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ABSTRACT

‘Liveability’ has been debated quite extensively. This is because major cities of the world are experiencing extremely high population growth and this has impacted the cities’ environment and space composition negatively. In theory, ‘liveability’ is likened to the level of an individual’s living quality in the city. However, modern development has ignored the basic principles of urban design. This research therefore aims to identify the quality aspects of urban design that influence the liveability of a city. The objective of this research is to study the aspects that influence the design quality of a liveable city, the quality attributes of urban design and the importance of those attributes in making the city liveable. The study area is Kuala Lumpur as it is the only city listed in the world ranking of liveable cities. It focuses on the city’s physical environmental attributes. The research adopts a case study approach and used the survey research method. The questionnaire was used to collect data from 330 residents. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 15 residents and two government agencies which are the Urban Planning Department and the Performance Management Delivery Unit (PEMANDU). Multistage stratified sampling technique was used to select respondents for the questionnaire survey and semi-structured interviews. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse the data collected. The findings reveal that appreciation of historical sites and cultural values are the two most important aspects in determining the liveability level of Kuala Lumpur followed by the sense of belonging and lastly, the sense of place. Twenty seven attributes were identified as having a relationship to the residents’ background. Four major attributes that will promote Kuala Lumpur’s liveability are use of public transport, the voicing out or articulation of opinions, provision of recreational sites and the heritage memory of historical buildings. In conclusion, the historical and cultural elements of Kuala Lumpur have great influence on the sense of place and belongings for its residents. These elements will also play a major role in promoting Kuala Lumpur as a liveable city in the future.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This research examines the attributes of urban design quality for a liveable city based on the residents’ perception. ‘Liveable city’ in this research means a city with good quality space. ‘Urban design quality’ in this research means a place which consists of the sense of place, sense of belonging and appreciation of culture and heritage value. The ‘city’ refers to Kuala Lumpur city centre as it is the only city which is listed in the world as the most liveable city by Economic Intelligence Units. The research works on the basis of the factors that contribute to liveable city based on the theoretical framework of the liveable city. In general, a city is a place where residents are concerned towards the enhancement of the community. Therefore, they will feel encourage to improve its environment. Liveable cities give much benefit to the people in many ways, especially economically and socially (Chin, 2011). Therefore, in order to bring back high quality of life, it is important to conduct research about liveability of a place especially in the context of a Malaysian city.

This chapter is divided into four main parts. The first part of the chapter explains about the research problems that are elicited the research. The second part will further answer the research questions and objectives of the research that is derived from the research programmes. The third part will explain on the scope, justification of the research, and limitations of the research. The final part will elaborate the thesis structure and the overall chapter organisation.
1.1 Problem Statement

At the beginning of the research, it is important to identify the main issues and problems that are happening in the city before constructing the research to the next level. In addition, there is also an enormous number of potential criteria for assessing the liveability of a city. In some non-scientific survey, safety/crime, international connectivity, climate/sunshine, quality of architecture, public transportation, tolerance, environmental issues and access to nature, urban design, economic conditions, proactive policy developments and medical care are among the issues that occur in the city. This section explains the global and local issues of liveability of a city.

a. Global Issues

More than half of the world’s population is living in cities and the urban population is predicted to grow at an unprecedented rate (UPAT, 2010). The world is undergoing the largest wave of urban growth in history. In 2008, for the first time in history, more than half of the world’s population were living in towns and cities. By 2030 this number will swell to almost 5 billion, with urban growth concentrated in Africa and Asia. While mega-cities have captured much public attention, most of the new growth will occur in smaller towns and cities, which have fewer resources to respond to the magnitude of the change (UNFPA, 2007). Liveable cities concept has been used in the 1980’s and 1990’s in North America as a response to the continuing problems or urban sprawl and car dependent land use patterns (Abd. Aziz, N & Samad Hadi, A 2007; Auckland City, 2000).

The scale of growth in cities presents new social, economic and environmental challenges for those who live, work and does business. The essential components of the city’s liveability is the city’s identity and values, making the city attractive to inhabitants, visitors, talents and as well businessman, developers and investors. The liveability and sustainability of cities are now recognised as critical issues for the future of the planet. Across the globe, governments, institutions, designers, planners, researchers and corporations are searching for ways to make
cities better – using less energy and resources, fostering innovation and stronger communities, and providing populations with the most liveable environments (UPAT, 2010).

