

Conserving Kampong Heritage in Urban Singapore: A Case Study of Kampong Buangkok

Done by: Caroline Ong Shu Xian

Rebecca Heng Zer Lyn

Ho Qi Xin

Raffles Girls' School (Secondary)

Citation - Caroline Ong Shu Xian, Rebecca Heng Zer Lyn & Ho Qi Xin, 2006. *Conserving Kampong Heritage in Urban Singapore: A Case Study of Kampong Buangkok*. 22p. An unpublished project report by students of Raffles Girls' School (Secondary), supervised by Ho Kah Wai. Submitted on 14 January 2006 for final judging at the Singapore Science & Engineering Fair (Behavioral Science).

SUMMARY

Using Kampong Buangkok as a case study, the study focuses on people's views on kampong lifestyle and heritage, which influence their opinions on the conservation of the kampong. Surveys and interviews were conducted for insights on kampong lifestyle and views on land use planning approaches versus heritage conservation. Findings suggest that kampongs are seen more as "getaways" than residences. Most feel, kampongs, tied to our heritage, should be conserved for education and tourism, but felt powerless in conservation efforts. While focus remains on the viability of Kampong Buangkok, the greater issue of conservation policies, urban development and land use emerges.

ABSTRACT

Kampong Buangkok is the last traditional village in urban Singapore, challenged against Singapore's need for land space. While we must consider the need for space for development, hence the pragmatic approach towards land use planning, kampong heritage is invaluable in our urban jungle.

Using Kampong Buangkok as a case study, the study focuses on people's views on kampong lifestyle and its heritage value, which influence their opinions on whether and how the kampong should be conserved. Methodologically, this was achieved through conducting questionnaire surveys on people who have never experienced kampong life, ex- and present kampong residents. Ethnographic work provided opportunities to interview people at Kampong Buangkok and observations allowed us to understand their lifestyles. In-depth interviews conducted provided further insights on kampong lifestyles and views on pragmatic land use planning approaches versus heritage conservation.

The findings suggest that kampongs are generally viewed as backward and unhygienic, and seen as a "getaway" rather than for residence. Nevertheless, most feel that kampongs are tied to our heritage and should be conserved for education and tourism purposes. While many acknowledged the state's pragmatic land use planning approach, they felt powerless in the decision-making process that decides the kampong's fate.

In conclusion, while focus remains on the issue of viability of Kampong Buangkok, the greater matter of policies on heritage conservation, urban development and land use emerges. The eventual survival of Kampong Buangkok not only holds importance to its

residents but displays the response of the state towards important matters as heritage conservation.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Kampongs in Singapore

Since resettlement efforts were put in place by the government back in 1959, kampongs in Singapore have silently but evidently disappeared from the ever-changing landscape of our modern country (Wong and Yeh, 1985). These kampongs, rich in heritage and history, were home to generations of Singaporeans long before public housing was developed.

Kampongs evoke nostalgia and fond memories in current and former residents who have long left the kampong to move into the comfort and convenience of modern housing (Chua, 1994; Chang and Teo, 2001). This nostalgia can be attributed to the many lifestyle aspects unique to the kampong, for instance togetherness, communitarian cooperation and a sense of security and trust amongst kampong residents (Wee 1989, Chua 1994, Chua 1997). However, the reality of Singapore's land space constraints and inclination towards economic development cannot be disregarded (Wong and Yeh, 1985; Dale, 1999). Thus, kampongs will have to make way for other more essential and pragmatic economic development.

1.2 Why a Study of Kampong Buangkok

Kampong Buangkok is the last residential kampong in Singapore, rich in heritage and history. It embodies the many lifestyle aspects of the kampong, but also stands at the crossroads between the preservation Singapore's identity and the choice of pursuing our

modern aspirations. Kampong Buangkok began back in the 1970s when Mr. Sng, the father of the current landlady Ms Sng Mei Fong, purchased a plot of land at Lorong Buangkok. The land that was purchased was then leased out to the residents who reside in it till today. Though many have moved out, the ex-residents still go back to visit frequently, a testimony of their pride for the kampong. Even then, kampong Buangkok's eventual fate is almost certainly controlled by the government. It would, nevertheless be worthy to note the viewpoints of currents, former and non-residents of the kampong and its viability in modern landscape and ability to withstand the changes in time. Kampong Buangkok is no doubt a valuable and rare landmark in contemporary Singapore.

