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Assalamualaikum wbt dan Salam Sejahtera,


Seminar Antarabangsa tersebut diadakan sebagai salah satu usaha Kerajaan Negeri mengorak langkah kearah Strategi Pembangunan Semula Bandar (Urban Regeneration) yang merupakan salah satu daripada enam (6) Pakej Rangsangan Ekonomi Negeri Selangor yang telah diumumkan oleh Kerajaan Negeri.

Akhir kata, saya ingin merakamkan penghargaan pada semua pihak yang terlibat dalam menyediakan Buletin Rancang (Edisi Khas) ini dalam masa yang singkat. Yang lebih utama, Buletin Rancang yang diterbitkan ini dapat dijadikan rujukan khas dan juga sebagai asas dalam merangka halatuju agenda Pembangunan Semula Bandar dengan lebih jelas di Negeri Selangor.

Sekian, Terima Kasih

MOHD. JAAFAR BIN MOHD. ATAN
Pengarah
Jabatan Perancangan Bandar dan Desa Negeri Selangor

15 Disember 2009
Assalamualaikum wbt and a very good morning,

Alhamdulillah, all praise and glory for Allah SWT, for it is with His blessings and guidance that we are able to gather here today in this conference. It is indeed an honour for me to be here this morning to deliver this speech and present this Keynote Paper in this auspicious Conference, where great minds congregate to discuss revitalizing city development towards a sustainable urban future in the State of Selangor.
1. THE LARGER DEVELOPMENT PICTURE

Global and National Population Forecasts

1.1 First and foremost let me begin with some insights on the global scenario and forecasts for the future world population. Figures from the United Nation’s World Population Series corroborates that in 2008, the world population stood at 6.7 billion, an increase of about 83 million from 2007. By 2050, the world population is expected to increase by 2.5 billion, passing from 6.7 billion in 2008 to 9.2 billion.

1.2 At the same time, the population living in urban areas is projected to increase from 3.3 billion in 2008 to 6.4 billion in 2050. Thus, the urban areas of the world are expected to absorb all the population growth expected over the next four decades while at the same time drawing in some of the rural population. (United Nations, 2008)

1.3 Most of the population growth expected in urban areas will be concentrated in the cities and towns of the less developed regions. Asia, in particular, is projected to see its urban population increase by 1.8 billion, Africa by 0.9 billion, and Latin America and the Caribbean by 0.2 billion. Population growth is therefore becoming largely an urban phenomenon concentrated in the developing world. There will be an increasingly large population to accommodate in the context of space requirements for economic and social activities.

1.4 Looking at the picture at home, Malaysia’s population in mid-2009 stood at 28.3 million, and the United Nations projects the nation’s population to grow to 40.4 million by 2050. Projections from Malaysia’s National Physical Plan indicate that the population of Peninsular Malaysia would increase to 26.8 million in 2020, from a total of 18.5 million in 2000. Peninsular Malaysia’s population would largely reside in urban areas of various levels and categories. While Peninsular Malaysia’s urban population stood at 65.4 percent (12.1 million) in 2000, it is expected to increase to 75 percent (20.1 million) in 2020. Spatial requirements for urban and city development would thus continue to be a challenge to meet the needs of the ever increasing population.
Pressure on limited urban resources

1.5 Cities and towns will expand in size and nature to play very important roles as engines of growth to spur development. Cities are expected to provide economic opportunities, and create conducive social environments for a better quality of life. Cities will grow, evolve and age over time into complex and dynamic systems to meet the needs of evolving businesses, employment, housing needs and lifestyles through generations. However, the urban population’s expansion over the last 50 years has placed excessive pressure upon the limited resources of the environment.

1.6 Excessive industrial growth, increased motorized transportation movements and social lifestyle expectations, contribute to the expansion and continued sprawling of cities. This gives rise to the excessive use of energy and carbon burning which affects the environment and the inner cities. At the same time, older cities now face deteriorating urban infrastructure and services, inefficient water supply, sanitation, waste management, and transportation problems as well as worsening environmental conditions.