The sprawling cities of the developing world are vibrant hubs of economic growth, but they are also increasingly ecologically unsustainable and, for ordinary citizens, increasingly unliveable. Evans, P (2002) claimed that the level of pollution in the city has been rising, and the amount of the affordable housing is decreasing and so are the quality and green areas. Since three-quarters of those joining the world's population during the next century will live in third world cities, making these urban areas more liveable is one of the key challenges of the twenty-first century. He added that rapidly urbanising region of the future is the global challenge for liveability as urban development occurs at multiple nodes across landscape, as town and village starts to expand. The United Nation Environmental Protection (2010) stated that a successful city must be balanced in terms of the social, economic and environmental need, and being able to respond to pressure from all sides. This will led to people having a better life.

World Bank (2010) explained how a crowded population in the city like Bangkok and Jakarta probably have difficulties to be in the liveability ranking because the problems found in their transportation system and also infrastructure. Meanwhile, safety issues always make the front page in Third World countries. Violent crimes have increased in most cities in recent years. Urbanisation, rapid economic liberalisation, growing mass political upheaval, violent conflict and inappropriate and inequality policy, are amongst the numerous complex factors that are themselves linked to poverty and inequality.

Demographic changes are now transforming the world and the conditions of a city. According to Van Vliet, W (2009), urban development nowadays should offer a wide range of community voices because it has become a major component to create a liveable city. Prosper (2010) stated that major demographic trends are affecting the community as well as the environmental impact itself. These changes and desire to maintain a good quality of life for all residents evolve over time.
Furthermore, measuring liveability may also allow state and local government agencies to target resources to promote equity and it refers to the fair distribution of access opportunities, which are among the residents regardless of their socio-economic background (New Zealand Population Health, 2012).

From this discussion, it shows that the increasing number of population, and different demographic background has become the major challenges that determine liveability aspects of the city. This problem has caused a limited space which remains as an issue and concern whether sufficient thoughts have been considered to make the federal capital city a more liveable beyond this decade and for the next generation. Thus, people living in metropolitan cities will not have enough room to unwind and de-stress themselves as the city serve not as a place to play but only focus as a place to work.

b. Local issues

In order to achieve the target of among the best place to live, the environment plays a big role into creating a liveable city as it becomes one of the challenges to sustain the resources. In Economist Intelligence Units Ranking, Kuala Lumpur was ranked at the 78th place in 2011 for world’s liveable city ranking and ranked at 77th place in 2012, but remain stagnant at 74th in the Mercer Studies for the best place to live in year 2011 (Boo, S.L., 2011). However, the majority of the towns in Malaysia have experienced urban decay and urban regeneration which is caused from the production of low quality living in many aspects. Urban decay has lead to the formation of higher crime rate, environmental issues such as pollution and distraction, and poor services of public transportation system. At this moment, citizens are concerned about high quality of the environment and the happiness level when living in such areas.

Tansmit.my (2011) in its article stated that one of the constraints happening in Malaysia at that time was that land use was highly sprawled with not many open and green spaces left. The relation of smog to urban sprawl is well known. Sprawl of an area of the residential, commercial, recreational, and shopping functions are
zoned apart from each other, and this caused greater energy expended in getting people and materials back and forth between them. The question is what effects do population trends, patterns of urban growth, zoning and improved exhaust devices or fuel have on environment?

The effects of sprawl towards the environment may be caused by transportation system networks. In Greater Kuala Lumpur, most activity centres have sprung up in satellite towns due to congestion in downtown KL, and these make commuting and travel patterns more complex and harder to solve because trip origins and destination are all over the place (Mohd Said, H., 2011). Malaysia city centre are now rushing to build expensive rail lines like in Singapore and Hong Kong while breaking all other principles in transforming KL into a corridor city, which can be seen through government plan on mass rapid transit (MRT) in 2011. Malaysian Physical Plan (MPP) reported that the highest energy consumption in Malaysia comes from transportation and Industrial which is 40% while the other sectors remain stagnant between 0% to 10%. This clearly shows that Malaysian cities are away from sustainable environment as both transportation and industry are the biggest contributor towards low quality environment.

In order to upgrade the quality of life in Malaysia, the government has come out with Government Transformation Program (GTP) in order to improve the organization and the living standard of the people. The initiative of the program is to reduce crime, fighting corruption, improving student outcome, raising living standard improving rural basic infrastructure, improving urban public standards and addressing cost of living (GTP, 2011). The programs are aligned with liveability criterion set by EIU which is stability, healthcare, education and infrastructure.