1.3 Objectives of our Study

At a general level, our research is directed towards how different groups of people feel towards the kampongs in general and the future of Kampong Buangkok. Our research will also explore the possibility of the kampong being conserved.

Specifically, the objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To identify with the various viewpoints of different groups of people about the kampong landscape. Generally, the study considers two groups of people, namely the 'insiders', or people who have lived or are presently living in a kampong; and the 'outsiders', the general public who have never lived in a kampong before.
2. To understand how these varying viewpoints have resulted in differences in how the different groups of people want to conserve the kampong.

3. To find out the feasibility of Kampong Buangkok being conserved in Singapore's context, given the land constraints.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

In general, research on kampongs is limited in the geographical as well as the sociological sense. The term 'Kampong' means 'village' in Bahasa Melayu, and is strictly restricted to villages in the Southeast Asian region, and hence reading is also extremely limited. In addition, as Singapore is land scarce, kampongs here are affected by economic development - clearing of land for housing and other needs. The rapidity of this removal also ensured that little was documented about these kampongs, further making the pool of resources which to draw from even smaller.

This literature review will focus on two main aspects, first, the way of kampong life and its evolution, and second, the need for heritage conservation.

2.1 Kampong life and its evolution

Kampongs signify a 'tradition which predates the arrival of Raffles' (Seet, 1995:204) but are still very much reminisced among Singaporeans (Chua, 1994; 1997), even after clearing all but one of them. Chua elaborates on the conditions of the general kampong and the daily lives of kampong dwellers; while Wong and Yeh (1985), and Seet (1995) study specific kampongs and their demographics as well as segregations. Seet (1995) studies the largely-Malay kampong of Wak Selat, and Wong and Yeh (1985) provided a case study the Chinese kampong of Soon Hock Village.

One highlight and an important factor in kampong life was the presence of kampong spirit, defined as a sense of looking out for each other (Wong and Yeh, 1985; Chua, 1994 & 1997). This hence cultivated a sense of security and the feeling of being among friends. However, Wong and Yeh and Seet cite exceptions.

Wong and Yeh (1985) reported that although kampong spirit was evident, the kampong was divided along social class lines. Seet (1995) explained that the Chinese living on the fringes of the kampong were ostracised by the largely Muslim community, hence dividing the kampong into two. These might have impacts on the kampong spirit, which could have been then diluted.

After Singapore gained independence, economic development was vital in creating a modern cityscape and thus, the need for the clearance of kampongs arose (Wong & Yeh, 1985; Lee, 1999; Teo, Yeoh, Ooi and Lai, 2004). Wong and Yeh (1985) explain that the competition, for land was fierce, therefore the pragmatic approach of the government was to clear the land. Dale (1999: 125) adds, saying that potential conservation buildings were looked upon as slums which 'had to be cleared and redeveloped'.

High-rise residential housing was introduced along with land clearance. Building a 'community' within each high-rise housing estate was important (Chua, 1997). Furthermore, ethnic integration was one of the social objectives of the Housing Development Board (HDB) (Wong & Yeh, 1985; Dale, 1999). Research by Chua (1997), has, in fact, shown that the authorities have made effort in replicating the 'kampong spirit' in HDB estates to

increase socialisation, in the process, build the 'community spirit'. Examples include external corridors, void decks and shopping facilities.