1.7 Challenges in planning and managing urban and cities development, would therefore escalate in time when land for expansion is scarce. Continued sprawling and expansion of cities into valuable greenfield areas consequently leave areas of inner cities to run down and decay in dilapidated conditions. This adversely affects the physical, economic, and social environments of inner city areas.
2. THE DEMAND FOR RENEWAL AND REGENERATION

Dynamic approaches in city development

2.1 In facing these challenges, planning and managing cities in this context require new and dynamic approaches. Initiatives and actions to refresh city living and treat cities as living ecosystems, is inevitable. Measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change impacts and fostering the involvement of private sector and civil society in the process of urbanization, is pertinent.

2.2 Managing urban issues and development requires integrated approaches in reviving the development of cities. The appropriate combination and utilization of smart growth development concepts, mixed and compact cities’ development and transport-oriented developments that revitalize economic growth and market attractions, must be explored and implemented. In this context, all areas of cities and towns must be given attention. While the ‘young’ growth centres are injected with development, the ‘old and once flourishing’ city and town areas must not be left to decay further, but must be refreshed and given new breath.

Defining Urban Regeneration

2.3 Most often, the definition of urban regeneration is intermingled with urban renewal and urban redevelopment where urban regeneration is regarded as a part of urban renewal initiatives. The Merriem Webster dictionary defines Urban Regeneration as “the rehabilitation of deteriorated or distressed urban areas, by slum clearance and redevelopment construction in housing and public facilities”.

2.4 However in differentiating them, urban redevelopment is regarded as the physical activity of reconstructing distressed or dilapidated areas into better environments or simply the ‘destroy old’ and ‘erect new’ perspective in development. Urban regeneration, on the other hand, is a comprehensive programme of land redevelopment with the complex combination of economic, physical planning, management and social considerations. The ‘old’ is enhanced and ‘new’ developments are constructed to revitalise the economic growth and the social environments of the selected areas.

2.5 Urban regeneration involves rehabilitation efforts of impoverished and derelict urban industrial areas and neighbourhoods by large-scale renovation or reconstruction of housing, public works, commercial uses and mixed developments. These elements of urban regeneration are brought together to improve the social sustainability, economic viability and the infrastructure of city areas and to help improve urban landscapes.
The Urban Regeneration Wave

2.6 The modern incarnation of urban regeneration began in the late 19th century in developed nations and since then, the process has had major impact on many urban landscapes, and demographics of cities around the world. Moving away from the traditional demolition, reconstruction and population displacement renewal schemes, present regeneration efforts are more comprehensive with the combination of economic, physical, institutional and social considerations for building effective and sustainable environments.

2.7 Urban renewal and regeneration is now a pertinent ingredient for building sustainable cities. Many success stories of urban regeneration efforts from various developed cities and other parts of the world such as the UK, USA, Australia, Canada, Sweden, Hong Kong, Singapore and South Korea can be benchmarked to see how concerted efforts have transformed and revitalized cities. Successful examples indicate how derelict brownfields, dockyards, industrial areas, and worn-out city areas are transformed into new, fresh and vibrant economic centres providing new opportunities and city environments.

2.8 Just to name a few examples, for instance in the UK, the high profile construction of the innovative and exclusive waterside regeneration development at London's Canary Wharf in the 1980s reflected, in part, the hopes and aspirations of the Conservative Government at that time. In London's Canary Wharf, the transformation of the once shipping dockyard, has boosted the Docklands into a major business centre with improved transportation links and an increasingly acceptable area to live with a ‘more than double’ population figure.

