Abstract—The rapid physical development in the cities has put great pressures to the historic urban areas. It has caused deterioration, or even, loss of historic fabric. At present, those problems are also being experienced by Surakarta, which is popularly known as Solo, the second largest city in Central Java Province. This city is chosen as a case study considering the historical and cultural values that it has. This paper aims to explore what the problems of urban conservation in Surakarta are and identify what could be the roles of stakeholders to improve them. Finally, it concludes with some recommendations to improve urban conservation in Solo. To reach the objectives of the paper, exploratory studies were conducted at the beginning to understand the situation with the help of theoretical and practical data. Interviews of key informants are conducted in an in-depth semi-structured manner. For assessing future developments, a scenario-building method was used to build strategies, by assessing the current situations, trends and tendencies, and both predicted and potential conditions in the future. The outcome of the strategy assessment was finally synthesized in the form of conclusions and recommendations.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The term heritage is used to represent a kind of legacy that has been bequeathed by the earlier generations to be passed on to the current and future generations. Ashworth and Turnbridge (1990:105 in Timothy and Boyd, 2003:3) define heritage as: “The contemporary uses of the past... the interpretation of the past in history, the surviving relict building and artifacts and collective and individual memories are all harnessed in response to current needs which include the identification of individuals with social, ethnic and territorial entities and the provision of economic resources for commodification within heritage industries.”

Timothy and Boyd (2003) argue that the majority of heritage supply is urban in location. Urban heritage comprises not only individual buildings or monuments of historic interest, but also the physical attributes of buildings, public spaces, and urban morphology (Orbaşlı, 2000). The term ‘heritage’ acknowledges not only the non-economic values of the asset – in contrast with ‘resources’ which implies the consideration of its economic values – but also its bequest which further implies certain obligations and responsibilities (McKercher and da Cros, 2002).

In Asia where the heritage conservation has not yet gained a wide public awareness, the heritage management differs completely from that of Western countries. In 2001, the draft of the Hoi An Protocols has acknowledged an historic urban site as well as one of four types of cultural heritage to be protected. This document, which was prepared in 2001, aims at professional guidelines for assuring and preserving the authenticity of heritage sites in the context of the cultures of Asia.

Nevertheless, in Asia, the concept of urban conservation was neglected due to its lowest position in the governments’ priorities, until a couple of decades when several countries like the Philippines and Thailand have started such programs (Lasafin and Kammeier, 1993). There are two possible basis of this condition. First, for many Asian countries “the past” is still quite close to “the present”, so that threat to losses of past structures is not yet felt by many people, including the government, except for cultural critics and advanced urban policy makers. Second, the rapid urban growth in Asia has necessitated basic urban facilities and infrastructures improvements and housing developments, so that there was not much left for “protecting the past for the future”.

In Indonesia, urban conservation is a brand new issue if it is compared to historic or archeological conservation started more than a hundred years ago. Urban area revitalization programs were started four years after the economic crisis severely hit Indonesia in 1998 when the recovery of local economy and the improvement of living conditions became urgent issues.

II. URBAN HERITAGE IN SURAKARTA

In Surakarta City, cultural heritage comprises not only monuments and buildings but also important urban areas. Since the early independence period, the local authority had acknowledged ‘culture’ and ‘tourism’ as among the significant assets of the city. At present, all documents of the urban development framework mention the importance of the culture and the cultural legacy that the city bequeathed from previous generations, which make their conservation a necessity.

Some important strategies in urban conservation and development like public private partnerships, physical conservation measures, and facility and infrastructure improvement, are also mentioned in policy documents. Public participation scheme (Musrenbang) and tourism awareness encouragement program (Pokdarwis) show good endeavor by the local Municipality to involve the public in urban development and conservation. It will also encourage public control of local government policies.
Some historic inventories were completed, which were then legally enhanced through the passing of the Mayor’s Decree No. 646/116/I/1997, concerning the designation of historic buildings and areas for conservation. There are seventy historic buildings, monuments and urban sites that have cultural significance to the city listed in the Decree and are protected under Cultural Property Law. The cultural heritage is arranged into six categories: 1) areas or districts, 2) traditional buildings, 3) colonial buildings, 4) religious buildings, 5) gates, memorials, bridges and street furniture, and 6) parks and open public spaces.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that a decree does not have sufficient legal capacity to regulate historic conservation in the city. As a result, it can neither ensure to protect the conditions of the cultural property listed nor put pressure on all stakeholders to consistently implement historic conservation. Such a function can only be held by a local regulation, which is still absent up to the present day. If the listed properties are still unprotected, the fate of the non-listed buildings is even worse. These buildings have to give way to new development. Some of them were sold through privatization. Only if the owners understand the historic value of their property, will the property be conserved and rehabilitated with their owners’ own investments. However this condition hardly ever happens for privately owned property. Moreover, for the non-listed buildings, it is probable that there will be no attempts to prevent them from demolition.