2.2 Heritage and conservation

However, writings by You and Lim (1984) show that the government's attempts were futile. In the 1980s and 1990s, nostalgia for the kampong in particular, emerged (Chua, 1997; Teo et al., 2004). Chua (1997: 165) defines this sense of nostalgia as 'the desire to rest'. Various readings (Chua, 1994 & 1997; Teo et al., 2004) attribute this phenomenon to the hectic and stressful lifestyle that Singaporeans are living, that people feel the desire of contentment, the need to find relief, physically and emotionally (Yeoh & Kong, 1999: 139).

According to Teo et al. (2004: 109), following the emergence of nostalgia for the kampong, 'governing elites' observed the increasing influence of the West in Singapore society which included values that were not in line with traditional Asian values. This prompted the government to draw up measures such as the conserving of landscapes to encourage Singaporeans to be more appreciative of our heritage and also have a sense of identity (Tan, 1999; Chang & Teo, 2001).

Dale (1999) however felt that it was due to the availability of land and tourism needs that led to the conservation efforts. Supporting this, several studies (Kong & Yeoh, 1994; Chua, 1997; Chang & Teo, 2001; Teo et al., 2004), state that it was the need for an authentic and oriental Singapore (elements of which had been largely removed during redevelopment) that made conservation an 'economically acceptable' venture.

Readings by Chua (1997), Lee (1999) and Teo et al. (2004), however, show that conservation efforts were less than successful, as these areas, are mostly rebuilt and commercialized zones targeted at tourists, so much so they lose their original ambience and social life. Projects such as Chinatown and Kampong Glam are spiritually sterile. Teo et al. (2004: 124) describes such projects as ‘museumisation ventures’ in which ‘museumisation’ actually refers to ‘the creation of idealized past’, ‘suitable for tourist consumption’.

As Lee (1999) points out, much emphasis has been placed on the conservation of the facades of these areas, conservation of communities, such as the kampong, would most probably be difficult.

As such, this study attempts to find out people’s perception of the kampong landscape, which has been largely cleared, for development purposes. Their responses will indicate how our mental image of kampongs has evolved over time. Following, the study seeks to engage the people’s views on conservation of the kampong heritage.

3 METHODOLOGY

In order to understand people’s views on conservation in Singapore and to find out their opinions towards state policies and priorities on land use, a two-prong research method comprising both quantitative and qualitative methods is employed. Questionnaire surveys, in-depth interviews and ethnographic were used.

Survey questionnaires were conducted with two groups of people, namely the “insiders” and the “outsiders”. “Insiders” include people who have lived in a kampong or are living in

kampong Buangkok. “Outsiders” refer to people who are not in any way associated with the kampong. Each group of respondents comprises of different age groups, gender, religions, ethnicities, income levels, occupations and educational levels. A total of 95 “outsiders” and 81 “insiders” responded to the survey questionnaires. The respondents were randomly chosen and care was taken to ensure a fair representation of the population. Responses were then tabulated and analysed, additional comments were also taken note of.

Ethnographic work was carried out in order to understand the situation that Kampong Buangkok was in and its living conditions. There were also opportunities to talk to the residents of Kampong Buangkok to find out their views on the future of the kampong. A total of six in-depth interviews were also conducted with current and ex-residents of kampongs, people who have never resided in a kampong before and an experienced planner to learn about the possible future of the kampong. The interviews were then transcribed and analysed.

4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section considers the differing and various opinions of insiders and outsiders in the conservation of the kampong, and the state’s dilemma of conservation. Section 4.1 discusses both the insiders’ and outsiders’ impressions of kampong life in general. Section 4.2 explains the future of the kampong and the various and differing reasons for conserving it. Section 4.3 demonstrates the irony of the enthusiasm in conserving the kampong juxtaposed against the unwillingness of people to live in kampongs. Section 4.4 explains the dilemma of conservation from the government’s viewpoint.