2.9 Another UK example, Glasgow, has been transformed from a redundant, dilapidated city of economic decline with high unemployment, urban decay and population decline to a revived economy with its regeneration of inner-city areas, especially the largescale Clyde Waterfront Regeneration, and the Glasgow Harbour Project. The futuristic Glasgow Harbour regeneration project is one of the largest waterfront regeneration projects in the UK. The city now resides in the Mercer index of top 50 safest cities in the world and is considered by Lonely Planet to be one of the world’s top 10 tourist cities.
2.10 From Down Under, the Melbourne Docklands, Australia, is another regeneration example. The area, once used for docks, rail infrastructure and industry, mostly fell out of use, vacant and unused during the 1980s. Urban renewal began in 2000 and now the project boasts wide open water promenades and road boulevards with contributions of landscaping and public art commissions. The Melbourne Docklands has become a sought after business address attracting multinational corporate businesses.

2.11 Urban regeneration in Cheongyecheon, Seoul, South Korea is a “back to nature” initiative. The renewal project involves the restoration of a stream that was covered by an elevated highway which was then deteriorating and posed safety problems. The project was aimed at revitalising the economy of the Seoul metropolis and to become a human-oriented and environmental-friendly city. The urban renewal project was the catalyst for revitalizing downtown Seoul, transforming Cheongyecheon into the centre of cultural and economic activities. Cheongyecheon is today a popular site among Seoul residents and tourists.
2.12 **Malaysia** has her fair share of redevelopment efforts that have taken place over the years. Back home in **Kuala Lumpur**, perhaps one of the most prominent redevelopment projects in the country is the transformation of the former Selangor Turf Club area in Jalan Ampang to the **Kuala Lumpur City Centre** (or better known as KLCC) where the tallest **Twin Towers** stand.

2.13 Another admirable project is the transport-led urban regeneration efforts of the KL Sentral as Kuala Lumpur city’s transportation hub. The project represents a vivid transformation of the Brickfields neighbourhood into a more promising local economy and creating development opportunities and impetus for growth in the area. It is clear that the transformation of Brickfields from an ethnic residential and commercial enclave to a cosmopolitan hub is linked to the railway-linked regeneration effort.

2.14 And we are most fortunate that this two-day Conference will enrich us further with the experiences of more regeneration efforts from the cities of Washington DC, Brisbane, Singapore, and local experiences of Georgetown and Sentul Raya from knowledgeable guests and speakers.
3. DEVELOPMENT IN THE LOCAL CONTEXT OF SELANGOR

Selangor – position and contribution

3.1 The State of Selangor is Malaysia’s most populous state where the nation’s biggest conurbation, the Klang Valley, is situated. In 2008, Selangor’s population was 5.07 million, increasing from 4.1 million in 2007. The Selangor State Structure Plan projects the population of Selangor to grow by 2.9% to **7.3 million in 2020**. In Malaysia, Selangor is the state with the highest net in-migration, recording a 9.5% net in-migration in 2003 as compared to Kuala Lumpur’s net out-migration of 28.9%. Selangor State is also the nation’s most urbanized state where more than 88% of her population is urban. This is expected to increase to 90% by 2020.
3.2 In terms of economic contribution to the development of the country, Selangor’s share to the nation’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is about 21% (2007), with substantial shares in the manufacturing sector as well as the transport, storage and communications sector, at 40% and 33.1% respectively (2007). Selangor’s labour force participation rate (LFPR) was 66.5% in 2000. The labour force participation rate of Selangor is expected to increase to 70.7% in 2020 with about 2.8 million workforce. This shows a large availability of working age group and essential workforce to boost the development of the state, besides its expected in-migration.

3.3 Selangor’s geographical position in the centre of Peninsular Malaysia contributes to the country’s rapid development as Malaysia’s transportation and industrial hub. As a State enveloping the city of Kuala Lumpur, many of Selangor cities have developed to accommodate the sprawl and overspill development and population growth of the national capital. This has provided immense job opportunities and attracted local migration as well as migrants from other states and overseas. In recent decades, the influx of immigrants has further contributed to Selangor’s population.