The current conservation policy in Surakarta is dedicated merely to building conservation and historic area revitalization, and it does not include non-historic areas. This can be seen from the Urban Spatial Master Plans (RUTRK and RDTTRK) as well as the RTBLs, which provide detailed implementation guidelines for historic area conservation.

III. STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION IN CONSERVATION

To understand the problems that have hindered conservation in Surakarta, it is necessary to identify stakeholders and review their current and potential or future roles. They are government and agencies, private sectors and general public. Details are arranged in the following tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I</th>
<th>PRESENT STATES AND POTENTIAL ROLES OF ‘GOVERNMENT’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Present states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Housing and Urban Conservation Office</td>
<td>It acts as the leading player in urban heritage conservation. It has completed several Master Plans concerning revitalization of several cultural heritage properties through the Local Planning Board (Bapeda).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Historical and Archeological Conservation Office</td>
<td>This agency is responsible for site monument conservation of nationally important sites located in the respective region, like the Great Mosque in Surakarta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Urban Planning and Spatial Planning of the City of Surakarta</td>
<td>So far, coordination has been started between the Municipality and the Agency in some urban conservation projects. In terms of funding, the provincial government has been granted some assistance for urban conservation in the city of Surakarta.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE II</th>
<th>PRESENT STATES AND POTENTIAL ROLES OF ‘PRIVATE SECTORS’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private property owners</td>
<td>They own almost thirty percent of all listed cultural properties, and tend to sell their property. The new owners are not aware of the historic values of the buildings and therefore make alterations to the building substance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private palace managers</td>
<td>These palaces are cultural institutions that function as formal residences the royal family. Due to the limited financial support from the government, they independently seek resources to finance conservation, such as from entrepreneur groups and foreign organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur groups</td>
<td>Some groups of local and national entrepreneurs had successfully rehabilitated some buildings in KaratonKasunanan by providing financial aid. There are also some good precedents in cultural heritage conservation by an entrepreneur in Surakarta, like DalemWuryaningrat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private investors</td>
<td>They are potential stakeholders that have not yet been utilized in the heritage management in Surakarta. Ironically at present, they contribute to the problem in urban conservation concerning privatization of several cultural heritage properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III
PRESENT STATES AND POTENTIAL ROLES OF ‘GENERAL PUBLIC’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage, society, academics, and professional groups</th>
<th>Present states</th>
<th>Potential roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Solo Heritage Society (SHS), a non-profit organization, was established and supported by public funds. It aims to preserve cultural heritage. Professional groups, like the Indonesian Institute of Architecture Surakarta, should also strengthen their commitment to urban conservation, for instance by providing technical training for conservators.</td>
<td>Being resources of scientific and technical expertise, academics, heritage societies and professional groups can play important roles in education and awareness. By establishing effective networking, they will be able to pioneer and lead public controls towards government policies concerning urban conservation and development. They will also be able to act as government advisors in this matter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Residents as host community | At present, there are several municipal policies that provide opportunities for the residents to get involved, through a public participation scheme arranged in public meetings based on the Mayor’s Decree of Surakarta No.3/2004, and the other is the Pokdarwis, tourism awareness encouragement program. | If the residents start to become aware of the importance of their cultural heritage, they will feel motivated to carry out self-supported-based conservation in small-scale urban areas in order to protect their historic environment. Such a way of conservation provides a potential solution to the limited funding for conservation. |

| Tourists | Sustainable tourism development is important in Surakarta in order to sustain urban conservation. Tourists in Surakarta are stakeholders who has not been been considered. | The number of foreign tourists can be increased through more active promotion and the establishment of a bilingual tourism information website, maps and sign posts apart. However, heritage commodification and fake façadism should be prevented. |