Malaysia is now facing an increasing density of people who live in urban areas. According to the Zainal Abidin, M (2012), in 1960, the urban population in Malaysia was 25% of the total and it has increased rapidly to 65% in 2005 and 72% in 2010. It is expected to reach 80% by 2015 because the rate of urbanisation in Malaysia is 2.4% per annum. The conurbation of Kuala Lumpur itself is approximately seven
million people, which makes up 20% of the total Malaysia population (Chan. C., 2013).

Referring to Table 1.1, population density in federal territories itself is expected to be nearly double in the future. But in 2012, cities are needed to be equipped to accommodate the demands of the new residents (Zainal Abidin, M., 2012). He added that the issues of rising cost of living nowadays are the primary cause of much unhappiness in the cities of Malaysia. This urban poor group has faced challenges to find more affordable living areas because in the city now what is left are cramped housing areas, lack of recreational space and lack of affordable educational opportunities. This lack of attention towards this group of people shows that different kinds of socio economic background would have their own demand towards the environment that they need.

Table 1.1 : DBKL’s 2020 Structure Plan population density in Federal territories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>17.7915</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>8,038</td>
<td>245,611</td>
<td>13,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangsa Maju-Maluri</td>
<td>46.5858</td>
<td>380,300</td>
<td>8,163</td>
<td>443,712</td>
<td>9,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentul-Menjalara</td>
<td>46.0998</td>
<td>344,500</td>
<td>7,473</td>
<td>445,025</td>
<td>9,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damansara-Penchala</td>
<td>47.4531</td>
<td>167,100</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>259,078</td>
<td>5,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukit Jali-Setapah</td>
<td>43.2288</td>
<td>318,300</td>
<td>7,363</td>
<td>464,271</td>
<td>10,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bdt Tun Razak-Sg Besi</td>
<td>41.1694</td>
<td>266,900</td>
<td>6,483</td>
<td>340,669</td>
<td>8,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KUALA LUMPUR</strong></td>
<td><strong>242.3284</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,620,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,840</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,198,366</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,577</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source : KL City Plan 2020*

The KLCP 2020 has determined that the optimum density should be 400 people per acre. This density will allow the city residents to have a comfortable living space. However, the assigned density in Brickfield, Wangsa Maju, Segambut had reached to 500-800 units per acre (KLCP2020, 2011). Izzah (2010) stated that the residents of Kuala Lumpur are classified as urban poor as the public still has to deal with increasing costs while the level of wages remain stagnant. This situation of
poverty is debated by Zainal Abidin, M (2012) who claimed that poverty is a cause of social problems in the city which lead to an unhappy environment. This situation has been taken seriously by the government by implementing the policies in the Global Transformation Program through ‘Improving living standard’ as one of the criteria.

Apart from this, the element of world class city is also low level of crime and high personal safety. This is the main contributor of greater investment and enhancement of economic activities. Reducing Crime is one of the Government Transformation Programs in its National Key Result Area (NKRA, 2011). According to the graph, total crime rate for poverty in 2010 alone slightly decreased from 2009, but in prior years (2004-2008), it continued to rise but NKRA results in 2011 showed that street crimes jotted down to 39.7%.

![Figure 1.1: Total Number of Crime Rate in Kuala Lumpur 2004 to 2010](Source: Royal Malaysian Police Department, 2011)

Although Malaysia has started the green city initiatives to make Malaysian cities more liveable (Chin, P., 2011), it is still important to note that while population density figures of Singapore and Greater Kuala Lumpur metropolitan areas are the same (7,000 person/km-ish), the cities are in stark contrast in terms of density patterns and open spaces. If we look at Google maps, we may see that not many green spaces (open spaces for public, golf and private clubs excluded) are
presently left within the confinement of metropolitan Kuala Lumpur (Transit.my) as only 61 hectares of forest reserve remaining (CHKL, 2011).

According to the Ministry of Federal Territories and Urban Wellbeing (2011), the amount of green space per person in the city centre is only 12 square meters, which is not only below the WHO standards of 16 square meters per person, but also falls behind other leading liveable cities, such as Vancouver with 22 square meters per person. At current trajectory of population growth, the amount of green space per person will be half that of WHO standards at 8 square meters per person by 2020. The focus of this Entry Point Project (EPP) in the Economic Transformation Program is to have a sufficient green space within the city centre of Kuala Lumpur and in areas beyond the city.