**Selangor cities and arising issues**

3.4 The major urban centres in Selangor are Petaling Jaya (2008 urban population of 261,000 persons), Subang Jaya (315,400 urban population), Shah Alam (258,300 urban population), Ampang Jaya (574,300 urban population), Kajang (356,800 urban population) and Klang (617,500 urban population). The population of these urban centres are mostly concentrated in the operational areas of the municipalities, recording high population densities. For instance, the Ampang Jaya Municipality has the highest density of 108.32 persons per hectare, followed by Petaling Jaya Municipality with 55.66 persons per hectare. The Subang Jaya Municipality has a density of 33.78 persons per hectare, Kajang Municipality with 31.82 persons per hectare, Shah Alam and Klang with 15.21 and 14.11 persons per hectare. Due to the economic opportunities and location, Selangor cities now play prominent roles in the flourishing developments of the Klang Valley.

3.5 The high rate of development and population increase in the State brings challenges which need to be tackled. While the lack of clear urban limits has led to urban sprawl encroaching upon environmentally sensitive and major agricultural areas, the inner city areas face issues of decline in quality of living. Substantial parts of the aged inner city areas are now less competitive in urban economies, have inefficient transportation system, inefficient infrastructure supply, insufficient community services, lack of emphasis on urban design and heritage conservation and are also degrading environmental quality. This demands attention and action.

3.6 The increase in development demands new economic priorities, job opportunities, efficient transportation linkages, renewed areas for housing, social amenities, commercial and other urban landuses. Thus, while preserving agricultural and environmentally sensitive areas, cities and towns of Selangor require combined approaches of redevelopment and revitalization of its old and ageing cities into fresh and vibrant economies with environment-friendly and energy-saving features for achieving sustainability.
Aspiration for a Sustainable Future

3.7 Sustainable Development has always been the ultimate agenda of the Government of Selangor to ensure the development in the State is geared towards achieving a balanced and sustainable future. The principle of Sustainable Development is upheld in Selangor’s Sustainable Development policy and Agenda 21 with its integration into decision-making, formulation of policies, laws and regulation. Principles of Sustainable Development is further translated into the Selangor State Structure Plan in guiding the physical landuse policies of the state.

3.8 The Selangor 2025 Development document (Laporan Hala Tuju Pembangunan Negeri Selangor 2025), sets out the State policy for building sustainable communities of high culture and morale, addressing socio-economic imbalance, strategic urban and landuse directions, and preserving sustainable environments. For a sustainable future, by 2025 the State’s landuse share for agriculture areas and forests must be preserved at 30 percent each, while 2.1 percent shall be retained for water body and waterways, leaving only 37.93 percent for built up areas. This shall require the control of urban activities encroachment into agriculture and forests areas. Thus, the renewal and redevelopment of inner cities which are ageing and decaying, is not an option but is now a necessity in Selangor to foster further economic and social development of the State. To date, the towns of Petaling Jaya, Klang, Ampang and Kajang have been identified as appropriately in need of regeneration initiatives.
Historical growth and development of towns

3.9 Perhaps it would be appropriate for me to briefly recollect the early developments and growth of the older cities of Selangor that are in need of regeneration. As for Petaling Jaya, its development commenced in 1952 as an answer to the problem of overpopulation in Kuala Lumpur. Petaling Jaya has since witnessed a dramatic growth in terms of population size and geographical importance. It started with the construction of 800 houses centered around the area currently known as “Old Town” today, later with the developments of PJ South and PJ North. Petaling Jaya progressed rapidly due to the massive rural-urban migration, developing more areas in Sungai Way and Subang districts along with new areas such as Subang Jaya and Section 52. Manufacturing in Petaling Jaya has declined or many wish to relocate to areas with lower land prices for expansion purposes; so many industrial areas in PJ are not suitable anymore. In this case, the main purpose of urban renewal is to deliberately change the urban environment and to inject new vitality through planned adjustment of existing areas to respond to present and future requirements for urban living and working.

