise in reminiscence".

Photo (P1) on the right above shows the overall site of the project standing in marked contrast to the high-rise buildings around it. In the background one could notice the row of three storey shop-houses (Arrow) that has been painted in pastel colour demarcating the conservation area.

Views of the main entrance (P3) of the complex from the car park complete with the landscaped trees planted in the foreground. Notice the pastel colours used on the finished project, although this was not the original colour.

Photo (P4) shows the finished building entrance with the added decoration that enhances the main entrance to the Market. The colours chosen has given the project its landmark distinctiveness.

(Source: Tan, 1998:11 Visage Magazine)
Figure 3.14 Conservation Projects in Malaysia: Restoration and adaptive re-use-
Selangor Region Telecom Building (Telecom Museum), Jalan Gereja and Jalan Raja Chulan.

Showing the Selangor region Telecom Building circa 1950. The building was built in 1928.

The building was of utilitarian design with an external façade of distinctive classical grandeur displaying an architectural style of the Neo-Classical school devised from the 19th pattern book.

Initially it was identified for demolition to give way for a new tower block of the new Telecom HQ.

The building was saved from demolition by the Prime Minister who passed-by the site while demolition (Dec. 1984) was in progress. A conservation order was imposed in April 1985, gazetting the building for conservation because of its architectural heritage and historical value. This building adds another landmark to the city.

(Source: Majalah Arkitek, Journal Pertubuhan Arkitek Malaysia, 1985)
The Yayasan Warisan Johore (Johore Heritage Foundation), on the other hand, was established in the southern-most state of Johore. Being part of the State Government organisation, it only deals with heritage within the State of Johore and limits itself to projects initiated by the State government, from which it receives some funding.

The situation is also similar for the Museum Corporation of Melaka (PERZIM), which is a Melaka State Government subsidiary. PERZIM's duty is to look after the cultural built heritage of Melaka State, a duty that was formerly under the auspices of the Southern Zone branch of the Museum Department. In executing its duty, it relies heavily on the co-operation of Melaka's municipal and local authorities to furnish them with details of planning and development applications within designated conservation areas and those involving heritage buildings. Its actual duty is only to comment and advise the local planning authorities on matters pertaining to conservation of the built heritage (Building Control Committee 'Conservation Control').

PERZIM is at present involved in disseminating information for educating school children and creating awareness among the public on matters pertaining to conservation of the cultural heritage. Their programme, "Heritage conservation awareness week", with school children and the public has been successful. PERZIM is also training local tourist guides on the understanding and appreciation of the urban built heritage and its relationship to the history of the area. PERZIM's work seems to receive encouraging support from local communities and tourists.

Unlike local amenity societies and conservation organisations in the United Kingdom, which have affiliation with national, regional and international bodies, Malaysian local amenity societies do not have any formal link either with the government or between themselves. The Museum Department does however take an interest in their work and extend advice and at times financial assistance if required. Again this is done more on a need-to basis and is therefore reactive rather than proactive. This emphasises the need for a systematic approach to conservation management at central or national level to co-ordinate the work and provides a vital link between all the parties involved.

### 3.8 Incentives in Conservation Programmes

Presently nationally designated incentives for conservation or maintenance works to heritage building in the country are very obscure. For example study of media coverage (NST, 1992:4) (NST, 1993:4) of conservation issues during the field study,
Figure 3.15 Levels of Conservation Administration in Malaysia.
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revealed that a form of incentive being proposed and given out by some local authorities for the preservation and conservation of the architectural heritage does exist. The Kuala Lumpur City Hall, for example, has propagated the idea of the "transfer of development rights" and has also used it in some of their development planning approvals (refer to PAM building caption).

The Seremban District Council on the other hand will exempt owners from paying assessment tax for two years if they carry out restoration work on their properties. Taiping Municipal Council is also looking into the same incentives, and is trying it out in some of their planning approval cases. They also distribute paints to deserving property owners to help them with maintaining their property. Most local authorities are willing to waive the assessment tax (similar to council tax in the UK), which is the council's prerogative, if owners do maintain or restore their heritage properties. The Melaka Municipal Council through *PERZIM* even renders professional advice and helps owners and developers with proposals for developing their properties. Penang Municipal Authority is studying the possibilities of offering two types of incentive to property owners who are willing to conserve or preserve their property;

- the first is in the form of a planning incentive, aimed at facilitating conservation work, which maximises built-up area and site utilisation, and reducing costs due to planning requirements;

- the second is in the form of a financial incentive, which should cover the cost of conserving and preserving the structures and things incidental to the works.

What is certainly lacking at the moment is a co-ordinated set of financial incentives that the various State Governments and local authorities could offer to property owners. A clear and consistent framework in the approach to managing conservation programmes should incorporate this and form part of the new "Conservation Act" through the proposed provision of a revolving 'Heritage Fund'.

A Government cultural conservation committee has spent substantial amounts of time, studying the various incentives granted by other countries with more established practice in built heritage conservation. Among these countries, the British incentives system, pertaining to the execution and management of conservation work was preferred and most easily followed. Tax relief, development requirements in parking spaces, open spaces, control of building heights and the transfer of development rights are some of the possible incentives that are currently under study by government agencies responsible for conservation-related work. Some of these methods have been used, in projects already carried out, e.g. transfer of development rights in the
conservation of the PAM Building complex and the Central Market Development. While the compulsory requirements on the number of car parking spaces in most conservation related works/projects, has been reduced or waived completely by many local planning authorities, this is done mainly on the good will of the local planning authorities rather than as a norm in the planning approval. In an effort to slow down the degradation of traditional and cultural heritage and retain the built heritage, 'The Badan' has also recommended to the government that some form of financial incentive be given to deserving owners (refer to Appendix 3.3).

Patronage of conservation is not very encouraging in Malaysia. Other than the obvious tourist patronage, it is almost non-existent apart from a few donations and sponsorships by large corporate entities. Long-lasting patronage has always been difficult to secure, since conservation tends to be seen as the concern of the elite and the upper middle class. 'The Badan' has so far been successful in securing some patronage from among the royal circle through the connections of their committee members. This is due to the fact that Badan's committee members comprised in the past, largely of upper class, especially expatriate wives of local professionals, although this has since changed. This situation has, however, given 'the Badan' a high profile but made it appear as another gentrified upper class society association.

The need to raise public participation is emphasised, but without incentives it will be difficult to achieve without a change in the public perception, awareness and appreciation. Figure 3.16, The Malaysian framework for area-based conservation process and management shows how this could be done and achieved. The built heritage conservation legislation at Federal level will provide the administrative and technical guidelines, which in turn will guide the Board or local authority in implementing all conservation work. The administrative guidelines will also provide opportunity for the public to be educated and participate in the conservation process through local amenity groups.

3.9 Guidelines and Legislation

Guidelines

The Government is now encouraging respective Ministries and Departments to speed up the process of formulating the Preservation of Building and Historical Areas Act (Akta Pemugaraan dan Pemeliharaan Bangunan Warisan dan Kawasan Bersejarah).
Concurrent with the preparation of the Act, guidelines pertaining to its execution are also being prepared. These documents are the *General guidelines for the Conservation of Building and Conservation Areas* and the *Technical Guidelines for the Conservation of Building and Conservation Areas*. Both are administrative documents to serve as management guidelines to be read in conjunction with the proposed bill and should be used as a tool for implementing conservation works. These guidelines will also complement existing acts and which previously have been used for conservation related work.

**Legislation**

As well as the Antiquities Act Town and Country Planning Act, Act 172, 1976, there are the Local Government Act, Act 173, 1976, the City of Kuala Lumpur Planning Act, (Act 267), 1982, the Johore Enactment No. 7 1988 and the Malacca Enactment No. 6 (Preservation and Conservation of Heritage and Sites) 1988. Detailed discussion of the provisions of these Acts is given in Appendix 3.1.

It is sufficient to say here that the Antiquities Act, the Town and Country Planning Act, the Control of Rent Act and its Decontrol, and the Local Government Act are the few legal documents that have an immediate and direct effect pertaining to the work of built heritage conservation.

The Antiquity Act which is the main instrument, which addresses the issue of conservation in the country is inadequate to address the conservation of the living built environment because its concerns are more inclined towards the protection of ancient monuments and historical sites. However conservation areas are neither archaeological reserves nor necessarily historical sites.

Even though the defined meaning of monuments in this Act includes, "...building and its site, of which their preservation is a matter of public interest due to the reason of religion, history, tradition or archaeology...", there is no mention of architectural significance or town planning interests as a criteria.

The Town and Country Planning Act is being used by local authorities to administer development orders and it has clauses that prohibit the demolition of heritage buildings. Its contents are modelled along the lines of the Development Plan System of the UK
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Built Heritage Conservation Bill (Proposed)
- What thus this entails?
- What will it do?
- When will this be used?
- How thus it relates to existing laws?

Amenity Groups

Area-Based Conservation Management

Administrative guidelines (new)
- Providing a forum in disseminating information from Federal Government to the Local Authority, in implementing conservation work
- To provide a direct link, from the three tier government system, to the implementing authority
- To disseminate and gather uniformity in the implementing strategy

Technical guidelines (new)
- Needed by the local authority implementation unit for the technical administration of conservation works
- Guided practice document for implementing procedures
- The technical 'dos' & 'don't' in conservation

Awareness
- Create awareness among general public, politicians, academics and professional, the need to protect before too late.
- Make these people conscious of the presence of national heritage artefacts around them that need to be conserved.
- Eradicate indifferent attitude of developers & planners alike of destroying valuable heritage.
- Instills a sense of duty upon present generation, of the importance of conserving the townscape identity for a sense of 'genus loci'.

Education

Local Authority/Board Implementors of works.

The general public

Local Level

The need to educate the general public on the importance of conserving the built & cultural heritage in general.
- Education need to be encouraged in school, colleges & University
- Effective publicity of finish product also provides a means of educating the public and others

© Amer DMU/Ph/D./9600
(TCP 1971). However its provision for conservation is inadequate and falls short of those provisions spelled out in UK legislation. The Malaysian version is mainly concerned with the control of development planning in general (planning permission and so forth) and does not make clear definitions of what conservation requirements are. Article 27-(a) (b) and (c) of the Act has been tested in measures pertaining to the demolition of heritage buildings (NST, 1994). The penalties that have been imposed to the developers, however, have not proved to be a great deterrent (RM 600.00 for every single day that the developer refrains from rebuilding the property).

Under the 'Further powers of the Local Authority', (Part XII section [101c (iv) & (f)] of the Local Government Act, ACT 133, 1976), the Council's President of the Local Authority (Yang di Pertua Majlis Tempatan), has authority to handle all matters pertaining to the conservation and preservation of heritage buildings.

101(c) (iv) "...to maintain or contribute to the maintenance of historical buildings or sites and acquire any land..."

The local authorities seldom use this power. This is due to the priority set by local authorities in providing towns with utility infrastructure rather than spending on antiquarian concerns.

The original Control of Rent Act (CoRA-ACT 363) (Rev.1996) on the other hand, actually does not have a direct influence on the conservation of built heritage. In conservation terms the Act only prevents long-term tenants of pre-war properties from being evicted from the premises without owners having to pay heavy and difficult compensation; thus preventing the property from being redeveloped. It is feared that the decontrol process of the Act may have some implication on the pre-war heritage buildings, especially those located in urban historic centres. This is due to the lifting of certain restrictions, which would open the floodgates to redevelopment. The fear of decontrol has also led to lack of maintenance of these properties by the tenants due to the anticipated increase in rents which decontrol process would permit.

3.10 Planning and Management Problems in Conserving the Cultural Built Heritage of Malaysia

Ever since Malaysia embarked on conservation works, there has been an absence of a clear-cut concept and strategy for its implementation. Neither are there any comprehensive guidelines or technical specifications that would guide the works that
needed to be undertaken. Professional and co-workers have been referring to work practices from other western countries in the course of executing the work. This however may not give the appropriate solution locally. Often conservation work was based on trial and error, which may be too costly for priceless heritage buildings or even historic areas.

From the discussion in this chapter several issues and problems have been identified. They are listed below:

**Administration**

- conservation of cultural heritage in Malaysia is still considered an elitist venture and the government has not given serious commitment to promoting cultural built heritage conservation due to the concentration on developing and industrialising the country;
- lack of effective administration, management, co-operation and co-ordination from and between related departments or institutions dealing in built heritage conservation work;
- confusion and sometimes conflict between the local authority and the Department of Museums, as to whom should be responsible for enforcing the statutory regulations concerning conservation;
- there is no clear, concise, consistent and effective policy on conservation;
- there is no formal inventory system for the built heritage and conservation areas, even though, in general, there is a system of "Gazetting" of monuments and cultural heritage. Records of existing work are difficult to access, scattered and not shared freely among interested parties;
- specific legislation pertaining to building and area conservation is non-existent although there are old and obsolete (related) pieces of legislation in use;
- the new Conservation Bill is in the process of being drafted but a number of obstacles have delayed its enactment.

**Resources**

- finance, funding and patronage for conservation work is difficult to secure;
- the absence of specialised conservation training and educational programmes have resulted in a shortage of trained personnel;
- there is shortage of technical facilities, e.g. a conservation laboratory, in the country to carry out research and investigation into conservation science and related issues;
although amenity societies exist, they are segregated by location and uncoordinated.

General issues

- the Malaysian public lack awareness and has not been actively involved in the implementation of conservation work. Thus public participation has not been harnessed to its full potential;

- pressures of development, urbanisation and modernisation are difficult to stop especially in large developing urban centres where changes are continuously taking place and enforcement is unable to maintain control;

- a shortage of conservation professionals in the country hinders not only the execution of conservation work but has also affected the selection and formulation of the heritage building inventory;

- there is no serious punitive deterrent in existing legislation to prevent unscrupulous demolition of cultural properties and the 'permitted' devaluation of appearance and character of designated conservation areas. Enforcement of legislation is thus a major issue.

3.11 Conclusion

Chapter Three has listed and discussed at length the various issues, processes and management problems that Malaysia, as a post-colonial developing country, is experiencing in trying to conserve her built heritage.

This chapter has shown that, although there are some initiatives, by private as well as government sectors, it is generally undertaken on a piecemeal basis. Proper plans, or programmes or a comprehensive inventory in the protection of the cultural built heritage do not exist. Most if not all of the conserved work consists of prominent individual monumental structures and important public buildings, which are owned by the government or its subsidiaries and not really under threat of demolition or redevelopment. It is the everyday private buildings, which provide the character and appearance of urban historic places, that are really under threat from redevelopment.

Moreover the conservation of these heritage structures has been undertaken in the absence of defined conservation policy guidelines and deficiencies in resources. Although there is related legislation with regard to the protection and conservation of the cultural heritage, it does not address the problem directly. These laws were not designed for conservation purposes although they may support the process. The inadequacy of the present legislation thus demands a more specific law. The
completion and enactment of the Preservation of Buildings and Historical Areas Act, along with its supporting guidelines is extremely urgent.

This chapter has also pointed out that at the moment the Malaysian public is not appreciative of the importance of preserving cultural heritage. They are traditionally only excited about preserving the historic built environment when they can see personal economic benefit. This is largely due to their ignorance or an indifferent attitude, underlining the need to increase awareness. In the past they were not concerned at all in conserving the built heritage especially that of the post-colonial era. This attitude is slowly changing due to the success of some conservation projects, as illustrated in this chapter, and the potential benefits that these projects have demonstrated.

In focusing on the protection and conservation of individual cultural built heritage items (monuments and buildings), the value of groups of buildings and related landscape has so far been neglected. In Malaysia the concept of protecting a whole area of historically and architecturally significant buildings has not yet materialised. The planning approval committee and planners have neglected traditional townscape character and appearance. Consequently many developments in urban centres are unsympathetic and mediocre. Their structures lack architectural richness and are in stark contrast to the existing two or three storey buildings. This lack of sensitivity by the authorities concerned was underlined in the recent amendments made to the current legislation (TCP, 1996 and CoRA, 1997) relating to conservation issues.

Dury (1995:20) has proposed that if the cultural built heritage is to be conserved and protected there must be an 'option value' whereby the public must be willing to pay for the preservation of historic buildings. The public must also be willing to maintain the 'intrinsic value' that is placed on the existence of resources, even though they have no intention of using them. These contributions are necessary so that their continued use and enjoyment remains an option for present and future generation. Thus even though conservation areas and heritage buildings belong to private individuals, the owners have a moral duty to the general public to protect and conserve the property, so that they are not destroyed for the benefit of one's personal gain (Drury, 1995:20). This point is consistent with Malaysia's VISION 2020 whereby the intention was to create a caring society.
Conservation of the cultural built heritage, either in the UK or the other more developed Western countries, is implicitly based on the assumption that private constraints or costs are at least balanced by the economic or other benefits to the wider community. It is this concept that needs to be expounded to the Malaysian public and administrators in order for conservation programmes to succeed in Malaysia.

The problems that have been highlighted in this chapter are not only familiar to neighbouring post-colonial countries but also similar to the problems that were experienced by developed countries when these countries were initially developing built heritage conservation strategies.

Chapter Four will investigate the conservation administration of a selected number of these developed countries, looking at how they manage their cultural built heritage, especially in the urban setting.
Area-Based Conservation and Administration

Understanding, defining the concept and practices.
Stones make a wall, wall makes a house, houses make a street, and streets make a city. A city is stones and a city is people; but it is not a heap of stones and it is not a jostle of people. In the step from the village to the city, a new community organisation is built, based on the division of labour and on chains of command.

(Bronowski, J., 1973, The Ascent of Man.)

4 Introduction

This chapter will look at the area-based approach to conserving the urban built heritage i.e. conservation area. A study has been made of those countries where area-based conservation is already established and, in particular, looking at the processes and procedures followed in the United Kingdom. The aim is to identify and learn approaches which could be adapted to suit the Malaysian situation. The chapter concludes with an appraisal of the role and potential of urban area-based conservation in Malaysia.

Similar to other post-colonial countries, which are coming to terms with their cultural heritage conservation, Malaysia's initial built heritage conservation focus was on the glorification of individual buildings especially monuments. The familiar, old urban built heritage and its environment were taken for granted and not included in conservation planning. However, even though these familiar buildings may not merit gazetting (listing) individually, their presence in the historic setting, visual appearance, physical character and the volume of spaces that they created, contribute to the overall character of an area particularly if historic buildings make up the main townscape (Ross, 1966:30)

Chapter 4 Area-Based Conservation and Management.

The concept of group value, as one of the principles for the selection of buildings to be listed, embodies the fact that historic buildings cannot be isolated from their setting. Individually, these ‘familiar buildings’ may not be of any great value but as a group or an ensemble they could make significant contributions to the historic urban landscape. Thus in order to accord them the necessary protection, they need to be recognised as part of a whole, as an ensemble. This could be done by protecting the whole area in which the buildings are located, through a process called conservation area designation or ‘conservation area’.

4.1 What is a Conservation Area?

Using the definition as practiced in the United Kingdom, a conservation area is an area so demarcated that it has a special architectural or historic interest and as such its appearance, sight views and character are desirable to be preserved or conserved. It therefore can be an area of rural landscape or a developed urban setting, ranging from whole historic town centres, cities or squares, terraces and smaller groups of buildings (Davies, 1992:1, Mynors, 1991:146). These areas will often be centred on listed buildings, but not necessarily always. Similar criterion as mentioned above has also been widely used to determine conservation areas in most of the countries in Western Europe.

Different countries have different names and terminology for their conservation areas, although the principles used to demarcate the sites or areas to be conserved are similar, differing only in the type and degree of control and designation criteria used. The French termed their conservation areas as “secture sauvegardes” (safeguarded sectors) which included the “zone portege” (protected perimeter) (Chatenet, 1995:47; Larkham, 1997:90-91); the Dutch called it “beschermde stadsendropsgezichten” (protected town and village view) (Pickard, 1997). The Japanese called their conservation districts “Dentotekikenzoubutsugun Hozonchiku” (traditional building conservation districts-TCBD) (Asano, 1999:239); the Germans called it Heimatschutz” (protection of the homeland) (Papagoergiou, 1971:38) while the Australians and the Americans called them “Landmark Sites” (Freestone, 1995) and “Historic and Cultural Areas” (Rhose, 1987, Cullingworth, 1997) respectively.

---

2 An area of 500meters perimeter around the 'monument classified' reserved as protected area.
In the UK, for example, the statutory definition of conservation areas, as set out in the Civic Amenities Act of 1967 and in section 69(1) of the UK Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, is "...Areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance" (Minors, 1995:56; English Heritage, 1995:1). This definition has been the basis for conserving areas of architectural and historical interest, in the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Scotland). The Policy Planning Guidance Note 15 (Department of the Environment of National Heritage, 1994) emphasized (para 4.2) that "It is the quality and interest of the areas, rather than the individual buildings, which should be the prime consideration in determining these conservation areas" (Mynors, 1991:146; English Heritage, 1995). In the process of formulating Malaysian conservation programmes, the authorities and conservation practitioners have adopted the UK definition for conservation area.

Conservation areas can take many forms, sizes and character. In general it is the collective appearance of the area which is worthy of protection. Within the boundary of conservation areas, in the UK for example, the local authority has a duty to seek 'the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas' (Reade, 1992). The practice encourages a positive and proactive approach to sustaining the character of the conserved area and ensures that in all planning decisions, attention is paid to the special architectural and historic nature or character of the place.

In order to enhance and sustain conservation areas, changes in its built environment is inevitable (Maguioire, 1997:10). Designating a conservation area however, does not mean fossilising it by preserving in toto. It is the management of change within the historic urban surrounding which will be the biggest challenge in any area designation.

However, before an area is designated its quality needs to be assessed. For example in the UK, conservation areas have a two-stage assessment before they can be designated. The area identified must first and foremost be an area of special architectural or historic interest, not just some interest. Secondly the area must also be seen as desirable to preserve and enhance the character or appearance of the area (Mynor, 1984:146). Buildings which contribute to the character or appearance of the area do not necessarily have to be of special architectural or historic interest themselves (listed buildings). Hence it is not necessary for the conservation area to
be centred on listed buildings, although in the UK context it may well be, and very often is (Mynors, 1991:146).

On the administration of these conserved areas some countries exercise their control via their National (e.g. French), Central (e.g. Dutch and Japanese) or Federal government (e.g. Germany), while others exercise their controls at the regional or local level (e.g. USA-State level and UK-local authorities). There are also others who have a mixture of both central and local control of varying degree (UK-with the power of designation also with the Secretary of State, the Dutch—with joint designation of areas by the Minister of Cultural Affairs, Recreation, Housing and Physical Planning and the German Federal government decentralising powers to the Municipalities).

The administration and management of these conserved areas are sometimes being administered directly by the government or by a designated body appointed by the government to work independently or with the government. For example the French and the Australians have set up 'commissions' (CNSS and AHC\(^4\)), the United States has set up a council (ACHP) while others are using the government machinery or agencies to execute the work. Whatever the method used to administer these conserved areas it was carried out in relation to the country's political climate.

4.2 The International Context

The concern for area-based conservation started in Europe. It is largely a post-war phenomenon, related to the modern rebuilding of cities after the destruction of the Second World War and the mass destruction of the old, the familiar and the cherished local scene. ((Papageorgiou, 1971:23; Lowenthal, 1983:230). The sudden loss of a sense of belonging to a place, during the new waves of reconstruction especially after the war, made people realise the importance of conserving a whole area\(^5\). The growing international concern for the concept of area-based conservation was stated in the *Charters for the Protection of Historic Towns and Urban Areas* (ICOMOS, 1987), better known as the 'Washington Charter'. This document which considers the broad principle for planning and protection of historic urban areas, is particularly useful in the process of conserving an area.

The Washington Charter which is based on earlier documents, in particular the UNESCO's recommendations concerning the *Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas* (UNESCO, 1976) and the *Bruges Resolution* (ICOMOC, 1975)\(^6\) has developed comprehensive principles and standards for the conservation of historic towns. These documents have also expanded the concept of area-based conservation to include smaller towns and not just large urban centres.

Although there are international agreements on the criteria and process of area-based conservation designation, its implementation differs from country to country. These differences reflect local conditions, differing national aspirations and approaches to the philosophy and practice of conservation. For example the American approach to built heritage conservation is in opposing tangents compared to the conservative British approach. The British stance in socialist development control also contrasts sharply with the North American capitalist franchise (Feilder, 1980:10). Not only is the nomenclature different but the understanding of the terminology is also different. What is understood as conservation areas in the British context (insitu conservation) is not the same as in conservation areas in the American sense (translocation).

In Japan and Australia, areas are conserved because of their associations with forefounders of the sites. In the East, the spiritual values of a place, for example the Nara Temple shrine, Japan, are highly valued. In Malaysia, rituals associated with the construction of dwelling buildings (the Malay house\(^7\)) are also preserved. The rituals will start with the selection of trees in the forest and continue right through the building processes. Not only will the building structures be conserved, the area where the source of the construction materials were obtained will also be protected. This process contrasts with the main thrust of the Western European approach where there has been greater preoccupation with the fabric of the building but is in line with the Eastern European countries, e.g. the Poles who value the authenticity of spirit or character (Johnson, 2000:62). Whatever the emphasis and criteria used, each of these countries has developed its own conservation system to suit the present needs of the country.

---

\(^6\) Resolution of the International Symposium (\(4^\text{th}\). ICOMOS Assembly) on the Conservation of Smaller Historic Towns,
4.3 Assessment of Area-Based Conservation Programmes and Procedures:- lessons learned and its application

This section will now review a range of conservation systems and approaches. This review is however confined mainly to the developed western countries. Its aim is to identify practices, particularly those relating to the management and administration of urban area-based conservation, which can be adapted to enhance the management of conservation work in Malaysia.

These countries were chosen to provide a balanced global conservation scenario and also due to accessibility of written material on conservation practice. For historical reasons, particular attention has been paid on the management and administration of area-based conservation in the United Kingdom. Table 4.1, at the end of this chapter, summarises the approach practised by countries surveyed on the management of their area-based conservation.

The Process

The main aim of designating an area, in an area-based conservation process, is to protect the architectural and historical character of the area and its surrounding periphery from being developed unsympathetically. Designation basically is a declaration of a statement of intent by the local authority to protect or preserve the character of the area while at the same time enhancing it. In the UK the criteria used to conserve any area which may be judged worthy of designation as a conservation area, are very much simpler than listing a building or scheduling monuments. The emphasis is on 'character' (in a conservation area context it normally relates to visual appearance) and 'appearance' (is more of a planned situation rather than an acquired trait) of the area itself.

The "character" as defined in the UK Circular 8/87 (Historic Building and Conservation Areas-Policy and Procedure, at para. 54) is, "...pleasant groups of other buildings (i.e. other than listed), open spaces, trees, a historic street pattern, a village green, or features of historic or archaeological interest may also contribute to the special character of an area". These elements are important and need to be conserved in order enhance the character and appearance of any area or place.

The character of a conservation area also relates to its role and function in the neighbourhood, land uses and buildings, which may be subjected to changes. Physical changes to the land and buildings will result in changes in character, which in turn will cause changes in activities resulting in the lost of identity and character of the conserved area.

The "appearance" is totally a visual sensation and, as far as conservation areas are concerned, it relates to features such as design plan, form, materials, the height and bulk of buildings and in particular their relationship in the form of spaces. It covers the visual appreciation of civic design and townscape features. Thus in controlling the appearance of conservation areas, one needs to consider the effect of the proposed development on the overall appearance of the area. Every new development should be designed, not as a separate entity, but as part of a larger whole. Conservation area designation thus has the intention of managing the changes that are going to take place within the designated areas.

In order to look into the sustainability of these protected areas, the study has analysed a few pertinent topics in relation to the administration and management of the conservation area. The topics analysed are the legislation, administration and controlling agency, conservation dilemma, enhancement programmes, grants, financial aids and incentives.

**Legislation**

Conservation legislation played an important role in the early conservation practices of all the countries studied (see Table 4.1). Unlike Malaysia, each of the countries studied had legislation directly related to the protection of their cultural built heritage and conservation areas. Whilst some countries have a general legislation, others have a more specialised and sophisticated one to deal specifically with the issues. More specific legislation was also devised in respect to the type of listing or gazetting being practised in a particular country. Existing international charters and guidelines have supplemented and formed part of the guiding principle in the execution of all conservation work (see Table 4.1, Legislation) in all these countries studied.

However, having legislative powers alone to control conservation is not enough in itself. Successful conservation programmes will be determined by the way in which statutes are interpreted and used (Hallard, 1982). According to Hallard, legislation is
more often seen as a deterrent rather than an encouragement. Thus together with restriction and control there should also be rewards that could entice not only the property owners but also the authorities concerned in conserving these areas. Incentives in terms of financial backing and tax exemption on expenses incurred in restoration and heritage repair work are most welcomed by property owners.

Although the political climate of the day will also determine that legislation will be enacted to protect areas and the built heritage, it is still open to interpretation. In the words of Spennemenn, (1993:20), "...historic preservation is largely heritage interpretation as seen from the preservationist's point of view. Thus preservationists, biased by their own ideological, spiritual, and political frameworks, determined the preservation, and hence interpretation, of the past for the future". Therefore it is important that, not only a qualified person be made responsible for conservation work so that legislation will be interpreted accordingly, there is also a need for a dedicated institution specifically responsible for all conservation work. This, however, has not happened in Malaysia due to a shortage of qualified personnel and the absence of a specific law governing area-based conservation practices.

For Malaysia there is an obvious need for a specific legislation for an urban area-based conservation programme, since existing legislation has failed to address current shortcomings. Punitive deterrent in existing and associated legislation has not been able to address these problems. Together with the legislation there is also a need to strengthen the enforcement, provide frameworks and qualified officers, in the right places and situation in order to make the legislation work.

Administration and Control

Conservation usually implies a technique that enables changes to be expressed, indeed requires it to do so. Presently, the idea of a protected area however is coming to mean an area where change in the form of a new building or structure, is either prohibited altogether or if accepted is required to be 'pastiche', imitating the existing. Sometimes new buildings are dressed in fake or a replica skin, especially on the outside, in order to blend them into the heritage surrounding.

In the Japanese system of townscape conservation, the historic street façade is valuable and is protected at all cost. Behind these protected façades, contemporary facilities were installed. Similar work has also been practised in the Australian
conservation scene whereby the strict control on heritage development during the early 1970s and 1980s has led the development industry to resort to façadism as the solution to conservation work (Freestone, 1995).

Although area-based conservation has the intention of controlling development, designation of a conservation area does not preclude the possibility of new development within the designated conserved area. New developments should be designed in a sensitive manner and having regard to the special character of the area. In ensuring this, local planning authorities need to involve the public by making applications for planning permission for any new development, which is likely to affect the character or appearance of a conservation area, available for public consultation. This will enable the public to inspect details of the application and make representations to the local planning authority. The responsible authority should also publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of character and appearance of conservation areas.

In England, for example, the local planning authority is required to inform the central body e.g. at that time the Historic Building and Monument Commission, of any proposals or developments (Telling, 1986) for consultation, before work could proceed. This is also the case in the American system whereby the American Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) is consulted, or in Australia it is the Australian Heritage Commission (AHC). This practice is good in order to ensure compliance with current heritage requirements.

In managing conservation areas it is also necessary that there should be a specific agency that is separate but not distanced from the government department's bureaucracy and restrictions. An independent agency or organisation, like the Dutch's RVM (Skea, 1988), the Japanese Bunkacho or the French CNSS, which could work easily with the government and the amenity bodies as well as the private owners of properties would benefit conservation generally. In all the countries that have been studied (see Table 4.1, Administration), these organisations are either stationed at the central or regional level. Presumably this was done to facilitate better management although in the case of the UK, conservation areas are basically locally controlled.

From the comparisons made in Table 4.1, Malaysia's conservation programmes will definitely benefit from the central (National or Federal) level of administration,
executed by an independent agency or a Board (semi-government). For the short term planning this would be a workable solution in order to co-ordinate initial programmes that have been set by the various Federal and States governments. This level of administration has also been practised in the Federal Republic of Germany (which also has a three-tier level of government with three levels of conservation control) and to a certain extent the United States of America.

In Malaysia, the conservation practitioners have also been more inclined to look at facadism, although without fully understanding the real meaning of the word. Façadism has been used as 'the solution' rather than treating it as a last resort to the problem or as a means to an end. Therefore it is vital that the concept of architectural façadism is properly addressed so as not to be misinterpreted and blindly followed by developing countries pursuing built heritage conservation.

Enhancement Programmes

In the last thirty years when conservation area designation was first established Europe, a lot of research has been carried out in the UK on the conservation area character and its preservation (Mynors, 1984, Morton 1990, Suddard & Morton, 1991. EH, 1997). Other parts of the world have also undertaken the research but little has been done or written about their enhancement factor. A lot of effort and energy seems to have been channelled towards the preservation and conservation of the area and the buildings in them. Due consideration needs to be given towards the enhancement factors as dictated by the conservation area definition. This is important, failing which the area would deteriorate and lose its special character. However, care should be taken that these enhancement programmes do not "disneyfy" the area and turn it into another theme park. Continuous enhancement management is required to make area designation sustainable.

In the effective treatment or management of conservation areas it may also involve issues which ought to be dealt with in the context of a development plan; for that reason the inclusion of conservation policy in the local plan may well be desirable. Efforts need to be channelled in devising conservation area programmes, whereby this could be achieved through the Dutch system of having a 'development plan' to guide post-designation process (Voorden, 1981). The Australians on the other hand

---

8 FEDERAL-supreme conservation authority, STATE (larger State)-Higher conservation authority; DISTRICT/MUNICIPAL-Lower conservation authority.
use Conservation Plan documents for enhancing their gazetted landmarks and areas of historic and cultural significance. However, conservation area designation should not focus solely on the prevention of change. In the earlier UK designation system, this confusion happens because of the interpretation through practice, since there were no definite criteria set in the process of designation as set in the 1967 Act (Worskett, 1975:17). The same statutory term was applied to an area as well as to an individual building and monuments, at least in the early stage, as discussed earlier. Whereas the initial intention of area designation was to provide a means of protection to the overall setting which make up the 'vistas', with special architectural or historic interest, similar to the French system of designating the 'zone portege' (protected perimeter) and the 'secteurs sauvegardes' (safeguarded sector) (Chatenet, 1995:47).

Earlier process of designating conservation areas in the UK was seen to have 'failed' due to the failure of the 1967 Civic Amenities Act to formulate a set of criteria for designation process. The processes and criteria were left to the discretion of the local authorities and their planning officers (Worskett, 1975; Morton, 1993). Much too often, the areas designated then did not merit national standards. At times the Act was used as a means of asserting and protecting local neighbourhood amenity and property values. At other times it is being used as a measure of development control, preventing undesirable new development (Delafons, 1997(b): 116). The UK Civic Amenity Act also does not specify to whom the preservation or enhancement of the area must it be desirable and opinions are unlikely to be unanimous. Although these shortfalls have been rectified by the PPG 15, this type of situation needs to be avoided by countries intending to designate areas and a merit standard needs to be determined so that the process will not be open to abuse.

Unlike the lenient UK system, the strict, complex and lengthy designating process of the Dutch system, the 'beschermd stads-endropsgezichten' (see Appendix 4.1) or the selective French and Japanese system, ensure that only the very best of areas are being designated as the country's "protected town and village views" (Skea, 1988:17). The French designation of 'secteur sauvegades' is also systematically and centrally controlled, thus limiting its number (Kain, 1975:428). In the French system only areas of "National" importance are considered (see Table 4.1, Type of Area-Based Conservation). Similarly, the Japanese only designate areas, Traditional Buildings Conservation Districts-TCBD's (Dentotekikenzoubutsugun Hosonchiku), of high value and are highly selective in designating their TCBD's or conservation
districts (Ezua, 1994:17). To the Japanese the principle of small quantity but high quality applies. Their TCBDs or IPDs\(^9\) (Important Preservation Districts), which are the urban conservation areas, consist of basically protected traditional living environment which preserve the historic appearance of the external or roadside facades while the internal portions of the building are modernised in 20\(^{th}\) century artefacts.

In Malaysia's efforts to promote conservation areas, the selection process adopted should be more in line with the principle of small quantity but high quality (similar to the Dutch or the Japanese). The British process of too many devalued designated areas of local interest or the American system of preserving the "hollowed ground" should not be followed. High quality cultural areas of national interest should be Malaysia's targets (see Table 4.1, Selection Criteria) which would then provide Malaysia with the very best of samples. This will provide Malaysian practitioners with a benchmark for conservation areas practices and a showcase of selective exemplars for future conservation works.