4.1 Impressions of the kampong

Impression of kampong	'Outsiders' (%) (n = 95¹)	'Insiders' (%) (n = 81)
<i>Physical living environment</i>		
Cluttered	12.6	8.6
Close to nature	60.0	56.8
Backward	38.9	11.1
Unhygienic	45.3	14.8
<i>Emotional environment</i>		
Relaxed	69.5	63.0
Less stressful	56.8	60.5
Simple way of life	74.7	72.8
More willing to share	38.9	44.4
People are friendly	53.7	55.6
<i>Advantages and constraints of kampong life</i>		
People are uneducated	10.5	4.9
People have little education	23.2	21.0
People live there as they have no choice	4.2	3.7
Lower cost of living	50.5	40.7
Little presence of modern technology	40.0	33.3

Fig 4.1 People's impression of a kampong

Despite not having lived in a kampong before, the majority of the outsider respondents had largely the same impression of a kampong, as that of the insider respondents. This idea was one of positivity and simplicity. This similarity of opinion may be due to the fact that those who have not lived in a kampong heard from their parents or grandparents about kampong life. Both groups had generally positive impressions of kampongs, and most felt that kampongs in general were 'simple', 'relaxed', 'close to nature', and 'less stressful', among others. We can say that the public's impression of a kampong and its lifestyle is largely based on and influenced by how the insiders portrayed the kampong. Mrs. Ho, an ex-kampong resident reminisces, describing kampong life and explaining the conditions then,

¹ Number of respondents for each group.

The respondents could agree to more than one statement hence the percentages do not add up to 100.

“Very fun as we were kids, simple and carefree. You could rear anything anywhere and keep any kind of pets you wanted because people didn’t mind, so it was unhygienic too.”

Sandra, a student at a local primary school, who has not experienced kampong life, said,

“I like to think of childhood in a kampong as carefree and untroubled. Back then, they had so much more of a childhood as compared to us now. My father tells us stories about his good old kampong days, as he calls it, and we enjoy it a lot.”

However, there were obvious differences between the insiders’ and outsiders’ view on kampongs in general. The outsiders were more negative towards the kampong, with a larger percentage using words such as ‘backward’, and ‘unhygienic’, in particular, to describe the kampong, whereas a smaller percentage of insiders felt the same way. This is probably because the outsiders have never lived in a kampong and in addition to the knowledge of its frugal lifestyle, comparing kampong life to the more comfortable life now, the kampong seems ‘backward’ and ‘unhygienic’.

4.2 Future of the kampong

Despite these setbacks, however, most people want the kampong to be conserved (91.5%), as their positive impressions and experiences of kampong life far outweigh the negative ones. Despite this, they have altogether different reasons why it should be conserved, as

seen in Figure 4.2. Interestingly, the outsiders felt more strongly about their reasons for conserving the kampong, especially for the rich heritage and culture (48.3%), as compared to the insiders (30.6%).

Reason to conserve kampong	'Outsiders' (%) (n = 89²)	'Insiders' (%) (n = 72)
Kampong spirit of togetherness	28.1	31.9
Natural environment	43.8	38.9
Laidback way of life	16.9	8.3
Rich heritage and culture	48.3	30.6

Fig 4.2 Why the kampong should be conserved

This interesting result might be because the outsiders, especially the younger generation, a recipient of kampong life recollected in abstract sentiments by others, 'experiences' only the good memories of others' kampong lives, and feels nostalgia for it as a criticism of their current stressful life. (Chua, 1994; 1997) In truth, they have not seen a kampong, much less lived in one, and what they know about kampongs are influenced by what they have heard from others and read in books or the press. What they do know is that there is the invaluable heritage and culture of the kampong that should be preserved, and hence are merely conserving the kampong for the sake of conserving it, and may not consider the social value if the kampong is conserved.

Insiders, however, felt most strongly than outsiders about conserving the kampong's spirit of togetherness (31.9%) and its natural rustic environment (38.9%). They want to preserve the kampong not as a museum to showcase the past, but as a place that will be remembered

² Out of the 95 outsiders' respondents, 89 want to conserve the kampong.

for its lively kampong spirit for generations to come, and proves the point that conservation efforts, if any, must be holistic, and the preservation of spirit of the kampong is crucial.