3.10 Eventually, in a boundary realignment exercise in early 1997, parts of Petaling Jaya such as Subang Jaya, Sunway, Puchong and USJ were placed under the jurisdiction of the then newly formed Subang Jaya Municipal Council or MPSJ. The Petaling Jaya Municipality today covers an area of 97.2 square kilometres with a population of about 600,000 persons.

3.11 The royal town of Klang has been a site of human settlement with strong connections to the Malacca Sultanate leading to the establishment of the Selangor Sultanate in the 18th century. In the 19th century the importance of Klang greatly increased by the rapid expansion of tin mining as a result of the increased demand for tin from the West. Today Klang is no longer the State capital or the main seat of the Ruler, but it remains the headquarters of the District to which it gives its name.

3.12 Other fast developing areas in Selangor include the towns of Kajang and areas of Ampang. Kajang as a modern town owes its rise in particular to the coffee estates which were opened up around it in the 1890s. Kajang was later known as the famous ‘satay town’ with various development areas opened to accommodate thriving business activities. Ampang is a suburb of Selangor, and was previously a tin mining town located in the districts of Hulu Langat and Gombak. Ampang now houses large businesses and housing developments. Ampang is also the home to many Koreans and other expatriates.
4. GEARING FOR LOCAL REGENERATION EFFORTS

4.1 Beginning as vibrant economic centres for the State, over the years the older towns in Selangor have aged and are not functional to meet present-day needs and challenges. Urban renewal and regeneration is thus, needed to replan and transform the old urban and industrial areas of Petaling Jaya, Klang, Ampang Jaya and Kajang to revitalize economic activities, provide better transportation linkages and infrastructure for enhanced and efficient social environments. Urban regeneration is a complex combination of social, economic, planning, construction and management activities;

4.2 In translating the policies from the State Structure Plan, the Local Plans for these municipalities have earmarked the appropriate areas for redevelopment in these towns. All in all, an approximate total of 2,375 hectares have been identified in the Local Plans and Draft Local Plans of Petaling Jaya, Klang, Ampang Jaya and Kajang which are ripe for and in need for regeneration and redevelopment.

4.3 Approximately, a total of 1,672 hectares are areas in Petaling Jaya, namely the industrial, commercial and residential areas of Sections 13, 51, 51A and 52.
4.4 **Klang** has an approximate total of 131.4 hectares in need of redevelopment, especially the Klang town centre and Kampung Pandan of Klang, besides the banks of the Klang River.

4.5 **Kajang** has an approximate area of 412.4 hectares identified which are the town centre and Sungai Ramal areas while 159.3 hectares have been identified **in Ampang Jaya** covering the areas of Ampang New Village, residential areas in Jalan Jelatek, Taman Keramat (or better known as the Colombia Flats) and traditional villages in Kampung Pandan Dalam.
Regeneration – the State’s Agenda

4.6 Following this need, I am more than pleased to reiterate that redevelopment of urban areas is one of the six Selangor Government’s Economic Stimulus Package that has been announced recently. The stimulus package, which includes the rehabilitation of the Klang River and enhancing the transportation system, is expected to generate an estimated RM10 billion in investments. The urban regeneration and redevelopment programme is aimed at revitalizing the towns, creating job opportunities, enhancing the quality of life, improving amenities and infrastructure, improving management of the state assets as well as generating more revenue for the state and local governments.

Setting the Local Context

4.7 We realise and are aware that implementing this effort on regeneration in the State shall not be an easy task. Mechanisms for preparing the appropriate development plans, refining the legal aspects, stakeholders’ consultation and institutionalizing the implementation authority to undertake and implement the effort shall have to be carefully planned. The State Government is committed and determined in this venture and has embarked on initial moves towards this.