**Financial Backing and Incentives**

Conservation programmes need substantial amount of financial backing. In order for conservation plans to work, there need to be monetary backing or economic incentive provided (Smith, 1969:307). Some countries like The Netherlands and France have revolving national funds (the NRF-National Restoration Fund and FAU-Fonds d'amanagement Urbain) to support their conservation area programmes. Other countries like Japan, has centralised subsidised budget while the Americans (Davis, 1985) and the Australians (Freestone, 1995) have rebate schemes in the form of tax incentives that will ease the owners burden of conserving. United Kingdom on the other hand has many forms of grants English Heritage Grant, Architectural Heritage Fund, Historic Building Council Grant, City Council Conservation Grant, Lottery Grant, to name a few, to facilitate most of their conservation activities. However ad-hoc grants as practised in Germany are not advisable, as it will only lead to uncertainty in project planning and also a hindrance to on-going work.

---

Although there are moves towards providing patronage and financial backing in many of the developed country's conservation programmes, not enough is being done towards this end. On the other hand, in developing countries there is too little commitment from the authorities and fund providers. Malaysia will need to study in detail how other countries provide their funds and incentives for conservation. The examples from the United Kingdom, France and The Netherlands's revolving national funds and the centralised subsidised budget by the Japanese and the Americans are exemplars to be studied and followed, if appropriate (see Table 4.1, Grants and Finances). Recommendations proposed by the Malaysian Heritage Trust in Appendix 3.3, Chapter Three, should also be considered for implementation if found to be suitable.

As a start, it should be the responsibility of the government, in Malaysia as in many other developing countries, to initiate and finance conservation work. This is because ordinary citizens in most developing countries are preoccupied with the upgrading of their living status rather than concerns for preserving the antiquarian love of the culture. Therefore in this respect governments and conservation practitioners must be sensitive upon the role that financial support and patronage play in conservation programmes because conservation work is generally accepted as an expensive endeavour and thus causes dilemmas in its implementation.

Conservation Dilemma

Urban landmarks are commonly perceived as heritage structures. Heritage structures reflect a society's cultural and historical background, in general terms and through associations with specific events and people. Heritage elements in the urban built environment are conducive to the development of a sense of a place, which in turn may exert a positive influence on the perception of what is heritage to the community living in the particular area. In area-based conservation it has been an accepted phenomenon that the significance of the city's physical character to the sense of a place, security, and stability of its inhabitants is now well established (Lynch, 1960). As Konrad Smigielski once said, "a city without old buildings is like a man without a memory." (Ward, 1968:ix)

Although this is generally true, one person's landmark may be an object of hostility to another. Conservation thus should be localised and should be seen through the eyes of the locals rather than being dictated by foreign experts or blindly adopting
foreign values, practices and norms, as propagated by many foreign-trained professionals and experts, which was highlighted by Menon (1989 & 1993). If local cultural traditions and identities are more pertinent to developing countries, they should then be preserved or conserved. The Western conservation philosophy and preoccupation with the fabric of structures should not be the prime concern in Asian’s conservation practices. It is the eastern cultural values and tradition of construction that need to be conserved in order to make the Asian’s built heritage conservation practices unique for this region in relation to the perishable nature of its heritage built fabric.

It is also a known fact that conservation in the developed Western countries as in other developed countries is contentious. Through inclination or vested interest, there are constantly those who would conserve either less or more, in general and the specific, of which the merits or cultural values of individual or group of heritage buildings are frequently debated and contested (Shaw & Jones, 1997). Conservation of the built environment will remain a contentious issue, for it involves safeguarding the past for the future, but adapting it so that it remains relevant to the present (Teang, 1991:4)

In former colonial countries like Australia, India, Malaysia and to a certain extent America, post-colonial issues proved to be the dominant factors in conservation debate, although by no means the only scope of heritage contest. The acceptance of ‘migrants and settlers societies’ cultural heritage proves to be more difficult, especially if it is located in a multi-cultural society like Malaysia. This situation is related to the fact that migrants and settlers culture which has not been assimilated and contributed to the richness of the original inhabitant’s culture or one which is over-dominating, as in the case of the Singapore’s Malay Heritage (Kong and Yeoh, 1994), is resented by the original inhabitant of the place.

On a lesser note is the background tension as to which townscape or area components matters most for posterity. In short ‘whose heritage and which heritage should one be conserving?’ This question is also more likely to surface in a multi-ethnic environment or a plural society than in a homogeneous one. Thus from the perspectives of an urban conservation one needs to know and be sensitive as to what constitutes the nation ‘s heritage and for whom it is to be conserved?.

Hence the practice of area based conservation or in designating areas for conservation purposes, in a multi-cultural urban area, society or cities, is always more difficult. The non-homogeneous nature of urban population has aggravated the matter, more so in a plural society like Malaysia where divergent identities and ethnic goals exist among competing social groups. Although this rarely happens in the mainly homogeneous western society or for that matter the Japanese society, it has posed a problem in multi-cultural Singapore's conservation programmes (Kong and Yeoh, 1994:248). This situation is also evident in the Australian conservation scene, whereby not enough is being done to conserve and preserve the Australian aboriginal heritage. In Malaysia the merits of conserving the (Chinese) shop houses and row houses is still a contentious issue, especially among those in power and those responsible for its conservation and preservation (Leng, 2000:12; Bristow, 2000:20). Urban conservation in all these countries, has become a political exercise, frequently with sinister overtones for those groups out of power and for those who are in, of which status quo was the order of the day (Turnbridge, 1984; Freestone, 1995:89, Shaw and Jones, 1996).

Therefore in the UK at present there is also a rethinking process and a review of the policies relating to the historic environment (English Heritage, 2000). The consultation papers drawn up in June 2000 reviewed the national strategy in terms of understanding, belonging, experiencing, caring and enriching the historic environment. The review was undertaken in view of the globalisation of the world culture and the changing trend of society's composition, together with the strong ethnic culture presence in the British culture of today.

From the brief descriptions of the area-based conservation practices and area designation process in the countries as discussed above, one could conclude that there are various ways and means of carrying out area based conservation process. Whether it is conserving an area insitu, conserving only the historic streetscape or the process of translocation, area-based conservation processes rely upon the country's aspiration to conserve and preserve the (heritage) cultural resources available.

Conservation Area Designation in Malaysia

The present conservation (area) zoning in Malaysia has failed to address the needs of an area-based conservation process. Development zoning process has not been
able to promote and enhance urban historic heritage areas neither has it been successful in controlling the type of redevelopment that has taken place, especially in places where the economic and developmental pressure is great. The zoning process in Malaysia is not designed specifically for conservation purposes and it is not meant to solve the problem of urban conservation but to control the type of redevelopment within the zoned area, in line with the stated (conservation) objectives of the structure plan.

Although designating historic heritage areas is important, designating too many of them should be avoided because it will only devalue them. Designating process should be highly selective as in the case of the French, the Dutch and the Japanese and it should be undertaken with the most stringent criteria, possibly of national importance, at least during the initial stage of the designation. This will then be in tandem with the efforts of the Malaysian government in fostering national unity, identity and culture as discussed in Chapter Two. Designating using local criterion and values could be developed later when the conservation process is more established and when the Malaysian public has been educated and made more aware and appreciative of the importance of heritage conservation.

The need for a very selective designation of areas is further related to the resources that are required and available to manage them, of which Malaysia has very little. With limited financial and staff resources it is impossible for the relevant authorities to devote their energy towards protecting too many areas. Too many designations are also risky because without a definite reason for conserving areas and the right resources to manage and enhance them, the areas will freeze in time and development will stagnate. The architectural built heritage in these areas will soon fall into dilapidation, which will then provide reasons for its demolition. Situations similar to this which happened in the UK, should be a deterrent and should not be repeated.

In the absence of standards and specific guidelines on the 'designation process', conservation area zoning in Malaysia has been more of a response to a particular development control problem, for example to control demolition, rather than arising from a specific detailed appraisal of architectural and historic character. This situation is also related to the absence of standard criteria used to judge the architectural and historic character that is so vital and necessary in area designation
process. These standards must be included in all policies set up by any country intending to protect or designate historic conservation areas. The criteria that are usually being used in the selection process as practised by other developed countries are basically based on the historic and national interest and this is complemented by the special architectural or archaeological interest (Table 4.1). Some of these criteria are quite common in the conservation processes and practices of the countries analysed. Therefore Malaysia can also adopt them too, except that in a plural multi-cultural society, designating ethnically dominated areas can be a sensitive issue, and this has to be undertaken cautiously.

After designation, the areas must be managed, resources must be deployed and policies developed. It must also be accepted that the character of conservation areas does change through time and it is the enhancement of the area, through these changes, that conservation area designation seeks to manage (Conzen, 1975:10; Maguoire 1977:10). Hence the component of an effective conservation management must therefore be a set of standards, which can be applied in particular cases, administrative procedures for ensuring compliance (enforcement) with these standards and financial support at a realistic level.

Although legislation is an important instrument in the process of designating an area, it should be distinct and separate from the legislation for gazetting buildings although the criteria used can be the same, 'of special architectural or historic interest'. Attaching Urban conservation process with the 'old Antiquity Act', as currently practiced in Malaysia will only complicate the matter. Care must also be taken that legislation is not toothless and there are ample infrastructures to support it. Permitted developments as certified in the process of development planning control in these zoned areas, must also be seriously controlled so that over time they do not devalue the character that one tries very hard to preserve, although this restriction should not contravene the personal property rights of individuals.

4.4 Summary and Conclusion

This chapter has been looking at the concepts and processes of administering and managing conservation areas. It has specifically looked at urban area-based conservation practices and administration. In doing so this chapter has also looked at several developed countries' (urban) conservation process and practices. These
processes and practices were analysed from a Malaysian viewpoint, to tap the experiences and evaluate their methodologies that are most appropriate, for probable inclusion into the Malaysian situation.

The area-based conservation practices that Malaysia can adopt and improve based upon the comparative analysis undertaken in this chapter are as follows:

- **Designation criteria:** the criteria for gazetting and designating an area must be determined and should have a high national value similar to the system practised by the Dutch, the French and the Japanese system. Designation procedures must be stringent and selective, similar to the Dutch (Appendix 4.1), but need to be flexible and not too complicated to enable changes if necessary.

- **Designation process:** gazetting and designation of areas need to be carried out by a centralised organisation or body (e.g. Dutch-RVM, French-CNSS, Japan-Bunkacho, Australian-AHC), which should be equipped with the necessary resources. The personnel undertaking the job must be dedicated to the issues and process of cultural heritage conservation. This is to avoid designation or gazetting that does not sustain national interest.

- **Conservation administration:** conservation administration in Malaysia needs to be centrally administered, similar to the three-tier German Federal system and the centrally administered French and the Dutch system, in order to benefit from the present hierarchical three-tier system of the Malaysian government.

- **Conservation tools:** the use of Conservation Plan by the Australians as a guiding document, promised a good method of managing and administering conservation areas. The American 'Chicago Plan'\(^{10}\) (Transfer of Development Rights-TDR) (Ford, 19979:217) method of controlling redevelopment in conservation areas should be seriously considered if not

\(^{10}\) In American TDR, unused development potential of the land is being purchased by the government who will in turn sell it to other developers, thus freeing the already unfortunate owners the burden of having to hold on to unsold TDR and the task of looking for buyers. In the British TDR system (as in the Malaysian) the rights remained with the owner to use or sell.
followed since it is a better model for incorporation in Malaysia than the British TDR.

- **Financial aids**: aids in the form of grants (UK), rebate schemes (Australia), subsidised budget (Japan) and various tax incentives, credits and deduction (USA) are all viable forms of incentives that will encourage the conservation of heritage properties and the enhancement of conservation areas. Direct compensation or reimbursement to owners for the cost of repairs to heritage building would benefit them directly.

Presently in Malaysia, there are various practices being adopted by individuals and organisations undertaking conservation work, all of which were executed with good intentions and reasons, although not necessarily using the right solution. With the absence of a defined philosophy for conservation in Malaysia, these various methods seemed to work quite well. Until more definite conservation policies are formulated for the country the present practices will still continue.

In order to consolidate these practices, the Malaysian authorities and practitioners need to adapt and slowly modify some of the proven good practices suggested in this chapter, to the needs of Malaysian and discard present practices that are detrimental to the cause of conservation.

Finally, it can be concluded that there is diversity of approach to urban area-based conservation. It differs from country to country with wide differences being found in the balance between powers available and the clarity of the policies being applied. Some countries' practices contradict established practices in other countries, for example the Japanese, Australian and American process of translocation\(^\text{11}\) as compared to the British and French in-situ area conservation. Although there are established norms, these processes suit some better than others. Malaysia can use the experiences of other countries' conservation practices with caution and need to suit them to the local culture and national aspiration together with the way Malaysians perceived the protection of their heritage buildings and areas. Existing Malaysian practices can only be improved after some of the processes which have been discussed in this chapter, be tested in the local context.

\(^{11}\) "translocation" in the Japanese or American term is the re-siting of selected collections of heritage structures into a chosen sites which is later designated as a conservation area e.g. Colonel Williamsberg in America, whereas conservation area in the British or French situation values the historic nature of the site together with its original contents and conserving insitu designated structures which are either listed individually or as a group.
The next chapter will look at an urban historic development centre, a typical but unique Malaysian town of Taiping. The case study of the town will focus on its historic conservation zones, surveying the composition of the town's pre-war buildings and analysing the risk and threats that these urban structures are experiencing in the process of rapid redevelopment of the town centre. The chapter will also generally look at the administration and management of conservation works in the town.
Table 4.1 Comparative Study of Conservation Process and Management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUSTRALIA</th>
<th>ENGLAND/UK</th>
<th>FRANCE</th>
<th>GERMANY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</td>
<td>Local Government Act 1948</td>
<td>National Park act 1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Buildings &amp; Ancient Monument Act 1953</td>
<td>Malraux Act, 1962 (Secteur sauvegardes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Authorities (Historic Building Act) Act 1962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civic Amenities Act 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Town &amp; Country Amenities Act 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning (LBCA) Act 1990, s. 69(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Area-</strong></td>
<td>Gazetting of Landmarks. Designating Areas of historic and Cultural</td>
<td>Conservation Areas-areas of architectural or historical interest which</td>
<td>Secteurs sauvegardes</td>
<td>Helimantschutz (protection of the homeland including cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>are desirable to be preserved or enhanced.</td>
<td>(safeguarded sectors or 'protected areas')</td>
<td>heritage and countryside).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;zone portée&quot;(500 metre circum.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td>The Commonwealth or Federal</td>
<td>Designation at local level with an option at National level (Secretary</td>
<td>Commission Nationale des Secteurs Sauvegardes (CNSS)</td>
<td>Powers delegated from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government is only responsible for issues of national important.</td>
<td>of State). All designation notified at National level to Secretary of</td>
<td>Commission Locales des secteurs</td>
<td>Federal Government to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control is spread across the three levels of Government.</td>
<td>State-Circular 8/87 and PPG15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australian Heritage Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supreme Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authority-Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Conservation Authority-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State (larger State).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Conservation Authority-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District/Municipality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- "Zone portée" refers to a protected area with a width of 500 meters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criterion</td>
<td>Preserving landmarks of culturally important</td>
<td>&quot;Special architectural or historical interest, character or appearance which is desirable to be preserved or enhanced&quot;. Local designation with local values.</td>
<td>Present a historical, artistic or picturesque character justifying the conservation, restoration and rehabilitation of all or part of the built environment, (500-metres radius protected perimeter around buildings or monument).</td>
<td>Protected areas of special distinction. Historic landscape of cultural importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>ENGLAND/UK</td>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Best practice guidance for cultural heritage was already available to all levels of government since mid 1970s</td>
<td>- Initially starts with the preservation of monuments, then individual historic buildings &amp; later their surroundings.</td>
<td>- Early legislation on protecting national monuments are very strict. Change of ownership and use, need to be approved by the Minister.</td>
<td>- Protection and rehabilitation of historic urban centres became a national conscience in the early 19th Century.</td>
<td>- Germany was the first to introduce protective legislation for the built heritage in 1818.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Early conservation consciousness was glorification of individual Georgian buildings of British imperialism.</td>
<td>- Protection of areas came later, in the designation of Conservation Areas.</td>
<td>- Owners are entitled for 50% grant for all authorised restoration work.</td>
<td>- Germans have acquired an early appreciation of townscape and reconstruction of urban areas especially after the World War.</td>
<td>- Creating a protected area around a group of monuments is a federal matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Re-erection of old buildings and saving of bits from demolition sites.</td>
<td>- Designation of areas, carried out at local level, resulted in the 'significance and priority' being devalued.</td>
<td>- 75% of owner's contribution to restoration cost is deductible against income tax.</td>
<td>- The 1945 Law introduces the 500 metres radius, 'protected zones' around historic monuments are also the concept of &quot;zone portege&quot;.</td>
<td>- The Federal Act (Federal Law), incorporated monuments protection in the Federal legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facadism became the development industry's initial approach to offset strict heritage control in the 1970's and early 1980's (Heritage Act).</td>
<td>- UK legislation tends to restrict owners of historic buildings from carrying out conservation work.</td>
<td>- Designation of areas is carried out at central Govt. levels.</td>
<td>- The Federal Construction Act enabled districts, streets and buildings of historical, artistic or urban development interest to be preserved.</td>
<td>- The Federal Nature Conservation Act 1976 (1987) provided for the designation of protected areas, conservation of historic landscapes of cultural importance, areas of special distinction and surrounding of monuments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Burra Charter, 1979, formed the basis for present conservation works and active involvement of the Federal Govt.</td>
<td>- Local interest groups are consulted during designation process.</td>
<td>- The 1945 Law introduces the 500 metres radius, 'protected zones' around historic monuments are also the concept of &quot;zone portege&quot;.</td>
<td>- Creating a protected area around a group of monuments is a federal matter.</td>
<td>- Creating a protected area around a group of monuments is a federal matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Heritage conservation is seen today as the government's powerful force for status quo, due to lack of resources.</td>
<td>- Present day conservation includes redundant Hospitals and Churches, Military Installation Docklands, Waterways etc.</td>
<td>- Conservation process restricts building height within the designated historic areas.</td>
<td>- The Federal Act (Federal Law), incorporated monuments protection in the Federal legislation.</td>
<td>- The Federal Nature Conservation Act 1976 (1987) provided for the designation of protected areas, conservation of historic landscapes of cultural importance, areas of special distinction and surrounding of monuments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conservation processes in Australia are generally standard. However it does vary &quot;laterally&quot; between States and &quot;vertically&quot; compared to national guidance.</td>
<td>- Conservation of British towns means selective preservation &amp; improvement of the townscape to maintain the town's character, without neglecting activities carried within.</td>
<td>- Strict legislation resulted in slow designation.</td>
<td>- Creating a protected area around a group of monuments is a federal matter.</td>
<td>- Creating a protected area around a group of monuments is a federal matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>NETHERLANDS</td>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>USA (AMERICA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The 1918 Agency for the preservation of Monuments and Historic Buildings.</td>
<td>• Street and Drainage Act 1974.</td>
<td>• The 1897 promulgation of the Ancient Shrines and Temple Preservation.</td>
<td>• National Historic Preservation Act 1966.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criterion</td>
<td>Area must be of national importance and of historical, archaeological &amp; architectural interest.</td>
<td>Areas selected are basically of National importance, basically of archaeological interest.</td>
<td>Artistic &amp; technical superiority for buildings. Outstanding historical or scientific value &amp; distinctive expression of school or locality. Preserving townscape façade for historical values of town.</td>
<td>National, State &amp; Local significance together with historic and aesthetic values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>NETHERLANDS</td>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>USA (AMERICA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Designation followed by conservation plan prepared at Central level and adopted by Local Councils.</td>
<td>-Early conservation programmes only protects monument and antiques.</td>
<td>-Earlier legislations were to protect single building or single monument.</td>
<td>-Initially the American preserved only what they choose to preserve (individual structures and great architectural works).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Conservation involves two separate departments thus creating unnecessary problems.</td>
<td>-The Antiquity Act, which governs antiquities and ancient artefacts, is used to protect built heritage in-use.</td>
<td>-Translocation of historic buildings into open-air museum site which is later designated as conservation areas.</td>
<td>-Patriotism was the early driving force of the historic preservation movement in USA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The administrative complexity of the Dutch’s system of designation has slowed the rate of protection.</td>
<td>-Buildings that are 100 years old are automatically governed by the Antiquity Act after their declaration as ancient monuments.</td>
<td>-The idea of conservation is to preserve street façades to maintain historical values of the area but the interior of dwelling has modern amenities typical of modern living in Japan.</td>
<td>-Present day preservation is broader and includes vernacular, folkloristic &amp; industrial structures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-National Restoration Fund (NRF) heavily subsidised by Central government</td>
<td>-No ‘designated conservation area’. However areas “zoned” in the structural plans as “controlled development areas”, for conservation purposes.</td>
<td>-Due to perishable nature of building materials (timber) used and the threats of natural disaster (earthquake) and threats of fire, preservation of the building fabric is secondary to &quot;Japanese spirit of building construction's tradition&quot;, and conservation process (Ise Shrine, NARA, Japan).</td>
<td>-Constitutionally protected property right, makes preservation works and powers to protect historic buildings difficult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-The Museum department conservation zones are regional boundaries, identified by the Department only as the departmental administrative areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Lacking a formal framework and co-ordination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Malaysia's urban heritage are very young, thus preoccupation with the fabric of buildings should not be the prime concern.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-In the American preservation concept there is a sense of place, of preserving hollowed ground, even though little remains associated with the event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Understanding the problems on the ground
5 Historic Town of Taiping: A Case Study

Discussions in earlier chapters (Chapters One and Three) have identified that building conservation work in Malaysia is being carried out mainly on an ad hoc, piecemeal and need-to-do basis. Conservation work has mainly been concentrated on individual buildings or property while ensembles or groups of buildings and 'areas' have been neglected. These disorganised and unguided practices, if left unchecked, will be detrimental to the cause of Malaysian built heritage conservation programmes. In order to understand better the current practices and the conservation dilemma that Malaysia is experiencing now, this chapter will discuss an urban historic centre, which although unique in its own right, is representative of other similar urban centres in Malaysia.

Taiping, situated in the northern part of West Malaysia was selected for the case study. Taiping was chosen for the fact that its historic centre is intact, and to a certain extent, unique in its character and the extent to which it is spared from major development pressures. Taiping also depicts the universal character of a Malaysian urban setting in terms of its townscape and built heritage. Other well-established historic and heritage centres in Malaysia have been devalued and redeveloped so much as a result of the
country's robust redevelopment and urbanisation process in the last economic
development cycle boom, that their integrity is being eroded slowly.

Although there are other older urban centres like Melaka, Penang and Kuala Lumpur,
which have a longer history of development, these towns are experiencing too great an
economic pressure and redevelopment. Unlike in the smaller urban centres, any
decent proposal in these older cities would be very difficult to implement and it would
not be representative of the situation in Malaysia. Conservation in these highly
urbanised towns is the exception rather than the norm. Together with changing
architectural taste, rising land values and over zealous property developers and market
speculators in these towns, there is little chance that the 'old two to three storey shop
houses or row houses' would be saved. The huge return from multi-storey
developments that have set their mark in these towns is too tempting to be missed.

Thus Taiping, which is set away from major pressures of intensive development, due to
its geographical position and the recent realignment of major road networks (see
Figure 5.1), is representative of other smaller urban developed centres or towns, such
as Kelang, Kota Setar, Muar etc., in the country. Due to this Taiping is an ideal case
study in an approach towards an area-based conservation exercise. Unlike Kuala
Lumpur, Penang or even the Historic City of Melaka, Taiping was able to maintain its
heritage setting and its urban built form, almost intact, although earlier redevelopment
has disturbed certain parts of the historic character and ambience of the town.

Purpose and Scope of the Case Study

The general purpose of this case study is to identify and illustrate the current problems
and threats in the present approach to conservation practices in Malaysia. The case
study also illustrates the absence of a concerted effort in an area-based conservation
approach. The case study also sets out to gauge public attitudes, their level of
awareness and acceptance, towards the process of conserving the cultural built
heritage and areas within (urban) historic heritage settlements. The findings from this
case study will then be used to formulate an approach to the process of administering
urban historic settlements, vis-à-vis designated conservation area.
Figure 5.1 The North-South Expressway corridor has created a new opportunity for development within the highway periphery.

Showing the main access route, the Federal Highway 1 (Jalan Persekutuan Satu) and the North-South expressway (Lebuh Raya Utara Selatan) (second dispersal) and the old road out of Taiping to the north, Jalan Pengagih Utama 3. Shaded areas are land parcels, which have potential for industrial development, residential and agriculture. (Source: Taiping Local Plan, MPT, c. 1990s.)
Specifically the case study examines a typical urban architectural built form, the shop houses and row houses, which are the main land use form in most of the developed urban centres in Malaysia. This building type is found not only in the urban commercial centres but also in the smaller village ‘business quarters’, the difference being in the size of the building (single storey rather than double storey) and the construction material used. Some of these single storey timber buildings still exist within the periphery of most urban centres as in the case of Taiping (see Figure 5.2). The urban redevelopment and modernisation resulting from the fast expanding economy, however, has threatened the survival of not only the timber shop-house and row house buildings, but also the more recently built masonry ones located in the centre of the business districts. This case study was also to illustrate the impact of changes, imposed by insensitive redevelopment, upon the intrinsic character and appearance of this historic town. The town building survey, Figure 5.4, was undertaken to identify areas and buildings within the town centre, which are worthy of protection and conservation.

The scope of the case study was limited to the old town centre of Taiping. These are areas within the jurisdiction of the Taiping’s Municipal Council (Majlis Perbandaran Taiping-MPT) administration as shown in Figure 5.3. There are over 1000 buildings in the study area but only about 600 of them can be considered to be conserved. The rest of the buildings were built after 1946 and have little or no historical, architectural or socio-cultural significance, nor do they contribute to the town setting. This information was extracted from the report of a townscape study undertaken by the School of Housing, Building and Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM, 1995:45). Without a thorough assessment these numbers could not be definitely confirmed because of the ongoing redevelopment process within the town, but the survey suggests that they are reasonably accurate.

With the help of the Council’s (MPT) staff a random visual survey of the town’s building stock was carried out. The survey exercise was limited only to the exterior (façade) of the buildings. This was due to the fact that access to the multiple ownership properties was not possible in most cases. Although the interiors of these properties are not included in the objectives of this research, it is fully understood that they should have a bearing on future decisions taken in conserving the built heritage area. Two areas

---

1 Exact number could not be determined due to lack of information from the Council, and buildings get demolished for development periodically.
These are the remaining early and humble beginning of the modern brick and mortar shop houses (P1 & P2) and row houses (P3) of Taiping. They are located on the edge of Taiping town, built of timber with corrugated zinc sheet roofs. These houses are usually single-storey, has very high and steep roofs and a mezzanine platform for storage or sleeping quarters (especially for the shop houses). The row houses also have a mezzanine floor for extra room space and storage.

Figure 5.2 Early shop houses and residential units built of timber walls and zinc roofing sheets.
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Figure 5.3 Map of Taiping: Town Setting

- **Surveyed Area**: The area that has been surveyed.
- **Government and Institutions**: Areas designated for government and institutional use.
- **The Lake Garden**: A significant public space in the town setting.
- **Government and Institutions**: Areas designated for government and institutional use.
- **Residential Area**: Areas designated for residential use.
- **New Residential and Commercial Area**: A developing area for residential and commercial use.
- **Part of Old Town**: Historical areas of the town.
- **Surveyed Area of Old Town**: Specific surveyed area within the Old Town.
- **Main Entrance & Exit Route**: Routes for accessing the town.
- **Tree Lined Streets**: Streets with tree planting.
- **Part of Old Town not being surveyed**: Areas of the Old Town not included in the survey.

**Case Study: Taiping Town**

**Town Setting**
were then identified for a more detailed study, one area is basically a residential area (row house-Appendix 5.2a) and the other is basically a commercial area (shop house-Appendix 5.2b), although both areas have a mixture of both.

5.1 An Approach (methodology) to Surveys and Interviews

The fieldwork was carried out over a period of six weeks in two stages. The first stage involved gathering information, familiarisation and the study of literature and existing documents in various government departments, in Taiping and in the State capital, Ipoh. It concluded with a map study carried out in the office of the Municipality's Town Planner. Discussions carried out with the Council's planning department have helped to identify areas in the town as worthy of conservation. A stake holder structured interview was also conducted with the Council's President to identify the Council's policy and shortcomings with regards to the management issues and approaches in their conservation efforts.

In the second stage, a photographic survey exercise of the townscape was carried out from which two areas were selected for further study. A total number of forty-two properties in these areas were surveyed. As part of the survey the owners or occupiers were also interviewed (more of the latter than the former) using the quick listing survey forms modelled on the English Heritage (EH) and RCHME questionnaires, see Appendix 5.1. All information gathered was analysed in a simple statistical analysis (due to the small size of the sample) and inferences were made and conclusions drawn from the analysed data.

Townscape Survey

A general visual architectural survey of the external façade of these two storey shop houses and row houses in the town centre was carried out in order to identify the overall character and appearance of the town and to determine the overall general condition of the building's fabric. The photographic visual survey focused on the townscape architectural composition, character, appearance and layout of the town focusing on the developmental changes, threats and risk, to the town fabric. These data were mapped onto a town area map identifying the various types of detrimental development and changes in the townscape, Figure 5.4.
Quick Listing Survey of Buildings and Fabric

The quick listing survey is a process undertaken to identify quickly or rapidly property that is suitable for listing purposes. Basically, the quick listing survey exercise carried out in Taiping was only on the external physical conditions of the properties in order to classify the state of risk that they are in. A risk survey format based on the English Heritage risk table, modified by Yackub, (1992:304) was also included in this survey format, to map out the type, condition and the risks that these pre-war buildings are facing. This survey process would help to identify buildings and quarters in the town that merit conservation designation as part of the proposed area-based conservation proposal in this study.

From the random visual survey carried out, two areas were identified and selected for a further detailed survey. One of the areas chosen is basically a residential quarter on the northern edge of the town boundary and the other is the business quarter situated in the centre of the town (see Appendix 5.2a and 5.2b). These areas were chosen as representatives of the shop houses and the row houses locations. The quick listing survey exercise was carried out in these areas, using the quick listing format of the English Heritage (EH, 1992:8) and recording technique of RCHME (1996); the questionnaires were adapted and modified after a 'sounding board survey' was carried out among Malaysian colleagues studying in the UK. Modification to the questionnaires was made in order to suit local conditions and situation.

Interviews with Residents

A structured interview was also carried out during the execution of the quick listing survey, see Appendix 5.1b. These interviews were carried out mainly with a family member of the ground floor tenants and sometimes with the property owners themselves. The interviews were carried out in order to gauge the perceptions, level of understanding and opinions of the residents/tenants on conservation activities and programmes which have been proposed and those already implemented by Taiping Municipal Authority (MPT). These interviews enabled the gathering of first hand information on how ordinary residents think and feel about the conservation issues raised. It also facilitated the interviewer to record spontaneous reactions on sensitive conservation issues that involve the residents.
5.2 Limitation of Case Study Survey

Since the case study was carried out in Malaysia the time available for extensive fact finding and counter checking of information was limited, so the survey analysis depended mainly on the photographic evidence compiled during the field study. This method was chosen to maximise the time allocated for the fieldwork.

The quick listing survey forms devised in the UK for this specific survey in Taiping have their shortfalls. They failed to take into account the various types of tenancy agreement within these pre-war buildings. It was discovered that multiple tenancy is the normal practice in most of these pre-war urban shop houses. The row houses were, however occupied mainly by a single family (usually the owner) with extended kin (grandfather/mother or both); sometimes other family members who are single or widowed are also living in the premises.

Dual tenancy in a single property was expected, but multiple tenancy and multiple occupancy on both floors of the shop houses were unexpected. This has affected the analysis of the survey in relation to determining the relationship of the amount of rent paid to the care and maintenance of the property. Most of the time the interviews were held with the tenant/occupant of the ground floor shop section while the top floor tenants or back portion ground floor tenants were not accessible or difficult to access. Thus this might not be indicative of the rental paid for the whole property.

When the fieldwork survey was carried out, it was during the transition period of the repeal of the Control of Rent Act (Act 572). Hence the tenants and occupants interviewed were very sceptical about answering the questions and the answers given were very cautious and at times hesitant. The tenants responded only after repeated assurance that these questionnaires and answers were meant to be used for academic purposes and that there was to be no mention of names and addresses in the final analysis of the data.

Information on rental paid for the premises, given by the tenants and sub tenants, is suspected to be arguable. The amount of rent declared may not be the amount that is actually paid to or received by the actual property owner. This was due to the multiple layers of tenancy of the properties and the fact that these tenants and sub-tenants fear repercussions from the authorities (especially revenue collectors) and property owners. On average the amount declared seemed to be reasonable since the questionnaire...
used a format of range rather than exact amounts. The analysis relating to the amount paid and repairs undertaken upon the buildings was slightly affected by this.

5.3 Historic Town of Taiping: Geographical and Historical Context

Taiping is a town situated in the north eastern state of Perak in West Malaysia (refer to Figure 5.5). Being one of the oldest developed and modern urban centres in Peninsular Malaysia, Taiping was the first capital of Perak and it was the most 'urbanised' state during the British colonial administration in Malaya. Taiping's surrounding area was rich in tin deposits, which later attracted British administrators from India who already had trade relations with the Prince of Wales Island (Penang 1786) north-west of Taiping. The British brought in Chinese miners from Penang, adding to the existing early inhabitants, to work in these tin mines. Later, Indians were brought in to work on the new rubber plantations. With the influx of the Chinese miners there were soon factions, clan clashes and eventually war, the 'Larut War of 1874'. This gave the British colonial administration reasons to intervene in the local administration, which precipitated Taiping's modern history.

![Figure 5.5 Map of State of Perak.](image)

Map showing location of Taiping town in relation to the other development centres in the State and Penang Island. The proximity of Port Weld was an advantage to Taiping then, and later when Penang port was granted a free port status.

When the Pangkor Treaty (1874) was signed after the Larut War, the British made Taiping into their main administration centre for Malaya. The town was transformed into a busy and developed administrative and business centre completes with its own public, administrative, judicial, telecommunication, recreational and the 'shop house and row house' buildings. This development was brought about by the abundance of tin ores and peace brought by the treaty, together with the appointment of a British
Resident who advised the local administrators. To show that Taiping was an important administration centre, senior colonial administrators were placed here (Khoo, 1981:14).

Together with progress came a string of historical firsts that made Taiping into one of the first modern towns in Malaysia. Progress and development were rapid and by 1883 Taiping already had its own court building, library and office buildings. Taiping had the first planned recreational facilities; a man-made Lake Garden (1880), a racecourse for Europeans (1886) and the first hill resort, Bukit Larut (Maxwell Hill-mainly used by high-ranking British administrators for recreation and recuperation). In terms of transportation history Taiping had the first railway track, Taiping to Kuala Sepetang (Port Weld), (1885). In education Taiping had the first English school (Kamunting-1878) in Malaya and the first English girls' school - Treacher Girls' School, 1899. A museum, (1883-completed in 1903, exhibits included) and a zoo housing exotic animals and a herbarium which was also a research centre for pre-history, ethnology and zoology were also built. All these features, which are located within Taiping municipality, have made Taiping town a popular destination for local tourists.

Taiping was a well-planned town. It was laid out in the grid system of planning, with its own Public Buildings (administration centres, court house, municipal buildings, schools, hospital), market place and religious buildings (see Figure 5.6). Most of these original buildings, considered as being of the 'British colonial heritage', still exist and are in use, with very little adaptation carried out on them. However, similar to other major development centres in Malaysia, redevelopment has placed this historic town under threat.

The development of the old town architecture is believed to have been based on the 1822 Raffles's Ordinance, which was first introduced in Singapore and later used in the Straits Settlement (British Malaya). This ordinance saw the construction and evolution of permanent two storey shop house and row house buildings in Taiping and other towns in the country. These buildings which started as single storey with timber panel walls, attap (Figure 5.7), zinc (see Figure 5.2) and later asbestos sheet roofs were replaced by masonry buildings. By the 1880s most buildings were already built of

---

2 'Raffles Ordinance': subsequently replaced by the 'Straits Settlement Ordinance' and by-law; stipulates that 'All houses constructed of bricks and tiles have a uniform type of front each having a veranda of a certain depth, open passage on each side of the street'. Journal of Indian Archipelago, Vol. VIII, 1845, pp. 101-109.