An example taken from Central Park in New York, Hyde Park in London and the Imperial Palace and its ground in Tokyo has shown the importance of public park to not be touched (Zainal Abidin, M., 2011). This is compared to our city, where a separate park is located far from each other. The issues of preserving the city green lung or maximizing the commercial value of land are debatable. He added that a land price in the city has become higher and it is very tempting to go for commercial purposes rather than green lungs.

![Figure 1.2: The quality of life index in Kuala Lumpur (Source: KLCP, 2020)](image-url)
Jane Jacobs believes that in order for a city to remain sustainable, they must embrace its past in future planning. Wan Abdullah Zawawi, N.A (2011) stated that “the unchecked redevelopments are destroying our unique multi cultural heritage. The subsistence of this built heritage is threatened by demolition, uncontrolled changes and rapid development pace”. Due to the rapid development, many heritage sites and building are at risk around the world including Malaysia (Kamaruddin, K et al, 2013) and also losing the value and appreciation on the environment. Sulaiman, A.B (2012) stated that the environment that we create in the present will eventually play significant role in creating the person, society and cities of the future. He also added that the existing city weakness is when the design of the building are abandoning the good design principles and the people have little say in it. The amount of space is limited in the city and it is impossible for the city to further expand. This has caused an overwhelming experience to fill the city and has cause the missing art of building cities which is ‘placeless’ and lack of sense of unity to the city (Shamsuddin, S., 2012).

This situation has been predicted by Relph saying that modernity and globalisation will continue to contribute a city to be ‘placelessness’ (Najafi & Mohd Shariff, 2011). Wan Ismail, W.H and Shamsuddin, S (2011) suggested that the original urban character should be conserved to maintain Kuala Lumpur’s Urban Identity. But somehow there is also some contextual consideration that is not given much emphasis in design by architectural practices (Sulaiman, A.B., 2000; Shamsuddin, S et al 2012) as shown in figure 1.3.

The National Urban Policy 2006 stated that most Malaysian town also lacks in identity. As things were developing in the past which may bring identity to a place, it were destroyed if it is not proven to be relevant or very significant (Stokin, M., 2011). Old cities in the developing nations including Malaysia are currently facing intensified urban problems as a result of rapid economic development and population growth. The emergence of new townships at the edge of many historic cities in Malaysia has affected the significant identity of these places (S. Y. Said et al, 2013). Kuala Lumpur distinctive local identity is entrenched in its traditional shop
houses (Wan Abdullah Zawawi, N.A., 2011), but majority of the buildings in the city are adopting design themes from other countries creating confusion in identity as most of the themes are not suitable to merge into Malaysian cities. There are also too much emphasis on creating iconic buildings rather than focus on the spaces between buildings and the public realm (Shamsuddin, S., 2012). This concern towards a city which is losing identity is mentioned by W.M Sudi (2013), “the erosion of architectural heritage is closely linked with the loss of socio-cultural identity and consequently resulting in the deterioration of the quality of urban life”.

The city hall has been rather proactive in protecting heritage buildings and areas (Waz, N.A., & Alias, A., 2008). Another problem as observed in Malaysia is the disregard of the heritage value (Fagence and Craig-Smith in Shamsuddin, S et al, 2011) and this shows how urban design is not being given priority in Malaysia even at policy level. This situation may also become a reason why the issues of urban design arise in most Malaysian cities. This is proven by an interview with Dr. Zainah as the Head of Morphology, Urban Design and Conservation officer in Town and Country planning Board Malaysia, which she stated that;

‘We are already prepared for the Urban Design Guideline but it has never get a chance to enter the committee meeting for approval because the higher committee often give other guidelines as a priority.’
Thus, it is also difficult to overcome the situation to ensure the Malaysian mission is aligned with the Liveable Cities indicator by the EIU (PEMANDU, 2012). According to Datuk Suhaili during the interview, “One of the indicators of EIU is the city ‘climate’. For us, it is difficult to measure because the Malaysian climate is naturally hot and wet climate throughout the year and this creates discomfort. And it seems not fair to rank it equally between the tropical city and the solstice city”. Furthermore, the members of public are not being consulted until the public viewing of the draft development plan (Wan Abdullah Zawawi, N.A, 2011). By this little awareness, it has become a question whether the strategies are going to work without knowing and taking into account the real needs of the people.