IV. PROBLEMS IDENTIFICATION IN URBAN HERITAGE CONSERVATION

Financial aspect: lack of funds and absence of financial assistance schemes

A lack of adequate financial resources for heritage conservation is one of the most profound difficulties facing heritage managers in most of the world (Henson, 1989; Isar, 1986 in Timothy and Boyd, 2003). This is also the case in cities of Indonesia, including Surakarta. In Surakarta, like in many other cities, there are no regular funds allocated to conservation due to the annual budget deficit.

In Surakarta, the historic conservation budget, which is mostly delivered given to projects, is made up of funds coming from the national government, the province and the Municipality. The national government contributes the greatest amount. The Municipality usually offers the least.

Financial assistance currently available is a regular contribution to two historic palaces, which are designated as national cultural heritage sites. Nevertheless, the amount of subsidies is very limited compared to their real operational costs. Moreover, the conservation practice is carried out through temporary projects, and not continuing or sustainable.

There are several financial resources for building rehabilitation, such as public subsidy (through ‘gap funding’, direct grants, and low-interest loans), tax deduction or exemption, as well as revolving funds (Tiesdell, et al., 1996). However, in Surakarta, no financial assistance schemes have been developed for private owners. The only incentive that the Municipality had offered was neither subsidies nor tax deduction, but rather a certificate for those people who were considered successful in conserving their property with their own investments.

The government should change their policies from passive to active, which means in compensation for restrictions they impose, they should offer financial assistance for conservation to private owners (Lasafin and Kammeier, 1993). For those privately owned properties in Surakarta, most owners might find financial difficulties to maintain or repair them, except for those who are coming from the higher level of society. Historic building conservation, especially that of Javanese traditional houses, is certainly expensive in terms of material, technical expertise provision and maintenance costs.

Conservation aspect: vacant and decaying historic property

There are many decaying historic properties in the city, not all publicly-owned but also privately owned. In the case of public property, the problem might have resulted from the lack of concern or attempts to maintain those buildings and areas. The problem also correlates with the lack of regular funding for conservation from the government or local authority. For those privately owned properties, most owners might find financial difficulties to maintain or repair them, except for those who are coming from the higher level of society. Historic building conservation, especially that of Javanese traditional houses, is certainly expensive in terms of material, technical expertise provision and maintenance costs.

Therefore, at present in Surakarta, motivation for conservation can be said to be a reflection of the resident’s economic condition. The higher the economic condition level, the greater the motivation for conservation. One of the traditional noble houses, DalemWuranyingratan, which was bought by a local prominent entrepreneur, was restored and later used as a semi public museum. Another example of private restoration of historic property is the former government office building Kantor Pertani, despite the critique over its modern appearance.
The failure to find technical problem in contradicted to the priced house.

redesigned for commercial functions. Public historic property, most of the land was sold and is also notion of identity, as destroying such a building is like breaking building or environment is, by any reason, deteriorating. Nevertheless, the demolition of an historic was sold to a private owner, and now is vacant and was sold to the private sector so far. At least seven of 19 colonial buildings listed in the Mayor’s Decree No. 646/116/I/1997 are now privately owned. Some notable examples are Vastenburg Fort (listed as No. 26) a former Dutch fortification in the city center and Kadi polo Hospital building (listed as No. 31), a former hospital of Mangkunegaran which was sold to a private owner, and now is vacant and deteriorating. Nevertheless, the demolition of an historic building or environment is, by any reason, contradictory to the notion of identity, as destroying such a building is like breaking a link of the past, the present and the future (Budiardjo, 1984).

The historic site was sold to private owner who was planning to build a hotel on the site. Nevertheless, before the project started, the economic crisis severely hit the country. At present, the remaining structure and meters of the site were secured, the building is suffering from lack of conservation funding and is now deteriorating.