3 A perishable material made of sago palm tree leaves weaves into a split bamboo rod making a horizontal panel, six feet by two feet wide.
P1 shows the main Government administrative building, the Taiping District Office, in the old section of Taiping town. It has colonial design features, and is still in use.

P2 shows Main Road (Jalan Besar) in Taiping in the early 1880's. Earlier the old town had dirt road before being macadamised (tarmac). Notice also that the famous 'angsana' trees of Taiping were not yet planted.

View of the Main Road looking towards the Hill Station. Notice the young angsana trees (P3) beginning to line the streets. The same road (P4), but with more mature trees which provided the town with a cool and relaxing character. These matured trees that can be seen growing over the roof of the shop house, blocking sunlight and are a danger to the building, causing them to be cut down later.

The race course (P5) where the British Colonial Administrators and their family spent their leisure time (this is now the site of Hwa Lian School).

A public building (P6), the wet market of Taiping during its construction, c. 1890. This building is still in use and due to be conserved and converted into a cultural (dry) market.

(Source: Khoo. K.K., (c.1980), Taiping, Museum Department, Malaysia.)
of plastered brickwork with clay tiled roofs and Europeanised facades. The street was later lined with *angsana* (*pterocarpus indicus*) trees (Figure 5.6), which provided not only shade from the tropical sun but also gave Taiping town its lush green character. Very few of these trees survive in the town centre due to road expansion and the danger that these trees posed to the shop house buildings (DORA, 1935:18, CYF, 1935:9).

### 5.4 Taiping Townscape: the Town's Development and its Character

With all the historical features in Taiping, the structure plan (MPT, c. 1990) study has identified Taiping as a tourist attraction centre. The newly opened North-South expressway has taken some of the pressures from redevelopment within the old town centre of Taiping, to other less populated areas in the north of the town now being developed instead. The corridor created by the North-South Expressway and the Federal Route One, provided a new opportunity for development within this periphery (see Figure 5.1), as indicated in the MPT local plan (MPT, 1996:3-2).

Taiping has about thirty historical sites, spread within its municipal boundary. These sites have been identified, as the sites of the 'first development', in the history of Malaysia. However, all of these sites are located outside the old town study area. New developments and redevelopment activities and the expansion of the town itself have often threatened these sites especially those that are located within the periphery of the old town and study area. If these historical sites are not officially protected (some have been scheduled for gazetting), new developments (as seen from the aerial photographs of the town development, see Figure 5.8), will encroach into it and destroy its intrinsic value. The character and integrity of the town will be lost for good.

Taiping has three aspects of historical heritage development. First is the historical development of the town itself. The existing historical sites mentioned above are testimonies to this aspect. Some of these buildings are still in active use; e.g. the railway station, aerodrome, museum etc. Taiping town was planned on the grid system with a strong vista line cutting right through the middle of the town and pointing directly to the town focus, the Larut Hill. This planning system has managed to keep the character of the town almost intact, at least in terms of the town plan, built form and plot divisions. The two and sometimes three-storey shop house buildings built on these plots have been fairly well maintained till today. Insensitive high-rise development scattered around the town, however, is slowly eroding the town character
Figure 5.7a An illustration of a street in Kuala Kangsar (c. 1880s), with earlier version of shop houses, as discovered by the intrepid traveller and writer Isabella Bird.


Figure 5.7b Picture of a street in Ipoh (cir. 1887) during the early transition period of the shop house

The photograph shows the early transition of the traditional shop house from traditional perishable natural raw materials to more permanent building materials of brick and plaster. This brick and plaster construction was first introduced at the ground floor, in the front portion of the building, to cater for the five-foot pedestrian way, as stipulated in the Raffle's Ordinance 1822, (Singapore). (Source: National Archives, Malaysia, G. 1788, N 1093)
and appearance although much of the original town planning and built fabric is still intact. The pressure to redevelop within the existing historic core poses threats to existing old fabric. Large scale incompatible developments, especially the one stop departmental stores and supermarket (refer to Figure 5.9) are slowly encroaching and taking over business from small time businesses and retailers operating from these traditional shop houses. Unable to compete with these big corporate retailers, they have to close down or sell out their businesses and property. These concerns about new redevelopment pressures have been identified in Taiping's local plans study in section 4(d) of the Introduction, which says that "...uncontrolled redevelopment would change buildings with historical values and those having architectural/aesthetic features, with concrete blocks." (MPT, 1996:1-7).

Secondly, during its peak Taiping was not only the centre of government but also a centre for commerce and trading. Testimony to this is the presence of many important government departments such as the Court House, the State Survey Department which has since moved down to Ipoh, the Telegraph Office, the Public Works Department district headquarters, the Museum etc. In the business sector the
presence of prominent financial institutions, for example the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank and The Standard Chartered Bank (which are usually present in large town business centres), is proof enough to show the importance of Taiping as a business centre.

Thirdly, in terms of tourism, Taiping is still popular among local tourists. Taiping's Lake Garden and Hill Station are among the main attractions. The Lake Garden areas were well planted, with 'rain trees' (*enterolobium saman*, some are over 100 years old), lining its footpaths and roads on both sides. These huge mature trees have always intrigued visitors, local and foreign alike (see Figure 5.10) give Taiping its unique and restful character. Other places of tourist interest are the Museum, the Commonwealth War Cemetery and the Burmese Pool. These places are located just outside the boundary of the old town study area.

In pre-independence days, high-ranking British colonial government officials from other parts of the country regularly visited Taiping for recreational and post-retirement purposes. Even today, Taiping is still dubbed as a 'pensioner's haven' because many government officials choose to make their retirement home in Taiping. This is mainly because of its serene climate and environment and the fact that Taiping town itself has not changed very much, from the time it was fully developed.

### 5.5 Analysis of the Surveyed Data

The survey data collected was analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). The result generated by the statistical analysis (see Appendix 5.1c) together with the information collected from residents/tenants interviews and the townscape (photographic) survey, was used to make inferences as to the conservation situation in the town especially and the country generally. All data collected was counter-referred against each other using the triangulation process (see Chapter 1) in order to deduce a sensible conclusion pertaining to the inquiry. Some of the outcome of the survey was also cross tabulated against relevant or corresponding questionnaires in order to find out the cause and effect relationship. In the discussions below most of the pertinent points of the survey are evaluated individually while others were aggregated in order to maximise the information gathered.
Figure 5.9 Examples of (massive block of development) one stop departmental stores that have spoiled the character of the old town.

P1 Fajar Supermarket, Jalan Panggung Wayang (Theatre Street / Jalan Pasar)

Large developments like this departmental store have changed the building scale and the character of the place. Such developments not only kill small time retailers but also cause traffic and parking problems. Notice also the tacky addition of traditional architectural features on the end of the building (use as food bazaar).

P2 Fajar Supermarket, Jalan Taming Sari (Main Road)

New mixed developments of one stop departmental store and hotel like this are gaining popularity in Taiping. However they are totally out of character with the existing traditional built forms of the old town. This development is the result of corporate clients buying groups of single dilapidated buildings and/ or neglected open sites.

P3 The Store, Jalan Panggung Wayang (Theatre Street).

Another recently built departmental store to cater for the growing needs of shoppers in Taiping town. Notice also the old food court (bazaar-arrow) in contrast to the new development, and notice also the open space next to the food court, which threatens the survival of the food court.
Figure 5.10 Huge 'rain trees' some over 100 years old, lining both sides of the road in Taiping Lake Garden.

Mature Rain Trees (Enterolobium saman) along the Lake Garden Main Road, some of which are 100 years old. The branches of the trees form an arch over the road making driving along it a very cooling experience. It is this scenery that is being admired by tourists coming to Taiping Lake Garden.
Townscape (visual) Survey

In Taiping as well as other former Straits Settlement centres, there are two types of building which make up the built form of the old town enclave, the "row-houses and the shop-houses". These buildings are the two-storey pre-war masonry buildings and their style can be divided into various architectural, or categories determined by the period and time that they are built. The styles identified are i) Early shop-houses, ii) Utilitarian, iii) Transitional shop-houses, iv) Straits Eclectic, v) Art deco, vi) Anglo-Indian, vii) Row-houses (refer to Figure 5.11). These styles have also been identified in conservation proposals prepared by MPT (MPT, 1997) and the commission study undertaken by Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM, 1995). These buildings' styles are often repeated in the other urban old town centres in other parts of the country. These styles vary in their elaboration of details depending on the opulence of the property owners. Thus the buildings in Penang have more elaborate decorations due to the status of the business population there.

The results of the survey have also confirmed that Taiping's old town centre is a good location for both business premises (90.5%) and living accommodation (79%). This is attributed to the original physical layout of the town, which has a mixture of residential dwellings and business premises side by side together with other services within reach of each other. Small 'specialised' family business, operating from the shop house premises, make-up much of the character of the town.

Visually, the town buildings and structures are considered to be in a fairly good condition and intact with only a few exceptions, but there are no seriously dilapidated structures that could not be repaired. Most of the buildings that seem dilapidated would only need a face lift and minor repairs to bring them back to an acceptable and usable condition as could be seen in the illustrations, Figure 5.12. Buildings that have been maintained by property owners have shown that maintenance does enhance the property visually and environmentally. Examples of these well-maintained buildings, as in Figure 5.12a, can be seen scattered around the town. These works however are not being planned nor co-ordinated by the Council, but are mainly routine maintenance undertaken by the owners who live in the property themselves. Some dilapidated buildings are the by-product of irresponsible construction of large high rise development, which has caused structural failure to the existing traditional buildings making them unsafe to live in, Figure 5.13. Other properties have been left dilapidated
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Figure 5.11 The various building styles and rich mix of urban architecture in Taiping old town.

Two types of row-houses in Jalan Lim Teong Chye (Cross Street 6), the TRANSITIONAL TYPE (No: 10, 12, 14) and the UTILITARIAN type No: 2, 4, 6, 8, & 10)

ART DECO style of shop houses in Jalan Kota.

Jalan Tupai shop houses of the ART DECO style
Another of the 'UTILITARIAN' type of shop houses. Unlike the one in the top photo (P3) these are located on the main road, Jalan Kota, and most of the units are still in active use. Only one unit is vacant. If properly restored this block of property would portray a good conservation piece, as an example to the public.
by their owners in the hope of redeveloping the site after compulsory demolition of the structures. Thus, one can notice that next to a maintained building, there are dilapidated (non-maintained) buildings, which could in future affect the maintained buildings.

The visual survey has also uncovered other factors that contribute to the deterioration and dilapidation of old buildings in Taiping town. Some buildings were left without the basic maintenance and the main problem could be summed up as sheer neglect. Others that have been maintained even with the basic repair like painting the façade or repairing broken masonry or windows, have shown potential for better conservation works upon them. These buildings were maintained not so much out of awareness of conservation but mainly for the love and care of an inherited property. These buildings are usually owner occupied (by extended family members or single family). The main problems with these buildings are the normal weathering due to age and lack of maintenance. Dampness in the lime-plastered wall due to trapped water made worse by structural defect, cracks and crevices. Clogged and broken gutters and drain pipes, make the wall damp and provide suitable conditions for the growth of the wild 'ficus' plant (see Figure 5.14). In fact in most of the buildings that are not properly maintained, there are plants growing on the walls. The presence of these plants is more obvious in the abandoned or partially occupied properties.

If water and plants are the natural threats to these old buildings, man-made structures have also posed threats to the character of the town and the buildings themselves. Developments, which are insensitive to the scale, volume and composition of the streetscape, have changed the character and townscape scene. The local authority's policy of allowing four-storey development on individual plots to replace existing building has caused great intrusion on the integrity and visual cohesiveness of the adjacent buildings, which are architecturally significant to the historic character of the town. These four-storey developments are more obtrusive if they are on the corner the 'grid' block, see Figure 5.15, and worse still if a whole block is being developed unsympathetically.

Unsympathetic signage on buildings (Figure 5.16) also marred the visual appreciation of the street scene and the signage wars among retailers were further 'encouraged' by the fact that the local authority's policy of signage size corresponded to the revenue returned, as revealed by the Planner in MPT. As long as this policy remains and the
No. 100 Jalan Barrack

One of the latest redevelopment projects (1998) that conforms to the conservation guidelines of Taiping Municipal Authority. The owner was persuaded to scale down his development and keep the original façade (P1) and abide by the conservation programmes planned for the area.

However the owner was allowed some reversible minor changes; changing the roof finishes (P2) due to difficulties in obtaining the 'V-shape' Chinese clay tile and lack of skilled roofers to lay the tiles, and the addition of an internal concrete staircase and new brick wall partition in the kitchen and service area in the back (P3).

Photos (P3&P4) are showing the renovated interior of the shop house, new brickwork inserted to partition the internal toilet and kitchen. The sunken internal courtyard was maintained and new corrugated concrete tiles replaced the old 'V-shaped' Chinese roof tiles.
Figure 5.12a Good and bad examples of building maintenance works (painting and plastering) scattered around the town.

No. 24 Jalan Pasar (above), another example of a good conserved building and immaculately maintained (see below). No. 26 is of a different style shop house, not being maintained properly.

No. 55-56 Jalan Silang 6, can be of the same standard if conservation policy were co-ordinated. These properties, have not been properly maintained, the exterior façade have been left to deteriorate but have enough detailing features if they were to be conserved.

No. 24 Jalan Pasar

This row house unit is very well maintained (at least externally), but the author was not able to view the inside. It stands in the main street leading to the market place and thus gave a good impression to the public, demonstrating what conservation could achieve.

No. 55-59 Jalan Silang 6

The cause of deterioration is that it has not been maintained even though the structure of the building is still intact and in a reasonably good condition. All the original features of the building are still intact. Some 'face-lift' works seemed to have been carried out to the unit No. 55.
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Figure 5.13 'Architecturally' significant buildings threatened with structural defects due to unsympathetic high-rise development in Taiping town.

These three units of architecturally significant buildings, (L to R) No. 60, 58 & 56, Jalan Taming Sari, are in various states of dilapidation. Units 56 & 58 are in use especially the ground floors. Unit 60 is in a dangerous & ruinous state and the local council have used the powers in the Street and Drainage Act (Act 133) to seal off the building and shore up (arrow) the main beam to prevent the building from collapse. This structural failure was caused by piling activities of the new development beside it.

(L to R) No 172 & 170 Jalan Taming Sari (North), another architecturally significant buildings that have been structurally 'threatened' (damaged), during the construction process of the unsympathetic, new high-rise development beside them. Steel columns and beams, to protect the structure (arrow) from collapse have shored these buildings up.
authority is pressed for funds, Taiping's building street façade will always be cluttered with huge signage. Figure 5.16 also showed some signage covering almost all the façade of these buildings. The signage, on these architecturally significant buildings, should have been controlled and regulated so that it would not obscure the façade of the buildings, which gave the town its character. Signage could be better designed and reduce in scale and an example of a well-designed signage is already present in the town itself, Figure 5.16 and if this good sample can be expanded elsewhere in the town, it will help to enhance the streetscape.

Other than this signage there are also other examples of good maintenance and repair work that have been undertaken by property owners and tenants, especially in the row houses. Examples of these works can be seen in the visual illustration in Figure 5.17.

**Quick Listing Survey of Buildings and Fabric**

In determining the occupancy status of the surveyed properties, the result of the analysis, in Table 5.1 below, showed that 28.6% of the properties surveyed were 'owner occupied' while 42.9% are under tenancy. The percentage of those under tenancy, however, could have been much higher if the multiple occupancy unit figures (28.6%) were added to it, as multiple-occupancy properties have tenants living in them, some of them with the owners themselves living upstairs. Due to the difficulties in getting into these buildings this data was not possible to obtain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of occupancy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Tenancy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple tenants</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The properties under *multiple occupancy* need to be analysed further (probably a more thorough survey and correlation studies) to find out the percentage or number of properties that are shared with the owner or owner's extended families who may or may not pay rent. Some of these properties also have two separate tenants occupying the properties (ground floor units are used totally for business/office/retail and upper floors are used for residential accommodation and sometimes for offices), of which one tenant is possibly the owner.

The result of further correlation analysis could then be paired with the responsibility of maintenance for the property as shown in the above table; this could then give clues to
Figure 5.14 Damage to building fabric due to lack of maintenance to building services, water damage and plants.

This block of row houses (P1) has been neglected; however the unit No. 5 has been restored and rehabilitated and is currently in use but the rest, although inhabited are in a deplorable state (not maintained). Unit No. 3 has been maintained, not in use, but kept in better condition than the rest.

Unit No. 7 (P2) (used as storage) has trees (ficus plant) growing in the end column (top right) near a leaked rainwater downpipe and the end wall plaster is peeling off. These buildings need minimal repair work to bring them to the same level as unit No. 5. The fact that the new supermarket/hotel development backs on to the front of this block of row houses has made this block unfit for habitation due to the hotel and supermarket delivery services using this back lane.

No: 191 Jalan Kota (burnt down building).

'Ficus' plant growing in crevices and damp places especially in leaked section of the rainwater down pipes. Conditions like this will later cause bigger cracks on the walls and in some cases the ficus plant grows into ‘trees’.

Example of property still in use (developer’s drawing office), but poorly maintained by the tenant/owner (tenant only renting the ground floor). Plants are seen growing on the walls and the plaster and painting not maintained due to rainwater damage. According to the tenant, the roof is also leaking making this building very vulnerable.
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Figure 5.15 Examples of large high rise incompatible corner developments, that are out of character with the surrounding styles.

P1

Recent corner unit development (P1), that is neither compatible nor sensitive, to the heritage character and appearance of Taiping. The new blatant architecture like this that is spoiling the charm and appearance of the town.

P2

New (modern-design) four-storey development (P2), that "squeezes in" (arrow) the traditional two-storey shophouse. This new concrete architecture lacks the character that traditional two-storey shop houses provided to Taiping town.

P3

The scale of this development (P3) is totally out of character with the original Taiping townscape. Like all other four-storey developments, it was developed for the multi-user speculative office spaces. Most for the floors for this kind of building are unoccupied, due to preferences of low-rise building, unless patronised by large corporate financial institutions, like this one.
Advertisements and shop signage are also affecting the facades of two-storey shophouses. Seen here on one of the streets in Taiping, Jalan Panggong Wayang, where most of the photographic retailers are located, each shop tries to outdo each other in their signage, each trying to attract customers to their business. This practice has ‘destroyed’ the facades and resulted in cluttering of the beautiful eclectic façade. Some signs cover the whole façade.

**GOOD SIGNAGE DESIGN**

One of the very few good examples of how to solve the cluttered business signage and advertisement problem of the retail properties. This one was well received by the authority and served as a good example of how signage could be incorporated in the existing building design without infringing on the design itself. Properly calculated (the width), it can also act as a sun shade and the bamboo blind used in both the opposite units could be hidden behind the signage.
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Figure 5.17 Examples of ‘well conserved buildings’ where the work has been undertaken by the owners of the properties themselves. These buildings (usually row houses) are mainly owner occupied and hereditary family home.

ABOVE: These two fine examples of row houses are well maintained and immaculately ‘conserved’ by their live-in owners. These buildings are family houses, which was passed down from generation to generation. No. 162 (P2), sits right in the middle of the business district, on the main road, among other shop houses. No. 33 (P1), is located in south side of Jalan Stesen. The owners have painstakingly conserved the building so much so it has been the talk of the town and it is often photographed by tourists.

No. 33 Jalan Stesen

No. 162 Jalan Kota (North side)

These are much simpler row houses, which are well maintained. No. 24 (P4) stands on the main street leading to the market place, while No. 81 (P3) (business office) is on the main street, both these buildings have given good external impressions as to what ‘conservation’ could achieve. Some of these conserved row houses (identified by two windows and a central door on the ground floor) are also used for business premises.
the cause of dilapidation and the risk the property is currently experiencing. Although the tenants are not liable for the maintenance of the property, since there is no formal rent agreement, they are expected to do so and will do so due to the low rental paid in accordance with the Control of Rent Act for these pre-war properties.

Currently 41% of the urban shop houses in Taiping, which are under tenancy, are solely used for business purposes. It is only if these small 'specialised' businesses can be maintained that the survival of these properties can be assured. This is because the residential usage of these buildings is declining slightly as shown in the table below. Those residents who maintain their residential units are mainly the first generation residents of the town, which are mainly in the single-family category or those with extended family caring for their old age parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of tenancy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple family</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the single-family category, the properties were either used totally for dwelling, or business with living accommodation upstairs, while the family business is carried out on the ground floor street level. This is the typical usage especially in owner-occupied shop house buildings.

In terms of usage there have been very few major changes. On mapping the previous and present usage of these properties, see Table 5.3 and see also Appendix 5.3a, the survey uncovers that eighty-percent (80%) of these buildings have remained residential cum retail (business). This confirmed the hypothesis that given the choice, residents would prefer to keep and maintain the usage of the building, status quo. However, there is a slight fall of 2.55% (from 51.3% to 48.8%) in the percentage of properties under the residential cum retail category. There is also a substantial drop of 14% (34.0% to 20.0%) in the solely residential category of the property. This situation is related to the conversion of row houses to shop houses (as observed in the townscape survey), with business premises on the ground floor only and offices on the upper floor. In some instances the upper floor is kept vacant for future storage facilities as disclosed by some of the respondents interviewed. This current trend would further lead to deterioration of the building due to lack of usage and maintenance.
Table 5.3 Showing the previous and present usage of the properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Present Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous usage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational cum retail</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysed data (C.02) revealed that 81% of the properties surveyed are occupied and 9.5% are partially occupied or vacant. In the 9.5% partially occupied premises it is only the ground floor area that is occupied or rented and this is mainly for small retail business purposes. Although 90.5% (C.01) of the buildings are occupied or partially occupied, only 29% of them are in good condition, while 67% are generally fair (measured by the Scale of Risk (SoR) table), which included some vacant buildings. The rest of the buildings are in various grades of deterioration and are in poor condition.

The above result was cross tabulated against the scale of risk (Figure 5.18 and Appendix 5.3b), and it was discovered that only 12% of these properties are at risk, of which 10% (C.02), of this percentage are vacant buildings. The rest are partially occupied premise (ground floor only), which consist of another 10%. However a great number of these properties, 59.5% (C.03), need to be watched for potential risk especially those which are in good condition but are vacant (risk grade 5).

Figure 5.18 Graph showing the cross tabulation between Scale of Risk Condition and Occupancy.
Although only 11.9% of these buildings are at risk from dilapidation it is also interesting to note that as far as 'buildings to be watched' (in grade 4&5) are concerned, there are various other reasons and threats, other than their physical conditions, that will render them to be at risk. Some of these buildings or properties are at risk (see Table 5.4 below), due to change of taste (45%), not only by the owners themselves but also by the tenants. This is then related to the change of use, which accounts for 41% of the total surveyed properties (see also Appendix 5.3c). These changes of taste and use are also related to new developments that are slowly taking shape in and around these buildings. The emergence of new one stop departmental stores (Figure 5.9), mentioned above is one of the reasons.

### Table 5.4 The various reasons why the buildings are at risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons building at risk</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change of use</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of ownership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of taste</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at risk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When properties change ownership or tenancy, renovation and alteration are usually carried out to suit new requirements and usage, e.g. converting residential to retailing or residential to business/office spaces. From the visual survey businesses like a fashion house, hairdressing salon, lighting and photographic shop caused a lot of damage to the frontage of these buildings. The damage occurs during 'permitted' conversion, alteration, and renovation, see Figure 5.19, of these buildings to suit the nature of the new businesses or usage. These 'changes of taste' renovations included fitting the premises with modern day requirements such as large glass windows, security grills and bars, water pipes, and window unit air-conditioning systems, which in conservation terms are detrimental to the character of the old town. Sixty percent (60%) of them are in a fair state of alteration/renovation, while 7% are in a poor or very poor state of renovation/alteration.

Most, if not all of the renovations/alterations had been carried out by the tenants or sub tenants themselves as indicated by the statistical analysis (ap 06 & ap 07), in Table 5.6 During the interviews, it was also discovered that this situation is changing and will change in the future. Generally long-term tenants do not want to, and are no longer obliged to carry out repairs. Currently they are not willing to spend their own money on

---

* Grade 4 are buildings in "fair" condition & Grade 5 are buildings in "good" condition, for details refer to Risk Table in Appendix.
on repairs due to the fact that rental on these properties will increase. They are not sure whether they will still be living or want to live in these rented premises after the expiry of the transition period of the decontrol in December 1999. Due to this reason, it was observed that some of these buildings had not been maintained, although the buildings are still in use. After the decontrol process, with an increase in rental, it would be the owner's responsibility to maintain these properties or buildings.

Overall the survey has revealed that 50% of the premises are actually in a good state of repair while another 41% are in a fair state. This does mean that the pre-war shop house buildings in Taiping are fairly well looked after although their future still depends on their ability to sustain the threats of economic pressure and to find a compatible tenant and usage, in the environment of change mentioned earlier. In this situation the authorities must be very selective in allowing redevelopment in relation to the decontrol process.

In relation to the decontrol process the case study also looked at the rental paid by tenants for the property that they used. This was the most sensitive question since the repeal of the Act. Although the tenants and residents were reluctant to actually mention the exact rent, a range of possible rental rates was proposed in the survey format.

Fourteen percent (14%-d.03) of the properties surveyed paid rent between RM100-200 Ringgit/month (£1.00 = RM6.4 in 1997), Table 5.5. This low rental rate was related to the 'pre-decontrol' period and has not changed much since it was first agreed in the 1960's. This rental rate used to be for the whole building but lately however it is mainly paid for the portion rented on the ground floor only, of which 40% of these premises were being used for business purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rental rate</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701-800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.19 Damage to frontage façade of buildings due to alteration & renovation. (Detrimental and irreversible change, due to 'change in use')

Jalan Barrack, Taiping

These four units of 'straits eclectic' style shop houses (P1) are in fairly good condition and are in active use, but the corner unit has been renovated due to 'change in use', (the type of business), as a bridal showroom. The 'half hipped' roof has also spoiled the elevations of the building. Notice the glass window being punctured on the sidewall and the front facade window being fixed with full-length glass panels. The new extension at the back (arrow) is also out of character, and the air conditioning condenser unit spoils the façade.

Jalan Kota, Taiping

These are among the classic examples of the adulteration of the traditional façade of the shop house, with a "change in use" by the new owners of the shophouse. This kind of change has marred the integrity of the two-storey building façade. These types of changes, 'change in usage/incompatible usage' imposed on the property should be avoided and strongly discouraged by the authority or even penalised. This change alters permanently and drastically changes the character of the townscape, destroying the beautiful façade of the building that gives Taiping its character. The front entrance (P2) to the living accommodation upstairs is more in line with the 20th century design of shop houses.
From the analysed result slightly more than a third (36%) of the properties surveyed are paying rental below RM500.00/month, and only about 12% of these properties are paying rent more than RM1,000.00. These higher rented properties however were identified as properties being leased out after the decontrol process, not by property owners but by earlier tenants who were there before the pre-decontrol period. Even though the rental is high it does not benefit the rightful property owners, at least not until the full implementation of the decontrol process. Thus this increase in rent has not helped to maintain the property. This situation will change with the full decontrol, taking place in December 1999.

From the total sample, 43% of the properties came under the "not applicable category". This group of properties are actually owner occupied (Table 5.6), and they do not pay rental. However this figure differs slightly from the data above because some owners were occupying the ground floors for business purposes while living elsewhere. The top floor is normally rented out for dwelling purposes.

With respect to the outdated and uneconomical 'Control of Rent Act 1966' (see Chapter Three), which was enforced until very recently, the responsibility for repair of these pre-war properties lies with the tenant, due to the low rental paid. It was mutually understood that tenants rather than owners will undertake any repair (major repairs however need owner's consent) to the properties. This was confirmed by the survey result in Table 5.6, when it was recorded that 57% of the respondents who are tenants were responsible for the repair and maintenance of their rented properties, although the tenants undertook this task with reservation, according to the interview. This 57% respondents actually represented 100% of those renting the properties, meaning that all tenants repair and maintain their rented buildings at their own costs. This maintenance however is basically the daily repair and upkeep of the property to make it liveable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property owner</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This situation however, is slowly changing. The uncertainties of rental rates (although these have been pre-calculated in the repeal act, Act 572), have deterred any further maintenance by the tenants, which would result in further deterioration especially in those buildings which are already in a bad state of repair.
Interviews with Taiping’s Urban Residents

The reaction of Taiping’s urban residents towards the designation of Taiping town (ap 08) as an area for conservation was also captured in this survey, in which 68% of the residents interviewed agreed to the area being designated. Only 8% disagree, while 24% of them are either “not sure or do not know” about the process. However, the 68% who agreed to the designation process, have stipulated that if designating the area would mean an increase in rent, then they would not support it, neither would they contribute to it.

The same reason was expressed, especially by the 8% who disagreed with the idea, while the other quarter of the community are not aware of conservation issues and thus do not know what to do and are not sure what conservation designation entails. Although the majority agreed to the designation process, they basically agreed because that is what the authority wanted. This was expressed by some of the respondents interviewed, saying "...kalau `council' mahu bikin, kita apa boleh buat, ikut saja lah..." ("...if the council wants to implement it, what can we do, just accept it...") as recorded in the interview. This confirmed the earlier assumption that real understanding and awareness of conservation issues is still sadly lacking among the general public.

In relation to agreeing to designating Taiping town as a conservation area (ap.13), 40% of respondents interviewed subscribed to “maintaining the character of the old town” (ap.13) and at the same time 21.1% chose to maintain the “2-storey character of the old buildings”, thus making a total sum of 60.6% agreeing to maintain the present character and appearance of Taiping’s built heritage i.e. the 2-storey character of shop houses and row houses. This confirmed that attachment to the old fabric of the town does exist although this could mainly be in the older generation of society, while the younger generation prefers new and modern buildings as revealed during the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.7 Preferred character and appearance in Taiping.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain character of Old Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain two-storey old building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control development only to four-storey building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain greenery in town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve street pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the survey also showed that 18.4% of the respondents wanted development to be controlled to only 4-storeys high. This can be seen from the present redevelopment taking place in and around the Old Town. Although the local council planning department practises this type of development control, the case study has shown that it is really not a good practice, especially if the four-storey developments stand out like a sore thumb in the existing group of buildings (see Figure 5.15). According to the residents, business properties that are four-storeys high or more are usually vacant in their upper floors. These properties are not popular with the older generation and small business tenants. The older generations do not like climbing up the stairs due to their age (buildings of four-storeys and lower do not require a lift and a handicapped lift is not usually the norm though recent amendments to the bye-law do stipulate so). These buildings however are mainly favoured by the corporate institutions of which there are not that many in Taiping.

The residents were also asked to identify a single factor (ap.12) that they would value the most about Taiping. In identifying this single feature or character which residents of Taiping value most of their town, 34% chose the “peaceful environment”, while 32% responded to the ease of “accessibility to facilities” as their most valued feature or character of the town. On further detailed examination of these two characters, the peaceful environment mentioned is related to the fresh and cool weather and Taiping’s natural Lake Garden, of which 21% of the respondents singled out the Lake Garden as their most valued feature of the town, Table 5.8 below. On the other hand the facilities mentioned above referred to the eatery, utility services, shopping and places of worship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful environment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility to facilities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Garden</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility to eatery &amp; food</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old town</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (4 did not answer the questionnaire).

Taiping being typically a Chinese community town, food (11%) was culturally the other main feature of value acknowledged by the residents and accessibility to the food bazaars or restaurant, the day or night stalls, became the main criteria of value. Thus the proliferation of day and night food bazaars all over the town makes this another distinct character of the town, more so for the night character of Taiping. These however have recently given way to the introduction of fast-food outlets (Kentucky &
McDonald) and food arcades within the one-stop departmental stores. Many of these traditional food bazaars have since been demolished, some due to structural failure of the building while the closure of others was due to hygienic conditions.

The 'Old Town' however was the last factor of concern by the respondents interviewed. However, if we refer to Table 5.7, the factor of 'maintaining the character of the old town and maintaining the two-storey building' was ranked the highest. This has indicated that respondents may not actually understand or are unaware of the relationship of the old town with the character that they would like to maintain for the town, hence there might be some misunderstanding of the concept of conservation and indeed of area-based conservation. This is also supported by the survey data in b.05 (class of gazetting) where none of the occupiers or residents know whether the building that they are living in is gazetted.

The residents were also interviewed on their willingness to support and contribute to the cost of conservation. Generally 60.5% (ap.09, ap.10 & ap.11) of the residents interviewed agreed that they should contribute towards the cost of maintaining their Town's heritage, while 32% disagreed, Table 5.9. About 8% of the respondents were not sure or did not know the answer and there are four missing values (respondent not answering question) in this criteria survey. The percentage agreeing could have been higher if the four missing values were accounted for and those in the 'not sure' group seemed incline to agree.

| Table 5.9 Showing willingness of public to pay for conservation work. |
|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Frequency        | Valid Percentage|
| YES              | 23              | 60.5             |
| NO               | 12              | 31.6             |
| Not Sure         | 2               | 5.3              |
| Don't Know       | 1               | 2.6              |
| Missing value    | 4               | (9.5)            |

The above question was followed by questionnaires that gauge how much these residents are really willing to contribute for the upkeep of their heritage. This result was verified by asking the question twice but in a different manner. The result is tabulated in Table 5.10 whereby the percentage of equally shared (50/50) contribution was 31.4% and the percentage of the whole cost being borne by the authority is 28.6% which is almost the same as the first table. The tendencies in this respect seem to point towards the authority paying for the work with another 17.1% of the respondents saying a 20/80 (occupier/authority) contribution. Again this also points to the fact that
the authority would be expected to be the main contributor for all conservation work in the town.

Table 5.10 Proportion of public and authority contributions towards the cause of conservation work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupier / authority</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0/100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residents' opinions were also consulted on their desire to live in the urban centre of the town or leave it, if new developments resulted in the construction of tall buildings consisting of office-cum-commercial premises. Slightly more than half of the residents (53%-ap.15) agreed to stay and live in the urban centre even though it was going to be developed into a high rise commercial-cum-office building area, while the rest disagreed. However on further analysis of the reasons of those wishing to stay, it was discovered that only 3% would stay because of their business commitments. Eight percent have nowhere else to go since they were born here and 11% will stay because they have stayed here all their life and considered it their home. While 21% say they will stay because they like the area and the neighbourhood.

It was also noticed that there is a growing trend in the emergence of large-scale departmental stores in Taiping town. Although Taiping's older generation despised these giant one-stop shopping centres, as revealed by the interviews, they are very much preferred by the younger generation due to the choice of goods that they offer and at a much cheaper price together with the convenience of shopping under one roof. These trendy departmental stores, tend to 'kill' the livelihood of the town's small time family business. To date Taiping already has four of these (Figure 5.9) chain departmental stores. These new departmental stores also threaten the mere survival of the traditional shop house. This was disclosed as one of the reasons for the closure of many of the small retail units, which could not compete with the big giant.

When these small-scale individual business units close down, a large corporate body tends to purchase the plot and other plots surrounding it. These units when joined
together enable the prospective property developer to redevelop the property into a large-scale development project, which is permitted by the plot ratio calculation in planning approval. The developers are also allowed to raise the development much higher than the existing surrounding development, up to four-storey height. The developer always takes up this allowance, in order to maximise his investments. This practice however has proved to be detrimental to the character of Taiping's townscape. The architecture of these buildings is usually out of character compared to the traditional two-storey shop house. The construction process of these multi-storey blocks causes undue stress to the surrounding buildings, making their structure unstable and unsafe (Figure 5.13), resulting in them being abandoned by the tenants and later being demolished by the owners.

5.6 Summary and Conclusions

From data collected in the field survey and later analysed, 90% of the buildings in Taiping town were found to be not at risk from natural dilapidation and deterioration. They are more at risk and threatened by the development and redevelopment that is slowly engulfing the town. This is in relation to the redevelopment of properties to meet the demand of new purpose-built buildings and the prospect of an economic return, which could be gained from redeveloping the urban land on which these traditional buildings stand. Tragically these new developments have been allowed to be developed too large and too high, which is out of character with the existing architectural style and skyline of Taiping.