Without even realising it, in many developments that are in progress, traces of our culture and history are embedded in the sites. Eventually, these traces that are important for the identity and sense of place of a particular area and also crucial in the educational and cultural development of a nation which may be lost in the future (Kamaruddin K et. al, 2013). The city environment should promote and appreciate its heritage because it gives value and at the same time bringing identity and sense of place to the people. They provide important links between the past and the future which few modern buildings could achieve, even in a renewed environment (S. Y. Said et al, 2013). It is crucial to maintain the historic fabric of the proposed regenerated area in order to maintain its connection with the past.

There are only few research that had been done in finding liveability factors as many researchers and city council had agreed to use the liveability factors which are outlined by EIU team. The approaches of liveable cities have been discussed by Zuidema and Roo (2009). Most of the research is about creating a liveable environment, as an example, the book review on “Liveable Neighbourhoods” by Western Australian Government Planning commission (2001), “Urban Environment & Infrastructure towards Liveable City (Bigio & Dahiya, 2003)” which discussed how the urban environment management creates liveable environment. “Design Changes for Liveable Urban Streets (Voigt et al, 2003)” has also discussed on creating and designing a liveable streets environment in the City of Charlotte, North Carolina to propose new transportation network guidelines for the city.
Two of the research had already been done in Malaysia is by Abdul Aziz, N and Hadi, A. S (2007) on “Linking Urban Form to a Liveable city”. The research discussed the contribution and relationship of urban form to a liveable city and stated that many researchers pose the urban form as one of the factors that can worsen or improve the sustainability of the city. Another research title “Addressing Urban Poverty Issues to achieve liveable city” by Wan Azriyati et al (2010) had discussed about scope of poverty, characteristics and designation of housing policies for affordable housing and the needs for local authority to revisit the programmes to achieve the liveable city status. Another research was conducted about “Liveability dimension and attributes: their relative importance in the eyes of Neighbourhood and Residents” by Leby and Hashim (2010) which discussed about people’s perceptions about the place they currently live at; whether it is a good or bad place to live to be a liveable neighbourhood.

Prior to this, the concern towards the urban design of the city in Malaysia is not given priority and interest even at the higher level. This is why this research is important because it will address all those problems under the terms of the urban design quality for the city of Kuala Lumpur as the previous studies shows that only few aspects of urban design has been done into creating a liveable city such as streets and neighbourhood aspects, but none in general. Therefore, this thesis would address the major attributes to a good urban design quality that focuses on the residents’ perspective. The finding is hoped to act as reference for Kuala Lumpur’s development in the future.

1.2 Research Question

The central question is a general statement about the issues that are derived while the two sub-questions are more focused on the details of the study. The main question is:

‘What are the aspects of urban design quality that affects liveability of city centre?’
This main question leads to the detail matters of the research. There are two sub-questions for this study which are:

i. What are the attributes of urban design quality that will increase liveability?
ii. Why are the urban design quality attributes important to increase liveability of the city centre?

1.3 Aim of Studies

The aim for this research is to identify aspects of urban design quality that affects the liveability of a city.

1.4 Research Objectives

The main objectives of this research are as below:

i. To determine attributes for an urban design quality for a liveable city.
ii. To identify why these attributes are important to increase liveability in a city centre.

1.5 Significance of Study

The study is significant because in the latest 10th Malaysia Plan (2010) that was announced by Prime Minister, it had stated about ‘Building Vibrant and Livable Cities’ in Chapter 6 entitled, Building and Environment that Enhances Quality of life. This proves the main concern towards a liveable environment is already at the national level. Apart from that, the National Urban Policy that had been recently released in 2007 had stated the liveability aspect to be considered under NUP 5 (to optimal and balanced land use planning shall be given emphasis in urban
development), NUP 8 (Environment Sensitive Area and Prime Agricultural Areas shall be conserved) and NUP 9 (Open space and recreational areas shall be adequately provided to meet the requirements of the population).

Furthermore, the importance of liveability aspects are shown in the Government Transformation Program which is highlighted in the National Key Result Areas (NKRA’s) and National Key Performance Indicator (NKPI) which states exactly the same criteria of liveability by the EIU such as reducing crime, fighting corruption, raising living standards and improving urban public transport. Confident in improving the situation, the Malaysian Government aims to reach the top 20 Most Liveable cities by the year 2020.