Most are eager to conserve the kampong for mainly tourism (36.9%) and educational purposes (34.1%). They would like the kampong to be kept so as to “remind us of the past” and also allow future generations to learn about the previous generation’s way of life, as well as inculcating in them a sense of national identity (Tan, 1999). Although most residents of Kampong Buangkok were against conserving the kampong for tourism, there were some who supported it. Mr. Jamil Kamsah, one of the few younger residents at Kampong Buangkok and a supporter of the cause of tourism at the kampong, commented,

“...if the kampong were to be turned into a tourist spot (where tourists live the kampong life), I’m willing to quit my job to help in the running of the village.”

Whether for tourism or otherwise, Singaporeans surveyed did have in mind an idea of how the kampong should, or should not be like, and there were proposals to improve the sanitation, amenities and facilities of the kampong before opening it to the public. In addition, there was also critique on the conservation of various ethnic historic districts, including Chinatown and Kampong Glam. One of the survey respondents specifically stated that a conserved kampong “should not be like another Chinatown”, a commercialised area with restored buildings, but with none of the original ambience and social life of the area.

4.3 Kampongs: A thing of the past?

Despite much enthusiasm and fervour for conservation, many were unwilling to live in a kampong if it was left in the ‘original state’. Of the both groups of respondents who said yes to living in a kampong, most stated a common condition; that the stay would only consist of a few days, where the kampong is viewed as a getaway. Bryan, a student who has lived in a kampong in Malaysia, points out,

“It would be a way to run away from the city life here, and staying there for short term would be fun, but not long term.”

For the outsiders, most gave reasons such as being used to the current, more comfortable living conditions and inconvenience. Mr. Ho, who has visited a kampong, explains,

“They (Singaporeans) enjoy the facilities and convenience of the modern lifestyle and want to drive cars, live near to town and use the latest technologies.”

For the insiders, not only had they been accustomed to modern high-rise living, they also had had enough of the problems they had faced when living in a kampong, including flooding which often plagues kampong Buangkok (The Straits Times, 19th January 1999).

Ms Sng, a current resident at the kampong, noted,

“If you ask the Malay families if they want to live here again, they won’t want to.”

A significant finding was that more insiders (63.0%) would not want to live in a kampong again, as compared to people who never lived in kampongs, the outsiders (35.8%). The former, perhaps, remembers the hardships and inconveniences of the kampong then, and recognises that the material deprivation in kampong life is never forgotten nor desired. (Chua, 1994, 1997)

4.4 Conservation and the state — the dilemma

The government has been in two minds regarding heritage preservation. It recognises the importance of conserving history, but on the other hand, also wants to get the best financial returns---but these conservation developments “do not usually even pay for themselves” (Chua, 1997: 42). Yeoh and Kong (1999, 144), note,

“In Singapore, from the state’s perspective, heritage has important social economic and political purposes. Not only does it represent the city’s cultural wealth and diversity, it serves to bind Singaporeans in a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural state together and also to ‘sell’ Singapore abroad as an exotic tourist destination.”

Besides the problem of the commercialisation of conservation sites, which contributes to the areas’ lack of authenticity, there is also the problem of land scarcity in Singapore. With the contestation of space for development, conservation is not the top priority. Says an experienced planner who was interviewed and understands the difficulty of conserving kampongs in view of the limited land space,

“In Singapore’s context, it would be very difficult to retain sprawling kampongs given our scarce land resources. We will have to balance the desire to keep kampongs with the need to optimise the use of our limited land.”

Nevertheless, the Urban Redevelopment Authority (URA) takes the task of preservation and maintenance of our heritage seriously. It states in its website³; “Conservation of our built heritage is an integral part of urban planning and development in Singapore.” It also mentions that the restoration of historic areas not only “add variety to our streetscapes” but also protects “the important reminders and representations of our past” and adds to the “distinctive character and identity of our city”.