Although to the locals the traditional two-storey buildings seem familiar and ordinary and are found in abundance in all the towns in Malaysia, this does not mean that the buildings in Taiping do not deserve to be protected or conserved. Demand for modern amenities and changes in taste, usage and the desire for refurbishment have also contributed to the urgency to conserve these buildings so that they are not adulterated or renovated beyond recognition of their original architectural style, as had been shown in Figure 5.12. These buildings and the urban historic areas of Taiping town are not only significant to the history of the State of Perak but is also significant to the history of the country. The fact that these pre-war buildings are slowly disappearing and being replaced by new insensitive development is reason enough for their conservation. What is more, their architectural value is significant to the historical development of not only the area but to the whole country in general.
Due to the plot size of these traditional properties, which are small in width but lengthy in depth, it is only logical for economic reasons, to develop the site upwards as seen in the illustration. This however has produced structures that stick out like sore thumbs between rows of traditional two-storey structures. Not only are these structures alien to the character of the old town, they are also poorly and insensitively designed in relation to the existing architectural fabric. These single plot infill developments really need to be scrutinised more diligently by the council’s architect and planning department so as not to result in the sore thumb effect. Their façade design also needs to be monitored so that it will be more in harmony with the surrounding traditional style in order to protect the character of the town. The bare masonry and dull exposed concrete structures are visually obtrusive to the character of any townscape.

Redevelopment of several units of shop house lots into a single block of one-stop shopping centres, however, has not only killed the livelihood of small businesses, but has also generated other downstream problems such as heavy traffic and parking. Although these problems have not reached a critical level yet in Taiping, there are tell tale signs that point in that direction. These usually huge blocks of multi development are also breaking the traditional townscape rhythm of the town. Although they are accepted and appreciated by the younger generation, the older people do not take kindly to them, certainly not those who have businesses competing with the large supermarket chain, which these large development blocks were constructed for.

These large departmental stores and supermarket developments could have been persuaded by the local authority concerned to be located in the new areas along the periphery of the new highways where there are areas earmarked for development, rather than imposing themselves in the historic core of the old town. These new areas are already becoming popular due to their easy access to the highway. An out of town centre shopping mall should be able to take some of the problems resulting from redevelopment pressure and threat such as, traffic congestion and car parking, away from the historic urban core.

By doing this, it would encourage the traditional, small, and specialised businesses and service providers to come back and carry out their business in this town since there seems to be a great demand for two storey shop houses, based on the development just outside Taiping old town, in Kamunting. Without the pressures and the hustle and bustle of a busy business centre, tenants and owners might be encouraged to come back to live in the abandoned row houses and conserve them. That is, if the authority
is able to regulate and manage the effect of the decontrol process of the Control of Rent Act.

It is also important to ensure that conservation work is not treated on a piecemeal basis (as could be seen in the Taiping examples). It needs to be viewed on a broader perspective and seen more as a cohesive grouping rather than as individual units. There needs to be a systematic programme and stringent control over the type of development and usage of these buildings. Infill development within a block must be seriously controlled and its design scrutinised so as not to be obtrusive to the traditional character of the old town as shown by the case study. The four-storey permitted development height together with the construction material used needs to be reviewed and not given blanket approval. Only by doing so will the authority be able to control the development threats and ensure that the townscape appearance and historic character is not devalued or ruined by the slow process of accumulated ‘permitted development’.

The result of the survey has also brought about an unexpected point of concern for these pre-war shop houses. The decontrol process of the Control of Rent Act, although it is not directly related to the cause of cultural heritage conservation, nevertheless would have an effect on the condition of these buildings. Its repeal however, does have a direct effect on the maintenance of these properties although the physical effect was not noticeable during the period when the survey was carried out. In spite of that there are indications that maintenance would not be carried out on these buildings by the present tenants, as revealed in the interviews. The full decontrol process (December 1999) could also lead to demolition and major redevelopment if no measure is taken to protect these properties quickly when the decontrol process takes full effect. In order to quickly protect these properties an approach towards area conservation designation would temporarily provide the necessary protection before other measures could be put in place. Designating the area would enable the authority to control the type of development taking place while at the same time protecting those buildings and properties which have not been gazetted (refer to Chapter Three).

The reluctance of existing tenants to repair and maintain their rented property, because of uncertainties of future rental as a result of this decontrol, would also eventually lead to deterioration in these properties and thus give reasons for their demolition (redevelopment). The property owners on the other hand have an indifferent attitude towards repair and they are not investing, from the little rent collected, in the repair of
these buildings; thus this will further aggravate the situation. These are the main concerns and fears felt by the present tenants as disclosed by them during the interviews. This situation is also true elsewhere in the country.

Like many urban centres in Malaysia, modern Taiping has remained an essentially Chinese town. Although its Chinese and Indian Temples, Buddhist Monasteries, Commonwealth military cemetery, churches, temples and mosques provide a considerable mixed assortment of cultures and sites of interest, reflecting Taiping's varied cultural heritage, Taiping provides very little in its heritage to reinforce the status of the indigenous Malays and their culture. Taiping Municipal officials admitted during the interviews that this intrinsic situation has created 'problems' when local government sets about implementing conservation policies and programmes; indeed this is Malaysia's unique conservation problem. The 'problem' is also related to the Federal Government New Economic Policy (NEP) (Second Malaysia Plan 1971-1975), a policy dedicated to improving the status of its indigenous or Bumiputra population (Chapter 2). The Chinese business community in Taiping town owns ninety percent (90%) of the properties whereas only 10% are owned or occupied by other ethnic races. Most of the indigenous Malay businesses are located either in the specially allocated 'timber bazaar' areas or on developed 'wakaf land' belonging to the Islamic religious council or department, while the Chinese dominate the old masonry shop house buildings.

At present some of these old buildings in the centre of the town continue to house Chinese clan associations and multi-dialect groups as they have always done. The buildings that remain have changed very little, although some are in need of basic maintenance. However more of these buildings are being demolished than have been conserved, as new modern purpose built buildings have replaced some of them.

If this demolition process continues the character and appearance of the historic town will slowly be eroded by the new development and it will soon lose its charm and importance as a heritage town. Modern developmental intrusions, especially in infill sites need to be seriously and strategically managed in order to facilitate growth without impairing the town's character, value and appearance. In order to do this conservation works need to be integrated in the policy and planning process of the State, especially with the authority responsible for development planning permission.

---

5 'Wakaf land' are land donated by individual Muslims to the custody of the Islamic Religious Department for the communal usage of the Muslim community.
permission. Protective measures should be taken as a collective effort rather than on an ad-hoc piecemeal basis. In other words ordinary architectural built heritage should be conserved as a group or as an area.

The quick listing survey has identified areas and groups of buildings in the town as worthy of conservation or protection. These areas have been marked in Figure 5.4. These areas however are selected based on the degree of developmental threats that the properties are experiencing and the degree of changes that have happened to the buildings within them. The authority (MPT) concerned should now look into these areas in more detail and make plans for their protection and conservation. This will protect not only the monumental buildings but would also protect the ordinary and familiar local cherished scene or townscape. If this process is set as a precedent in Taiping, other deserving heritage old towns that are similar to Taiping's urban built form would also be able to follow suit.

Initial conservation measures, which have just been introduced by Taiping local authority, see Chapter 6, have managed to protect some of this valuable architectural fabric but more needs to be done if Taiping wants to retain its status as a historical urban centre. Due to lack of priority and proper guidelines pertaining to these measures, conservation programmes have not advanced, as they should. There is still a lack of understanding in the local community about the benefits of conservation and most of the present upgrading and maintenance works were undertaken not with a conservation intention in mind but to suit the owners' business purposes and changing taste. The Authority only tries to persuade these owners to comply with the proper conservation techniques when rehabilitating their two storey-shop houses. This move is slowly gaining support, as can be seen in Figure 5.12.

The case study was able to illustrate that there are problems in the efforts to conserve the built heritage of Taiping town. The conclusions drawn from the study are therefore listed below:

- There is no organised programme for built heritage or urban area conservation in Taiping.

- Although there are various individual properties being 'repaired and maintained', not 'conserved' in the technical sense, all these efforts are being carried out by individual property owners, without the local authorities' specialist guidance.
Most well-maintained properties (row houses) are basically owner occupied.

Majority of buildings (shop houses) which are maintained, but 'not properly conserved', are basically those under tenancy. The owners of the premises relate this to the decontrol process of the Control of Rent Act (CoRA), and the trivial rental received by them.

The decontrol process of CoRA, has resulted in tenants not being willing to carry out any more repair due to the subsequent increase in rental.

Owners do not want to undertake repairs due to their losses in the past and the anticipated benefits/profits from possible redevelopment of their property in relation to decontrol process.

The survival of these pre-war properties will be threatened if no measures are set in place to protect the tenants from leaving the property due to redevelopment especially after the decontrol process i.e. "gentrification process".

Significant areas within the historic Taiping town have not been identified for possible designation and their enhancement programme has not been formulated even though the whole town has been identified as a conservation zone thus resulting in the demolition of valuable heritage building and structures.

Redevelopment projects on infill sites have devalued the town's character, when the heights of new buildings are increased over and above the traditional two or three-storey existing buildings.

Permitted development, i.e. changes in traditional façade design due to business requirement and changing taste, has also devalued the historic town character.

Finally it can be concluded that these pre-war shop houses and row houses in Taiping are really not at risk in themselves. They are threatened, more by the redevelopment process and lack of maintenance rather than through natural dilapidation, although natural vegetation poses some threats to the fabric of these properties which are not maintained.
Local Authority Survey and Conservation Guidelines

Analysis, interpretation of survey findings and interview discussion
6 Introduction

In Chapter Five, the old town of Taiping, a unique urban historic development centre that typifies many other Malaysian towns, was studied. The case study which has looked at one typical heritage built form in the town, the pre-war shop house and row house, together with interviews with the residents, was carried out in relation to the current development growth of the town and the conservation efforts of its local authority. The outcome of the case study, as expected, has revealed the risks and threats faced by these properties as a result of the growth of redevelopment. At the same time the result has pointed out the importance of local government actions towards the success or otherwise of architectural conservation ventures in Malaysia.

This chapter will now look at the role of a selected number of local authorities in Peninsular Malaysia, and investigate the awareness and understanding of conservation legislation, procedures and other related issues pertaining to the authorities' duties in protecting the urban built heritage. This inquiry, which is an extension to the case study undertaken in Taiping, is important because in relation to the urban conservation issues, it is the local authorities that are responsible for the changes to the traditional...
urban fabric. These local authorities also control the type and pace of redevelopment within these urban historic settings or town centres, which affects conservation.

In the process of carrying out the survey, it was also found necessary to look at the outcomes and discuss some of the local authorities' conservation guidelines provided from the survey inquiry, and which are presently being used in the execution of conservation works. These guidelines will be discussed in relation to the survey data and their effect on conservation works, already undertaken.

The inquiry above was carried out using postal questionnaire surveys, sent to a selected number of the major Majlis Perbandaran or Municipal Councils, City Halls and City Councils, which manage urban conservation works, within their organisation.

6.1 Purpose of the Survey

The general purpose of the survey was to assess the present role of the local authorities, Majlis Perbandaran, in the field of built heritage conservation. The survey focused specifically on the following points:

- the authority's role and commitments in conserving the urban built heritage and areas
- the legislation, enforcement powers and the capabilities in implementing them
- the support that these municipal authorities offer to property owners undertaking conservation works
- the conservation resources, in terms of personnel, funding and policies
- level of co-operation and participation between the local planning authorities and the public
- interaction of the local planning authorities with other government and non-governmental agencies relating to the built heritage conservation process.

The survey's objectives were to gauge the development of conservation programmes, and the obstacles and shortfalls faced by the local authorities in managing and executing their duties. In this context the local authority survey was carried out with the intention to determine any limitations within these organisations in order to propose suitable practices, with regards to changing environments and circumstances. These changes hopefully would enable these authorities, which are presently empowered to execute architectural conservation work, to address conservation issues, in line with existing resources and the needs of the country.
6.2 Process of the Survey

Methodology

The questionnaire form for the local authority survey (see Appendix 6.2), was devised and formulated in the UK. It was based on the local authority survey carried out by Larkham, (1986), who modified it from studies by Gamstone, (1975). The interview questions were also based on Burke's (1974,1976) townscape study. Some modifications were made to the format of the questionnaires in order to focus on the needs of Malaysia and to enforce the fact that built heritage conservation issues were still a very new subject for many local authorities' administration. Some factors in the UK's model questionnaires, like the provision of grants and the support of amenity societies in ensuring the success of conservation work, were reviewed, modified and subsequently changed to suit the perception and degree of understanding of the Malaysian respondents.

The questionnaire was divided into six sections with each section focussing on the main research questions pertaining to the administration and management issues of area based conservation in Malaysia. Section One focused on the designation processes and administrative procedures currently practised by these municipalities in delineating (designating) areas for conservation purposes. Section Two concentrated on public participation and awareness in the protection and gazetting process. Section Three looked at local authorities' manpower resources and requirements, while Section Four looked at inter-departmental linkages and co-operation in the execution of the work. Section Five and Six looked into the financial support and existing processes and procedures involved in the protection or conservation of the urban architectural heritage.

Target Group and Response Rate

To facilitate a quick response from the local authorities and in order to collect the completed forms before the end of the fieldwork period, a total number of twenty-two questionnaire forms were posted from the UK to local authorities in Malaysia. Out of these twenty-two questionnaires sent out, one was to Dewan Bandaraya Kuala Lumpur (City Hall K.L.), two to Majlis Bandaraya (City Councils) of Ipoh (MBI) and Johore Bahru (MBJB) and twenty numbers to Municipal Councils (Majlis Perbandaran-MP). These twenty municipal councils including the City Hall and the two City Councils are the urban planning and approving authorities in Malaysia (see Appendix 6.1).
Two questionnaire survey forms were also sent out, from Malaysia, to two quasi-government organisations; i.e. the Lembaga Muzium Melaka and Warisan Melayu Johore. These two organisations were included in the survey with the advice of the Majlis Perbandaran of Melaka and the Majlis Bandaraya of Johore Bahru. These two quasi-governmental organisations form part of the approving committee for development planning control, especially those concerning heritage buildings and historical sites in these two municipalities.

A time frame of four weeks was given to these local authorities to respond to the questionnaire survey, so that it could be collected during the time allocated for the field study period. There was a 100% response to the survey with one very late reply from the City Hall of Kuala Lumpur, which arrived in the UK.

In the context of urban conservation in Malaysia it is these Municipal Councils which have conservation zones within their jurisdiction. Also, within these selected local authorities there are technical professionals dealing with the conservation issues, and it is here that urban conservation has really been an issue. The questions forwarded to these authorities were also related to their administrative and management role in the conservation of the built heritage and areas, together with their programmes in seeing built heritage within their jurisdiction is protected.

Other smaller local authorities, the District Councils, (refer to Appendix 6.1), have been omitted from this survey because these District Councils have not allocated or determined any conservation zones within their boundaries. Also, these smaller local authorities do not have professional officers within their organisation to deal with conservation, let alone on any technical matter, although some of them do have some sub-professional officers dealing with the normal everyday council matters. Most of the conservation issues that arise within these smaller local authorities are brought up to the State Government, who deals with it. This then would be carried out through the various other State agencies or Federal agencies, depending on the level of importance of the artefacts or sites (related to the three tier level of government discussed in Chapter Two).

**Limitation of Research Survey**

The limitation in the questionnaire survey process was mainly in its timing, which like the Taiping case study, was carried out after the decontrol process of the Control of
Rent Act was enforced. The decontrol process has stunted the local authority's efforts in the promotion of conservation works. This was due to the uncertainties of occupation of these pre-war properties and the possibilities of the sites and buildings being redeveloped by the owners. The only consolation at that time was the downturn of the country's and region's economy (the 1997-1998 Asian economic crisis), which did not provide a suitable climate for redevelopment.

Due to distance and the limitation of time, this local authority questionnaire could not be piloted but was discussed at length with the thesis supervisors. Also, due to the time pressures there was minimum interaction between the author and local authority officer responding to the questionnaire forms. Some discrepancies, which were discovered in the returned answer scripts, were clarified only through short telephone conversations.

With the exception of five local authorities, the rest responded to the questionnaires on time. The ones which were delayed gave reasons of not knowing how to answer these questions, which indicated that these local authorities have not had the experience in dealing with area-based conservation issues nor were they certain how to tackle the matter. This was clarified during inquiries made about the whereabouts of the questionnaires that were sent to them.

6.3 Interpretation of Analysed Survey Data

Local Authority Responsibilities

All of the municipal authorities surveyed indicated that they were aware of the statutory powers bestowed upon them regarding issues of protecting the historical and architectural heritage, although these powers were only found in the miscellaneous section of the Local Government Act. However, less than half (42%) of them have any stated policy guidelines or statements concerning the matter.

From the point of view of conservation development, the outcome of the initial questionnaire does not seem very encouraging. However, a quarter of the authorities surveyed are the newly upgraded District Councils, in newly created municipal boundaries, especially those in the state of Selangor. The majority of these new municipalities, including some old ones (46%), do not have conservation policy guidelines (see Chapter Three) and do not delineate or designate areas or conserve any architectural heritage (Q3c). This is because major new towns like Shah Alam (MPSA), Petaling Jaya (MPPJ), Subang Jaya (MPSJ), Ampang Jaya (MPAJ),
Selayang (MPS) and Temerloh (MPT) do not have older buildings or areas worthy of conservation.

The analysed result has also shown that local authority statutory powers in conservation were channelled to do other works not related to the maintenance of the heritage building (Q01b). Only a quarter of the municipalities, actually used these statutory powers to maintain heritage buildings. This could also be an indicator as to how much officers in the local authorities understand about the importance of these statutory rights to the process of conservation.

Half of the authorities (55%, Table 6.1) statutory powers were directed for other activities (which were not indicated) and only 27% of it were used for maintaining heritage buildings which only belong to the council (Q01b). A senior management officer of Taiping municipal authority, during the stakeholder interview, reinforced this fact. The officer disclosed that the priorities of the local authority are towards upgrading infrastructure facilities and maintaining the sanitary cleanliness of the town. According to him heritage protection is not the priority of the council and the lack of resources within the council, to undertake the task would further aggravate the problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain building</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to maintenance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire property / land</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine out of ten (92%) municipal authorities are aware of the 1996 amendments to the Town and Country Planning Act, which have implicitly included some conservation measures for areas and buildings in relation to development and redevelopment control (Q24a). Since these measures are embedded in the development planning control and local action plan documents, conservation control and measures cannot be enforced unless local action plans exist within these authorities, which so far have taken time to prepare and be gazetted. According to Dr. Ting Chew Peh, the present Housing and Local Government Minister, only five out of the seventy-eight local (action) plans prepared have been gazetted so far (The STAR, 1998). This situation is definitely not a good sign in a country like Malaysia, which is developing rapidly.
Progress on Identifying Conservation Areas

Slightly more than half (50% & 4.2%) of the surveyed municipal authorities have identified or 'delineated' areas as planning (conservation) control areas within their boundary, although half of these have less than five areas (see Table 6.2), identified as areas deserving conservation protection (Q03b). In fact it is only Penang Municipal Council (MPPP), and Historical City of Melaka Municipal Council (MPMBB), that has identified more than a single area deserving designation.

Table 6.2: Number of 'conservation areas' in Municipal Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of areas designated</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanswered</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This one local authority having 6 nos. conservation area

Eleven surveyed authorities, which accounted for 46% of the respondents, did not respond to the question to determine the present number of designated conservation area (Q.03c). This is because these municipal authorities were only set up very recently as a result of boundary splits from existing municipalities or due to the expansion of new towns, and being newly developed areas they do not have conservation areas.

The other half (50%) of the surveyed municipal authorities which have areas delineated for conservation or for planning control and restrictions purposes, have only identified one area, the old town centre, under their local plan. Out of the thirteen authorities with conservation areas; ten municipal authorities use multiple criteria of character, appearance, architectural and historical significance in the process of the designation, Table 6.3 (Q04b), and only three confined themselves to only architectural and historical significance for its choice of designation.

The one factor common to all these delineated areas is that they are made up of buildings from the pre-war era and their architectural style is familiar to every other old urban centre in the country, i.e. the urban 'Malaysian Shop House and Row House'. All of the 'conservation zones' identified in the municipal council structure plans and local plans are usually made up of the 'old historic development centre' which is obviously the old town itself. This is the reason, why the significant value that dominates this selection criterion is historical and architectural in nature, due to the presence of these traditional built forms in the town.
Table 6.3: Criteria used to determine significance of area as conservation area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character and appearance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural &amp; History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Not applicable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New Municipal authorities without designated conservation area

The selection of these conservation zones was basically a planning process, done during the process of formulating and drafting of the structure plans, and subsequently the more detailed local plans. The task is usually undertaken by a special Structural Plan Unit of the Federal Town Planning Department in co-operation with the State and local authority's planning department. Sometimes external consultants are also brought in to help.

From the total number (12) of local authorities surveyed, that do identify conservation zones within their boundary, one-third of them had the area identified or chosen by their own planning staff (Q.4a). The public, however, is only involved during the exhibition of the public consultation process of the structure or local plans. Any written objections could only be made during this period. One-third (33.3%) of the surveyed authorities acknowledged receiving assistance from the public in their designation process through this method (Q.10c). Whilst this opportunity was given, the public sometimes has an indifferent attitude to the process, and a quarter (6) of the local authorities surveyed reported a poor response in the public consultation. Although responses from them are satisfactory they are usually reactive rather than proactive (Q.12c).

Management Resources and Personnel

Since conserving an area is basically a planning issue, 63% of the municipal authorities surveyed have planners managing the conservation aspects, see Table 6.4 (Q07). The planners basically administer the development control processes, working closely with the State Planning Department. The municipal architect (if there is one) is usually not involved in this process. In almost all of the municipal authorities in Malaysia, an architect's department does not exist per se, except in City Hall KL. In authorities that do employ an architect, the person is usually placed in the building or planning control
department, if not the engineering department. Other than City Hall KL, which has a conservation and urban design unit (*Unit Pengekalan dan Seni Bandar*) the only other municipal authority that has an architect managing the conservation unit, is *Majlis Perbandaran Kelang*. Only one other authority uses both their architect and planner to deal with built heritage conservation issues. The rest of the municipal authorities rely on their non-technical staff or sub-professionals, i.e. technical assistants or technicians\(^1\), who are not trained in this field.

### Table 6.4 Profession of officers in charge of conservation issues in local authorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect &amp; Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Conservation Officer</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planners</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other than these two main professional disciplines, there are also others involved in the management of conservation issues in local authorities. They include Landscape Architect, Administrators and Building Engineers and the 'Conservation Officers\(^2\)', Table 6.4. A fifth (21%) of the municipal authorities are also using non-technical officers to administer conservation issues in their areas (see Table 6.4).

**Staffing: Manpower and Expertise in Local Authorities**

From the total number of authorities surveyed for their conservation professionals, twenty-three (96%) did not have any, nor do they have personnel trained in the field of built heritage or architectural conservation in their department. The survey result however, indicated that although there is no expert there is however continuity in the personnel involved in the work process, carried out by the local authority (Q14c). This could be due to the fact that the persons managing conservation issues in these local authorities are the senior management, the Director, Deputy Director, Senior Assistant Director and Assistant Director, of the unit and managing conservation work is part of the job specification (Q.14d).

---

\(^1\) Technician posts in Malaysia are basically the bottom-most position of the technical ladder. Some technicians are from rank and file acquiring their skill through in service training. Present day technicians are trained in Polytechnic and have proper certificate qualification.

\(^2\) From the author's experience and knowledge working in Malaysia (up to July 2000), there are no academically trained or qualified conservation officers in any local authority in Malaysia, although these two local authorities have indicated as such.
Although these authorities do not have specialists managing their conservation work, the majority (79%) of them do not plan to employ or recruit conservation specialists or a person trained in built heritage conservation, to fill this gap (Q.15a). This high percentage of local authorities not wanting to recruit specialists is due to a quarter of them being new municipalities and some of the older ones, that do not have conservation issues within their organisation, not needing to do so. But, for those authorities that do have conservation issues in their organisation, this 'reluctance' to recruit, will aggravate the problem and will further burdens the planning control department, which will have to shoulder this task.

This recruitment of conservation officers issue has been debated repeatedly in all the conservation seminars and conferences held in the country. There was a general consensus in these conferences (see Chapter Three) that there is an urgent need to recruit trained conservation personnel, to be employed in local government organisation to manage conservation issues. Due to constraints in resources and the general belief in local government that conserving the cultural heritage is not the major role of the council (Q.01b), this has not happened yet.

Taiping's Municipal Council planning officers have also aired their concerns over the above issue. Without the presence of a specific conservation unit and an officer, the planning department, they say, is left to look after conservation and enhancement programmes for the areas delineated. This responsibility was reflected when 83% (20) of the local authorities surveyed have indicated that conservation work is being administered by physical planners although the questionnaires were sent to the local authority administrator (Q.08). With the exception of City Hall Kuala Lumpur and the other two City Councils, all other Municipal Councils' planners would not be able to cope with this extra burden due to shortage of staff and lack of resources.

In order to gauge the effectiveness of instructions or policies on conservation within the municipal authorities, the survey has also analysed the designations or posts held by these officers within their organisation. It was discovered that nearly 80% of them are in the senior management position. They are Managers, Directors, Deputy Directors or Assistant Directors of the unit they serve. All of the Assistant Directors (20%) are actually directly involved in the execution of the work (Q.07). In the City Council of Ipoh, a planner is designated specifically to manage conservation issues in a sub-unit of the Planning Department called the 'Unit Pemeliharaan dan Rekabentuk Bandar' (Conservation and Town Design Unit).
Although the officials involved in conservation issues in these local authorities all held high positions, as indicated by the survey result above, the conservation process however has not progressed quickly or professionally enough to benefit the nation and the public. The loss of various important heritage buildings mentioned in Chapter Three, testifies to this. Most conservation works are usually carried out by other organisations, like the National Museum, National Archives, Public Works Department or by Badan Warisan Malaysia, if not by the individual owners themselves. The lack of a policy statement and the fact that 78% of the local authorities do not even have a Conservation Advisory Committee (Q.27a) nor is there a specific conservation unit being set up in almost all of these authorities could be the reason for this slow progress. The fact that 80% (19) of the local authority’s Planning Department is being burdened by this task could also contribute to this reason (Q.25). In this respect nearly half of those councils surveyed do not have any policy guidelines or statement, pertaining to the direction of their conservation programmes, where this might be expected.

Forward Planning

A quarter (i.e. 6) of the municipal authorities surveyed, which have designated conservation zones, depended upon the Local Plan as their instrument for forward planning in conservation works (Q.28), while four others use the Action Area Plan (a more detailed document extracted from the local plan). However, about one-third (30% (7) see Table 6.5 below) of these authorities did not answer this particular question and three others do not have anything or any document at all guiding them in their conservation work, if any. This is probably due to the fact that many authorities have not gazetted their structural plans (The Star, 1998)\(^3\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master plans/ Development plans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local plan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action area plan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not answering</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) A check with the latest sources revealed that out of the ninety-seven local authorities that have completed their structural plan, only sixty-four have been gazetted and since then only five local plans have been gazetted.
Inter-Agencies Co-operation and Organisational Policies

Since area and architectural conservation is still a new issue in many local authorities in Malaysia, one expects that these local authorities would communicate among themselves and seek advice where they could. As could be seen in Chapter Two, this could be done through the National Joint Council of Local Government. There seemed to be close co-operation among them, although most of the discussions took place within the departments themselves.

Local authorities have a statutory duty to the State Government in matters concerning and affecting conservation issues. Local authorities are also obliged to accept instructions from Federal Government who dispense them mainly in the form of a non-obligatory 'administrative instructions' (54%), although more often than not they are not followed. The survey results have also confirmed the theoretical concept that was illustrated in Chapter Two, concerning the three-tier system of government in Malaysia, whereby local government seeks the help of the State government and Federal government and vice versa, top down and bottom up management.

Although internal communication was the main 'modus operandi', in matters of built heritage conservation local authorities also seek the help of other local authorities, whereby two thirds (68%) of them also seeks the help of other departments, mainly (29%) the Museum Department (Q.19a &b). One third (38%) of the local authorities in the survey do not consult a specialist when planning applications are made in the delineated conservation area, while another third (33%) do consult the State Government (Q.16).

Funding and Financial Assistance

What is obvious in this section of the survey is that, none of the municipal authorities surveyed have allocated funds to support conservation wok. For the one-third (33%) of respondents who answered 'YES' to this question, the source of funds was actually mapped to the funds allocated for building maintenance, obtained from the Building Department under the maintenance budget programme (Q.20b). This fund is being used primarily for major repair works in councils' own properties rather than for conservation objectives. Some of the funding for conservation is also obtained from the operating budget (Q.21), although this seems a bit dubious, using the operating budget for maintenance work.
From the survey result it seems that funds needed for conservation are taken from whatever money is available within the council, probably surplus or as and when it is made available. This is unhealthy because no conservation programmes can be formulated without the knowledge of how they are going to be funded or where the resources are coming from.

6.4 Existing Guidelines and Actual Examples of Conservation Work

In the process of the survey exercise it was also discovered that there are illustrated guidelines prepared by some of these local authorities (some authorities supplied them together with the returned questionnaire). These guidelines are used to promote building conservation works and assist prospective developers and property owners in those urban areas which consist of basically the shop house.

One of the many objectives of the local authorities when preparing these guidelines is to stimulate an interest in conservation by highlighting how a conservation area can protect and enhance property values, by emphasising the historical/architectural quality of the built environment (DBKL, 1990:Obj.C4). These guidelines and policies which are usually drawn up by the larger City and Municipal Councils are also being adopted by other smaller local authorities; if not in their specific conservation documents, they are incorporated in the structure plan/local action plan. The objective of analysing and discussing these guidelines in this chapter is to evaluate their effectiveness when one uses them and to study the effect they have on the historic environment being conserved.

Some of these guidelines also illustrate the type of permissible development, together with incentives and restrictions, which exist for buildings and areas within the boundary of the municipality. Illustrated proposals were made available to anyone interested in development located in conservation zones. These illustrated 'conservation guidelines' are directly related to the development planning controls, which govern the building setback, the structure's height (Figure 6.2), visual sight line (Appendix 6.3) and the number of permissible storeys. The retention of significant façades and dominant features that give character to the surrounding environment (Appendix 6.4) is also included in these guidelines. In the case of City Hall DBKL, it even provides sketched solutions as to how these two-storey shop house buildings could be developed (Appendix 6.4a and 6.4b).
Some of these illustrated guidelines, however, have caused 'damage' to the urban setting and changed the character of the place (see Figure 6.1). Prospective developers, architects and designers tend to follow the proposed illustrated guidelines (Figure 6.2), as an easy way out of the planning approval. This unfortunately has resulted in several undesirable outcomes, in infill redevelopment of the heritage precinct. It usually happens in the larger urban conservation zones like Kuala Lumpur (see Figure 6.1 and Appendix 6.3c), Penang (Figure 6.2a) and others. Sometimes when the smaller Municipal Councils, like Kelang and Taiping (see Figure 6.2b) adopt these guidelines the same result was observed.

The guideline on permissible height of development is inversely related to the plot ratio calculation, which allows development to rise up to a maximum of four-storey high (Figure 6.2). This has caused considerable damage to the two-storey character of most urban historic townscapes. The infill development that now rises up to this new four-storey permissible height (sixteen metres maximum), usually causes façade disruption to the integrity of the unified block, which is intended for conservation. In the Malaysian context, these four-storey infill developments in 'conservation areas' always stand out disastrously like a 'sore thumb' and corner infill developments are the worst.

The set-back for building in infill development as indicated in these guidelines, Appendix 6.3a & 6.3b, should not have been allowed to be implemented and new developments should have respected existing building frontage/lines. These set-backs create a void in the elevational treatment and break the harmony of the existing façades. Depending on the rate of redevelopment of other units within the block, these set backs created a mini-square or a 'cul-de-sac' in front of the new development and also break the continuity of the traditional five-foot pedestrian way (Figure 6.3), which is the main characteristic of these urban heritage shop houses. Set-backs have not proved to be the solution. An alternative route or a by-pass would have been a better solution failing which, a restriction or a ban on entry of private vehicles could be a better short term solution. In the long term the policy of selective and sensitive development and the reuse of old buildings should be the target.

Proposed green landscaping as shown in Appendix 6.3a neither does justice to the new development, nor does it enhance the area. This new development changes the character of not only the built forms but also the traditional route of pedestrian shopping Figure 6.4. Local authority guidelines on the permissible height of new development in
Figure 6.1 These are the outcomes of conservation work following the façade retention guidelines advocated by the local authorities.

These are some of the conservation works approved by the City Hall of Kuala Lumpur (DBKL), following the guidelines set out by them. The work was based on the "façade retention and sight-lines and height (how much new building one can see from the street)" as set in the guidelines. This form of "conservation" deals mainly with the external appearance of the building and trying to fit a modern working environment into an old shell.

'Facadism' Malaysian style: The MBf Finance Berhad Building (Jalan Tun Perak, KL).

The preservation of the façade of the shop-houses (4 units) for the new one block office and bank development in Jalan Tun Perak Kuala Lumpur.

The Third, Fourth and Fifth floor additions have done injustice to the preserved façade. To make matters worse an elevated light transit rail network runs on the centre median of the road blocking this photographic view.

(Source: Self)

The retention of a façade in a large mixed retail development, with UDAOCEAN Supermarket as the anchor tenant, in Kuala Lumpur's Chinatown (conservation zone 2).

Another controversial piece of built heritage conservation (facadism) work approved by City Hall. The UDAOCEAN departmental store (Jln. Tun H.S.LEE) was built on this parcel of land, which used to house two storey pre-war shophouses on it.

The new development only retains the skin of the façade along the sides. The corner edge was recessed in (A), thus giving a void space while the window panel marked (B) was not restored but finished quite blatantly.

(Source: Majallah Arkitek, May, 1996)
Figure 6.2 Local authority guidelines on the permissible height of new development in relation to planning plot ratio.
Figure 6.2a A development based on the MPPP guideline in one of Penang's conservation zone

This large new four-storeys development tried to complement the street façade of the two-storey building in the conservation zone. The building was set back to the former row house's building line and its façade simplified the elaborate Straits-eclectic facade of the two-storey houses, while the massive roof design has also been broken to give it a sense of roof-scape scale. Although this development is successful in its own right, owing to the cost of land in the centre of Georgetown's historic core, the sheer volume of the development is out of scale and character to the surrounding environment.

Figure 6.2b A development based on the adopted (DBKL) conservation guidelines in the conservation zone in Jalan Berek, Taiping

A massive four-storeys office cum retail business was very insensitively built, puncturing through the cohesiveness of the old row of buildings. Even the design has not been well thought and is totally out of character with the existing surrounding. It stands out like a 'big white elephant'.

(Source: self photograph)
Figure 6.3 Examples of development projects affecting conservation area character.

Below (P1): New massive development on the far right breaks the continuity of the two-storey shop house and the setback cut off the continuity of the covered (weather-shield) five-foot way. Kuala Lumpur City conservation zone.

Below (P2): New development in the old town of Seremban, notice the setback for the corner unit and the third unit (arrow), while the second unit and the rest of the block (whether refurbished or not) maintained the street frontage. An inappropriate solution to solving the problem.
relation to planning plot ratio within the urban centres, results the loss of the traditional five-foot link-way sheltering the shoppers on foot from the tropical sun and rain.

These set-backs, which are presumably, in most cases, to cater for road and services expansion and to solve urban traffic problems are a short-sighted solution to the problem. Other measures like traffic calming and the prohibition of private vehicles in the high street and historic precinct, could have been imposed as a better measure. These measures have not been seriously tested and implemented although they have been tried on a very small scale by the City Hall of Kuala Lumpur and Melaka Town. Traffic calming, diversion and restriction, as seen in many Western countries’ conservation areas, could provide a better solution as compared to setting back the building, resulting in the loss of integrity in the traditional façade design.

In the long term these Illustrated guidelines by City Hall of Kuala Lumpur, and other local authorities need to be reviewed and possibly changed accordingly, because they do not capture the true spirit of conserving an area nor do they protect historically or architecturally significant properties. The guidelines merely encourage the retention of street façades and the front portion of the building up to the first half of the original pitched roof, whilst permitting an entire new development to be constructed above, usually independent of the original building (see Figure 6.4). Thus there is no connection at all between the ‘architecturally significant’ old building (facades) and the new development.