4.8 Consultants and experts have been appointed to work along with the State Economic Planning Unit, State Town and Country Planning Department and the Local Authorities to study and identify actual sites for regeneration and to suggest priorities in developing them. A Special Committee has been appointed to oversee these studies and actions for the regeneration efforts. For the Klang area, the redevelopment of the Klang River is of priority. The State is now undertaking a landuse study to inventorize development along the banks of the 21 kilometres Klang River alignment in the Klang, Shah Alam, Subang Jaya and Petaling Jaya Municipalities.

4.9 From the legal perspective, the State intends to prepare development plans through the Special Area Plan mechanism as stipulated in the Town and Country Planning Act, 1976 (Act 172). We also understand that other related legislations that may have implications shall have to be studied, updated and coordinated along the way.

4.10 From the institutional perspective, experiences of Hong Kong and Singapore indicate the necessity for establishing appropriate implementing bodies to spearhead renewal projects. Hong Kong and Singapore have Urban Renewal Authorities established while regeneration in Melbourne Docklands is through the existing agency of its State Government of Victoria. In South Korea the Seoul Metropolitan Government established the Cheongyecheon Restoration Project Headquarters and Cheongyecheon Restoration Research Corporation for establishing and review of the restoration plan for the Cheongyecheon stream restoration.
4.11 In terms of funding, experiences of successful regeneration efforts demonstrate that urban regeneration is most effective when it is delivered in partnership with those groups and organisations best placed to influence the success of urban regeneration projects. The initiative for private funding or joint public-private funding is essential. This means that Government and Local Authorities would work in partnership with construction companies, private sector organisations and local communities.

4.12 From the social perspective, consultation with local communities about urban regeneration plans has been recognised as being vital to the project's success. This is because urban regeneration has direct links to, and affects directly, the communities living in the areas where regeneration is planned. As a consequence, community regeneration is an integral part of urban regeneration. Successful urban regeneration will not only work at the physical level but will result in the building of successful, viable, vibrant and sustainable communities. In Selangor, perhaps a Citizen's Committee could be formed like in Korea, in order to emulate the experiences of successful projects from abroad.

4.13 The State is determined that renewal efforts shall involve social inclusion of stakeholders into redevelopment efforts. Initial plans under discussion have touched on aspects of provision of affordable housing for low income households, micro-financing schemes for qualified low income individuals to ensure their direct involvement in development of urban slum areas, the improvement of IT infrastructure and broadband penetration and to enlarge regeneration areas into mini-city centres. These areas can then be transformed into hubs of economic activity for business, education and social activities as well as enhancing growth small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in these areas.

4.14 I would suggest that the possible approaches to neighborhood regeneration can therefore be identified as: (i) redevelopment, wherein a neighborhood is rebuilt anew; (ii) rehabilitation, wherein the existing structures are preserved and upgraded; (iii) and integration, a combination of the first two approaches. Each approach can involve the re-housing of the population on the original site or its relocation to another part of the city.

4.15 In terms of redevelopment, for developers, redevelopment represents maximum profit through the sale of new centrally-located units. For local governments, this approach represents maximum use of land, higher floor area ratio, and has the advantage of introducing higher income groups and commercial activities to the city center, which increase tax revenues. It also leads to higher population density and improved services and infrastructures, which is highly desirable for modernizing inner-city areas.
4.16 However, this approach may carry heavy social and environmental costs. The demolition of architectural environments is probably the most serious consequence of the redevelopment approach. It can bring about the sacrifice of a community’s cultural heritage and the destruction of viable neighborhoods. Redevelopment generally involves the relocation of the original population to another part of the city. Even when the residents are re-housed on the same site after its redevelopment, the transformation of the neighborhood beyond recognition has inevitable psychological impacts upon the community.

4.17 For rehabilitation, often termed as conservation or preservation, is seen as the opposite of redevelopment. It is based on preserving, repairing, and restoring the natural and man-made environments of existing neighborhoods. Rehabilitation is applicable to areas where buildings are generally in structurally sound condition but have deteriorated because of neglected maintenance.

