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ABSTRACT

The current research explores the service perspectives in enhancing the Development Proposal Approval Process (DPAP) performance. Problems of ineffectiveness, inefficiency and unsystematic still exist in current DPAP, however, few studies have explored the enhancement on these issues from the service perspective. Thus, this research attempted to bridge the gap and develop a conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP based on the service perspective. In line with this purpose, the objectives of this research were to identify elements of DPAP enhancement based on the service perspective; to evaluate the existing model of DPAP; to develop a practical conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP and to validate the conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP. In light of this, mixed method which included both qualitative and quantitative method was adopted in this research. The research was divided into five stages in order to realize the research objectives settings, viz.: literature review, elements identification, evaluation of the model of DPAP, conceptual model development and validation. Meanwhile, the sampling, interviews and questionnaires methods were used in data collection. The assistant director in the division of local government policy and improvement at ministry of housing and local government, inspectorate and quality team at ministry of housing and local government and department of town and country planning as well as the entire local authorities in Johor state were involved in data collection. Thematic and statistical analyses were adopted to analyse the data. The quantitative analysis in the form of statistical analysis and the qualitative analysis in the form of thematic analysis were adopted. The developed model was verified in the real world situation before effectiveness study and then validated in terms of its feasibility and reliability. Throughout the process, all planning department of local authorities in Johor state were involved to verify and compare the proposed conceptual model in the real world situation. The analysis results and desirable suggestions obtained were used to further improve and revise the conceptual model. After model revised, the effectiveness study was conducted in the departments of building and engineering local authorities to explore whether the model can improve the effectiveness (day reduce-mean), efficiency (%) and maximum efficiency (%). After that, the conceptual model was validated in term of feasibility and reliability through the survey at all the one stop center departments. Eventually, the research findings suggest that at least 50 percent of the improvement on entire DPAP performance can be achieved and 50 percent time reduction can be obtained in the entire DPAP timeframe setting. Consequently, the developed model generates mutual benefits for both the government departments and the applicants. This model can be used as a guide or reference for related government departments. It is also believed that this research is able to create a new potential future research area for DPAP enhancement study.
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5.2 Question 1: The functions of the “Conceptual Enhancement Model of the Development Proposal Approval Process” are clear and understandable

5.3 Question 2: The sequence of the process of “Conceptual Enhancement Model of the Development Proposal Approval Process” are properly arranged and systematically

5.4 Question 3: The step in the “Conceptual Enhancement Model of the Development Proposal Approval Process” is sufficient and to operationally manageable

5.5 Question 4: With regarding to the result obtain in effectiveness study, The “Conceptual Enhancement Model of the Development Proposal Approval Process” is an adequate instrument to help in reduce the time required in the DPAP timeframe setting and easier the operational process execution in DPAP

5.6 Question 5: The “Conceptual Enhancement Model of the Development Proposal Approval Process” is an adequate instrument to raise the effectiveness of DPAP

5.7 Question 6: Consideration with the outcome of effectiveness study, the “Conceptual Enhancement Model of the Development Proposal Approval Process” would satisfy the government department’s responsibility needs

5.8 Question 7: The “Conceptual Enhancement Model of the Development Proposal Approval Process” is adaptable with normal government department responsibility operation and performance
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preamble

This research explores development proposal approval process (DPAP) enhancement through the service perspective. The current research attempted to establish the importance of service perspective in enhancing the development proposal approval process (DPAP) performance. The research would create mutual benefits for both the government departments and the applicants. Eventually, this research would create a new potential area and open new avenues of opportunity to link the service perspectives with DPAP enhancement in order to strengthen the DPAP performance and reduce the time required in DPAP timeframe setting.

This chapter is an introductory division which provided a brief overview on the topic and the motivation for the research. It comprised background of the study, the nature of the investigated problem, the research questions, the research aim and objectives, the scope of the research and the justification for the research. The significant contribution of the study was also presented. This chapter also provided the research approach and thesis outline.
1.2 Research Problems

Shelter is among one of the basic needs for the mankind. Therefore, real estate sector is playing a very important role to the mankind and there is always inextricable link among the natural environment, structural environment (sustainable planning) and social environment. Any sustainable society with stainable conserve and natural resources and national economic growth would be impossible without proper management in the real estate sector (Cheng and Hu, 2010; Efe and Aydin, 2009). One of the greatest problems in early 1990’s is that the improper planning and management in real estate development causes the global environmental problems such as deforestation. Lack of re-stocking forest land in turn leads to several issues including ozone layer depletion, global warming, air and water pollution, toxic wastes dump problem, disaster of flooding, deforestation and the consequent climate change (Cheng and Hu, 2010; Efe and Aydin, 2009; Adler and Ziglio, 1996; Costello and Preller, 2010; Esra Cengiz, 2013; Thomas, 2001; Earp and Ennett, 1991; Frank and Engelke, 2001).