Figure 6.4 Example of a conservation redevelopment work based on DBKL (City Hall) conservation guidelines.

**Jalan Dang Wangi, Kuala Lumpur**
(1998), Office cum retail development.

This redevelopment is the result of adhering to the conservation guideline issued by the Building Control Department, City Hall of Kuala Lumpur.

The two-storey frontage rises up till the apex of the original roof is being retained but the abrupt addition of the new 4½ stories does not do justice to the conservation efforts below.

However the design of the new addition has been kept simple and in harmony to the horizontal and vertical grid of the preserved lower ground façade.

(* source: New Straits Times, 1995)
The spirit of 'facadism' in the UK, or in other developed Western countries, is to retain the original street façade and develop the back portion of the building based on the roof and floor levels of the previous structure and possibly maintaining almost the same volume of structures. In the Malaysian context, this could not possibly work in the two-storey shop houses and row houses, because these domestic scale buildings lack the volume needed for an economic conversion to large-scale business premises without destroying their original design. Thus the building is best kept at its original height but there is great potential in redesigning the building lengthways, due to its great length (sometimes reaching to 100 feet).

6.5 Discussion Arising from Interviews and Data Collected

A point to note here is that although there are some areas identified in most of the prepared structure or local plans that have been gazetted, these areas themselves have not been thoroughly surveyed for the purpose of 'conservation areas designation' in the true sense of the words. A detailed study has not been carried out into their cultural significance or reasons identified as to why they deserve to be designated as conservation areas. Instead, in the proposed local plans these areas have been identified merely as development control zones for conservation purposes. In the case of Ipoh Municipal Council, the area is known as, 'Special control area and building block that preserves the façade or front elevation of building' (MBI, 1997).

With the exception of the Majlis Perbandaran Melaka, at present there is no statutory provision for financial help or grant scheme available to private property owners of heritage buildings, to help them protect or conserve their property. There is also no support for the daily maintenance of these significant heritage properties, although there are supposed to be monetary incentives provided for, under the Local Government Act (Pt. XII s.101c(iv)), which heritage property owners have never used. The authorities have also not exercised their powers or statutory rights to contribute to the maintenance cost or undertake repairs to valuable heritage buildings and properties that are left in a dilapidated state by their owners (as could be seen in the case study of Taiping). This situation arises because local authorities are themselves short of funds and many State Governments are dependent upon the Federal Government for various expenses (as reiterated by the Deputy Minister of Housing and Local Government).

The powers, which exist in the Street and Drainage Act (Act 133) and the Local Government Act (Act 171), enabling local government to undertake compulsory repairs
and acquire land and property, are very rarely exercised. This is because reclaiming the cost of repairs from owners, who could not afford it in the first place, is very difficult and would further burden the council or local authority. Also, the political environment at present is still not conducive for authorities to exercise these powers, whereby the government is still trying to unify the multi-ethnic population of the country, and conserving these 'immigrant built forms' is quite a sensitive issue especially to the indigenous local. This issue is also related to the freedom of ownership of property by citizens and the conservation dilemma, as mentioned earlier in Chapter Three.

State Government, which governs the administration policies of local councils, does not provide special funds to support this kind of work. For example, the State Governments of Johore and Melaka (1988), do statutorily provide funds for conservation programmes, but the one off amount allocated annually to the revolving fund is too superficial to support a decent conservation work. The revolving fund set-up, however, did not get enough support from the public, and contributions from the corporate sectors are insufficient to top it up. The State government was supposed to oversee the funds and their distribution but this did not happen. The Perbadanan Muzium Melaka (Melaka Museum Corporation) which was later set-up, to administer conservation programmes in the State of Melaka, does not make use of these funds nor do they capitalise on their statutory provision; this information was confirmed by the Corporation's official.

The Yayasan Warisan Negeri Johor (1988) also does provide funds for the administration of the body corporate but does not specifically offer grant aids for either conservation or maintenance work. Both these set-ups depended mainly on funds contributed from the State budget. Some help and funding could also be obtained from the National Museum or the Ministry of Culture, Art and Tourism under the auspices of heritage tourism development.

As a matter of hierarchy the Local and State Governments are also dependent on the Federal Government's instructions, policy guidelines and funding before carrying out any major conservation work. Since Malaysians regard heritage in Malaysia to be mainly of national value it therefore requires a national policy guideline, which could be used to guide the conservation works undertaken by these Governments. This national policy guideline could also fill the gap (deficiency in policy guideline within the local authority) in setting the standard of work and in devising a comprehensive framework for future development in the field of built heritage conservation. This guideline and
policy statement would then provide a platform upon which a more organised conservation programme could be based. As for heritage with local value, this is 'being taken care' at the local level through the natural process, as discussed in Chapter Three, and is being sheltered from the rapid development process.

6.6 Conclusions

The local authority survey, which was carried out with the objective of trying to investigate the awareness and understanding of officials within the organisations, about matters pertaining to the conservation of the urban built heritage, was considered to be reasonably successful. The survey data were able to confirm the research expectations and reveal some relevant new information as discussed below.

Although the survey population was small, the overwhelmingly high response was unexpected, and this has greatly helped in the analysis of the data collected. The 100% response from the local authority has helped in giving weight to the analysed data and made the result more convincing. This has helped in the understanding of the role, problems and restrictions that these authorities have in trying to execute work pertaining to the conservation of Malaysia’s urban built heritage.

When the survey was conceptualised, it was expected that all of the Municipal Authorities selected would have some form of programme in the protection of their urban built heritage. This was based on the fact that the selected municipalities are chosen from the larger of the many local authorities and are located in the most developed urban centres in the country. However, the majority of these municipalities were discovered to be very young and newly created within newly developed areas, thus not having any historical built form or areas within their jurisdiction. This is related to the high percentage of the authorities neither having any conservation areas designated nor do they have any conservation policy statement within their organisation.

It was also surprising to note that some of the older more established municipal councils also have not identified their conservation areas or their urban heritage for conservation purposes. This has also hindered conservation programmes and resulted in the ad-hoc works carried out by individual owners as seen in the Taiping case study.
The result of the survey has also concluded that although the authorities' staff are aware of the presence of legislation and statutory powers within their organisation, it has not assisted them in executing the conservation work. This is due to other external factors, for example the lack of policy direction, inventory and programmes to guide them in their work. This lack of direction coupled with the lack of trained personnel and understanding in the subject matter by the authorities' staff has not helped the conservation process either.

The reliance of local authorities on the Town and Country Planning Act, or other Acts which do not specifically address the urban conservation issues as discussed in Chapter Three, were at the same time clouding the conservation efforts by these authorities. The present legislation has also mingled the responsibilities between the Museum Department, the local authority and other organisations involved in the conservation of the built heritage, resulting in no clear definition which organisation is really responsible for the works.

The results have also revealed the deficiency and inefficiency of the present administration system, which is the result of lack of resources in terms of funding and personnel. This not only hampers the authority's effectiveness in administering the work but also leaves them no option but to treat heritage conservation as of less priority to the other demanding traditional local authority tasks, for example, infrastructure upgrading and development planning approval. Conservation of the built heritage within the local authority jurisdiction is thus left to the property owners themselves to undertake.

Although there is no financial support provided by local authorities, there are, however, some technical guidelines provided by some of the larger local authorities. Although produced with good intentions, in conservation terms, these guidelines have proved to be detrimental to the urban fabric and the course of conservation. Although the guidelines did provide some measures as to what should and should not be done in conservation terms, their implementation has been otherwise. Due to the detrimental effect on the urban historic fabric, these guidelines need to be reviewed and amended accordingly in order to rectify the situation.

As expected, most if not all of the local authorities are taking the easy way out by using the historical and architecturally significance criteria as a blanket reason for conserving the built form. More detailed study is required in this designation process in order to
make the conservation zones more meaningful. This lack of criteria in the conservation zones could also be the reason why it is difficult to formulate the National Conservation Inventory as discussed in Chapter Three. Most local authorities are basically toeing the line of others that have pioneered the work. This could be seen in the similarity of their technical guidelines and some policy statements, as and when they exist. Thus one could almost identify the similarity in some of the solutions taken and the mistakes created.

The larger urban municipal authorities surveyed, are the ones that are actively trying to promote conservation and area-based designation; their efforts are, however, being impeded by the lack of knowledge in conservation matters. The absence of specialists and the inability of the management to employ trained staff in the future will further burden the planning department, which through default has to undertake the task. This pressure on the planning department was the reason for the loss of valuable heritage properties through inability of the council's staff to monitor incompatible developments due to rapid growth and economic pressures, which further destroyed the character of urban historic areas.

The absence of a specialist or a trained conservation officer in many of the local authorities' administrations has also meant that enforcement of existing legislation pertaining to conservation issues takes less priority compared with other pressing council problems. As a result owners are left to maintain and protect their own heritage properties. The inability of the local authority's management to employ a specialist or a trained person in conservation has also meant that there has not been much progress or development in the field of built heritage conservation, other than the zoning process. Reviews of the zoned areas have not taken place and neither has there been any cancellation or re-designation of these areas.

In conclusion, the local authority survey has been able to demonstrate the fact that although there are problems in the administration and management of conservation work within the local authorities, they definitely have a role to play in the process. This effort, however, needs to be supported by other relevant infrastructures, especially in terms of manpower and financial resources that would make it conducive for the authorities to administer and execute the work and for the public and private sectors to participate.
Changing taste, style and design requirements, which have been detrimental to the historic character of urban centres also need to be accommodated but controlled, in order to facilitate the changing usage to these old buildings. Only then will conservation be sustainable and will attract property owners to participate in the conservation process.

For conservation work to be carried out effectively and efficiently, this task should be taken out of the local authority's responsibility. In the long-term, there should be established a separate and independent organisation to undertake this task, free from the encumbrances that the local authorities are experiencing now. Equipped with the necessary policy guidelines, legislation, trained personnel and adequate funds to implement conservation work, the new independent organisation should be able to concentrate on this specific work of conserving the urban built heritage. The local authorities should then be left to do what they do best, looking after the welfare and amenities of the municipalities, although their support in the field of development control relating to conservation and enforcement is definitely required and much appreciated. This inter-departmental co-operation among the various organisations and the various levels of government is not only necessary but also vital to the success of the conservation work.

For short-term measures it would also be helpful if local authorities' planning departments were equipped with the appropriate extra staff and a specific person was put in-charge of conservation. Specific revolving funds need to be provided to enable the local authorities to exercise their existing powers and to finance them for the benefit of conserving not only individual buildings but also the character of areas and townscapes.
7 Summary

The aim of this study has been to investigate how urban conservation works are handled in Malaysia and to reassess the current practices in line with present circumstances changes and requirements of the country as a whole. Inclusive in the aim of the study is the wish to examine the designation of urban heritage areas as conservation areas rather than as conservation zones as currently stipulated in the present development planning documents.

In order to focus the research towards the above targets, it has been necessary to look back at the historical development of built heritage conservation in countries of the developed West, which have developed the concept and promoted the cause. A comparison and evaluation of various other developed countries conservation area practices was also carried out in order to study their methodology; and to learn from their experiences in managing the conservation process and at the same time gathering ideas and principles in the process of urban conservation.

In the context of urban conservation processes in Malaysia, it has also been necessary to trace back the historical developments of the country, to look at the structures that
have contributed to the urban built heritage, identify factors related to their developmental changes, assess present conservation practices and processes as permitted by the local planning authorities, and evaluate the existing government's infrastructure and framework for cultural heritage conservation. This was further assisted by a case study on the built forms of a typical urban historic town and a questionnaire survey of the management and administration policies in major local authorities (municipal authorities) in the country. Stakeholder interviews were also carried out among selected government officials responsible for built heritage conservation and prominent public figures. This was carried out to gauge and determine the government's programmes for conservation and to determine the future direction of built heritage conservation as shaped by these stakeholders.

While the conservation of built heritage in towns and cities has attracted increasing debate in academic literature on urban development in Western cities (Slater, 1984; Lowenthal, 1985, Turnbridge, 1989) the subject has remained terra incognita for many Third World cities (Turnbridge, 1984:171). Rapid urbanisation and robust economic progress in many of the non-Western cities, have created a debatable forum, relating to issues of conservation and redevelopment in the urban planning agenda, in these cities (Kong & Yeoh, 1994:247). Thus many fast developing cities of the Third World are now starting to acknowledge area-based conservation as the natural next step in protecting their urban historic areas and its built heritage. Malaysia is among these Third World countries moving in this direction. This move, however, is not without its problems and restrictions. Conservation and redevelopment is particularly difficult to maintain, not only because countries in the Third World faced "economic and political problems of staggering complexity" but also because the tangible cultures that are present in the urban centres of these countries are difficult to classify (Fitch, 1982:402). The fact that urban built heritage in many Third World countries was developed by Western colonials aggravates the problems.

Having said the above, it is also significant to note that the movement for the preservation of individual monuments was launched between 1820 and 1850 (Papageorgiou, 1971:2) when the new industrial society was first beginning to assert its self. The destruction of the two world wars, and the rebuilding after that, in some of the old established European towns, especially historic urban centres in the developed Western countries, led to a new and more informed approach in the protection and

---

1 The term 'stakeholders' in the context of this study refers to administrators and policy makers in the government and non-government organisation.
preservation of buildings and areas. New developments taking place within the sphere of architecture and town planning after the wars were so radical that exceptional measures were taken as a matter of urgency to preserve historic urban centres. These measures were also implemented to subdue the fear that intrusion of unplanned new buildings, urban congestion and land speculation would ruin and destroy the character of the historic urban centres (Papageorgiou, 1971:23).

This same fear still exists today, although for a slightly different reason. Redevelopments, which take place in historic urban centres today, are due to changing taste and changing needs of the society; not to mention the replacement of the 'old' with the 'new and modern'. To top it all, it is the strategic location and high economic value of urban historic sites and properties that have enticed property speculators and owners to redevelop for profits. In so doing, 'old (heritage) properties' in urban surroundings are seen as stumbling blocks, and therefore demolished to make way for new developments.

Movements for the preservation of a whole urban centre and townscape, however, were started only in the last fifty years (Greece 1954, Germany & the Netherlands 1961, France 1962 & England 1967). These preservation movements were formed as a reaction to the destruction of townscape character arising from the loss of important buildings and structures, and redevelopment projects using prefabricated and movable architecture, which were also introduced around this time. These new architectural styles and building materials, which were introduced to speed up rebuilding and redevelopment processes after the Second World War, were insensitive to the surrounding built environment, especially when they were used to construct projects on in-fill sites in historic urban centres.

Although countries in Europe (e.g. Italy, France and Germany), started the conservation movement and were the first to take steps in protecting their cultural heritage (works of antiquity) and to restore their individual architectural monuments, it is the British conservation system and approach which appealed to many developing countries especially those that used to have historical links with Britain. In fact most of the earlier conservation practices in South East Asia and Malaysia were modelled on those developed in England but at the same time also drawing on practices from former British territories like Australia and the United States of America.
In the United Kingdom (especially England) conservation planning policy is second only to green belts and public support plays a major role in its success. Public support for conservation is also a form of conservation activity that helps to shape and guide change. This is done through planning policy, guidance, specialist advice and grant availability, and in the formulation and implementing of enhancement schemes (Larkham, 1996:109).

While public support for conservation in developed Western countries has become part and parcel of the conservation activity, in newly developed post-colonial countries the situation is otherwise. In these countries, there is generally a lack of understanding and conflict within the general public, as to the need to conserve, and on what should and should not be preserved. Hence there is also a lack of support and participation coming from them.

In a multi-cultural and plural society like Malaysia, the question of whose heritage should priority be given to, has also been a debatable and contentious issue. This is due to the fact that colonialism has stimulated strong nationalist reactions. Therefore the resentments and reluctance by some sectors of the society upon the preservation or conservation of anything that could relate one back to these colonial times, is fully understood and appreciated.

The Case for Urban Conservation

Urban historic districts require modernisation if they are to continue to be useful. Conservation of these districts therefore demands some measures of development and change. The principal issues that must be faced by these historic districts or towns are modernisation of housing and accommodation, improved traffic circulation and parking.

Trying to balance these issues, has created divisions among planners and conservationists, on how such new developments could best be incorporated into these historic districts, given the need to conserve their cultural values (Lowenthal, 1985:275-287). This is also the case in many of the historic urban centres in Malaysia. However, the guiding principle has already been ingrained in many international charters and recommendations, of which the UNESCO "Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas" (Nairobi 1976), is one.
The UNESCO recommendations proposed that there should be no question of not incorporating developments in conservation schemes in historic areas, except that these new developments need to be controlled and monitored closely so as not to devalue the very character that the conservation process is trying to protect.

However conservation works that have been carried out to many historic towns or architecturally significant areas, more often than not have resulted in the disintegration and destruction of existing local communities, or resulted in gentrification. This situation, however, is not acceptable in any conservation process. Area conservation should be sustainable and should not displaced the original inhabitant of a place.

Although the role and nature of built heritage conservation has not been fully understood by Malaysians, this does not mean that the contribution of architectural conservation towards preserving Malaysian built culture, is not appreciated or accepted by the Malaysian public. On the contrary, it is accepted with reservations and restrictions, depending on how much and how little conservation process could benefit them. This is the reason why the Malaysian public assumed that the duty to conserve the cultural heritage is not theirs but the governments, as deduced from the opinion survey of the residents in Taiping town. Nevertheless 61% of the respondents agreed to contribute to the cost of conservation against 32% disagreeing.

However, the concern here is that when the government is empowered to undertake conservation, it is usually the politician in office who will dictate what cultural heritage conservation should and should not be. This dictatorial instruction may at times work best for conservation as discussed in Chapter Three (Conservation Processes in Malaysia), but can sometimes be detrimental too. Hence conservation of the built environment should represent the beliefs of the inhabitants and promote an understanding of the past and the present, not to be predetermined by politicians (Nairn, 1965:158). Therefore, it would have been better to leave conservation decisions to the trained professionals who will decide what and which part of the architectural heritage that is best to be conserved. However, at present Malaysia is not able to do this due to the shortage of these professionals.

The study has revealed that there are many completed urban conservation projects in Malaysia, which were undertaken within the context of a limited infrastructure; framework, resources and personnel. The individuals or organisations that have carried out these works did so on a need to do basis, usually in the absence of a
definite programme. Their successes in true conservation terms are yet to be evaluated and some of them have already been branded as pastiche.

When conserving the urban cultural heritage in Malaysia, one also needs to be very careful and sensitive towards the non-homogeneity of the Malaysian society, so as not to create racial tensions. Due to the nature of the urban settlement in Malaysia, most urban centres are populated by the Chinese section of the population. Most urban centre properties, for example the shop houses and row houses mentioned in this study, mainly belong to the Chinese, even though the land itself may not. Conserving and preserving these properties, as disclosed by some stake holders and local authorities' officials, would only maintain the status-quo of these properties, and this would be in contradiction to the Government's New Economic Policy (NEP) (Second Malaysia Plan 1971-1975). A policy which is dedicated to integrating the plural (multi-ethnic) Malaysian society through closing the economic gap between them.

Although according to one Malaysian Deputy Minister, the current political system has eradicated racial tensions and has created a multi-cultural and multi-racial tolerance at State and Federal levels (Foong, 1998). The local government or local authorities may not be sensitive towards these issues. At the heart of the problem lies, the basic and fundamental questions of what is heritage; who decides which heritage is worthy of conservation and preservation; and what is the purpose for preserving it at all? With regards to these issues, there are still doubts amongst officials within the municipal authorities, and in other related government agencies, as to whose heritage these urban pre-war shop house and row house buildings belong to, and for whose benefit is the conservation work being carried out. The issue is also related to the efforts of the Malaysian Government in identifying or creating a national architectural identity through the traditional and urban multi-cultural landmarks or built forms.

Old urban built forms, which are commonly perceived as heritage structures, are usually conducive to the development of a sense of a place. They can be used to foster a sense of national identity in the built heritage, especially for future generations. However, most of the Malaysian urban built forms or architectural heritage, which are mainly the product of a colonial plural society, is very much a legacy of British colonial rule. Their present urban locations are related to the segregation policy of the colonialist, who separates the settlements of the immigrants from the locals. As a result there is a stigma attached to many urban built forms, that causes them to be
rejected as a national heritage by a certain section of the society, especially the indigenous population.

The Colonialist segregation policy has not only resulted in the lack of social bonding between the various ethnic groups in many post-colonial plural societies but has also invited resentment from the locals. The lack of "social-glue", resulting from this segregation, prohibits the acceptance of these urban built forms as part of the national cultural heritage identity.

The situation is further aggravated by the fact that the present day urban population is not homogeneous and they are usually divided by political outlook, socio-economic class, and deep-seated cultural and ethnic values, and their heritage perception will vary accordingly. These factors are the bigger issues in conserving the urban architectural heritage i.e. urban conservation in Malaysia. In the past, urban conservation was only viewed as restoring buildings, by touching up facades, repainting and refitting windows, as well as improving the built environment through pedestrianising and landscaping. This can be seen in the many example illustrated in this study. The permitted changes that are shown in this study, however, have been detrimental to the historic townscape.

Today urban conservation is seen as contributing to creating a national pride and a national identity, which is very crucial in a plural society like Malaysia.

Protection of Cultural Heritage

Malaysia's initial architectural heritage conservation approach has long been based on conserving individual buildings and monuments, which are heavily based on archaeology and managed by the Museum Department. Conservation of living traditions, local distinctiveness, historic urban areas and buildings ensembles are relatively new issues, although public interest and involvement have however been gaining momentum.

Malaysia's historic heritage areas that are to be protected are outlined in the physical planning policy documents (TCP ACT), either in the structure plans or local plans. These areas are usually "zoned" as 'development planning control zones' to facilitate conservation processes, rather than be designated as conservation areas per se.
Hence in this respect conservation zoning process in Malaysia has failed to prevent the destruction of character and appearance of these historic areas. This is because the zoning process has shifted planning practices, from concerns for 'heritage area protection' to concerns of 'development planning control' of the zoned areas. The shortage of personnel to enforce the rules and regulations pertaining to this issue has weakened the zoning objectives. Although this method of protection for the urban architectural heritage was previously acceptable, when Malaysia was still new to the idea of architectural conservation, it is now very important that this be changed for the better.

The establishment of a new system for conservation administration and control in this case is justified in order to shift the paradigm of conservation process and management from an indirect process to a direct one. The setting up of an independent body (see Chapter Eight) to manage conservation work will address the shortcoming of the development control zoning and its enforcement. However, as observed by Mohit and Kammeier (1996), a common scenario in most Third World countries is that, the overriding social, economic and political implications being so complex and vast, actual resolution to urban problems and issues are often lost. The planning process is usually encumbered at the problem identification stage. This observation holds true in the case of Malaysia whereby, even after lengthy discussion about the need to designate conservation areas, the recent amendments to the Malaysian Town and Country Planning Act have not directly addressed the issues.

Therefore built heritage conservation works in Malaysia should not have been packaged together with Museum conservation, which uses the Antiquity Act as its guiding document. This has only limited the scope of work that could be undertaken and stifled the process. The Antiquity Act does not address the problem of town planning and building in use, which is what urban conservation is all about. Presently the Act, which is the legacy of the British colonial administration, classified buildings by their age (100 years old and over), before they can be gazetted. This situation has been rectified in the UK, whereby even buildings as young as 30 years old and recently completed structures can still be listed (for example animal enclosures in the London Zoo etc.).

In the past Malaysians also relied on the Control of Rent Act, which they thought to have been a bonus to the cause of urban conservation in the country. With its final repeal (December 1999), it is now envisaged as being detrimental, especially to the
protection of heritage pre-war buildings (shop house and row house) in urban historic centres. Although this fear is still unfounded, results from the quick listing survey carried out in this study tends to indicate otherwise. It is therefore a potential problem and it needs to be urgently addressed in the very near future before it threatens the survival of these urban pre-war buildings, as the decontrol process will open the floodgate to redevelopment.

Development Threats

The processes of rapid and robust redevelopment and urbanisation during the period of economic boom (1990-1998) have destroyed many of the country’s urban architectural heritage and historic areas. These happened more intensively in rapidly developing urban centres, where infrastructure upgrading, together with the construction of businesses and administrative institutions, compete for the limited space available. Redevelopment pressures, infrastructure modernisation, construction of new purpose-built premises and replacement of old dilapidated properties have made urban historic areas very vulnerable. Unsympathetic new building designs which are out of scale and character, carried out on infill sites, have caused the most damage (see Chapter 6&7), thus making the reform of urban conservation priorities imperative. This situation has been illustrated by the case study in Taiping, where 90% of urban heritage buildings were found to be not at risk from natural dilapidation and deterioration. They are more at risk and threaten by the redevelopment process that is slowly engulfing the town.

Conservation Problems

Urban conservation movements in Malaysia, developed during the period of rapid developmental pressure, did so with very direct government control and interventions. As a result there is a significant stock of individually conserved ‘grand and famous’ public buildings, which are located mainly in urban administrative centres. However, there is still no conservation area being designated because this will cause conflicts to the robust efforts of the government to develop urban sites.

Some of the conserved buildings or structures possess particular ethnic characteristics or architectural style, while others have a general historic or architectural significance. While conserved public or government buildings are usually of Western architectural style, the urban private domestic buildings on the other hand have a mixture of styles in them. The urban shop house, which is the subject of this research case study, has a
mixture of features from the oriental and the western architectural style incorporated in them. The conservation process of these urban shop house buildings and in some cases row houses buildings, which form the typical urban built form in almost all Malaysian towns, has caused some concern among the Malaysian public and officials alike. The resentment in the process of their conservation was due to the colonialist stigma attached to them. This is further aggravated by a lack of interpretation for traditional national identity within the structure, which has proved to be not only a sensitive administrative issue, but also a sensitive issue to the plural society of Malaysia.

In the context of Malaysia's cultural heritage, the ultimate aim of built heritage conservation will be to retain for future generations a comprehensive record of the varied influences that the multi-cultural Malaysian built heritage has acquired through time. This aim is in tandem with the national cultural aim as prescribed in the nation's 'Cultural Policy'. Preserving these traits would provide a source of national pride and identity in the development of a truly Malaysian society. These then can be a resource for further research, for a truly Malaysian national identity in the built environment. This aim which has already been embedded in the cultural policy of the country, however, has not been fully embraced by those responsible for the protection or conservation of the Malaysia architectural heritage.

Area-based Conservation

Presently in Malaysia, very little effort is directed to protecting of the historic living environment, surrounding individually conserved built forms or areas of historical and architectural significance. The familiar and everyday domestic and commercial buildings that make up the urban townscape, which encompasses them, are being neglected. Area-based conservation protection has not yet materialised in the process and management of urban conservation in Malaysia.

Malaysia is also faced with problems resulting from the non-productivity of the historic segments within her cities. This is because the role of heritage areas have not been clearly dealt with in the master plans, although it has been considered and included in these policy documents, in relation to tourism development. The non-productive historic segments often raises questions with regards to the need to conserve areas consisting of built heritage and to resolve the traditional conflict and tension between
conservation and redevelopment. This tension is being perceived as a major disincentive for most of the conservation proposals made.

**Post-Colonial and Multi-Culturalism Issues**

Similar to many other post-colonial Third World countries, there are also mounting concerns about the fast disappearing urban, cultural and political heritage of Malaysia, particularly the tangible inheritance from the days of colonial administration and immigrant's migration, i.e. the colonial buildings and structures. The design of these buildings, which are derived from a rich mixture of architectural features from colonials' designers and multi-ethnic and multi-cultural local population, present difficulties of interpretation of the national cultural identity for the present society (Cleary, 1996). Since these buildings were mainly built during the colonial rule, by immigrant labourers, they are still viewed with apprehension by the indigenous sector of the population which has a strong nationalistic view. The question of whose heritage and for whom it is being conserved has always been the dilemma in many conservation projects in Malaysia. The dilemma is not so much a hatred or dislike for these foreign built and 'immigrant' occupied urban structures, but by the fact that not enough efforts have been carried out to protect and conserve the traditional architectural built form and built environment of the indigenous population, which causes the opposition.

Efforts in preserving these colonial relics by the authorities glorify past colonial supremacy and rekindles sad memories. Debates on whether to preserve or not to preserve these colonial and immigrant relics have often lead to confrontation. Thus these relics are slowly and systematically being eroded, not only by irresponsible owners and property developers but sometimes, also, by the government's redevelopment policy (the case of Chinatown in Kuala Trengganu-BWM, 1993:14-16). However, when the government did this, it is not with a spiteful intention, but merely to strike a balance between the almost non-existence of indigenous architecture and the predominantly immigrants built forms which dominate the urban centres and urban areas. This 'colonial or immigrants' heritage' may at present be rejected and disregarded, although in a wider context it is still part and parcel of the heritage of the country, albeit what Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) called 'dissonant heritage'.

Official conservation efforts in Malaysia today are now reflected in the rewriting of the country's heritage, with a focus on the indigenous Malay and Bumiputra's component and a corresponding neglect of the colonial and immigrants elements. Efforts by the
government have led to the recognition of an area's history endorsed by local historians and hence bringing a balance between colonial, immigrants and the local elements.

These efforts of the government, in prescribing the link between national identity and built heritage, as part of the ideology of modern nationhood, has been seen by others as distancing the country's history from the colonial and immigrants dimension of its past (Thomas and Spencer, 1971). However, temporarily, this is the appropriate short-term strategy until much more public acceptance can be gathered. In the long term, the Malaysian multi-cultural public need to realise that these perceived colonial and immigrant elements are very much part of the heritage and cultural inheritance of Malaysia. No colonial or immigrant society will ever build the kind of structures that are found in Malaysia again, in that, there must be respect for the work of those that have helped to build the country to what it is today. These structures will then be given the same protection and care it deserved similar to the other ethnic cultures in Malaysia.

Management Issues

Although there were piecemeal efforts to protect and conserve individual heritage buildings as described in Chapter Three, Five and Six, there has been a lack of consolidated effort to systematically conserve area or groups of buildings with group value, even though they provide the link between the built structures and its surrounding environment. At present there is also no official recognition given to non-gazetted buildings. These groups of buildings are being forsaken for more modern development rather than reuse to enhance the character and setting of the place. This situation needs to be addressed urgently in order to protect the integrity of these historic area or sites. An area-based conservation strategy is therefore imperative in order to give a temporary blanket cover, at least before the national inventory of heritage building can be made available to facilitate the final conservation process.

Nevertheless, there does exist a planning policy of 'zoning areas' for planning and development control, which can be taken as a starting point in the area-based conservation process. Owing to the differences in the social system, history and culture of the diverse Malaysian society, it is inappropriate to introduce directly these Western conservation practices into the context of Malaysian or Asian conservation processes without first acknowledging that there are shortfalls in the Western system.
The Western conservation processes, which are preoccupied with the authenticity of the structure's fabric, are in contrast with the conservation practices in many of the Asian countries. In Asian countries it is the respect for the living culture, traditions and process of construction and the spiritual values of structures and sites that made the maintenance and management of historic building or site important (Ave, 1998:6). Nevertheless, it is without doubt that some Western European conservation practices, concepts and legislation, including those of the United Kingdom (especially England), are relevant to Malaysian conservation programmes. This is related to Malaysia's historical association with Britain and the fact that many professionals within the building and construction industry are trained in the United Kingdom. The close similarity of many Malaysian statutes and legislations governing the conservation processes also provide Malaysia with the advantage of adopting some of the relevant British conservation system easily. This has been the reason for this study to focus on more of the UK conservation system.

These systems if adopted or borrowed should only be used as a starting point, which over time, must be modified to the needs and requirements of multi-cultural Malaysia. The adopted model or system must then be improved and developed by the handful of conservation trained personnel mainly academics from institutions of higher learning. This will make the process and change in the system to be uniquely Malaysian. In doing so Malaysia then needs to look hard and deep into her indigenous practices and also at the practices of her close regional neighbours in order to share experiences and to pool resources. This is because in future all Malaysian professionals and line managers would be trained locally and the affiliation to the UK or Western system would not be as strong as now.

7.1 Recommendations and Proposals

The recommendations and proposals below were derived from the results of all components of this research work and analysis of the field study. One very clear outcome that has surfaced from the research work is that there is still confusion as to who is really responsible for the conservation of Malaysia's built heritage. Even existing legislation upon which most conservation works rely on, have not been able to address the issues of responsibilities nor have they been able to solve the conflicts that arise as a result of redevelopment pressures, which threatens the survival of heritage buildings and historic urban areas.
From analysis of the local authority questionnaire, the stake holder interviews and supported by the case study of Taiping town, it can safely be acknowledged that there are deficiencies in the conservation processes, planning, administration and management of urban (built heritage) conservation work in Malaysia. In order to rectify these deficiencies, it is therefore recommended that the Federal Government of Malaysia should undertake the following proposals, which are aimed at addressing the shortfalls and deficiencies in the present process of conservation management:

1. **The setting up of an independent (quasi-government) body, the Malaysian Heritage Conservation Board, to undertake architectural heritage conservation works.**

Under the present system of Malaysian government (Chapter Two, 2.5) it is difficult for local governments themselves, or non-profit organisations separated from the public sector to lead the conservation process. There is too much bureaucracy, red tape and restrictions in them as revealed in the local authority survey. Therefore, the introduction of a new conservation administration system, which is able to mediate between the public, private bodies and individuals is strongly suggested. Such mediation could emphasise the common interests of both public and private bodies, and independently address the multi-ethnic multi-cultural issues of the Malaysian community, thus enhancing the effectiveness of conservation works.

Therefore the setting up of an independent body; a Malaysian Heritage Conservation Board (*Lembaga Pemuliharaan Warisan Malaysia*) would enable built heritage conservation administration and works, to be free of the encumbrances from government restrictions and bureaucracy. A Conservation Board with a working agenda similar to the English Heritage, Historic Scotland or other similar conservation organisation, would be able to generate its own income from gate collections, selling of souvenirs and sponsorship of advertisement, which can be exempted from taxes. In return the Board would be able to disburse grants and financial assistance to deserving conservation cases. As an independent Board it would also be able to receive financial aid from international organisations, for example the Gulbankien Foundation of Portugal, UNESCO, JICA (Japan) and others, and acquire soft loans, from the government, for its administrative and operational activities.

The Board itself could be staffed with professionals representing the various construction institutions and qualified persons dedicated in the course of built heritage conservation (see Figure 7.1). In the long term this will ease the workload of the
Museum Department and gradually transfer responsibility of managing built heritage and area conservation works to the Board. This will allow the Museum Department to concentrate on what they do best i.e. museum conservation and protecting antiquities.

The proposed Board could also reduce the burden on local authority planning departments, by allowing them to concentrate on their actual council works. These departments could act on an advisory capacity to the newly formed Board. The setting up of the Board does not mean that it is going to duplicate the work that has been handled by these two departments. Being a Board would enable them to reduce the red tape and bureaucratic process, although there will still be some which is inevitable. Being free of the normal restrictions, which other government departments have had to under go before work can start, the Board will have an upper hand on many of its decisions. This is related to the management, personnel, finances and implementation of work, only having to report to the CEO and the Chairman for its decisions. This will allow the Board to retain a light but firm touch in its dealing with local authorities.

- Establishment of a Conservation Advisory Council at the National and State levels

There should also be established a Conservation Advisory Council at the National and State levels in order to advise the Board on matters pertaining to the National and State interest. These Councils should be established under the organisation responsible for the conservation of the country's cultural heritage, under the same Ministry responsible for the Board, at the Federal level and the State Government at the State level. The National or State Conservation Advisory Council's duty, wherever applicable, is basically to advise the Conservation Board in its daily execution of work and probably to act as arbitrator in appeal cases.

- Central administration and control in the course of implementing conservation works

Although top down imposition of organisational strategy is no longer the trend in today's management operation, due to the nature of the Three Tier governmental system in Malaysia (Chapter Two, Figure 2.2) there are difficulties in implementing a bottom-up conservation administration policy. This is due to the dependency of State and Local Governments upon the Federal Government for most of their funding and directions. Therefore because of this, a top-down approach would be a suitable system of management whereby a control at Federal Government level would be able to systematically guide the direction of Malaysian conservation activities and facilitates
effective management, determines policy statements and disbursement of financial assistance. In relation to the proposed Board, the implementation of conservation work could still remain with the local government (franchise) with control and supervision from the Board at Federal level through one of the Executive Council (the National Council for Local Government), a bottom-up approach. Therefore this will be in line with Agenda 21, the document that set the framework of action for sustainability, which has emphasised that conservation must be both top down and bottom up.