4.18 In developing countries, upgrading generally refers to a comprehensive developmental approach wherein the original population remains on the site and incrementally upgrades the neighborhood, with or without public assistance. By treating the resident population as an active force in the housing process, this approach generates a greater pride in the neighborhood and halts the impending deterioration caused by a lack of investment and environmental concern. Rehabilitation is often perceived as a complex and time-consuming process which is more difficult to implement than redevelopment. It requires a high degree of social organization and social responsibility, as well as a total reorganization of the housing process.

4.19 The third approach to neighborhood regeneration, which referred to as integration, views redevelopment rehabilitation as complementary forces and combines the best aspects of both approaches. It consists of rehabilitation of what can realistically be saved, combined with reconstruction of new buildings in place of those beyond the reach of feasible rehabilitation.

4.20 Today, we consider integration as the most acceptable way to regenerate old neighborhood. It allows for flexible project implementation which can preserve the traditional urban environment and its human scale while achieving respectable densities. It respects the social order of the community by re-housing the majority of the original residents on the site and invites mass participation. Integration results in the creation of rich environment through the integration of new buildings within the existing neighborhood and allows for the development of a new form of contemporary architecture with local characteristics, enriching the appearance of the old city while maintaining its identity.
5. CONCLUSION

5.1 Our road map towards implementing these regeneration efforts is still a long way ahead. Infact, our efforts have just begun. The organizing of this conference is a step forward in the process of consulting and gathering more ideas from the experts, professionals as well as the public. We will definitely embark on more consultation and provide more channels for proposals and suggestions from the communities and stakeholders. The Selangor State Government is determined that regeneration efforts in the state shall consider and pay attention to issues from all perspectives to ensure projects are planned and implemented tactfully and coherently.

5.2 Finally, it is without doubt that, ultimately the successful implementation of these regeneration efforts shall lie on the effective cooperation and collaboration of all parties that are directly and indirectly involved in this strategy. As the head of government for the state, I believe that we are on the right track in moving towards the aspirations of Selangor as ‘a dream State’ (negeri idaman) for all. As we drive development efforts in new areas as well as revitalize old inner cities, we address development in a coherent manner, complementing each other towards quality living and sustainability. And I am confident that with sincere and concerted efforts from all parties, we can together work towards building a sustainable future for the State of Selangor.

Wabillahuttaufik wal hidayah wassalamualaikum wbt.
Thank You.
Resolution

We, the participants of the International Conference on Urban Regeneration – Towards Selangor’s Sustainable future, over two days, from 30th November 2001 to 1st December 2009, hereby make the following recommendations to the State Government of Selangor:

1. That we agree with the policy of Urban Regeneration for the inner cities of Selangor and that Urban Regeneration be one of the economic stimulus of the State Government;
2. We urge that there be strong continuous leadership and clear vision by the State and Local Government to implement the policy of Urban Regeneration for the benefit of the Public first in terms of access to employment, housing, recreation, commerce, leisure and religious needs for all sectors of the community;
3. That the State and Local Government engage local communities in all efforts of Urban Regeneration and practice a transparent process at all levels;
4. We strongly urge that there may be smart partnerships between Government at all levels, Businesses and the Community in finding and ensuring a balance between social, economic, physical, spiritual and environmental needs for city development and regeneration;
5. The Government set up a special vehicle with stakeholders’ involvement within the next two years to ensure that Urban Regeneration Strategies are implemented holistically, efficiently and comprehensively;
6. That we, as members of the community from all sectors, are willing to work together with the government to ensure the success of the policy of Urban Regeneration in order to make our towns and cities vibrant, livable, safe and comfortable for all.
7. We ensure that we too, aim for sustainable urban growth and share the concerns of the State Government to address many of the urban issues faced in the State.

Thank You.

All participants
Of the International Conference of the Urban Regeneration –
Towards Selangor’s Sustainable Development
30th November & 1st December 2009