In addition, improper and poor management in the real estate sector also results in human health problems and unsatisfying human settlements like the poor housing and home conditions; development projects that generate noise, air or other forms of pollution; development projects which conflict with existing uses in the area; inappropriate or poorly sited development; inadequate facilities or infrastructure (car parking, sewage treatment plant, access roads, drainage, water supply, energy efficiency); buildings that are structurally weak and are prone to hurricanes, earthquakes or other disaster events; development projects which have serious negative impacts on the country’s sensitive environment (particularly its beaches/coastal areas); projects/buildings that increase traffic congestion on nearby streets and etc. All of these are caused by the improper, poor and unfriendly planning or management in the real estate sector (Cheng and Hu, 2010; Efe and Aydin, 2009; Adler and Ziglio, 1996; Badland and Schofield, 2005; James and Donna, 2002; Costello and Preller, 2010; Wilkison and Reed, 2008; Esra Cengiz, 2013; Thomas, 2001; Bogner and Wilhelm, 1996; Burden, 2000; Cervero and Kockelman, 1997; De Groot and Van Den Born, 2003; Earp and Ennett, 1991; Ewing and Cervero, 2001; Frank, 2000; Frank and Engelke, 2001).
Apart from this, the national economic growth is also negatively affected by the improper planning or unfriendly management in the real estate sector. Economic recession, human financial problems, labor force problems, social issues and etc. are additional problems arising out of the improper planning or unfriendly management in the real estate sector. According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), real estate sector is a significant contributor to the country’s economy and should be based on the fact that all development takes place at an appropriate time and place. Specific areas of land development are only more suitable for specific types of activities and some activities have negative impacts on the development environments. Moreover, each of the development projects often prevents its use for another activity at the same time. Therefore, improper planning or unfriendly management in the real estate sector not only slow down the national economic progress but also affect the tourism sector, manufacturing industry, agricultural development, jobs available to the country’s labor force or even in revenue to finance government and public operations (Giles-Corti, 2006; Ross, 1997; Christopher and Somerville, 2000; Erwin and Frans, 1994; Chen X.W, 2012; Cheng and Hu, 2010; Frank, 2000; Ewing and Cervero, 2001; De Groot and Van Den Born, 2003; Cervero and Kockelman, 1997; Thomas, 2001; Wilkinson and Reed, 2008; Costello and Preller, 2010; Efe and Aydin, 2009).

Due to these facts, sustainable planning and management in the real estate sector is essential to ensure that all real estate development occurs in the right place, at the right time; They should satisfy the basic social or human needs; overcome the arising problems; and serve as an integral part of the process of national growth and development. Therefore, the development control responsibility by the government is an important one to evaluate applications for development permission; grant or refuse permission; ensure that the environment and natural resources are managed carefully and prudently for the enjoyment of present and future generations as well as conforms to a pre-determined set of policies or standards. Based on the subsection 19(1) of Act 172: “No person, other than the local authorities, shall, commence, undertakes, or carry out any development unless planning permission in respect of the development has been granted to him under Section 22 (treatment of application or extended under Subsection 24(3) [lapse of planning permission])”. This means that every project development at real estate sector should be obtaining all the
planning approval in accordance with the relevant authorities before any physical work can begin on site in order to seek sustainable planning and manages in the real estate development. In other words, only after all required applications have been approved, can the physical work commence on site. The process on obtaining all the planning approval from the relevant authorities can be defined as “development proposal approval/application process stage”. This stage also can be referred to as “predevelopment stage”, “initiation and planning stage”, “preconstruction stage” and “before development stage” (Kerzner, 2009; PMI, 2004; Aziz et al., 2011; HDA, 2010; DTCP, 2013). Essentially, this “development proposal approval/application process stage” is in the first stage for all the projects development. This stage is playing a significant role and will determine the overall project development process in the flow of activities. As a result, the development proposal approval/application process is significant for all the real estate development.