Figure 7.1 below shows the broad set-up of the proposed *Lembaga Pemuliharaan Warisan Malaysia* (Malaysian Heritage Conservation Board - the Board):

*Figure 7.1 Proposed set-up of the Malaysian Heritage Conservation Board*

- the Board could be set-up under its own special Act (similar to the Act used to set-up the Malaysian Construction Industry Development Board, CIDB). The Malaysian Heritage Conservation Board will initially consist of five sections, namely Administration, Business, Inspectorate, Legal and Works Units.
the Board will be headed by a Chairman of who will be selected from among distinguished antiquarians or persons with a deep interest in heritage protection and a respectable public figure.

the Executive Director is a person qualified in the field of built heritage conservation (preferably professional from the building industry, Architect, Planner or Building Surveyor etc) who will oversee the daily administration of the Board and manages the Regional Managers.

the Administration unit will be responsible for the general administration and the disbursement of grant aids and financial assistance.

the Business Unit is responsible for promotional works, management of access to the conserved properties and the gate collection and will also be responsible for generating revenue for the Board.

the Inspectorate Unit will be responsible for identifying the built heritage and areas fit for conservation and recording as well as entering them into an inventory or a register for public consultation later.

the Legal Unit on the other hand will be responsible for the formulation of the relevant conservation legislation and guidelines. This unit need not necessarily be headed by a lawyer but could be headed by a person trained in building construction and conservation or planning.

the Works units initially could be divided into four regional offices at Central, North, South and East Coast (initially not covering East Malaysia), with each regional office being headed by a regional manager with the minimal required personnel depending on the size of the region.

the funds to set-up the Board, could be disbursed from the Federal Government as an initial ‘take-off grant’ or a soft loan which is interest free. A revolving fund, for the grant aid schemes, is also to be set-up from financial sponsors from the big and successful Malaysian companies (tax deductible).

the Board’s staff could initially be seconded from relevant Government Departments or Ministries dealing with heritage issues or taken from the list of committee members sitting in the National Committee for the Conservation and Preservation of Old Building and Historic Areas.

in terms of its association with the government, the Board could be placed under the jurisdiction of the Ministry responsible for built heritage, culture or urban planning.

2. Educating the general public on the importance of built heritage conservation and area designation

Educating the general public is obviously a slow and momentous job. This cannot be achieved in a short span of time. It has to start from the young, from primary school education right up to the University level, as reiterated by the learned Professor in the
stakeholders' interview. This task will involved a spectrum of people and a host of organisations starting with the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Culture. Beyond that one has just got to learn right through the life span of oneself, learning as one goes along the conservation path. The promotional units of the proposed Heritage Conservation Board (HCB) will provide formal education of the adult public.

As part of the education, the public also need to be assured of and made aware that conservation process is not about preserving the homes of patriots, the setting of historic events and glorifying the masterpieces of great architects. Community participation in conservation related activities, good and legible interpretation of the completed work, educational visits to construction sites and expert explanation regarding the future community benefits, as against present individual benefits of preserving the built heritage, will all contribute to educating the public.

Completed works then are not to be treated as objects of isolated pleasure and reverence, fenced off and enshrined in historical museums remote from the rest of the landscape (Ford, 1979: p. 211). The notion of conservation being an elitist fascination must be countered quickly before it becomes ingrained in the mindset of Malaysians, which will be detrimental to the cause of Malaysia's conservation programme.

3. **Training the professionals and administrators who would in future undertake conservation works.**

Professionals and administrators who would in future undertake built heritage conservation works need to be trained locally. Specialised training at postgraduate level is urgently required and should be provided. Advance training would further enhance their perception and understanding of built heritage conservation processes and provides the country with a pool of qualified personnel. This can be done at postgraduate level in the local university. In fact the setting up of KALAM² (Pusat Kajian Alam Lingkungan Melayu–Centre for Research in the Malay World) at Universiti Teknologi Malaysia has paved the way, making this recommendation possible. This centre also undertakes consultancy works in Conservation.

At present there is also a training programme for the local authority's personnel in the form of in-service training for conservation, being organised by the Institute of Public

² KALAM (Pusat Kajian Alam Lingkungan Melayu) is a research and consultancy centre in the Department of Built Environment, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
Administration (INTAN). This non-certificate programme is only to create awareness for the local authority’s staff.

Regional co-operation in training is also recommended to enhance the understanding and perception of regional culture and the need to conserve the heritage in a wider regional context. This regional training can be packaged within the ASEAN region (SEAMEO-SPAFA\textsuperscript{3}) or the Asia-Pacific Co-operation (ACCU/UNESCO) which has a training base in every member country. Supervision of the training programme will be handled by regional and international experts with heavy emphasis on the regional and local context.

With better exposure and understanding of the need to conserve the built heritage, these trained professionals could then help to promote built heritage conservation work to the general public through their quality works while fostering regional and international co-operation.

4. The formulation of a specific legislation that addresses the problem of urban conservation (area based conservation) in relation to town planning and overall planning policy of the country.

For the long term planning there is a need to urgently address the issue of an area-based conservation legislation, so that it will not only control the type of development in these areas, but will also enable enhancement programmes to be carried out. Legislation alone may not be the solution to the protection of the built heritage or areas but specific legislation will help in the administration, control and manage change of over zealous redevelopment within the context of Malaysia's thriving economy.

Precise law for protecting and conserving areas in Malaysia is still non-existent. There is a need to define the criteria for designating areas, and to identify the administrative framework and infrastructure for the administration and management of conservation areas, including its enhancement. There is also a need to provide stringent punitive deterrents as well as incentives in the legislation in order to encourage conservation activities.

In formulating this legislation, Malaysia also need to look at existing international guidelines and charters, or better still, adopting some of them to provide direction in

\textsuperscript{3} SEAMEO-SPAFA-South East Asian Minister of Education Organisation-Seameo Project for Archaeology and Fine Arts in Bangkok.
future conservation programmes in relation to the regional and global context. One such relevant charter is the Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (or better known as the Washington Charter (ICOMOS, Oct. 1987). This Charter has already enunciated the broad principles and objectives for the conservation of our urban historic centres (see Appendix 7.1). It could be a basis in the designation of area based conservation programmes in Malaysia. Better still Malaysia could also get involve in the formulation of the ASIAN Charter which both India and Japan are actively promoting.

Due to the absence of a defined selection criteria for areas in the Malaysian gazetting process, there is also a need for a grading scale to categorise urban areas selected for the conservation area designation process. Since historic urban areas in Malaysia are not very large nor complicated, as demonstrated in the Taiping study, it is suffice that only two grades of scale be used to designate these areas - national and local.

The proposed designation grade for the urban area-based conservation could also incorporate the grading scale for individual buildings and precincts. One such example which would suit Malaysian requirements is proposed below (Mohit & Kamemier, 1996:398):

**Grade I**

Heritage Grade I comprises of buildings, conservation areas and precinct of national or historical importance, embodying excellence in architectural style, design, technology and material usage: they may be associated with a great historical event, personality, movement or institution. They have been and are the prime landmarks of the city.

**Grade II**

Heritage Grade II comprises of buildings, conservation areas and precinct of regional or local importance, possessing special architectural or aesthetical merit, cultural or historical value, though of lower scale than in Heritage Grade I. They are local landmarks, contributing to the image and identity of the city. They may be the work of master craftsmen, or may be models of proportion and ornamentation, or designed to suit a particular climate.

5. **Controlling redevelopment and managing changes in historic urban areas using existing planning control policies and procedures more stringently.**

The result of the robust economy of Malaysia has changed so much of the townscape in many large urban centres, that glass skyscrapers dominate the scene. In smaller
urban centres high-rise concrete buildings tower like a sore thumb over the traditional
two-storey shop houses. These buildings, which are mainly infill redevelopment and
unsympathetically designed, have devalued the traditional character of the area.

If this process continues, soon there will be no more traditional two-storey shop house
buildings left to be conserved. Although development is necessary, it should not
destroy the existing in the process of redevelopment. New development should include
the old, and they should be able to sustain one another.

Therefore in order to achieve this, the existing planning and development control
policies and procedures imposed by the zoning plans of local authorities need to be
executed more stringently. Blanket approval to the 'four-storey height' development
allowance, in most urban historic centres, must be reviewed. Building heights in urban
historic areas need not be standardised but could be reduced to three-storey rather
than four, as and when suitable and viable in conservation terms, more in character
with the surrounding.

The present local authorities' illustrated 'conservation guidelines' must be reviewed in
order that prospective developers do not follow them literally. May be it is better to
issue only broad written statements rather than illustrated examples at the initial stage
until the responsible authority is able to issue a more definite policy and guidelines on
built heritage and area conservation. Local governments and local authorities should
also be more stringent in exercising their powers using existing legislation that is
already available to them.

It is also recommended that the various Governments could also set-up 'conservation
salvage trust' or a 'conservation bank'. Traditional heritage building materials
accumulated from demolished building sites or those donated by the public could be
stored here and later made available and distributed for reuse to those in need, in
return for a minimum fee. This would solve the problem of non-availability of traditional
building materials.

Another pertinent point to urban conservation process and management is that, the
government needs to seriously study the possibilities of using the "transfer of
development rights" (TDR) as a sure incentive in the redevelopment of the historic
urban centres. The American 'Chicago Plan'\(^4\) (Ford, 1979:217) system of TDR would be recommended as a better TDR system than the one being practised presently in Malaysia (where the property owner holds the rights). Subsequently, physical planners need to ensure that fringes and suburbs of prospective conservation areas are reserved and designated as alternative development sites enabling the TDR schemes to work (e.g. Le Defense, Paris).

Transfer of development rights system in conservation area process has received favourable acceptance with the Malaysian public (the case of PAM Building, Chapter Three, Figure 3.6). The only problem is that most property owners would prefer that adjoining lands, on the fringe of conservation areas be reserved for this purpose, otherwise the TDR system would not work. This is why the American TDR - 'Chicago Plan', will appeal to more people.

On top of all these recommendations, any conservation action has to undergo a course of action whenever a site is about to be conserved, whether it is an urban site or otherwise. These steps are fundamental to the process whatever the circumstances and whatever the particular problems may be and no sound conservation work can be accomplished without them. The work flow diagram in Appendix 7.2, however, does not describe the action as such, but rather a model for professional and public co-operation during the conservation process, enabling the justification of the site or area chosen and kept the valuable built heritage intact.

7.2 Future Research

In the process of this study it was discovered that in Malaysia there is very little academic research dealing with the issues of built heritage conservation. Most literature about conservation of the built heritage is found in the professional journals, and in specific technical and newspaper reports. It is therefore imperative that the proposed areas of research listed below are undertaken in the very near future to facilitate and provide empirical data to support any decisions taken in formulating future policies for the conservation of the built heritage or historic heritage areas.

---

\(^4\) 'Chicago Plan' involves government purchase of a landmark's unused development potential or full space allotment under existing zoning and subsequent sale of those development rights to developer who then make his new building elsewhere larger than zoning regulations on new sites would normally permits.
Listed below are possible areas or topics for future research that would be helpful in the formulation of a conservation strategy and policy for an urban area-based conservation process:

i. The long-term effect of Decontrol of Control of Rent Act upon the conservation possibilities of the urban pre-war buildings.

This study has uncovered that the decontrol process of the Control of Rent Act has created uncertainty among the many tenants renting the urban pre-war properties. Further research is required to explore the actual effect of the decontrol process has on the tenancy demands of these properties and their redevelopment potentials and threats. The research should also urgently look into the benefits of regular building maintenance and the consequence of dilapidation due to neglect.

ii. Social and economic studies upon the possibilities of property owners maintaining, 'status-quo' urban shop house and row house usage to facilitate their conservation.

The quick listing survey has pointed out that there has been a shift of usage from previous as compared to present usage of the pre-war properties, i.e. row houses being converted as part of business premises and shop houses are being used as part of the residential accommodation and storage facilities. A detailed study is required to determine whether this change in use will continue as a consequence of the decontrol process and new purpose built terrace houses and large one stop shopping complexes. Also, there is a need to survey the usage of shop house top floors of these pre-war buildings, which seem to be mostly empty.

If the changes continue to be the carried out then there will be no buildings left to be conserved. The historical and heritage value of the area will also be lost and this will affect future policies on urban conservation not only locally but also nationally. The effect of gentrification as a result of these changes could also be included in this study, since there has not been much information on the displacement of tenants from these pre-war buildings.

iii. Study on ways and means of managing and delimiting traffic in the high streets in urban historic core of Malaysia's historic towns.

This study has also argued that pedestrianisation is not a viable solution to solve traffic problems in historic urban areas, due to climatic condition and the driving culture of the Malaysian public, although the general public consensus in the Taiping
survey indicated otherwise. Thus it is imperative to identify the areas suitable for pedestrianisation in relation to the existing ‘five-foot ways’ of the traditional shop house buildings.

This study could also be part of a bigger urban design study of larger areas, which includes the pattern of travel by the public into these urban heritage centres and the mode of transportation that they used.

iv. The effects of large scale one-stop departmental stores or shopping mall upon the traditional urban shop house in historic urban centres.

This study has touched on the emergence and existence of large one stop departmental stores in urban historic centres, which are slowly, but surely killing the traditional family-run retail businesses, which are carried out from the traditional two-storey shop house. Further studies are recommended to determine whether urban historic centres and family run retail business would still be sustainable if these giant shopping stores were to be built within the historic enclave or to be moved out to the fringes or suburbs of urban centres.

v. More urban design studies should be undertaken for other urban historic towns in Malaysia.

The case study on Taiping has shown that there are possibilities for an urban conservation process being carried out in smaller less threatened urban historic town. More studies of other similar urban historic towns in Malaysia, should be undertaken to complement this finding. The results can then be complied to provide a broader view regarding urban historic towns in Malaysia and the possibilities of conserving them.

There should also be a broader urban design studies in the approach towards conservation in urban historic areas for Malaysia. There is also a need to look at the possibilities of urban regeneration within the urban historic core, taking into account the effect that redevelopment has on the character and appearance of these areas. The possibilities of regenerating the areas with new sympathetic buildings and structures that will enhance the character of the area rather than devaluing its potential should be explored. Dilapidated buildings should be revived and re-used rather than choosing the easier option of demolition. Dedicated and stringent
control and enforcement, by the local authorities, must also complement these efforts.

These future research topics will be able to further enhance the findings in this research and will also add up to the body of knowledge that is badly needed to justify conservation especially, urban historic areas. Social and economic studies will prove the point and help to convince those Malaysians who see no value in the importance of protecting and preserving the cultural heritage, that conservation is beneficial and it even pays (Central Market Project, Figure 3.13 Chapter Three).
Conclusions

The way forward
National identities are co-ordinated, often largely defined, by ‘legends and landscapes’; by stories of golden ages, enduring traditions, heroic deeds and dramatic destinies located in ancient or promised home-lands with hollowed sites and scenery... Landscapes, whether focussing on single monuments or framing stretches of scenery, provide visible shape; they picture the nation. (Daniels, 1993 p.5)

8 Conclusions

A study of urban conservation in Malaysia is very timely. As a former colonial country, Malaysia has adopted a legislative and regulatory code that was inherited from the British practice. Moreover, that colonial past has left a complex legacy of building types and town planning forms derived from several European nations and different ethnic traditions. This inheritance is important to the nation in the long term, but its value is not widely appreciated in a country that is still consolidating its national identity and actively establishing a sound economic base.

The current approach to managing the conservation of Malaysia's built heritage has been thoroughly discussed in this study. From all the work undertaken in this study, it has been established that urban conservation processes and management in Malaysia have reached a crucial and conflicting stage, with very little co-ordination between those responsible for its planning and management and those who implement or execute the works. It has also reached a stage of dilemma whereby, not only the public but also those in authority, are questioning the objectives and purpose of conservation in urban areas. This conservation dilemma or concern is based on the view of many Malaysians who perceived conservation and development to be
contradictory to each other. To those Malaysians who are unaware and unappreciative of the importance of protecting and preserving the cultural heritage, conservation is seen as a stumbling block to progress and its contribution to national goals is often challenged or contested.

Robust development, economic progress and rapid urbanisation in Malaysia in the last ten years, has caused the destruction of many old, historic and heritage structures in many urban centres. In their place, have risen multi-storey buildings that for many represent the landmarks of progress in developing countries. This redevelopment process, which is usually unsympathetic to the traditional urban townscape, is seriously encroaching into the historic urban heritage areas. The presence of these 'landmarks of progress', in conservation terms, has devalued the character and appearance of many urban historic areas. In some large urban development centres, for example Kuala Lumpur, Melaka and Penang, the redevelopment process has already gone too far and has been so damaging that it cannot be reversed. However, in smaller urban centres, of which Taiping is a good example, the situation is quite encouraging, provided that an adequate infrastructure and framework is urgently put in place to protect and conserve historic environment.

If the battle to preserve and conserve the built heritage in large rapidly developing urban town centres of developing countries is largely a lost cause, there is potential for urban and area-based conservation process to be established in other smaller, and less redeveloped urban historic areas in Malaysia. This potential can be realised through an amended conservation infrastructure, framework and legislation at the Federal, State and Local Government levels. If the pressure of development and urbanisation in these areas is controlled, it can be redirected to other suitable areas. Although legislation alone would not be of much help, good and sound legislation, together with an efficient enforcement and far sighted views from trained administrators and professionals, success in urban conservation will definitely be achievable even though redevelopment process is threatening it.

If redevelopment presents one threat to the urban historic buildings and structures in Malaysia, as shown in the Taiping case study, the plural society and multi-cultural composition of Malaysian heritage also poses problems to conservation process and management (Chapter Two &Three). This is related to the question of whose heritage is to be safeguarded and what priority is to be given to its conservation and the special privileges that is enjoyed by a certain section of the population. Although multi-cultural
heritage issues are a delicate problem, it is hoped that over time its sensitivity could be reduced. Possibly with better education, awareness and dissemination of information the next generation of Malaysians would be more tolerant and liberal to the choice of what should and should not be conserved, especially pertaining to the built structures and artefacts from the colonial past. Therefore it is pertinent that the government must now lay the infrastructure and framework for conservation, as recommended in Chapter Seven, for future processes and management of the urban architectural heritage conservation in Malaysia.

The following are the main conclusions that have been reached in the process of undertaking this study:

**Conservation awareness and consciousness**

- There is an urgent need to change the mindset of the Malaysian public, educating them and inculcating in them with the awareness and understanding of the values of cultural heritage and the reasons for its conservation.

- It will also be necessary to create a change in the political environment, in which historic urban centres are redeveloped in their true values, and where policies and practices of governments are modified accordingly to accommodate these cultural values.

- It is necessary to redirect (change) the attitudes and perception of all people involved and having a stake in the process of urban conservation; such as economists, architects, planners, developers and administrators, for them to view at the long term benefits of conservation rather than focussing on short term quick financial gains.

**Cultural issues**

- The multi-cultural nature of the Malaysian plural society poses an extra problem in conserving the country’s cultural built heritage compared to the cultural heritage of predominantly homogenous societies of Western countries. However, in time to come, more Western countries (e.g. Britain) will also face a similar problem due to the globalisation of culture and the consolidation of their multi-cultural population.

- Public opinion on conserving the urban built heritage, for example the traditional urban shop house, are divided, as they are perceived to be highlighting colonial
and immigrant culture and heritage at the expense of the local and national culture. The 'identity crisis' in the Malaysian architectural built form has also contributed to the problem of conserving the built heritage.

Management and administration

- Local authorities need to be empowered and equipped with appropriate resources such as specialist staff, adequate finances and appropriate legislation to facilitate the control of redevelopment and to enable the local authorities to exercise their existing powers, associated with the problems of administering historic heritage urban centres.

- An inter-departmental co-ordination needs to be streamlined in order to avoid duplication and wastage of resources in terms of funds, personnel, materials and technical facilities.

- The conflict of maintaining the traditional values of an environmental townscape has caused a dilemma for planners and decision-makers in setting out sustainable strategies and development policies for urban historic centres.

- The inability and incapability of local governments in Malaysia to alleviate conflicts arising from tensions between conservation and redevelopment is related to the lack of essential resources within the organisation.

- In the regional context there is an urgent need to foster the cross-cultural link with other regional conservation centre, for example in the Asian region or on an ASIA-Pacific co-operation. Create a pool of regional experts, to lessen the dependency on Western experts and eventually to be self-sufficient regionally.

Planning and Development

- Further research needs to be undertaken on the issue of Decontrol (Control of Rent Act) in order to determine the effect decontrol has, on the survival of the traditional two-storey shop houses and row houses.

- Sustainable urban conservation in Malaysia will be achieved by developing technical expertise and management skills in the field of management of change, selection standards (designation criterion) and an established inventory system.
For the short-term measures it is necessary to staff the Museum Department and Municipal Councils (especially their planning department) with the appropriate extra staff and to identify a specific person in-charge of the built heritage conservation.

As for the long-term planning, an independent institution or body, the Malaysian Heritage Conservation Board (Lembaga Pemuliharaan Warisan Malaysia) must be established to specifically manage the built heritage conservation work, away from the bureaucratic red tape of any of the Government Departments.

Therefore in order to remedy the above issues the recommendations, as proposed in Chapter Seven and outlined below, will be able to solve if not assist in addressing the above mentioned problems.

I. The setting up of an independent (quasi-government) body Heritage Conservation Board will address the issues of:

- Governments and departments restrictions, bureaucracy and red tape, which have hindered the smooth progress of conservation programmes;
- shortages of staff in the local authority and Museum Department, the Board will have its own set of conservation personnel;
- undertaking research in various fields concerning the cultural built heritage conservation;
- sustaining urban conservation in Malaysia by developing technical expertise (specialist), selection standards and the much needed national heritage inventory register;
- regional cross-cultural links and the creation of a regional experts pool relieving the dependency on Western conservation experts.

--Establishment of Conservation Advisory Councils at the National and State levels will facilitate the;

- streamlining of inter-departmental co-ordination and duplication of resources, funds, personnel and technical facilities;
- solving of dilemma faced by planners and decision-makers in setting out sustainable strategies and development policies for urban historic centres.

--Central administration and control in the course of implementing conservation work will address the issue of;

- the inability and incapability of local government to alleviate conflicts and tension arising from conservation and redevelopment.
II. Educating the general public on the importance of built heritage conservation works will address these issues;

- the need to change the mindset of the Malaysian public, inculcating conservation awareness and understanding;

- perceived public opinion on the nature of heritage, the rejection of immigrants and colonial built structures and the Malaysian architectural identity crisis;

- the multi-cultural nature of the Malaysian heritage and the search for a national identity.

III. Training the professionals and administrator, who would in future undertake conservation works, will address the issues of;

- redirecting (changing) the attitudes and perception of stake holders; administrators, economist, architects, planners and developers;

- creating a change in the political environment, which will modify the practices and policies of urban conservation in the direction of its true cultural value.

IV. The formulation of a specific legislation that addresses the problem of urban conservation (area based conservation) in relation to the town planning and overall planning policy of the country will address the issues of;

- empowering local authority with appropriate resources to administer historic heritage urban areas;

- setting up of the proposed Malaysian Heritage Conservation Board (HCB), which will relieve other specialist departments of their duties.

V. Controlling redevelopment and managing changes in historic urban areas using existing planning control policies and procedures more stringently will address the issues of;

- the inability and incapability of local government to alleviate conflicts and tension arising from conservation and redevelopment;

- sustaining urban conservation in Malaysia by developing management skills in the field of management of change.

Thus conservation of the historic buildings in-use, including the urban historic environment, can be simply defined as human efforts to protect the valuable remains and retained the continuity of previous cultures, in the face of changes in the current social, cultural and physical environment. The process of conservation will enable us to protect our legacy, facilitate historical, architectural and cultural education and ensure variety in our environmental fabric in view of the globalisation of world culture.
The designation of historic heritage areas (area-based conservation) is without doubt a very important part in the process of conserving the urban architectural heritage and a major task of protecting historic and architecturally significance areas. Urban historic area conservation and preservation is important for Malaysia because historic artefacts command and deserve respect; it encourages our cultural roots to be expressed; helps to develop a sense of local identity and provides a readily accessible demonstration of the past for future generations of Malaysian to inherit.

Urban conservation process is an extension of the methodology and techniques applied to architectural and other forms of conservation. It thus includes many and various aspects of building conservation and physical planning, combined with social, economic, political and functional considerations. Therefore conserving Malaysia's urban built cultural heritage, on a piecemeal basis must be stopped. A more comprehensive conservation programme encompassing the total cultural built environment needs to be formulated and implemented. Conservation of Malaysia's multi-cultural urban built heritage then, would need to be judged against its own needs, the needs of Malaysia's unique plural population and the prevailing aspirations of the leaders of this multi-cultural nation, VISION 2020, without losing sight of the larger conservation goals, regionally and internationally.

If urban heritage conservation in Malaysia is to be sustainable into the twenty-first century its process and management need to be sensitive to the aspiration of her multi-ethnic population, dynamic, flexible and farsighted which precludes any standard approach since all heritage artefacts, buildings, sites and areas are different.
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Appendices for Chapter Two
APPENDIX 2.1 The Government set up for the two Federal Territories in Malaysia.

The Federal Territory Minister in the Prime Minister Department is responsible for the Federal Territories.

Kuala Lumpur is the capital city of Malaysia and it is situated in the Federal Territory. It is the centre of Federal administration and commerce. While Labuan Island is an off-shore financial centre, off the shore of Sabah.

The UDA Act governs development in the urban areas, which affect the city more than others do (KL City especially).
APPENDIX 2.2 Administrative Relationship between the State Government and the Local Government.

The Sultan post is generally hereditary and the TYDP is elected by the PM from prominent public figures.

The set-up of the State Government is similar to Federal Government. They have their own Executive Councillors (EXCO Members) who run the states like Ministers at Federal level. The States are headed by the Sultans or the Tuan Yang Di Pertua (Governor) for former Straits Settlements States. The Menteri Besar or Ketua Menteri administers the State like the Prime Minister at the Federal level.

The Menteri Besar and Ketua Menteri are President of the Municipal Council. While the District Officers (DO) are Presidents of the District Council. They all have executives powers in their respective Municipality or Districts.

The Local Government Act (Act 171) governs the daily administration of the Local Councils and it is in this Act that conservation becomes the prerogative of the Local Authority.

*TYDP – Tuan Yang Di Pertua.
APPENDIX 2.3 Test of Authenticity and Criteria for an outstanding universal value.

This is an extract from the full text of 'Test of Authenticity and Criteria for an outstanding universal value', the World Heritage Convention 1972 (UNESCO, 1972), for the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, Lichfield, (1988), Economic in Urban Conservation, UCL Press.

For an object in the 'cultural heritage' to be considered of 'outstanding universal value' it must meet one or more of the five criteria listed below, together with the test of authenticity.

The criteria are as follows:

(a)

(i) represent a unique artistic achievement, a masterpiece of the creative genius; or

(ii) have exerted great influence, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture, monumental arts or town planning and landscaping; or

(iii) bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a civilisation which has disappeared; or

(iv) be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement which is representative of a culture and which has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change; or

(v) be directly or tangibly associated with events or with ideas or beliefs of outstanding universal significance (the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstance or in conjunction with other criteria);

and

(b)

...meet the test of authenticity in design, materials, workmanship or setting (the Committee stressed that reconstruction is only acceptable if it is carried out on the basis of complete and detailed documentation on the original and to no extent on conjecture).


See also:

Appendices for Chapter Three
APPENDIX 3.1 Legislation related to the cause of Built Heritage Conservation.

Described briefly below are pieces of various existing legislation that have been used in Malaysia, to administer built heritage conservation work. These statutory documents are not specifically designed to administer built heritage conservation work, although there are relevant provisions in them. Some of this legislation are also out dated in content (in terms of addressing conservation issues) and as such is no more suitable to address the problems demanded by present day conservation process. Others have been recently revised to include requirement for urban conservation processes. In the absence of specific legislation to address conservation issues, this legislation will continue to be use as the guiding instruments for built heritage conservation in Malaysia until the proposed Conservation Bill becomes law.


The act inter-alia provides for the control and preservation of and research into ancient and historical monuments, historical sites and archaeological reserves. The act defined ancient monuments as any monument, which is reasonably believed to be at least one hundred years old, or which is declared as one. A historical site means a site declared as such by the Minister (a very wide definition). The act also mentions "Conservation Zones" which are in actual fact divisional administrative areas (refer to Museum Department Organisation Chart- Appendices 2.3).

Part IV Section 15(1), of the Act gives powers to the Minister to declare any monument to be an ancient monument (determined by age-100 years old) and any site to be a historical site, with the restriction that if it is located in the State territory, the state authority's consent is required. The limitation of this Act, is that it is mainly concerned with antiquities and non-living objects rather than people and their living environment.

Conservation areas are not necessarily archaeological reserves nor necessarily historical sites. Even though the defined meaning of monuments, in this Act includes, "...building and its site, of which their preservation is a matter of public interest due to the reason of religion, history tradition or archaeology...", there is no mention of architectural significance or town planning interest as a criteria for preservation.

The Act however has managed to address conservation of ancient monuments and historical sites under the purview of private ownership. It even provided the means of
removing or acquiring these private properties by private treaty or compulsory acquisition in return for compensation to be decided by an agreement. Compulsory acquisition is also subjected to Article 13 of the Federal Constitution pertaining to the rights of a citizen towards property.

**Town and Country Planning Act, ACT 172, 1976 (amended 1996).**

The Town and Country Planning Act, is used by the Local authorities to administer development planning. In it there are also clauses that prohibit the demolition of heritage buildings. The Act is modelled along the lines of the Development Plan System of UK (TCP 1971). However its provision for conservation falls short of the provisions spelled out in the UK Act. The Malaysian version is mainly concerned with the control of development in general (development planning control) and does not make a clear definition of conservation requirements. The UK version has a separate special statute relating to the conservation of the built heritage that is, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990(EH, 1995).

For the purpose of conservation, it is provided under S.58 of the 1976 Act that the State Authorities may makes rules, inter alia, for "the protection of ancient monuments and lands and buildings of historic or architectural interest". Using this clause, two State Governments, Johore and Melaka, have already enacted their own bill for preservation (see 4.9.8 below). It is this clause in the TCP Act that gave the Local Authorities, the legal arm of the state government, the power to act on conservation issues. Article 27-(a) (b) and (c) of the Malaysian Act have been tested in measures pertaining to conservation issues, with the demolition of the Hotel Metropole (NST, 1994), in Penang Island (a state declared gazetted building) as mentioned in Chapter One.

As mentioned by Chahl (1986) in his paper on 'Conservation in the legal context' at the conference, 'Strategy for Conservation', no specific statutory recognition is given to the 'area concept' (conservation area designation). Section 58(2) (f) of the TCP Act, only refers to protection of monuments, lands and buildings of historic or architectural interest. Under the new amended section of 21B (1b), there is however a requirement to indicate and show in the layout plans, and to give consideration to, the character and appearance of historical buildings within the vicinity of a proposed development.
Recent amendments made to the T&CP Act in 1996 have also failed to specifically address the issues of conservation areas. In the amendment the issue of conserving an area has been 'camouflage' in the drafting of the Local Plan (LP) instead of being incorporated as a policy issue of Structure Plans. According to information gathered from the Planning Department headquarters, the local plan is not only a local plan but could also act as a conservation area designating instrument. This is because the planning provision in the local plans only allows the current use of the land and structures presently on it. Future uses are now determined by the criteria set out in the current local plan. There appears to be no punitive deterrent included in this amended Act to prevent the character or appearance of such an area from being devalued or destroyed in the course of any approved development.


Part XII section [101c (iv) & (f)] of the Act, under 'Further powers of the Local Authority', gives powers to the Council's President of the Local Authority (Yang di Pertua Majlis Tempatan), to handle all matters pertaining to the conservation and preservation of heritage buildings.

101(c) (iv) "...to maintain or contribute to the maintenance of historical buildings or sites and acquire any land,... or in connection with the maintenance of historical buildings or sites..."

In most cases Local Authorities are reluctant or do not fully exercise these powers. This reluctance has been highlighted time and again, and especially by Nazir Ariff (NST, 1994), the former President of the Penang Heritage Trust, after the case of the overnight demolition of the Penang Metropole Hotel. He said:

"...we have laws on such things but unfortunately, they are never really followed. Politically, the administration are too flexible".

"...the State and the Council make far-sighted plans most times it appears that these are set aside in a biased fashion to accommodate vested interest."

This misguided stand often taken by the local authorities could be attributed to the following reasons. First, Local Authorities are heavily influenced politically, most Council Presidents being politicians. Therefore decisions made could be influenced by constituents of the politician who might have acted in their interest rather than based on conservation issues. Secondly local authorities are short of personnel thus lacking in enforcement and are seldom proactive and rather reactive. Thirdly due to the shortage
of funds to carry out all the tasks, priorities have to be selective and again conservation issues have to take a back step.

**Federal Territory (Planning) Act 1982, (ACT 267).**

The act is basically based on the Town and Country Planning Act (Act172), but is only applicable to the areas within the Federal Territory, City of Kuala Lumpur and the Island of Labuan. The Act gives the Lord Mayor of Kuala Lumpur the powers to prepare local plans and designate conservation areas when the structural plans are ready. The Act has also included the "preservation and planting of trees" wherein conditions may be included in the planning permission for a "tree preservation order". This provision prohibits the felling and cutting of any tree with a girth exceeding one metre without consent (tree preservation order).

**Urban Development Authority Act (UDA ACT).**

This Act is only applicable for the Urban Development Authority (UDA) and it relates to proposed developments carried out by it in urban centres. The Act allows UDA to purchase dilapidated properties and acquire land in dilapidated urban areas, demolish them and then redevelop for sale as part of the urban development. The Central Market project (refer to Fig: 3) fell into this 'trap'. Thankfully *Badan Warisan Malaysia* manage to save the market building from being demolished and prevent UDA from redeveloping the site.

**Street and Drainage Act, ACT 133, 1974.**

Part V; Section 83 (3) of the above act gives power to the Local Authority to repair and recover the costs, of ruinous buildings that are detrimental to the safety and public health.

Local authorities could use this power to address the problem of abandoned and dilapidated property especially in the urban areas. Due to development restrictions imposed on the property, owners often resort to abandoning their building and leaving it to deteriorate and fall into obsolescence. Functional and economic obsolescence are the main causes of urban heritage buildings deterioration. Owners would then have the opportunity to redevelop and benefit from the new development without any restrictions. The authorities in Malaysia seldom make use of this Act, the reason being lack of funds for the purpose and the difficulties of recovering the cost from the owners.

The Johore 'Yayasan Warisan Negeri Enactment' only concerns itself with monuments and historical sites. Similar to the other existing legislation, it has also failed to address the need for designation of conservation areas or urban conservation issues. A cursory check revealed that it takes its content directly from the Antiquities Act of the Museum Department, which explains the inclination towards monuments rather than the overall living environment.

Melaka State, Enactment No. 6, 1988.

The State of Melaka Preservation and Conservation of Cultural Heritage Enactment No: 6 1988 ("Pemuliharaan dan Pemugaran Warisan dan Kawasan Bersejarah", Negeri Melaka, 1988), is slightly more detailed in its content in addressing the issue of conservation of the built heritage. In this enactment conservation has been defined as the process of looking after a cultural heritage or conservation area so as to retain its significance. It has also allocated funds, which heavily rely on public donations to sustain it. The fund, which was started by the State government, is often insufficient even to finance the smallest of conservation jobs. This enactment has not been fully tested yet. In an interview with senior management of PERZIM it was revealed that they have not even used the provisions in the Enactment in the course of their duty. They relied mostly on the Structure Plans and propose Local Plans documents in the execution of their conservation work.

Both Johore and Melaka States Enactments are only applicable in the State in which the enactment was enacted, and cover only State owned property within the State boundary. It is not however, binding if the property belongs to the Federal Government even if it sits on State land.

Control of Rent Act (CoRA), Act 363, 1966 (Rev.1988).

The Control of Rent Act (CoRA) was formulated to established "fair rent" upon controlled premises; i.e. buildings completed on or before 31st January 1948 (pre war buildings). Owners of these pre-war buildings, which are mostly located in urban centres, feel that the Act has "outlived its usefulness (NST, 1991). The decontrol process of the above-mentioned Act, however, will have some implication on these pre-war heritage buildings. More research is needed to assess the implication of decontrol.
These pre-war buildings which are worthy of conservation, are in a state of limbo. The owners realised the huge potential of developing these properties but CoRA is regarded as a stumbling block in the way of getting better economic return both for their properties and the land they occupied. And adding insult to injury, the original act has made it necessary for property owners to subsidise and compensate their tenants. If they were to evict the tenants from their properties to make way for development, the compensation cost has to be agreed between them, and the authority will decide any dispute. The owner's grievances have been time and again highlighted in the local media (the STAR, 1993:), as a result of which the Ministry of Housing and Local Government have released a revised Act.