Socio-cultural aspect: informal vendors in or near historic monuments and areas

Informal vendors have been a non-technical problem in historic conservation. Before the revitalization program was undertaken, there are many illegal structures and informal vendors packed in or near the historic areas. This phenomenon is part of the excess of the economic crisis and social unrest of the city in 1998. Informal sectors were one of the worst hit economic sectors that caused many people to lose their jobs. During the projects, the Municipality succeeded in relocating the informal vendors and in reorganizing the environment around the North Square in the historic areas of Karaton Kasunanan. It took serious efforts and invested a considerable amount of fund in the relocation and the compensation for buying a simple or low-priced house.

A similar phenomenon could be found in other historic areas. The green area and streets near Banjarsari Monument and Parks is now crowded with informal vendors. The area surrounding the monument is actually a residential neighborhood. However, these informal vendors built temporary kiosks on the green area around the monument. Afterward more and more people came to the area and opened their booths. These vendors occupy both sides of the roads in the neighborhood that causes a chaotic and unpleasant view. The arrangement and revitalization of the area is a great task for the Municipality considering the possibly extensive mass reactions and demonstrations from the informal vendors against their relocation. Another problem will be the great budget required for their compensation payment.

Legal aspect: absence of local conservation regulations and ownership status conflict

At present, there is no local regulation regarding the conservation of cultural property in Surakarta. The Mayor’s Decree concerning the cultural heritage and inventories of academic studies are inadequate for conservation without the presence of local regulations. At present, the local authority can only have discussions with the private sector without having...
the power to restrict redevelopment in a cultural building or area, due to the absence of regulations. If a cultural property is to be demolished, it can be said that there will be neither law prohibition nor punishment.

The dispute concerning cultural property ownership between KaratonKasunanan (listed as No.1) and the inhabitants of Baluwarti (listed as No. 3) is also a problem for conservation in the city. Baluwarti is a neighborhood that is located inside the Palace fortified walls. The neighborhood houses not only some traditional noble houses of the royal family but also abdulalem (high-ranking court servant) during the kingdom period. Some of these noble houses located in this area are listed in the category of traditional buildings.

According to Presidential Decree No.23/1988 concerning the status and the management of KaratonKasunanan, the land and buildings of the Palace, including the Great Mosque and the squares, are the property of the KasunanSanSurakarta which is worth conserving as national cultural heritage site (Setiadi, Hadi and Handayani, 2001: p. 294-96). Nevertheless, due to the vagueness in the regulation of the territorial border of the Palace, the Decree is weak in terms of clarification of land and property ownership in Baluwarti.

This problem is certainly another hindrance in cultural heritage conservation in Surakarta. A reconciliation of the disputes is a prerequisite of comprehensive revitalization of the historic areas. The resolution process should involve both parties as well as respective agencies of the Municipality and the Assembly at local level (DPRD) as the mediators.

V. SCENARIOS AND STRATEGIES FOR THE FUTURE

In order to provide options for historic and urban conservation in Surakarta in the future, scenarios and strategies should be developed. The purpose of scenario development is not to provide accurate image of the future. Instead, it facilitates stakeholders to make strategic decisions about their future, to work together and orient their actions. In any case, the future will not be confirmed until the reality happens.

For this, we first need to know what the future that the city has to deal with might be like, in view of certain important factors. Scenarios are stories of possible futures that the city might encounter. In this case, scenarios will be developed based on aspects related to the city’s cultural heritage: conservation, tourism as well as socio-cultural and economic trends. Strategies are a sequence of activities and reactions to the scenarios.

Therefore, all of these issues that were assessed will be used as basis for developing scenarios and strategies for the future.

In order to provide options for historic and urban conservation in Surakarta in the future, three scenarios and strategies are developed. Strategy A is “business as usual” strategy which means that conservation in Surakarta will merely be carried out as extrapolation of existing trends. This strategy is basically a continuation of conservation measures that have been started in the city up to now. However as it follows current developmental trends, there are no essential maneuvers either in conservation or tourism prepared by the Municipality in order to improve the situation. Strategy B and Strategy C are developed in order to provide alternatives to Strategy A. Strategy B aims at developing tourism to generate economic benefits. Strategy C uses both conservation and tourism simultaneously not only to generate alternative resources for urban development and conservation, but also to protect urban heritage that the city has.