The high expectations of the authorities, as mentioned above, results in difficulty in achieving a balance between the economic goal of attracting tourists and the social goal of familiarising locals with Singapore’s past. As such, conflict also occurs in finding a way to effectively conserve the kampong such that it meets the needs of the state and is viable in land-scarce Singapore. The URA website states that,

“Quality restoration is more than just preserving a facade or the external shell of a building. It retains the inherent spirit and original ambience of historic buildings. It requires an appreciation and understanding of the

³ URA website, <http://www.ura.gov.sg/>

architecture and structure of traditional buildings, good management and practice.”

Ironically, only the architectural styles and ornamentation have been restored in existing conservation areas which include Kampong Glam and Chinatown. Traditional trades and activities were not retained in these areas, failing to retain, or recreate, the original ambience and social life, and hence were not successful in preserving the traditions and character of the respective areas.

As shown in the above projects undertaken by the URA, it may be extremely difficult to conserve the kampong and at the same time retain its original ambience. The same experienced planner commented:

“Developing the kampong into a heritage site or a resort usually requires significant intervention, apart from keeping the mere building ‘shells’, it is also necessary to retain the social life. It will likely entail major redevelopment, and modern facilities will have to be introduced to ensure that it is inviting to tourists. These changes will inevitably cause the kampong to lose its original spirit of place. Even “authentically replicated landscapes” may appear artificial.”

This is, apparently, the public’s exact sentiments. Some fear that the kampong would have lost its charm after being conserved. In fact, 18.1% would only decide whether to visit the

kampong, should it be conserved, depending on the way it is conserved. Bryan, who would not visit the conserved kampong, remarked,

“That (the idea of turning it into a resort) would be kind of fake. I think a kampong lifestyle cannot be made, it comes naturally. ...(furthermore) Malaysia has lots of kampongs, I can always go back.”

Conservation in Singapore is, however, in many aspects different from the conservation efforts of other countries, which have ample land space, resources, and manpower, as our small city-state lacks in area and resources. A kampong conserved but of no financial or social benefits will be deemed unviable, and considered a liability to the country in view of the amount of money spent on its conservation efforts, as well as the precious land that will not be put to good use.

Indeed, the different views and opinions on what to do with the kampong results in a tough decision that is to be made. Not only is there a struggle to find a compromise between what the general public wants and what the residents of the kampong want, it is also about meeting the needs of the state, at the same time, conserving the kampong optimally.

5 CONCLUSION

It is gratifying to note that many, both insiders and outsiders alike, felt positively about kampong life and kampongs in general, and most views were not distorted by the increase of material wealth in Singapore in this time and age. An exception was that a significant number felt that kampongs were backward and unhygienic.

Despite this slight negativity about the conditions in a kampong, a majority of Singaporeans surveyed agreed that Kampong Buangkok, the last remaining kampong on Singapore's mainland, was worth conserving, although they could not decide as to how it should be done, and why. Both groups of people in general felt nostalgia for the kampong as they are unhappy with their ever-stressful lives and look to the kampong as a representation of a more relaxed environment, and hence want it conserved. As to the how the kampong should be conserved, insiders felt that the spirit of the kampong should most importantly be preserved so that generations to come would appreciate the warmth and togetherness within a kampong, which would have been already lost in an urban landscape. Outsiders, however, felt more strongly towards preserving the kampong as a showcase, preserving the façade of the huts and documenting the lifestyle of kampong residents, for educational and tourism purposes.

Despite the differences, all agreed that preservation of the spirit of kampong life is very important if the kampong were to be conserved, as doing without it would be singularly preserving the 'shell' of the kampong without capturing its original ambience and spirit. However, it is a costly project with a moderate chance of failure if not conserved carefully enough to retain its original ambience and lifestyle, as seen in Chinatown and Kampong Glam, the URA's less than successful projects. Hence the state's dilemma is apparent--- to conserve the kampong to enrich the cultural lives of locals and attract tourists, risking failure and money, or to remove the kampong to maximise land use in land-scarce Singapore, but at the same time lose a piece of heritage. In addition, Malaysian kampongs would have similar ambiances which would as a result undermine the cultural value of

Kampong Buangkok if it were conserved, as Singaporeans can easily cross the Causeway to experience kampong life there.