This revised Act which provides for the decontrol of the present Act, took effect on 1st September 1996 with provision for a three years transition period up till 31st December 1999. Decontrol of the CoRA poses new threats to the pre-war heritage properties. It is feared that with the full decontrol, a majority of these properties would be developed as the floodgates open. The only consolation at the present time is that the slowdown of the economic situation in the Asian region has temporarily presented some of the developments from taking place immediately. Research in conservation area management would develop better understanding and will also permit the formulation of frameworks and guidelines, to address multi-faceted, urban conservation issues.
Appendix 3.2 Summary of interviews with public figures and government officials who are stake holders to the Malaysian conservation process.

**These notes are word per word extracts from the tape-recorded interviews with 'Stake holders'. Highlighted are the some of the pertinent points uncovered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>The need to conserve the built heritage</th>
<th>Public awareness/education</th>
<th>Laws / legislations</th>
<th>Political scenario</th>
<th>Technical guidelines</th>
<th>Incentives/grants/tax relief</th>
<th>Resources/skills/ 'craftsmanship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dato Ismail Adam</td>
<td>...Ministry's policy is to retain as much as possible cultural historical heritage</td>
<td>...current tenant may not see the &quot;economic light&quot; at the end of the tunnel</td>
<td>...there are inadequacies in the current laws and legislation</td>
<td>...tenant issues are political in nature. ...restructuring the society and property ownership in urban centres is cons. related issue</td>
<td>...urban planners need to think the kind of usage for this buildings, what advantage can they derive out of this.</td>
<td>...conserved areas need to be improved</td>
<td>...the Local Govt. is one authority that could supplement the weakness of the Museum. ...expertise is not to be found in great numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary General Ministry of Culture, Art and Tourism</td>
<td>...through the built heritage we can understand the concept of society's place ...conservation has been made one of the strategies for tourism development ...</td>
<td>...lots of unfounded fear relating to the future of the buildings and the future of the tenants. ...nations don't realise the long-term ...efforts need to make people realise the benefits of conservation ...conflicts between wanting to built anew and those wanting to conserve</td>
<td>...the Antiquities Act 72/76 gives very limited authority to the Museum Dept.</td>
<td>Nat. Museum does not have the authority, needed by the State to respond positively</td>
<td>...concern for indigenous built heritage (Malay villages) is a political agenda related to ethnicity ...very selective and representative in conserving the built heritage</td>
<td>old by itself is no reason to demolish dilapidated areas need to be developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...technical experts need to be pulled into one agency no choice but a Federal one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...the need to set up a conservation unit in museum headed by PWD architect or engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>The need to conserve the built heritage</td>
<td>Public awareness/education</td>
<td>Laws/législations</td>
<td>Political scenario</td>
<td>Technical guidelines</td>
<td>Incentives/ grants/tax relief</td>
<td>Resources/skills/craftsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dr. Kamarul Bahrin Buyong Director General, Department of National Museum, Malaysia</td>
<td>...cons. of the built heritage concerns the people living there ...conservation not a deterrent to development ...cons. a linkage of the people to the past ...heritage as tourism product essential to Malaysian tourism industry ...urban heritage is more so ... &quot;shouldn't kill Goose that lay the golden egg&quot; ...Malaysia is concerned about preserving its heritage.</td>
<td>...need to create awareness among the public and property owners ...benefits of cons. needs to be told to them ...public has never been exposed from early life to love heritage ...ordinary Malaysian is not aware of the context, but that does not mean they do not love conservation ...in Malaysian's tradition, preservation is a tradition...</td>
<td>...Antiquities Act (AA) encompasses both conservation and protection of movable and immovable cultural heritage ...federal constitution recognise the ownership of private property ...AA does not cater for urban landscape conservation, more towards monumental conservation. ...conservation means conserving monument, not recent heritage buildings before the world wars. ...AA focus very specific to preserve antiquity buildings, not urban townscape ...new legislation is required for conservation planning ...Rent Control does not hinder cons. ...amended TCP may be good for designating areas</td>
<td>...land is a state matter, permission from the State is necessary for gazetting ...concurrent approval from State very slow ...cons. of heritage is a cultural aspect and thus prerogative of MoCat / Museum not Local Govt. ...sensitive dilemma in preserving the urban heritage properties, related to the status quo ownership and restructuring the multi-ethnic Malaysian society ...Govt. has to play a major role ...political will is an important factor ensuring the success of cons. ...political leaders' awareness, of the needs to preserve.</td>
<td>...Knowledge and guidelines need to be dispersed to all Local Authorities.</td>
<td>...Govt need to give incentives, not necessarily money, may be transfer of development rights.</td>
<td>...Museum Dept. trained contractors and supervised them of their work. ...present organisation does not have enough powers to deal with multifaceted aspect of urban conservation ...Cons. area zone should be managed by the LAutho. ... an independent body or a Govt. Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>The need to conserve the built heritage</td>
<td>Public awareness/education</td>
<td>Laws/legislations</td>
<td>Political scenario</td>
<td>Technical guidelines</td>
<td>Incentives/grants/tax relief</td>
<td>Resources/skills/craftsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr. Krishnan nali Muniandy (Assistant Director, Department of Local Government, Ministry of Housing and Local Government)</td>
<td>...since 1994 the Cabinet directive to protect the built heritage and cons. areas Local Authority caught in the conflict of economic growth and conservation</td>
<td>...awareness also needed within the Local Authority on the importance of cons. preservation. general public has not been fully exposed to the importance of conserving. NGOs are important in playing their role other organisation, like school, media press also important for disseminating information increase public awareness the need for a specific law for conservation is urgently required.</td>
<td>...overlapping powers between the new law and the existing Antiquities Act. the need to repeal State's conservation enactment (Melaka &amp; Johore) amended TCP is not enough, need to strengthen cons. with specific law new Bill will reinforce and strengthen the powers of the LA repeal of Rent Control critical to conservation efforts two years time frame has been given to settle this proposed Bill will give the LA powers to identify and determine properties suitable for conservation.</td>
<td>...perception among the Local Authorities that conservation means just improving the façade by directing the owners to maintain the façade conservation is achieved proposed Bill will identify the LA as the key player in the conservation process</td>
<td>...drafting of Structure plan and Local Plan are instruments for managing conservation. in line with the proposed Bill, the guidelines for implementing conservation works has also been formulated.</td>
<td>...setting of the national funds by the Federal Govt in the proposed Bill. with the creation of the (conservation) fund the public will see the need to conserved and preserved.</td>
<td>...The proposed Bill has identified the need for training for the LA staff in managing conservation works and processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>The need to conserve the built heritage</td>
<td>Public awareness/education</td>
<td>Laws/legislations</td>
<td>Political scenario</td>
<td>Technical guidelines</td>
<td>Incentives/grants/tax relief</td>
<td>Resources/skills/craftsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dato Prof. Khoo Kay Kim (Professor of History, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur)</td>
<td>...we have a problem. There are two groups of people. One wanting to conserve and the other to eradicate the colonial past. The shop-house is a typical Malaysian urban scene which is fast disappearing. The values of the Malaysian public who have developed a value of making money.</td>
<td>...Malaysian public more obsessed in the economic growth and making money. ...blame upon the stereotype education system which have the wrong emphasis. ...plural nature of society, each ethnic group wanting to preserve their heritage. ...Malaysian public adheres to the Aladdin's lamp concept of &quot;old lamp and new lamp.&quot; ...Malaysian public are busy they work late and have no time for heritage. ...you cannot do it from the top.</td>
<td>...people involved in the formulation of legislation have forgotten the social effect, elements.</td>
<td>...shop-houses cannot be called Chinese shop-houses due to their evolution in the Malaysian scene. ...existence of the five foot-way introduce by Raffles in Singapore. ...Malaysia is a country where the State is very powerful. ...power to make decisions rests with the State. ...civil service believes in generalist not in specialist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>The need to conserve the built heritage</td>
<td>Public awareness/education</td>
<td>Laws/legislation</td>
<td>Political scenario</td>
<td>Technical guidelines</td>
<td>Incentives/grants tax relief</td>
<td>Resources/skills/craftsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dato' Zakiah Hanum Abd Hamid</td>
<td>...I think history should be preserved ...if you want to go forward you must look back, to see what existed in our people and nation ...understanding of what happened in the past is important if you want to progress ...every race in the world knows what existed within their race, their culture, customs etc.</td>
<td>...We are too kind a people, we let the &quot;WHITES&quot; bring in the immigrants ...when they were here they always condemn us and lifted other races ...even the PM now does not mentioned the 'MELAYU' (race) but the (new) Malaysian citizen. ...that Bahasa Malaysia (Malaysian Language changed from Bahasa Melayu), disturbs a lot of people. ...we must love our heritage, in order to pass down to the next generation ...the need to bring up the greatness of the race (by promoting the Malay culture).</td>
<td>...I don't have problem with the government they are always willing to help me. ...I get help direct from the Secretary General and the (Dept.) Directors. ...the point is I am sincere in carrying out my projects / works ...I do it voluntarily no money involved.</td>
<td>...don't think about money too much, don't let money control our livelihood ...like the Chinese always looking for money</td>
<td>...I personally appreciate our own experts ...the need to research on culture and bring it back for the people to appreciates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>The need to conserve the built heritage.</td>
<td>Public awareness/education</td>
<td>Laws/legislations</td>
<td>Political scenario</td>
<td>Technical guidelines</td>
<td>Incentives/grants/tax relief</td>
<td>Resources/skills/craftsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ms Ng Al Wah</td>
<td>...the Badan is a non profit organisation for the conservation of M'sian built heritage.</td>
<td>...there was no public movement in conservation...Majlis had no legal entity...?...after 4 year of fanfare and publicity the merger of the Badan the Sahabat and Majlis to form the new BADAN WARISAN M'SIA...development of Badan based on ICCOMOS and the BURRA Charter...owners of the Rent control heritage building have been deprived the benefits of their property for the last 40 yrs. ...need to promote the desire and love for cons. &amp; preservation...education is not something you tell, its something you soak over time.</td>
<td>...Badan does not have a forward role, only as facilitators acting behind the scene...in M'sia legislation before it become an active legislation is not the purview of the public, it is illegal to comment...there is a need to work within the democratic parliamentary system that exists not to compare it with developed western country...actually repeal of Rent Control has nothing to do with architecture or the built heritage...</td>
<td>...in the 80's its not politically correct to talk about cons...the country out of necessity needed to work towards growth...the presence of Malay &amp; Chinese Badan is trying to be a National body...you can do all you can, but it needs all the political will to implement it...gazetting by the responsible authority has taken too long...country has to have a vision of the kind of direction it wants to grow in...then cons. works in line with the vision...</td>
<td>...there are no guidelines as to the criteria for choosing buildings to be conserved...guidelines are needed to the type of treatment needed to conserve and preserve the heritage...</td>
<td>...we really have to work on the financial incentives for the owners...need to inspire developers to restore and at least reuse old properties.</td>
<td>...because of the lack of publicity, publication codification...the data for urban surveys is sitting in pieces of paper for 4 years and will be useless soon...everybody in M'sia refers to tertiary data source, no research...data on the built heritage is not confirmed...the no. of building are still not confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>The need to conserve the built heritage.</td>
<td>Public awareness/education</td>
<td>Laws/legislations</td>
<td>Political scenario</td>
<td>Technical guidelines</td>
<td>Incentives/grants/tax relief</td>
<td>Resources/skills/craftsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr. Annuar Hj. Abd. Rahman Council President Taiping Municipal Council (MPT)</td>
<td>...Local Authority understands the need to conserve but it's the priorities...cons. project by pocket, conserving a sample of development only we understand that cons. is not anti development in MPT,...the old building in town is the niche whose heritage is it to be preserved and the question of property ownership in urban centres.</td>
<td>...public do not value heritage like their western counter part educating the public is necessary not only the public do not understand the concept of conservation, we are also in the process of learning all this conservation issues should come from the property owners themselves not being forced upon them getting them really committed on the issues</td>
<td>...in order to implement this policies we need legal backing only when there is backing can we implement this. only after getting their mindset fixed on the importance of conserving heritage, can legislation be implemented.</td>
<td>...as an administrator I am here to implement the govt. policies any work has to be consented by the state, L.A is governed by the State. the State can &quot;direct us&quot; to do whatever. there needs to be a solid policy for the country</td>
<td>...the guidelines that we use are borrowed here and there not uniquely ours there is a need to develop our own guideline, we are in the process of formulating one.</td>
<td>...there is maintenance of govt owned heritage properties but the privately owned ...? MPT has devised some incentives to be given to property owners, quit-rent, assessment etc.</td>
<td>...non existence of Heritage NGO to help in the conservation work but presence of Business association for business sake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>The need to conserve the built heritage.</td>
<td>Public awareness/education</td>
<td>Laws/legislations</td>
<td>Political scenario</td>
<td>Technical guidelines</td>
<td>Incentives/grants/tax relief</td>
<td>Resources/skills/craftsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8   | Mr. Ismail Ibrahim  
Head of management and Legal Unit,  
Federal Town Planning Department, Kuala Lumpur. | ...Cons. Area Plan talks about ways of developing the area, sounds dictating and this deters the property owners in co-operating with LA ...in Local Plan you are allowed the present / current use but future use ...? ...our conservation programmes are plan led, clearly provided by the LP, indicating areas worthy of Conservation. | ...if the awareness of the Local Authority is great they could implement conservation by restrictions in their day to day work of issuing planning permission or Development order. ...in relation to planning control and planning permission conditions with regards to conservation can be attached to the permission | ...the Attorney General Chamber (AG) decided that due to time factors the amended TCP does not include the Cons. Area designation requirement  
...there is nothing in the amended TCP 1995 Act about the designation of Conservation areas ...this will be included in the "new comprehensive Act"  
...the amended sec.22, sub, sec. 5 (i, j, k) of act 172 ...what planning is to describe how the land is going to be preserved ...  
...non-technical people in JKT preparing the New Legislation forgot to do the consultation with other relevant Departments | ...what will be the effect of designation of an area and the position of the Property Owners  
...the preparation of the Local plan might be the solution to the problem  
...the status of the Local plan needs to be verified  
...what about the right of the individual citizen under Article 13 of the Federal constitution. | ...the LP is not only a Local Plan but also a conservation area designating instruments  
...in planning control concern, when Act 172 comes in to being, it means your right to future development is taken away  
...Cons. Area Plan sounds like dictating and infringes rights of property owner | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>The need to conserve the built heritage.</th>
<th>Public awareness/education</th>
<th>Laws/legislations</th>
<th>Political scenario</th>
<th>Technical guidelines</th>
<th>Incentives/grants/tax relief</th>
<th>Resources/skills/craftsmanship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mr. Lokman Omar, Director of Planning Department (Town Planner), Seremban Municipal Council</td>
<td>...whose heritage, if it is the Chinese, what for? European or Colonial's heritage what for ...it is the Malay's (indigenous people) that need to be preserved...! ...but for Malaysian may be good! ...in Seremban has no plans for conservation ...old town could not be developed 100%, so has to developed new township Seremban Two ...we just have a little bit of interest in these conservation, basically for image of town...! ...the old shop-houses have lots of problems in public amenities, upgrading necessary, e.g Sewerage disposal.</td>
<td>...private participation in conservation is hardly conceivable ...however there is some support from the Corporate Sector</td>
<td>...there exist all the necessary legislation for conservation ...but passing legislation to be enforced by Local Authorities, is “BULL SHIT”... ...writing new legislation without thinking of the problem on the ground is useless ...we need to face the public on the ground. ...what is the Govt. role in implementing this laws after formulating it?</td>
<td>...Chief Minister says that those who break the law enjoy those who follows the law suffer...? ...all sensitive issues need to be endorsed by full EXCO before implemented ...conservation is a sensitive issue, even if we have the powers we won't implement them until EXCO's have made decision ...with an independent President, it will have a bit of delay in getting confirmation of the EXCO.</td>
<td>...we have height constraints for development in the old town for single units, but in multiple units development we work on plot ratio</td>
<td>...the rent control need to be reviewed to give owners the opportunity to renovate property, repair and raise the rent. ...owners are not interested in renovating property if it cost more than new building ...this is related to the high assessment, land tax &amp; low return in rent.</td>
<td>...the problem is budget for maintenance. ...no problem for Govt Building or Corporate ownership ...cut backs in staffing and shortage make enforcement difficult and this is “Bull Shit”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>The need to conserve the built heritage</td>
<td>Public awareness/education</td>
<td>Laws/legislations</td>
<td>Political scenario</td>
<td>Technical guidelines</td>
<td>Incentives/grants/tax relief</td>
<td>Resources/skills/craftsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mr. Yaacob, Director, Perak State, Town And Country Planning Department.</td>
<td>...the political masters do desire to conserve the heritage, no question of valuing it. ...the Cultural sentiment is still strong on whose heritage are we conserving. ...the notion of the Nation's heritage has not really sunk into the mind of the general Public/</td>
<td>...public are subconscious about the gazetting process of conservation ...educating the property owners and at same time not denying them the opportunity ...getting them to understand the importance of heritage for future generation.</td>
<td>...new Land acquisition Act (ACT 486) provides for the owner the first fullest opportunity of benefits in developing his property</td>
<td>...only concerned about the Public rights to development based on Article 13 of the Fed. Constitution ...concerned over the Public consultation process ...there is a need to involve the affected property owners personally ...concern over the electoral vote, the politician thus concerned with the business community -nation's heritage = owner lost and suffering -nation's heritage = Private property</td>
<td>...Yackob thinks the Museum Dept is not the Dept to manage the conservation issues. ...he thinks an independent body (Corporation or semi-autonomous body) which is able to do their own accounting is a better set up.</td>
<td>...tax book conservation incentives such as transfer of development rights has not been utilised to it full ...the affected owners must be compensated enough for their losses ...any incentives enough to entice them to conserve</td>
<td>...funding was a great issue in protecting heritage ...the &quot;Three tier government&quot; posed a difficulty in sourcing funds! ...acquisition of properties is always out of the question due to shortage of funds and the miss-use of the Act ...funds from the consolidated Federal Funds, needed to bid for it. ...gates toll are not automatically ploughed back in the maintenance of the heritage product but goes in to the consolidated funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>The need to conserve the built heritage.</td>
<td>Public awareness/education</td>
<td>Laws/legislations</td>
<td>Political scenario</td>
<td>Technical guidelines</td>
<td>Incentives/grants/tax relief</td>
<td>Resources/skills/craftsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr Rosli Hj. Nor Architect Melaka Museum Corporation</td>
<td>...in Melaka conservation of the urban built fabric is slightly different since there are a lot more Row houses interspersed between the shophouses and are owner occupied. ...there is a sense of pride in the property.</td>
<td>...aimed at creating public awareness ...so far the property owners are very co-operative since they are occupying the properties, there is a sense of pride and belonging ...we have young conservationist programme to promote heritage building ...50% of Peranakan Homes are assured of being maintained by the &quot;Peranakan society</td>
<td>...gazetting is done by gazetting the areas ...had never used the State Enactment 6 for the conservation work and do not really understand the content of the Enactment</td>
<td>...our role is only to advise the Municipality in issues pertaining to conservation</td>
<td>...guidelines list the action to be taken by the owners and consultants.</td>
<td>...no incentives but help to promote the heritage properties through tourism and gate collection ...have partnership schemes with property owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Peranakan is in local term used to describe the Straits-born Chinese or the Babas and Nyonyas.
APPENDIX 3.3 Badan Warisan Malaysia—Recommendation for Financial Incentives to encourage conservation of Malaysia’s Built Heritage

RECOMMENDED FINANCIAL INCENTIVES TO ENCOURAGE THE CONSERVATION OF MALAYSIA’S BUILT HERITAGE.

1.0 Introduction

Malaysia is a unique country in that it has been enriched by the cross-influence of various cultures. Today, modern Malaysia is made up of a multi-cultural society. Each culture has contributed to the country and each has left its mark on our nation.

This is clearly reflected in the intermingling of Malay, Indian Chinese, Dutch and colonial British architectural influences in our building styles. Such an interesting mix of architectural styles is not found elsewhere in the world. Our architecture, culture and multiracial community have been one of this country’s main tourist attractions and an asset we cannot afford to lose.

1.1 Current situation

The onset of diversifying Malaysia’s primary assets from an agricultural to and industrial-based one has resulted in far reaching consequences which has change the very order of our society and encourage the movement of people from the villages to urban areas.

Now we find that the traditional Malay kampong (villages) is slowly becoming extinct. Already there are kampongs, which have been abandoned, or only occupied by the old. When they die, the kampong will cease to exist. If we do not act now, we shall loose the very fabric of our traditional way of life.

In the towns, the imminent repeal of the Rent will mark the demolition of approximately 40,000 rent-controlled buildings throughout the country. These buildings were often the first buildings, which were built in the small towns and thereafter steeped, in the very history and origins of these towns.

We envisage that the gradual disappearance of the traditional kampongs and the heart of small towns will soon be a reality if efforts are not now made to
encourage the retention of kamponds and the old buildings in towns. In fact we realise the efforts are now being made to decentralise industries away from the large towns to rural areas so providing employment in these areas. This will indeed help much towards alleviating the migration of peoples to urban areas.

Majlis Warisan Malaysia has recommended that the following incentives be incorporated into the national Budget in an effort to slow down the degradation of our traditional and cultural heritage and retain our built heritage.

2.0 Recommended Financial Incentives for Consideration in the next National Budget

2.1 The setting up of a Preservation Fund. This Fund will provide the grants and low interest loans to owners of heritage buildings who wish to restore their buildings following approved conservation guidelines. (It should be given tax-exempt status if it is set up outside the ambit of the government).

The Preservation Fund will be funded by taxing businesses in the Tourism Industry, which will benefits the most from the conservation of our built heritage.

2.2 Cost of repairs of heritage buildings should be allowed as a deduction against the owner's taxable income. Any unutilised amount to be carried forward for future years.

2.3 Allow rebate on duty for suppliers of traditional materials used in old buildings so encouraging the development of this type of business.

2.4 Waive service tax for business, which are involved in approved conservation work.

2.5 Allow deduction over and above the normal deduction (double deduction) for labour used in approved conservation projects.

2.6 Compulsorily acquired abandoned, neglected old buildings with the intention to restore these buildings to their original condition. These can be sold at a profit under a conservation covenant and the funds ploughed back into the Preservation Funds.

2.7 Allow tax exemption to owners on entry charges levied on public and tourists.

(Source: Majlis Warisan Malaysia, (1994), Consultation Meeting between NGO's and government agencies.)
Appendix for Chapter Four
APPENDIX 4.1 Development process for the protection of historic townscapes in the Netherlands.

- **STATE**
  - Selection: Survey of potential settlements

- **PROVINCE**
  - Registration: Settlements registered as worthy of protection
  - Propose areas for consideration

- **MUNICIPALITY**
  - Areas can be protected by municipal by-law

**DESIGNATION**
- Liaison between the three levels of government to decide whether a protected townscape is to be designated. Municipal priorities of key importance.
  - Preparation of explanatory memorandum and preservation order under Article 20 Monument Act.
  - Province has powers to prepare plan if municipality fail to do so
  - Preparation or revision of development plan within 1-2 years under Physical Planning Act

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN**
- Approval of Development Plan
- Approval of Development Plan

**PROTECTION/ENHANCEMENT**
- Protected townscape enhance by the state money managed by NRF
- Administration of restoration and enhancement on behalf of smaller municipalities

**FORWARD PLANNING**
- Research related to buildings and areas
- Provision of advice for provinces and municipalities

**KEYS**
- Main development process
- Administrative linkages

(Source: Compiled by R Skea from information received from Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, Zeist)
Appendices for Chapter Five
# Appendix 5.1 Quick Listing Survey Questionnaire

(For Urban Building Ensemble)

## A Building Particulars

| District: Larut, Matang & Selama Town: Taiping | Address of Property: .................................................. |
| Local Authority: Majlis Perbandaran Taiping. | .................................................. |

Name of Building if any: .................................................. |

## B Building Style / Type / Status:

- **A.** Free standing
  - Detached
  - Semi-detached
  - Terrace
- **B.** Single storey
  - Double storey
  - Three storey or
- In Conservation Area (CA)?
  - YES
  - NO
- Class of gazetting:
  - I
  - II
  - III
- Not gazetted in CA: ..................................................

## C. Scale to measure risk to buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Partially occupied</th>
<th>Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td>:1</td>
<td>:2</td>
<td>:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>:1</td>
<td>:2</td>
<td>:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>:1</td>
<td>:2</td>
<td>:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>:1</td>
<td>:2</td>
<td>:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Grade</th>
<th>1 Extreme risk</th>
<th>2 Grave risk</th>
<th>3 At risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings at RISK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings to be watched</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings not at RISK from Neglect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## D Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Ownership:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious/Charity/Association:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Statutory undertakers:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of occupant/s:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Owner occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Occupant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented: Rent Paid:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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E  Reason building at threat / risk.

- Change of use:  
- Change of ownership:  
- Change of taste:  
- Redundant:  
- Dilapidation:  
- Lack of Facilities:  

Pictorial evidence (front elevation):

Site location Map:  
Frontal Perspective View.

F  Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Previous / Present</th>
<th>Previous / Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cum retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others, specify: ...........................................  notes: ............................................................

G  Owners Preferred Use:

- Present use: ...........................................  Recommended use ...........................................  
- Market status:  For development:  
- New development: ...........................................  
- Not For sale  
- For sale: ...........................................  
- Price: RM ($): ...........................................  

H  Recommendation and action.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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Appendix 5.1b Questionnaire for Residents' Interviews.

Resident's Interview sheet for the detail study of the shop houses in the selected areas (block of development).

Modern uses for historic shop-houses:
Information for Case study: building users.

Address..........................................................................................................................

USE:
Current use:.................................................................................................................
Date first used:..............................................................................................................
Former use:....................................................................................................................

The Building
No of stories: 1.......2.......3.......4.......5.......>5........... Net floor area: ........................................... Sq. Meters
Ceiling to floor height:................................................... Metres

Construction type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plastered brickwork</th>
<th>Half plastered brick</th>
<th>half timber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timber on stilt</td>
<td>Timber on ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical factors:
(Please circle the following item as either very good (VG), good (G), fair (F), poor (P) or very poor (VP).


Keys:
- VG - Immaculate with no sign of fabric deterioration
- G - Well maintained with very little sign of fabric deterioration.
- F - Fabrics showing sign of deterioration.
- P - Fabrics deteriorating and partially occupied
- VP - Fabric deteriorating and vacant

© Copyright Amer / DMUPh.D/98'.
Economic opportunity

Form of Tenure: Own / Rented / Leased
If rented what is the range of rent do you pay for the premise?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RM 100-200</th>
<th>RM 201-300</th>
<th>RM 301-400</th>
<th>RM 401-500</th>
<th>RM 501-600</th>
<th>RM 601-700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Who is responsible for repair of the building? Owner/Occupier/Tenant

Conservation opportunities:

What will be your reaction if the council (MPT) designate Taiping town area (including your property) as a conservation area:

Are you willing to pay for the cost of conserving this building as part of the town's heritage? YES / NO

WHY?: ...........................................................................................................

How much are you willing to contribute to the cost of conserving the town heritage character and appearance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner / Authorities</th>
<th>20 / 80</th>
<th>30 / 70</th>
<th>40 / 60</th>
<th>50 / 50</th>
<th>0 / 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorities / Owner</td>
<td>20 / 80</td>
<td>30 / 70</td>
<td>40 / 60</td>
<td>50 / 50</td>
<td>100 / 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the one single factor that you value about Taiping town?

How would you propose to maintain the character and appearance of the Taiping town?

And Finally

If 'shop-house buildings' in Taiping town are being replaced by high rise commercial cum office development, would you still want to live in the urban centre of this town?: -(if YES why? If NO why not). YES / NO

I take this opportunity to thank you for your generous co-operation participating in this survey.

"THANK-YOU" & "TERIMA KASIH"
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Appendix 5.1c SPSS Results of the Quick Listing Survey of Building Stock in Taiping.

(a.1) Street location of building in the town.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building addresses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jalan Barrack</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teong Chye (CS59)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalan Stesen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b.01) Building Status: Type of buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Style</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early shophouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shophouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Deco</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b.02) Building Status: Free standing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(b.03) Building Status: Type of storey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of storey</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Double</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b.04) Building Status: Is it in conservation area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is it in Conservation area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid YES</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b.05) Building Status: Class of gazetting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Gazetting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Don't Know</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c.01) Conservation Opportunity: The external conditions of the buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Risk — Condition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c.02) The effect of occupancy on scale of risk (Based on the English Heritage Scale of Risk).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Risk — Occupancy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Vacant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially occupied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c.03) Scale of Risk: Determining the risk factor of the selected properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Risk — Risk grade</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid At Risk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be Watched</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be Watched</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at Risk</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d.01) Determining the ownership status of the properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership — Occupancy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Owner occupied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenancy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple occupancy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d.02) Determining the status of occupancy by the family occupying the properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership — Type of family</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Single family</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple family</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business only</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d.03) Determining the rental paid by the tenants and sub tenants of pre-war properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership — Rental</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid 100 — 200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 — 300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 — 400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 — 600</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 — 800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d.04) Determining the rental paid by the tenants and sub tenants of pre-war properties.

![Ownership - Type](chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership - Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e.01) Determining the reason for the building being at risk based on selected criteria.

![Reason building at Risk](chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason building at Risk</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of use</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of Ownership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of Taste</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at risk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f.01) Determining the previous usage of the properties to look at structural changes.

![Usage - Previous](chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage - Previous</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential cum retail</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(f.02) Determining the present usage of the properties to look at structural changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage - Present</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Residential</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential cum retail</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ap.03) Physical factors pertaining to Access of site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical factors - Access to site</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Very good</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ap.04) Physical factors pertaining to the building and environment surrounding it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical factors - Building state of Repair</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Very good</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ap. 05) Physical factors pertaining to the suitability of residential location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Factors — Residential Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Very good</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ap.06) Physical factors pertaining to alteration and renovation upon buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical factor — Alteration / Renovation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Very Good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ap.07) Responsibility for repair of building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for Repair</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Property owner</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix for Chapter 5

(ap. 08) Conservation opportunity: Reaction of the public towards designation of areas for conservation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation opportunity — Reaction to designation Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Agreed</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ap. 09) Conservation opportunity: The willingness of the public to pay or contribute to the cause of conserving their town's built heritage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation opportunity — Paying</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid YES</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ap. 10) Conservation opportunity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation opportunity — Contribute cost O / A</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid 20 / 80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 / 70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 / 60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 / 50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 / 100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing 0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ap.11) Willingness to contribute to cost for conserving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation opportunity — Contribute cost A / O</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 / 50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 / 0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart

(ap.12) One factor that you value about Taiping town.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation opportunity — 1 factor of value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Garden</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful Environment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility to facilities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility to eatery &amp; food</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart

(ap.13) Maintaining the character and appearance of the town.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintain the Character &amp; appearance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain 2-storey Old buildings</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain greenery in Town</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Developement, only to 4 storey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve Street pattern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain character of old Town</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart
(ap.14) If Taiping's built heritage is being replaced by modern high-rise.

### Replaced shophouses with Tall Bldgs. — Still live in urban centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart

(replaced shophouses with Tall Bldgs. — Still live in urban centre)

(ap.15) Reason for not wanting to live in Taiping if it was to be replaced by tall buildings, office cum commercial developments.

### Reason for YES / NO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for YES</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like tall building</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like to stay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay because of business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live here all my life</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No where to go</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No character no stay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hectic commercial centre not good to live in</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the areas and neighbourhood</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / No idea / Don’t care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move somewhere else</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart
Appendix 5.2a Site layout of the selected buildings in the quick listing survey.

AREA 1

TAIPING TOWN:- SURVEYED AREA 1

Site plan showing the individual shop-lots in the selected area of survey. Area 1 is the residential quarter and at present still remains as residential, but small retail businesses are slowly replacing it, especially in abandoned buildings. In Area 2, although there are at present good quality architecturally significant buildings, a lot more effort and enthusiasm is needed to protect these buildings and sites. This area is also the hub of the central business district, complete with its large-scale high-rise block development.

KEYS

- 4-storey buildings
- Surveyed buildings
- Architecturally significant Buildings
- Institutions
- Open spaces
- Modern 2 Storey buildings
- Vacant lots

Surveyed Area 1
Appendix 5.2a View of Surveyed Buildings in Area-1

Photo 1 (P1) Two types of Row-houses in Jalan Lim Teong Chye (Cross Street 6), the transitional type (No: 10, 12, 14) and the utilitarian type No: 2, 4, 6, 8).

Photo 2 (P2) Corner view of the residential block along Jalan Stesen and Cross Road 6. Noticed the deteriorating condition of the external wall of the end unit at the intersection of the road.

Photo 3 (P3) This block of row houses is still being lived in especially No 3, 5 & 7. No 9 is a funeral parlour. No.1 is vacant on the upper floor and No 11 ground floor ceased to be retail premises (because of the funeral parlour next door).
Photo 4 (P4):-

No. 58, 60 & 62 of Jalan Berek. No. 58 & 60 are shop houses with dwelling units above, while unit 60 is a row house with extended family living in.

Photo 5 (P5):-

These four buildings, (L to R) No. 54, 52, 50, 48 & 46, are in various stages of repair. Unit No. 48 window has been altered. It should have been similar to unit No. 50. These buildings are all being used as residential units (row house).

Photo 6 (P6)

L to R No: 1, 3 5
Three Row houses on Cross Road 6 (Utilitarian type), next door to the Council Rest House. All these houses are fully occupied by tenants (No.1) and owners No:3 & 5. Condition of building 'Fair'.
The former government Rest House has not been taken over by the Council. The building has been renovated and given a new lease of life together with all the facilities of a modern hotel. The external facade of the building has been repainted with striking pastel colours and an additional function hall is added on the eastern side of the building.
Appendix 5.2b Site layout of the selected buildings in the quick listing survey (AREA-2).
Appendix 5.2b Views of surveyed Buildings in Area 2

Photo P1 View of the historic clock tower (former Fire Station), being 'squashed' and dwarfed by the new development multi storey high rise block of consisting of institutional (banks) premises.

Photo P2 Notice in this row of shop houses, the first two units are modern designed buildings, the third and fourth units have 'renovated façade' while the next two units are in construction stage where the authority reputedly had control over the new building designs, are not in conformity to the design of the existing block (below).

Photo P3 A row of Eclectic style shophouses in Jalan Lim Tee Hoi, No: 25 to 33 odd numbers. Notice the more elaborate design in the façade and column designs.
Appendix 5.2 of Buildings Analysis Study

Photo P4 No. 35 Jalan Tupai (East)

One of the many detached, purpose built clan house (KANG HAR TONG Association) buildings situated among the shop houses. The interior of this building deserves being conserved in toto.

Photo P5 Jalan Tupai shophouses of the Art deco style, a cohesive architectural design, the window design would have been more attractive matching the unit no. 33A.

Photo P6 A whole block of 'Utilitarian' design buildings. All are still occupied, at least on the street level.
Appendix 5.2b Views of surveyed Buildings in Area 2

Photo (P7) No. 20 (six units) Fajar supermarket.

Six units of the traditional shop house building, starting from Unit 26 to 40 were bought by corporate clients 'Fajar Supermarket' and converted as the grocery section in addition to the existing supermarket development in the front.

The unsympathetic, 'tasteless' and monotonous, new façade design has destroyed the original character of the place (see the three buildings on the left) and threaten the other buildings.

Photo (P8)
No. (R to L) 22, 22A, 24, 26, 28A, 30 & 40 Jalan Tupai.
This row of beautiful shop house buildings is of the strait Eclectic type. Notice at both end of the block (units 13& 14, 17&18) the ventilation design is more elaborate than the middle portion, otherwise this block of shop house units is homogeneous in its design and is intact.

Photo P9 (L to R) No 13, 14, 15, 16 & 17 Jalan Kelab Cina (Eastern Road).