1) Strategy A: Business as usual (status-quo)

The first strategy is based on a view that urban conservation in Surakarta depends solely on the policies of the national government and the Municipality of Surakarta. There are no significant actions from other stakeholders to promote conservation. The local authorities basically maintain a status-quo in terms of cultural heritage protection.

2) Strategy B: Tourism-led strategy

This scenario envisages the problem of the future with a high level of concern. The basis of second strategy is that there are significant attempts to promote cultural heritage properties for tourism development. The strategy aims to generate economic benefits for the city. Both the local agencies and private sector put more investments on tourism.

3) Strategy C: Balanced heritage management

The rapid population growth, the pressures in city centers and the urgent demand for a better living condition bring all the stakeholders in urban development into a city forum (Musrenbang). Due to success of Pokdarwis program, people begin to realize not only the potential of tourism in terms of economic productivity, but also the significance of urban conservation. They come into consensus that integrated urban conservation is the key to achieve a better living and working condition for all the city’s inhabitants, as well as to increase economic productivity and become financially independent on the central government. Balanced heritage management is a strategy where heritage conservation and tourism are mutually developed, in which conservation values should be used as basis for sustainable tourism development in order to prevent its negative impacts.
Assessments of the scenarios and strategies

Each strategy is assessed and ranked from 1 to 3 based on certain aspects. Ranking 1 represents the highest and ranking 3 represents the lowest position in the respective aspect. Three aspects are used in the assessment of the strategies, namely:

- **likelihood**: ranking the strategies based on high probability of occurring.
- **affordability**: ranking the strategies based on money available to carry out particular strategies.
- **desirability**: ranking the strategies based on consideration being wished for or worth seeking as advantageous and beneficial.

### TABLE V
**Ranking of the Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) **Likelihood**

Strategy A has the most likely to happen since it basically runs business as usual in urban development. As the Municipality maintains *status quo*, there will be no stronger actions in enhancing and implementing conservation policies than it had been carried out so far. Strategy B is more likely to happen than Strategy C considering that tourism has been determined as one of the five essential sectors in development strategies. Strategy C has the lowest likelihood of all strategies as integrated urban conservation has not yet arranged in urban development policies of the Municipality. So far not all urban area conservation plans have been consistently implemented, making this strategy the least likely to happen.

2) **Affordability**

Strategy A is the most affordable one since it does not involve any significant changes either for tourism or for urban conservation in developmental budget allocation. Strategy B could be considered more affordable than Strategy C since it has lower cost of investments. Involving commercialization in tourism development, this strategy will attract private investors easier than Strategy C will. It will generate direct revenues and faster public investment returns. Based on these viewpoints, Strategy C could be the least affordable one. A heritage management requires greater public investments since it will not be able attract private investors, which tend to be profit-oriented, without political will and significant efforts from the local authority. Nonetheless if a balanced heritage management schemes is well prepared, the cost for strategy C will not be more expensive than that of Strategy B. This can be achieved through a consensus of both stakeholders of tourism and heritage conservation that understand and respect other party’s values and interests.

3) **Desirability**

Strategy A is the least desired one since the strategy does not make any significant improvement either to urban quality or to the heritage conservation states. Strategy B and C could be put either on the first or the second position. Strategy B could be more desired than Strategy C considering the government and the people tend to choose short-term gains rather than long-term ones. Moreover, material benefits sometimes could be more desirable than immaterial ones, for example direct economic income and physical improvement from tourism are more desired than tangible and intangible cultural heritage conservation. Nevertheless, a number of negative impacts that commercial tourism could bring about make this strategy less desired than Strategy C. Therefore, Strategy C is the most desired option, since it involves balance heritage management as part of integrated urban conservation and development policies, which not only be in favor for economic development through tourism, but also supportive to urban conservation, including monuments, historic buildings and urban areas.

The feasibility of scenarios and strategies is dependant on the external and internal conditions.