Based on these three main national documents, it is clearly shown that liveability a city is one of the main concerns towards new development nowadays and how crucial creating a livable city itself. It will then appear to be a safe, healthy and enjoyable place of living. The researcher thinks that it is somehow important to learn about the liveability aspects and components that would help the Malaysian capital city to be known worldwide for its high quality of life. The study hopefully would be able to contribute new ideas and bring forward technology so that Kuala Lumpur improves to score at the top place in the World Liveable City ranking.

1.6 Scope of study

The scope for this research is as follow:

a) There are many ideas related to the theory of liveability and urban design quality factors but for the purpose of this research, the urban design quality for a liveable city is about the city environment.
b) This research is only based on the residents’ general perception towards the city urban design quality and not an evaluation on the city design preference of its physical character or evaluation of the design theory.

c) The research is using happiness level as the measurement which is from ‘not happy at all’, to the ‘very happy’ into evaluating the attributes of the urban design quality of Kuala Lumpur.

d) This attributes of the urban design quality is mainly generated from the literature review on the concept of sense of place, the city sense of belonging and their appreciation towards heritage and cultural value. The components of the city sense of place include the physical aspects, meaning and values and also the activities happening in the city. The attributes for the physical aspects of the city is only covered for ‘building and vegetation’ and also the ‘city spatial organization (urban space and structure)’. The attributes for physical elements for views and movements are not included in this research. This is due to the method of assessing it is by the mind mapping by the residents, and therefore there will be a delayed time to apply this technique. Thus, the attributes of the city’s sense of belonging is generated from the meaning of sense of belonging that is formulated by UNESCO World of Heritage and the attributes for the appreciation of the culture and heritage value is derived from Kural (2008) which will be explained later in chapter 3.

e) Respondents in this thesis are limited to the residents of the Kuala Lumpur city centre due to dependency for the respondents income/age/ ethnicity/ and length of stay because literature review suggested that happiness will be influenced by the aforementioned categories. This research is also allocated with fixed area/premise/working space in relation to their roles.
1.7 Limitation of the research

This research acknowledges the issues of liveability is multidimensional, where cultural, economic, political, architectural and behavioural, as well as other sustainable aspects come into play. However, this study is only limited to the attributes of the physical environment of the city and not into the design of the place. This research also acknowledges that gender and income level (besides religious beliefs, ethnic background, age, length of living in the city) may influence their perception and satisfaction levels with the urban spatial environment and its attributes but it cannot be done due to the time constraint. A preliminary investigation would still be carried out to ascertain the situation.

The research is confined to the area of the Kuala Lumpur city centre. This is due to the fact that Kuala Lumpur is the only city in Malaysia that is listed in the World Ranking List of The Most Liveable City in the World. The city centre is chosen due to its function as the main location of economic activities, social and cultural event and public transportation hub. The population of the whole Kuala Lumpur region is approximately 1.4 million and it requires a big sample. Therefore this study is also limited to the city centre area as it embodies the essence of the character of most towns (Worskett, Kostof, and Moughtin in Wan Abdullah, W.Z., 2008). Time constraint in carrying out the research is also one of the reasons why this study only focuses at the city centre. The survey is done in the city centre. As mentioned by Chau (2000), the physical and functional character of a city centre as a distinctive and interconnected part of the city is need to be understood. Jacobs, J (2010) also described that ‘the point of a cities is multiplicity of choices’. Therefore the researcher chose the city centre of Kuala Lumpur as a case study.

1.8 Structure of thesis

In order to do this research in determining criteria for liveable places, there are five stages needed to be followed systematically, which are:
In chapter one, it is important to understand basic issues regarding the topic and what is happening in most cities in Malaysia. The information on this subject is obtained from readings, previous study and reference and observation of researcher based on requirement from research question. Discussion with supervisors will help to understand the issues and the problems of this study. This will scaffold the researcher to understand the issues and problems of this study. Results from this understanding will then form the objectives and aim of this study. To achieve the objectives, the research scope is outlined so that this research would be running as planned.

Chapter two and three in this thesis will explain about the whole literature review. The literature review is also known as documentary research and holds a wide range of resources and topics of discussion even on urban design itself. Therefore, there are two aspects which will be taken into consideration regarding the literature review of this research:

1.8.1 Definition and concept of liveability.

This first method is done by reading the definition written by knowledgeable experts and opinions regarding to liveablility. This study will also include the concept related to the scope of this research.