Photo P10 (L to R) No 18, 19, 20, 21 & 22 Jalan Kelab Cina (Eastern Road).
Appendix 5.3a (F1 & F2):- Determining the previous and present usage of the properties to look at the structural changes in the properties.

Usage --- Present

- Residential
- Retail
- Offices
- Recreational
- Storage
- Residential / retail

Usage --- Previous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage --- Previous</th>
<th>Usage --- Present</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
<th>Storage</th>
<th>Residential cum retail</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cum retail</td>
<td>% within</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5.3b Condition of Building (C1 & C2 X-tab (C3) Scale of Risk: Risk grade.

**Scale of Risk — Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Risk — Condition</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>To be Watched</th>
<th>To be Watched</th>
<th>Not at Risk</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Scale of Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Scale of Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Scale of Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Scale of Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Scale of Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Scale of Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Scale of Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Scale of Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5.3c  Building at risk (C3)  X-tab (E)  Reason Building at Risk (changes).

### Scale of Risk --- Risk grade

#### Scale of Risk --- Risk grade * Reason building at Risk Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Risk --- Risk grade</th>
<th>Reason building at Risk</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Scale of Risk --- Risk grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Risk</td>
<td>change of use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change of Ownership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change of Taste</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be Watched</td>
<td>change of use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change of Ownership</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change of Taste</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be Watched</td>
<td>change of use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change of Ownership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change of Taste</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at Risk</td>
<td>change of use</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change of Ownership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change of Taste</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Scale of Risk --- Risk grade</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5.3d Styles of building (b 5) X-tab (C3) Scale of risk:-risk grade.
### Building Style * Scale of Risk — Risk grade Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Style</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Building</th>
<th>% within Scale of Risk — Risk grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Shophouse</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straits</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Deco</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row-houses</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Risk — Risk grade</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
<th>To be Watched</th>
<th>To be Watched</th>
<th>Not at Risk</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Shophouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Deco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row-houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5.3e Responsibility for repair (ap7) X-tab (d2) Type of Ownership – Occupancy.

Ownership --- Occupancy

Ownership --- Occupancy * Responsibility for Repair Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner occupation</th>
<th>Responsibility for Repair</th>
<th>Property owner</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Ownership</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Ownership</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple occupancy</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Ownership</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Ownership</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 5.3f** Public willingness to pay (ap9) X-tab (ap8) reaction to designation area.

Conservation opportunity --- Reaction to designation Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation opportunity --- Reaction to designation Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Conservation opportunity --- Reaction to designation Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation opportunity --- Reaction to designation Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Conservation opportunity --- Reaction to designation Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation opportunity --- Reaction to designation Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Conservation opportunity --- Reaction to designation Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation opportunity --- Reaction to designation Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Conservation opportunity --- Reaction to designation Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation opportunity --- Reaction to designation Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Conservation opportunity --- Reaction to designation Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5.3g  Scale of risk- Occupancy (C1) Xtab (ap7) Responsibility of Repair.

![Bar chart showing the scale of risk for different ownership and occupancy categories with corresponding responsibility count and percentages.]

#### Ownership --- Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership --- Occupancy</th>
<th>Responsibility for Repair</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>Property owner</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Ownership</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership --- Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenancy</td>
<td>Property owner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Ownership</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership --- Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple occupancy</td>
<td>Property owner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Ownership</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership --- Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5.3h Ownership-Occupancy (d2) X-tab (d3) Ownership-rental.

![Graph showing ownership-occupancy distribution]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Rental

100 — 200 201 — 300 301 — 400 501 — 600 701 — 800 > 1,000 Not Applicable Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Occupancy * Ownership — Rental Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Rental

100 — 200 201 — 300 301 — 400 501 — 600 701 — 800 > 1,000 Not Applicable Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Rental

100 — 200 201 — 300 301 — 400 501 — 600 701 — 800 > 1,000 Not Applicable Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Rental

100 — 200 201 — 300 301 — 400 501 — 600 701 — 800 > 1,000 Not Applicable Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Rental

100 — 200 201 — 300 301 — 400 501 — 600 701 — 800 > 1,000 Not Applicable Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Rental

100 — 200 201 — 300 301 — 400 501 — 600 701 — 800 > 1,000 Not Applicable Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership — Rental

100 — 200 201 — 300 301 — 400 501 — 600 701 — 800 > 1,000 Not Applicable Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Owner occupied</th>
<th>Tenancy</th>
<th>Multiple occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
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### Appendix 5.3i Scale of risk-condition (C3) X-tab Responsibility for repair (ap7).

![Bar chart showing scale of risk-condition (C3) and responsibility for repair (ap7).](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Risk Condition</th>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 6.1 List of Respondents for the Local Authority Questionnaire.
(City Council and Municipal Council in West Malaysia)

Johore

1. Majlis Bandaraya Johore Bahru (MBJB)
   Jalan Dato On,
   Peti Surat 232,
   80720 Johore Bahru,
   JOHORE, West Malaysia.
   (u/p: Tn Hj Hashim b Harun)

2. Majlis Perbandaran Kota Setar (MPKS)
   Jalan Kolam Air,
   05675 Alor Setar,
   KEDAH, West Malaysia.
   (u/p: Tn Hj. Bakar b. Din)

3. Majlis Perbandaran Sungai Petani (MPSP)
   08000 Sungai Petani
   KEDAH, West Malaysia.
   (u/p: En mohd Asri Redha b Abdul Rahman)

Kedah

4. Majlis Perbandaran Kota Bahru (MPKB)
   15000 Kota Bahru,
   KELANTAN, West Malaysia.
   (u/p: Tn Hj Kamaruddin b. Mohamed)

Melaka

5. Majlis Perbandaran Melaka
   Bandaraya Bersejarah (MPMBB)
   Bangunan Graha Makmor,
   No 1, Leboh Air Keroh,
   75450 Melaka,
   MELAKA, West Malaysia.
   (u/p: Tn Hj Baharom b Majid)

Negeri Sembilan

6. Majlis Perbandaran Seremban (MPS)
   Wisma Perbandaran,
   Jalan Yam Tuan,
   70990 Seremban
   NEGERI SEMBILAN, West Malaysia.
   (u/p: En Hassan @Hassani b. Md. Zin)

Pahang

7. Majlis Perbandaran Kuantan (MPK)
   Wisma Perbandaran,
   Jalan Tanah Puteh,
   25100 Kuantan,
   PAHANG, West Malaysia.
   (u/p: En Basri Hj Sulaiman)

8. Majlis Perbandaran Temerloh (MPT)
   28000 Temerloh,
   Pahang

Perak

9. Majlis Bandaraya Ipoh (MBI)
   Peti Surat 1009,
   30820 Ipoh,
   PERAK, West Malaysia.
   (u/p: Tn Hj Radzi b. Yusof)

10. Majlis Perbandaran Taiping (MPT)
    Wisma Perbandaran,
    Jalan Taming Sari,
    34000 Taiping,
    PERAK, West Malaysia.
    (u/p: En Azmi b. Hashim)

Perlis

11. Majlis Perbandaran Kangar (MPK)
    Bangunan Pejabat Majlis
    Perbandaran Kangar
    No: 192, Jalan Kangar,
    01000 Kangar,
    PERLIS, West Malaysia.
    (u/p: En Suhaimi b. Majid)

Pulau Pinang

12. Majlis Perbandaran Pulau Pinang
    (MPPP)
    Tingkat 17, Bangunan KOMTAR,
    10675 Pulau Pinang,
    PENANG, West Malaysia.
    (u/p: Tn Hj. Mokhtar b Abas)

13. Majlis Perbandaran Seberang Perai
    (MPSP)
    Tingkat 9, Wisma UMNO,
    12000 Butterworth,
    PULAU PINANG, West Malaysia.
    (u/p: En Loo Kum Weng)
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Trengganu

14. Majlis Perbandaran Kuala Trengganu (MPKT)
   Tingkat 8, Menara PERMINT,
   Jalan Sultan Ismail
   20200 Kuala Trengganu,
   TRENGGANU, West Malaysia.
   (u/p: Tn Hj Mat Razali b Kassim)

Selangor

15. Majlis Perbandaran Petaling Jaya (MPPJ)
    Jalan Yong Shook Lin,
    46675 Petaling Jaya ,
    SELANGOR, West Malaysia.
    (u/p: Tn Hj Kamarul Bahrin Dato' Hj Abd Raof)

16. Majlis Perbandaran Ampang Jaya (MPAJ)
    Menara MP Aj, Persiaran MP Aj,
    Jalan Pandan Utama, Pandan Indah,
    55100 Kuala Lumpur
    SELANGOR, West Malaysia.
    (u/p:En Adailami Mohd Amin)

17. Majlis Perbandaran Klang (MPK)
    Jalan Perbandaran,
    41675 Klang,
    SELANGOR, West Malaysia.
    (u/p: En Mohd Don Mastor)

18. Majlis Perbandaran Shah Alam (MPSA)
    Tingkat 1, Wisma MPSA,
    Peti Surat 7200,
    40606 Shah Alam,
    SELANGOR, West Malaysia.
    (u/p: En Intanjuddin Hj Ismail)

19. Majlis Perbandaran Selayang (MPS)
    Persiaran 3, Bandar Baru Selayang,
    KM 15, Jalan Ipoh,
    68100 Batu Caves,
    SELANGOR, West Malaysia.
    (u/p: En Selamat Hamzah)

20. Majlis Perbandaran Subang Jaya (MPSJ)
    Persiaran Perpaduan,
    JalanUSJ 5,
    47610 Subang Jaya,
    SELANGOR, West Malaysia.
    (u/p: En Mokhtar Ahmad)

21. Majlis Perbandaran Kajang (MPK)
    43000 Kajang,
    SELANGOR, West Malaysia.
    (u/p: Tn Hj Abdullah Marjunid)

Wilayah Persekutuan (Federal Territory)

22. Dewan Bandaraya Kuala Lumpur (DBKL).
    c/oUnit Pengekalan Seni Bandar,
    Jalan Raja Laut,
    Peti Surat 1120,
    50350 Kuala Lumpur.
    West Malaysia.

Non-governmental organisation (NGO)

23. Perbadanan Muzium Melaka (PMM)
    Kompleks Warisan Melaka,
    Jalan Kota 75000 Melaka
    Melaka, West Malaysia
    (U/p: En. Rolsi Nor)

24. Yayasan Warisan Johor
    Yayasan Warisan Johor
    C/o Majlis Bandaraya Johore Bahru
    Jalan Dato On, Peti Surat 232,
    80720 Johore Bahru,
    JOHORE, West Malaysia.
Appendix 6.2 Local Authority Survey Questionnaire.

SECTION I: -
DESIGNATION PROCESS: *Looking at the present local authorities' administrative process and procedures in designating conservation areas*

For official use

1. a) Are you aware of the Local Authority statutory powers pertaining to issues on Conservation and Conserving areas or sites?  
   (Adakah anda sedar tentang bidang kuasa perundangan Penguasa Tempatan (PT), mengenai isu-isu Pemuliharaan dan Pemuliharaan Kawasan atau tapak bersejarah?)

   YES [ ]

   NO [ ]

b) If YES how did your Local Authority use these powers in relation to built heritage conservation?  
   (Jika VA, bagaimanakah PT tuan menggunakan bidang kuasa ini berhubong dengan pemuliharaan warisan terbina?)

   Maintain the buildings [ ]

   Contribute to maintenance [ ]

   Acquire the property / land [ ]

   Make grants [ ]

   Receive grant repairs [ ]

   Others, please specify: ____________________________________________________________

2. a) Does your Local Authority have any stated policy guidelines or statement on Cultural Built Heritage Conservation?  
   (Adakah PT. tuan mempunyai polisi atau panduan bertulis mengenai pemuliharaan warisan atau pentauliahan Kawasan Pemuliharaan?)

   YES [ ]

   NO [ ]

b) If YES, could you please provide a copy of the policy guidelines or write in brief below.  
   (Jika YA, tolong kepilkan satu salinan polisi atau panduan tersebut atau tulis ringkas di bawah ini?).

   ____________________________________________________________

3. a) Is your Local authority aware of the concept of conserving an area or conservation area designation as stated in the Town and Country Planning Act?  
   (Adakah PT tuan memahami akan konsep memuliha atau pentauliahan sesuatu kawasan?)

   YES [ ]

   NO [ ]
b) Has your Local Authority designated any Conservation Area in your boundary? (Sudahkan PT. tuan mentauliahkan sebarang Kawasan Pemuliharaan di dalam sempadan majlis tuan?)

** if the answer is NO for question 3b go straight to Q7

c) If YES how many Conservation Areas are there? (Jika YA, berapa banyak Kawasan Pemuliharaan yang ada?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1--5</th>
<th>6--10</th>
<th>11--15</th>
<th>16--20</th>
<th>21 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. a) How was the area chosen for designation? (Bagaimana kawasan ini dipilih untuk ditauliahkan?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By authority staff</th>
<th>By public petition</th>
<th>By amenities group</th>
<th>By interested institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Others, please specify: _______________________________________

b) What was the criterion (assessment) used for designating the areas? (Apakah ciri-ciri (penilaian) yang di gunakan bagi mentauliahkan kawasan pemuliharaan ini?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Appearance</th>
<th>Character and Appearance</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Architectural</th>
<th>Architectural and Historical</th>
<th>All of the above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. How were the conservation area boundaries marked (delineated) prior to designation? (Bagaimanakah sempadan kawasan pemuliharaan itu di kenalpasti (tandakan) sebelum di tauliahkan?)

6. a) Has the designation of conservation area been reassessed? (Adakah pentauliahkan kawasan pemuliharaan di semak semula?)
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b) Has there been any subsequent boundary modifications? (Sudah adakah pengubahsuaian sempadan?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c) Has there been a re-designation of the boundary due to loss of character? (Sudah adakah pengtauliahkan semula sempadan, di sebabkan kehilangan ciri-ciri rupabandar?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d) Has there been any cancellation of designation? (Sudah adakah sebarang pembatalan pentauliahkan tersebut?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. What is the profession of the present person in charge of conservation in this Local Authority? (Apakah skim perkhidmatan pegawai yang mengurus hal-hal pemuliharaan di PT. ini?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Building Surveyor</th>
<th>Conservation Officer</th>
<th>Engineer</th>
<th>Planner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Others, please specify: __________________________________________________________________________

8. What management position does the person above hold in your organisation? (Apakah jawatan pengurusan yang dipegang oleh pegawai di atas di dalam organisasi tuan?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Deputy Director</th>
<th>Senior Asst. Director</th>
<th>Asst. Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Others, please specify: __________________________________________________________________________
SECTION II:-
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:- To gauge awareness and societies participation in the gazetting or designating process of conservation areas

For official use

9. a) Does any Local Amenity Society (like the Majlis Warisan Malaysia, Johore Heritage Foundation, Penang Heritage Trust etc.) exist in your area? (Adakah pertubuhan sukarelawan tempatan (spt. Majlis warisan Malaysia, Majlis Warisan Johore, Amanah Warisan Pulau Pinang dll.) ujud dikawasan tuan?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b) If YES what involvement is there from this local amenity society in your Local Authority boundary? (Jika YA, apakah penglibatan pertubuhan sukarelawan tempatan ini di dalam kawasan PT anda?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observatory</th>
<th>Participatory</th>
<th>Advisory</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others, please specify: 

9. c) Does the Society itself initiate schemes for environmental improvement, building renovation, preservation, conservation etc? (Adakah pertubuhan ini dengan sendirinya memulakan rancangan untuk memperbaiki persekitaran, pengubahsuaian bangunan, pemulihan dan pemuliharaan dll.?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Has the Society advised or assisted or made representation to the Local Authority on the following matters? (Adakah pertubuhan tersebut menasihati atau membantu atau membuat pengemukaan kepada P.T. di atas perkara-perkara berikut?)

a) Administration and development control in designated Conservation Areas (Pentadbiran dan kawalan pembangunan di kawasan pemuliharaan yang telah di tauliahkan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b) Historical building control and preservation (Kawalan bangunan bersejarah dan pemuliharaan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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c) Conservation area designation
(Pentaulihan kawasan pemuliharaan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Was there any publicity arrangements made when an application for development is made in a conservation area? (Adakah sebarang usaha publisiti di buat apabila sesuatu permohonan pembangunan dibuat di dalam kawasan pemuliharaan?)

a) for gazetted buildings (Gazetted building consent)
(bagi bangunan-bangunan yang telah di gazet (Kelulusan bangunan bergazet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b) for non-gazetted building (Conservation Area Consents)
(bagi bangunan tidak bergazet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. a) Was the general public involved in the conservation designation process of their area? (Adakah orang awam terlibat di dalam proses mentauliahkan kawasan pemuliharaan mereka?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b) If YES, how is the public involved in the designating process?
(Jikalau YA, bagaimanakah caranya orang awam tersebut terlibat ?)

Public Proposals
Meeting / discussion
Case Hearing
Promotion

Others, specify ________________________________

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Encouraging</th>
<th>Encouraging</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION III:-
STAFFING: To find out about the need of manpower and expertise dealing with conservation issues of cultural built heritage.

13. Is there a designated conservation officer’s post in your organisation?
(Adakah jawatan khusus bagi pegawai pemuliharaan di dalam organisasi tuan)

YES ☐ NO ☐

14. a) Is there any conservation experts in your organisation?
(Adakah organisasi tuan mempunyai pakar dibidang pemuliharaan?)

YES ☐ NO ☐

b) If YES, what conservation qualification do they have?
(Jika YA, apakah tahap kelulusan pakar (pemuliharaan) yang mereka ada?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>First Degree</th>
<th>Post Grad Diploma</th>
<th>Master Degree</th>
<th>Ph.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others, specify _______________________

| Others, please specify: ________________________ |

14. c) If NO, is there any continuity in the personnel administering conservation matters as part of their job?
(Jika TIDAK, adakah kesinambungan bagi pegawai yang mentadbir perkara-perkara mengenai pemuliharaan sebagai sebahagian dari tugas harian mereka?)

YES ☐ NO ☐

14. d) What level of management does the person above have in the Council?
(Di tahap manakah pegawai yang di sebut di atas berada didalam pengurusan Majlis?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Deputy Director</th>
<th>Senior Asst. Director</th>
<th>Asst. Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others, please specify: ________________________
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15. a) Is there any plans to recruit Conservation Specialists / Experts for your Local Authority? (Adakah apa-apa rancangan untuk mengambil pakar pemuliharaan untuk P.T. Tuan).

[YES] [NO] [ ]

b) If YES, at what level, does the 'Specialist' qualification (graduate degree in Conservation) is desirable? (Jika YA, apakah tahap jawatan yang sesuai bagi pakar pemuliharaan untuk PT tuan?)

Managerial [ ]
Director [ ]
Executive [ ]
Senior Staff [ ]
Others, specify ________________________________

SECTION IV: EXPERT ADVICE: To gauge the various inter-agencies co-operation and policies regarding heritage conservation.

16. Was there any consultation with specialists (Architect, Planner, Building Surveyor etc) regarding applications for development in conservation areas? (Adakah apa-apa rujukan bersama pakar (Arkitek, Perancang Bandar, Jurakur Bangunan dll.) berkenaan permohonan pembangunan di dalam kawasan pemuliharaan?)

Within the organisation [ ]
Interested amateurs, Amenity Society [ ]
At State level [ ]
Outside Professionals [ ]
Other Local Authority [ ]

17. What is the type of link between your organisation (District Council or Municipal Council) and the State Authority, especially in the control items for planning (eg. Traffic, tourist etc.) which may affect conservation efforts? (Apakah bentuk pertalian di antara organasasi tuan (Majlis Daerah atau Majlis Perbandaran) dengan Pengusaha Negeri, terutama di dalam perkara-perkara kawalan perancangan pembangunan yang akan melibatkan usaha-usaha pemuliharaan?)

Direct [ ]
Indirect [ ]
Advisory [ ]
Mandatory [ ]
Statutory [ ]
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18. How was conservation designation process communicated to your local authority by the Federal government? (Bagaimanakah prosess pengtauliahan pemuliharaan di sampaikan kepada P.T. oleh Kerajaan Persekutuan?)

- Statutory declaration
- Meetings
- Administrative instruction
- Public exhibition

Others, specify__________________________

19. a) Did your Local Authority seek the help of other Local Authorities or other Departments concerning problems related to conservation matters? (Adakah PT. Tuan memohon pertolongan PT atau Jabatan lain di dalam menangani masalah mengenai pemuliharaan?)

YES [ ] NO [ ]

b) If YES, which of the following Authority or Department did you consult? (Jika YA, Penguasa atau Jabatan manakah diantara di bawah ini, yang tuan hubong?)

- City Council
- Public Works Dept.
- Museum Dept.
- Local Government Dept.

Others, specify__________________________
SECTION V: -
FINANCE: To find out the need of financial assistance and grant requirement in the process of conserving an area.

For official use

20. a) Does your Local Authority allocate any funds for Conservation management? (Adakah PT tuan memperuntukan apa-apa peruntukan untuk pemuliharaan?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b) What type of fund was specifically allocated for managing conservation areas from the Authority’s yearly budget? (Apakah jenis peruntukan tahunan Majlis yang telah di peruntukan khusus bagi pengurusan kawasan pemuliharaan?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Grant</th>
<th>Operating budget</th>
<th>Maintenance budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Others, specify__________________________

21. What other sources of finance or grant, if any, from the Council are being used for purposes of managing conservation programmes? (Apakah sumber-sumber pembiayaan jika ada, dari pihak Majlis untuk di gunakan bagi tujuan program pemuliharaan?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating fund</th>
<th>Maintenance fund</th>
<th>One off fund</th>
<th>Miscellaneous fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Others, specify__________________________

22. How does this compare with the past years? (Bagaimanakah jumlah ini jika di bandingkan dengan tahun lepas?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally new</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>Same as last</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. How was this allocation spent? (Bagaimanakah peruntukan ini di belanjakan?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Alteration</th>
<th>Major Repair</th>
<th>Upgrading</th>
<th>Purchasing</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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SECTION V: PLANNING: To find out planning processes and control within designated urban conservation areas

24. a) Are you aware of the new regulation in the Town and Country Planning Act (amendment 1996) pertaining to the Conservation area issues? 
   (Adakah Tuan akur akan keperluan baru di dalam Akta Perancangan Bandar dan Desa (Pindaan 1996) mengenai isu-isu kawasan pemuliharaan?)
   
   YES [ ]  NO [ ]

   b) If YES, what are your Authority’s plans to undertake the new requirements pertaining to Conservation area preservation and enhancement? Please state in brief below. (Jika YA, apakah pelan tindakan Majlis Tuan untuk melaksanakan keperluan baru ini mengenai pemuliharaan dan mempertingkatkan kawasan pemuliharaan? Sila nyatakan dengan ringkas di bawah.

25. In which unit or department is planning permission for Conservation related works being processed in your authority? (Di dalam Unit atau Jabatan manakah kelulusan perancangan untuk kerja-kerja berkaitan pemuliharaan di proses di PT tuan?)

   Architect Dept. [ ]  Engineering Dept. [ ]  Planning Dept. [ ]  Surveyor Dept. [ ]

   Others, specify [ ]

26. How are planning applications processed for Gazetted Buildings and development in conservation areas? (Bagaimanakah permohonan perancangan diproses untuk bangunan-bangunan yang telah di gazet dan pembangunan di dalam kawasan pemuliharaan?)

   Public notification in local and National media [ ]  Within the authority's Planning Office [ ]

   Notification to local and National Amenities Bodies [ ]  Notification in Professional Journal / Magazine [ ]
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27. a) Is there a conservation advisory committee in your organisation?
(Ujudah jawatankuasa penasihat pemuliharaan di dalam organisasi tuan?)

[ ] YES  [ ] NO

e) If NO, Why Not?
(Jika TIDAK, kenapa TIDAK?)


28. What element of forward planning exists for conservation matters
in your organisation? (Apakah elemen perancangan hadapan yang ujud di dalam
organisasi tuan mengenai perkara pemuliharaan?)


29. Is there anything else that you would like to add to this Questionnaire?
(Adakah apa-apa lagi yang Tuan ingin tambah di dalam soalan kaji selidik ini?)


I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your time, patience, assistance and co-
operation in participating in this research questionnaire. "THANK YOU AND TERIMA KASIH"

Now, to help me clarify your answers and to make my statistical comparison, would you kindly
complete following set of personal questions to facilitate me contacting you later if there is any
discrepancies and further queries regarding the answers that ave given.

Data of Participant: *Delete any items not applicable

Name & address of Local Authority

Name and / or designation of person interviewed

Tel. No.  E-Mail address:

District of ________________________________
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**p/s If your Local Authority is interested in the outcome of this survey please indicate below, I will try to send the Statistical result in due course.

YES  NO

Please return the completed form in the prepaid self address envelope on or before the 15th August 1998.

Future contact after the 30th August in the United Kingdom:

Amer Hamzah Mohd Yunus
Research Room 1:12, Clephan Building,
Department of Building Surveying,
School of Built Environment,
Faculty of Art and Design,
De Montfort University,
The Gateway, Leicester,
LE1 9BH,
United Kingdom.
Tel: 0116 257 7411 Fax: 0116 250 6352 E-mail: amer@dmu.ac.uk

This Questionnaire is copyright of the author © Amer DMU/PhD/98, copying is prohibited.

*Source: Modified, after Gamston (1975) & Larkham, 1985
Appendix 6.2a SPSS results of Local Authority survey.

Q01a Awareness of existing statutory powers pertaining to issues on conservation areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q01b How local authorities use these powers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Maintain Building</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q02a Awareness of statutory powers on the conservation issues (Stated policy or statement on cultural built heritage).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q03a Awareness of conservation area designation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Cons. Area designation.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q03b Awareness of conservation area designation (Has local authority designate any area?).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of Cons. Area designation.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q03c Number of conservation areas in local authority boundary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of conservation Areas.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid 1 - 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 24 100.0
**Q04a How was the designated area chosen?**

How was area chosen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority's staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public petition interested institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q04b What was the criterion for designating the areas?**

What was the criterion for designating the areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; history</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q06a Awareness of statutory powers on conservation issues (reassessment of boundary)?**

Awareness of statutory powers on cons. issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q06b Awareness of statutory powers on conservation issues (modification of boundary).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q06c Re-designation of boundary due to loss of character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q06d Cancellation of designation due to loss of character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q07 What is the profession of the person in-charge of conservation in your organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession of person In-charge of conservation.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect &amp; Planners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q08 In what management position does the present person in-charge of conservation sits in your organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management position above person holds.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q09a Does any Local amenities society exist in your local authority area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does any local amenities exist in your area?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix for Chapter 6

Q09b What are the kind of involvement does your Local amenity society have on conservation issues?

What kind of involvement from Society?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What kind of involvement from Society</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observatory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q09c Does the Local amenity society initiate environmental improvement?

Does society initiate environmental improvement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does society initiate environmental improvement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10a Society’s assistance, advice and representation in administration and development control in conservation areas.

Administration & Development Control in Cons. Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration &amp; Development Control in Cons. Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10b Society's assistance, advice and representation in *historical building control and preservation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society assist, advise or represented - historical building control &amp; preservation.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid YES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10c Society's assistance, advice and representation in *conservation designation process.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assist, advised &amp; represented - conservation Area designation.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid YES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11a What is the publicity arrangements for gazetting the buildings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publicity arrangement for gazetting a building.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid YES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11b What is the publicity arrangement for development of non-gazetted buildings in conservation area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publicity arrangement for non gazetted building.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid YES</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12a Was the general public involved in the conservation designation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was the general public involved in Cons. designation?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid YES</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12b If Yes, how were they involved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, How were they involved?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public proposal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting/Discussion Case hearing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Exhibition of Structure Plans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q12c** What was the response rate and quality of public participation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bar Chart**

**Q13** Is there a designated conservation officer's post in your Local Authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bar Chart**

**Q14a** Is there any conservation expert in your Local Authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bar Chart**
Q14b If YES what “qualifications” does this person have?

Yes, What qualification has he?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st. degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q14c If NO is there any continuity in the department conservation programme?

If NO, is there any continuity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid YES</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q14d In what position does this person sit in the department level of management?

What position does this person sit in the department level of management?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q15a Has there been any plan by the department to recruit a conservation specialist?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans to recruit Cons. Specialists</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid YES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15b If YES, what level of management position will this specialist occupy in the organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES, What level is the specialist's position?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Managerial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q16 Does your Local authority consult specialists about application for development in Conservation areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialist consultation about application for development in CA</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Within the organization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State level</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside professionals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Authorities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q17 What is the type of link between Local Authority and the state authority affecting conservation effort?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of link between LA and State, affecting Cons. efforts.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Direct</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18 How did the Federal government communicate the designation process to Local Authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation process communicated to LA by Fed. Govt.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Direct statutory declaration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative instruction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public exhibition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19a Did your Local authority seek the help of other Local Authorities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seek help of other LA.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid YES</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q19b If YES, which other department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES, Which department?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.W.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Department</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart

Q20a Allocation of funds for conservation management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation of fund for Conservation management</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart

Q20b What are the types of fund allocated for conservation by your Local Authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of fund allocated for cons. management.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating budget</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance budget</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart
Q21 What are the other sources of finance allocated for Conservation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other source of finance for cons. programmes.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Operating funds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance fund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous fund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q22 What was the budget from last year’s allocation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison to previous year.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Totally new</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as last year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q23 How was the allocation spent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How was allocation spent?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Minor alteration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major repair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q24a Awareness of the new amended TCP 1996, pertaining to the designation of areas for conservation.

Awareness of new TCP amendment 1996.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q25 In what unit or department is conservation-related work processed in your local authority?

Unit / Department processing Conservation related work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Planning dept.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surveyor Dept.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26 Processing of gazetted building application for development in conservation areas.
# Appendix for Chapter 6

## Processing of Gazetted building and development in Cons. Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public notification in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local and national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>media. within the</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority’s planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification to local</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and national bodies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal / magazine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Q27a Is there conservation advisory committee in your Local Authority?

### Presence of conservation advisory committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid YES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Q27b If NO, why not?

### If NO why not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid YES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of heritage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very few. exist in</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No interest in</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q28 Is there any element of forward planning in your conservation programmes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of forward planning</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master Plans /Development plans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Action Area Plan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q30 What is the profession of the respondent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession of Respondent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6.3 DBKL guidelines on visual sight lines set-backs for new development in relation to the existing façade.

G.8.0 VISUAL SIGHT LINE

G.8.1 Additions or development to existing blocks are permitted, if they are set back 20’ 0’’ progressively from the front building facade in order to avoid obstructing the visual sight line.

G.8.2 Buildings within a block should have a regular overall height with pediments to create an interesting skyline.

Figure 17
Appendix 6.3a The first alternative from the illustrated guidelines on the setbacks for development in conservation zones (soft landscaping option).
(source: Majlis Perbandaran Kelang, conservation guidelines.)

Local authority illustrated guidelines

These illustrated guidelines deals with set backs in new development schemes, which incorporate a portion of the shop front by using soft green landscape.

Notice how the five foot way (kaki lima) pedestrian passageway is being extended to provide the continuity in cul-de-sac set back.

(source: Kelang Municipal Council-MPK)
Appendix 6.3b The second alternative from the illustrated guidelines on the setbacks for development in conservation zones (incorporated option).
(source: Majlis Perbandaran Kelang, conservation guidelines.)

Usage of Public Space

Plan View (from above)

Usage of Set-Back Space for New building

Pandangan Sisi

Local authority illustrated guidelines.

These illustrated guidelines deals with set backs in new development schemes, which incorporate a portion of the 'old shop house' front section.

Notice how the original shop house block being chop off and incorporated as part of the mezzanine floor of the tower block. A new roof connecting the old to the new development is extending the original visual sight of roofline.

(source: Kelana Municipal Council-MPK)
Appendix 6.3c Examples of redevelopment projects affecting conservation area character.

Photo P1 shows the result of redevelopment in Kuala Lumpur 'China Town' conservation area, using the conservation guidelines produced by DBKL. The 'pastiche' massive block is totally out of character, although it tries to pick up the window detailing of the old shop house and staggering the building height as per guidelines.

Photos P2 show the encroaching modern developments (arrow A) in Kuala Trengganu 'China Town' conservation zone, that is threatening the character of the area, and the result of the setback (P3 arrow B) which is based on the guidelines adopted by all other local authorities.
Appendix 6.4 DBKL guidelines on co-ordination of façade treatment in a unified block of protected building.

G.3 COORDINATION OF FACADE TREATMENT

G.3.1 Requirements for whole block of shophouses:

a) Height

i) Consistency of facade treatment should be maintained in terms of the height of buildings, parapet, floor to floor heights, verandahs, windows, soffits, and gables.

ii) Consistency of design shall be maintained in terms of existing features, window spacings and general rhythm of elements.

b) Verandahways

i) Consistent height in verandahways, their widths and levels.

ii) Consistency of column sizes, spacings, design and rhythm.

iii) Consistency of internal elevational design.

Figure 9
Appendix 6.4a DBKL illustrated proposal on treatment of retained façade of original shop house and frontal space which is incorporated in new development.
Appendix 6.4b DBKL illustrated proposal on redevelopment of the original shop house and frontal space which is incorporating and connecting to the set-back of new development.
Appendix 6.5 DBKL conservation guidelines on the proposed vertical mounted signage for the first floor and above shop.
(Source DBKL Conservation guidelines document)

These DBKL design and fixation detail of the vertical mounted signage proposed for use on the shop houses in the conservation zones, is suppose to take away the clutters from the building façade. At the same time it provides the necessary advertisement for the shop from the travelling view of pedestrians and motorist.
Appendices for Chapter Seven

The following main points, extracted from the Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas, Washington Charter (ICOMOS, Oct. 1987), are related to the urban conservation processes discussed in the study.

PRINCIPLE AND OBJECTIVES

1. For the conservation of a historic town to be most effective, it should be an integral part of a coherent policy of economics and social development and of urban and regional planning.

2. The values to be preserved include the historic character of the historic town and all those material and spiritual elements that create this character, especially:
   - the urban pattern as defined by lots and streets;
   - the relationship between buildings, green and open spaces;
   - the formal appearance, interior and exterior, of buildings as defined by scale size construction, materials, colour and decoration;
   - the relationship between the historic town and its surrounding natural and man made setting; and
   - the role of the historic town has acquired over time and the threats to these values which would undermine the authenticity of historic town or area.

3. The participation and involvement of people of every age is essential for the success of the conservation programme and must be encourage. The conservation of historic town concerns first and foremost the residents.

4. Conservation in a historic town demands prudence, sensitivity and precision without rigidity, since each case presents a specific problem.

METHODS AND INSTRUMENTS

1. Planning for the conservation of historic towns and areas should be based on multi-disciplinary studies.

2. Continuous maintenance is crucial to the effective conservation of historic town.

3. When it is necessary to construct new buildings or adapt existing ones, they should respect the existing spatial layout, especially in scale and lot size.

4. In order to ensure participation and involvement of residents a general information programme should begin at school age.

5. Specialised training should be provided for those professions involved in conservation.
Appendix 7.2 Work flow diagram of basic conservation activities for conserving sites.

Diagram on next page shows a workflow diagram on how the course of action can be carried out. In the pre-designation stage a recording of the site's fabric or area is carried out via physical and documentary evidence, while the site is being investigated for its significance and condition. Having completed this exercise a statement of the area or site's significance is formulated and designation process follows. Preparation of the action plans will then follow suite taking into account the short and long term plans while at the same time periodic maintenance continues. Enhancement process should be carried out in the work implementation and all interventions must be recorded for future studies. On completion of all the activities these documents must then be lodged in the public archives for public accessibility.

Appendix 7.2 Work flow diagram for basic conservation activities for conserving sites.

GUIDELINES FOR THE FUNDAMENTAL COURSES OF ACTION IN CONSERVATION

Record fabric and found

INVESTIGATE

Site's significance

Physical evidence

INVESTIGATE

Site conditions

Consult

The public (especially indigenous inhabitants)

STATEMENT OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

Pre-designation appraisal report

Designation (gazetting) stage.

Prepare action plan

Long term

Plan for continued maintenance

Record all interventions

Place in public archives

Work Stage

Some operations must always be carried out when a site is about to be conserved. They are fundamental to the process, whatever the circumstances and whatever the particular problems may be and no sound work can be accomplished without them. The workflow diagram above does not describe an action as such, but rather a model for professional and public co-operation during the conservation process.