**a) External analysis**

The feasibility of scenarios and strategies is dependant on the external and internal conditions. External analysis involves situations and development trends in broader areas that influence conservation in Surakarta. Political will of the government of heritage conservation and urban revitalization includes:

- the acknowledgment of two palaces of Surakarta as the cultural heritage properties of national importance;
- the preparation of revision the legislation UU No.5/1992 to enhance protection of cultural heritage property; the enactment of a number legislations that acknowledge historic conservation;
- urban area revitalization programs funded by the Department of Public Work;
- cultural heritage conservation funded by the Department of Culture and Tourism.
An enhanced and broader stakeholder participation in heritage conservation is reflected by:
- the emerge and active networking of heritage societies in several big cities in Indonesia, including Yogyakarta, Bandung, Jakarta, and Medan
- the establishment of Indonesian Heritage Board

b) Internal requirements

Internal requirements are capacities and resources of the stakeholders in urban conservation in the city of Surakarta that are required to undertake the strategies. Strategy A requires existing policies and organizational structures of the Municipality. Strategy B requires considerable public funds to induce private investments in tourism, great interests from private sector, enabled public-private schemes. Strategy C requires broad interests, participation and cooperation of all stakeholders of the public and private sectors, as well as enabled public-private schemes in urban conservation.

c) Risk analysis

Situations that will affect the success or failure of the strategies include:
- national economic crisis, weakening of national currency
- regional or global economic recession
- great social unrests
- enormous natural catastrophes, such as a severe earthquake or flood
- socio-political instability

The existence of above-mentioned risks are going to influence the decision making of the government in conservation as other urgent development aspects, such as poverty alleviation, economic recovery, as well as housing and infrastructure provisions, will remain to be the government’s and local authorities’ main concerns. Moreover, any occurrences of these risks will even more affect Strategy B and C since both strategies necessitates a substantial amount of investments from both public and private sectors. Nevertheless, the degree of probability of these risks cannot be thoroughly assessed in this study due to the time and scope limits. Based on the assessment, Strategy A, which is the most likely to occur as well as the most affordable, is the least desirable of all strategies. In contrast, Strategy C, which is the least likely to happen and less affordable, is the most desired strategy of all. Strategy B is always ranked in the middle in all three aspects.

VI. FINAL REMARKS

Based on discussion concerning the three strategies proposed, with Strategy A, current problems in conservation remain. In the long run, it will lead to even worse conditions, including vanishing of spirit of place urban areas as well a loss of authenticity of historic buildings. Aiming at economic benefits in short to middle terms, Strategy B will bring about various negative impacts in the long run. Although ranked the lowest in two aspects, Strategy C is the most desired option as it provides the best solutions and therefore should be promoted in solving various problems in conservation in Surakarta. Strategy B can be regarded as an alternative to Strategy C, only if there are not enough financial resources or if there is an urgent need to boost the local economy. In this case, possible negative impacts of tourism must be anticipated through risk-preparedness.

However, even Strategy C is the most unlikely to happen, its high desirability from the conservation planner’s point of view necessitates the Municipality of Surakarta with the support from all stakeholders to undertake a big efforts to improve Strategy A and to achieve something better than Strategy B. Among the urgent steps are to take is to pass a local regulation which act as ultimate support for conservation in Surakarta as well as to evaluate and rearrange internal organization in the Municipality to create an effective inter-agency coordination. Public-private partnership is the next step to take through enabling regulations and public investments in conservation. Conservation values should be used as the basis for cultural tourism development with cultural heritage property as the most important assets. Tax and income gained from heritage properties should be partly returned to the properties themselves for maintenance fund and the Municipality should start to allocate more budgets for immediate safe measures of the heritage in danger.

Conservation is now a fundamental principle in the progress towards sustainable development. On this basis, current policies for urban conservation and heritage management in Surakarta are inadequate. Significant problems, disparities and deficiencies were identified, including lack of financial resources, absence of laws and regulations as well as poor implementation of policies. Therefore, it is based on these that future measures should be addressed.

Considering that negative impacts of both “business as usual” and tourism-led strategies, it is recommended that a balanced heritage management be implemented as part of policies for the future. The key to develop such policy is the involvement of all stakeholders in order to develop understanding and appreciation of interests and values to achieve mutually beneficial goals.

Suggested further studies include challenges in balanced heritage management as determining factor in sustainable development, as well as scenarios and strategies development for other comparable cities, like Yogyakarta and Bandung, in order to formulate a model management of heritage cities for secondary towns and cities in Indonesia.
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