1.8.2 Theoretical study

This second method is done by reading the theory, written by knowledgeable experts in the field of liveability. This study will include theories related to the issues that are related to the quality of life in a city such as environmental management, transportation development, infrastructure, and urban design. According to Gehl, J (2011), he points to Aristotle’s statement that, “a city exist for the sake of good life, and not for the sake of life only”. He also added that liveability means joy, leisure, health, communication and interaction, and not just fulfilling the basic needs. In a true liveable city, one can lead a good life regardless of age, gender, range, social
status or income (Louekari, M., 2011). This strengthens the fact that this research is using the resident's socio-economic background to determine the happiness level. Hence, quality lifestyle has been mentioned in KLCP2020 as a liveable city.

Chapter 4 and 5 describe the methodology used for this thesis. This research is conducted by primary and secondary data. Both primary and secondary data would help to strengthen the analysis on the next stage. The technique applied are;

a) Literature review of the book, reports, articles and related reading material.
b) Questionnaire survey to the Kuala Lumpur citizen
c) Interviews with related government department and organisation which is Town and Country Planning Board and also PEMANDU to describe the issues and challenges that are being faced in making Kuala Lumpur a liveable city.
d) Interview with fifteen respondents based on the analysis to determine what has caused the unliveable environment of Kuala Lumpur city. This is also to find the significant attributes of a liveable urban design according to the resident’s background.

i. Primary Data

Collection of primary data is taken through questionnaires and interviews with selected government agency such as a town planner and also non-government organisation involved in Malaysia’s development in Kuala Lumpur City Centre. This interviews involve the related professionals works in these fields of current policies and guidelines. This may ensure the suitability and effectiveness of government approach towards liveability in the city centre. Amongst the professionals selected are town planners, architects, and developers.

Questionnaire and survey will be subjected to the residence of Kuala Lumpur itself to know their understanding on liveable city. The question will be determined by their perspective so that it can be taken up by the relevant government agency in a city they desired to live in. Selected techniques are chosen
in doing this research for the premier data collection. There are three data collection techniques used in this research which is;

- Technique 1 : Questionnaire survey

  Respondents of this research are the Kuala Lumpur city residence. The survey is held in a form of closed ended questionnaire, in which respondents pick an answer from a given number of options. But there are some open-ended questions to ask the respondents to formulate their own answers.

- Technique 2 : Interview

  The interview will be conducted in two different parts. The first part of the interview is conducted with the government and non-government agencies. The interview uses the “semi-structured interview” technique and its purpose is to aid in collecting data carried out in the field observations. The findings will then be analysed qualitatively. Focus interviews with related individuals in the Town and Country Planning Department and also Performance Management Delivery Unit (PEMANDU). This is to review their understanding and knowledge in liveability and its approaches and to support data that have been collected by other methods. The second part of the interview will be held after the analysis of the questionnaire survey was made with the residents Kuala Lumpur. This is to justify the findings of the survey.

ii. Secondary Data

  The data is obtained through the reading of the issues related to research. References used are books, journal, newspaper, reports and websites. The information of liveability approaches in other countries has also been noted, by their liveable ranking on a few different research, and top 100 liveable cities in the world.
1.8.3 Analysis and conclusion

The analysis will be discussed in chapter 6 and 7. Data will be analysed by two different methods which are qualitative and quantitative. Quantitative methods are ways of collecting data which are concerned with describing meaning, rather than with drawing statistical inferences. The technique of qualitative method is used to gather in-depth understanding of principle and concept that has been used in regard to the research. Data collected in this study is in the form of a subjective related to element of understanding, effectiveness and comparison.

On the other hand, major categories or type to collect the qualitative data has been cited by Willian M.K Trochim (2006) such as in-depth interviews, direct observation and written documents. For this research, qualitative methods (e.g. case studies and interviews) lose on reliability they gain in terms of validity but provide a more in depth and rich description. In this research, qualitative data is obtained by interviews that are conducted after the questionnaire has been analysed to seek significant attributes of a liveable Kuala Lumpur.

The finding discussed in chapter 8 will identify the major indicator for a Malaysia city towards becoming a livable city by citizens with differing socio-economic background. The finding from both statistical data and interview will gain the answer to what are the factors and criteria that contribute to a city being liveable and outline ways to implement the criteria towards Malaysia city in the future. Therefore, based on the result, it will then help determine the major improvement and needs towards Malaysia town and help to suggest plans for improvement.
Figure 1.4: Summary of the thesis structure
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