Finally, whether it is a romanticised version of kampongs, or the “spirit” of kampong living as experienced by the insiders, a holistic picture of the kampong has been depicted. Therefore, to ensure a successful conservation effort, the public-- both the insiders and outsiders-- should be consulted, and their ideas, memories, experiences and perceptions of kampong be collected to obtain a more complete picture. Future studies could be done to gather more information about the distinctiveness and heritage of Kampong Buangkok to ensure it is worth conserving in area-challenged Singapore.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chang, T.C. and Teo, Peggy (2001), *From rhetoric to reality: Cultural heritage and Tourism in Singapore*, Singapore Inc.: public policy options in the third millennium, Eastern Universities Press, 2003

Chua, Beng Huat (1997), *Political Legitimacy and Housing: Stakeholding in Singapore*, London; New York: Routledge

Chua, Beng Huat (1994), *That Imagined Space: Nostalgia For The Kampung In Singapore*, Singapore: Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore

Dale, Ole Johan (1999), *Urban Planning In Singapore: The Transformation of a City*, Malaysia: Oxford University Press

Kong, Lily & Yeoh, Brenda S.A. (1994), Urban Conservation in Singapore: A Survey of State Policies and Popular Attitudes, *Urban Studies*, (pp. 247-265)

Kwok, Kian-Woon, Kwa, Chong Guan, Kong, Lily & Yeoh, Brenda (1999) *Our Place in Time, Exploring Heritage and Memory in Singapore*, Singapore: Singapore Heritage Society

Lee, Malone (1999), Heritage and Planning, in Kwok, Kian-Woon, Kwa, Chong Guan, Kong, Lily & Yeoh, Brenda (1999) *Our Place in Time, Exploring Heritage and Memory in Singapore*, Singapore: Singapore Heritage Society

Seet, K.K. (1995), Last Days at Wak Selat: The Demise of a Kampung, in Yeoh, Brenda S.A. & Kong, Lily (eds.), *Portraits of Places: History, Community and Identity in Singapore* (pp. 202-221), Singapore: Times Editions

Tan, Alvin (1999), Two Imaginings: The Past in Present Singapore, in Kwok, Kian-Woon, Kwa, Chong Guan, Kong, Lily & Yeoh, Brenda (1999) *Our Place in Time, Exploring Heritage and Memory in Singapore*, Singapore: Singapore Heritage Society

Teo, Peggy, Yeoh, Brenda S.A., Ooi, Giok Ling & Lai, Karen P.Y. (2004), *Changing Landscapes of Singapore*, Singapore: McGraw-Hill Education (Asia)

The Straits Times (19/1/1999), 'A Place and Lifestyle Trapped in Time'

Urban Redevelopment Authority (1993), *Objectives, Principles and Standards for Preservation and Conservation*, Singapore: Urban Redevelopment Authority

Urban Redevelopment Authority (date assessed: 18th November 2005), <http://www.ura.gov.sg>

Wong, Aline K. & Yeh, Stephen H.K. (1985), *Housing a Nation: 25 Years of Public Housing*, Singapore: Maruzen Asia for Housing & Development Board

Yeoh, Brenda & Kong, Lily (1999), The Notion of Place in the Construction of history, Nostalgia and Heritage, in Kwok, Kian-Woon, Kwa, Chong Guan, Kong, Lily & Yeoh, Brenda (1999) *Our Place in Time, Exploring Heritage and Memory in Singapore*, Singapore: Singapore Heritage Society

You, Poh Seng & Lim, Chong Yah (1984), *Singapore: 25 Years of Development*, Singapore: Nan Yang Xing Zhou Lianhe Zao Bao