In general, there are four (4) main planning applications that need to be submitted during the development proposal approval/application process which are (i) application for conversion and subdivision (124A)/application for surrender and re-alienation (204D), (ii) planning permission application (Subsection 21[1], Act 172), (iii) building plan application (Section 70, Act 133) and (iv) road and drainage plan application (Section 9, Act 133)/earthworks plan application (Section 70A, Act 133). All of this application must be endorsed by Land Office, Local Authority Planning Department, Local Authority Building Department, Local Authority Engineering Department and Technical Department (MHLG, 2008). Before 2007, these four planning applications were executed separately or submitted by stages in development proposal approval/application process which the applicants are needed to apply the land matters first according to the NLC section 124A (application for conversion and subdivision) and section 204D (application for surrender and re-alienation) before submitting the application for planning permission under subsection 21(1), Act 172 in second stage. Only after getting the endorsement from Land Office and Local Authority Planning Department, can applicant enter the third stage; building plan application under section 70 of Act 133. In the same way, only after getting the approval from Local Authority Building Department can the applicant move forward to the final stage which is application for road and drainage plan/earthwork plan under section 70A of Act 133. Each stage must be carried out in
strict order, meaning that without getting approval in first stage the second stage cannot be started. The same applies to the third and fourth stage. These multiple-step process may lead to several issue such as creating unnecessary delay or lengthening of the time required for getting the planning approval (Lee J.Q, 2010), red-tape from Local Authority in the application of land development (Ng S.Y, 2008), delay in getting approval according to the Section 124A & 204A-204H National Land Code (NLC) (Mohamad Fariz, 2009), unsystematic approval process (MHLG, 2008) and etc. In light of these facts, there are numeral enhancement methods, initiatives or approaches proposal by the researcher and government departments to seek to address the issues such as i) encourage using the pre-consultation method between the applicant with the local authority and external technical agency; ii) proposed templates, checklist and guidelines by DTCP and MHLG; iii) restructure, reengineering, reinvention the process execution (Abdul Jalil, 2004; Durst and Newell, 1999; Majed and Mohamed Zairi, 2000, Henry, 1996); iv) adopt the sequential descriptions approaches, behavioral or decision-making approaches, production-based approaches and structures of provision approach in the land development process (Gore and Nicholson, 1991) and v) adopt the “STAIR” model for managing and measuring the government performance (Mary and Tatiana, 2003). However, even the above-mentioned enhancement methods, initiative or approaches failed to address the efficiency and effectiveness of the development proposal approval/application process. In other words, the problems in delay or required lengthening time for getting the planning approval still cannot be solved.

In response to this, in 2007, “One Stop” Concept has been adopted in Malaysia government to enhance the development proposal approval/application process. Basically, the “One Stop Shop Concept” or “One Stop Business Centers” had been promoted by many countries as a new approach to enhance the government development service delivery system. The “one stop shop concept” can be defined as an association with arrangements which bring the related development function together and intend to expedite the development process. Based on the previous literature, one stop approach to development process not only increases the efficiency and effectiveness of the service and user benefits but also addresses problems in planning approval process such as delays in the implementation of
development control procedures, associated uncertainties, inflexibility administrative processes and departmental jurisdiction (Evans, 1995; Keogh and Evans, 1992).

Nevertheless, Blakely (1994) from the United States referred to this concept as “One Business Centers”. The “One Business Centers” is defined as an important economic development tool and as part of local economic development strategies which bring integrated information together on planning and development matters. Illsley et al. (2000). Further discussion and support were provided by Blakely (1994) who pointed out that this “One Business Centers” would create a good business climate in encouraging new business start-ups, facilitating business expansion, eliminating frustrating referrals and attracting new forms to the locality as well as providing positive value to economic planning and development matters. In addition, Burdett (1997) from United Kingdom stated that the term of “One Stop Shops” or “One Stop Concept” has been introduced basically as a single contact point for council services. This new approach is in response to the client focused agenda to increase the consideration of interface between service providers and their clients (for example improving access to information and provision of effective advice and guidance) (Ross and Rowan-Robinson, 1994; Illsley et al., 1997). Based on the Illsley, et al. (2000) the term of “One Stop Shops” or “One Stop Concept” actually brings the meaning of: “providing variety of services from a single location or access to services offered by a single organization or access to a range of organizations offering similar or related services within a single locality”.

As a result of this, our former Prime Minister Dato' Seri Abdullah Ahmad Badawi has introduced One Stop Centre (OSC) mechanism in year 2007 to improve the development services delivery system and expedite the process in getting approvals for development projects (The Sun, Monday, 16 April 2007, 08:13am). Several objectives and goals are included in this OSC mechanism such as i) to coordinate and facilitate the approval process for all the development proposal plans, ii) to reduce the processing time and expedite the process and iii) to standardize the procedures and process for development proposals applications (MHLG, 2008). Through implementation of the OSC mechanism, the development proposal approval/application process enables the stage or concurrent submission of applications. Undeniably, the clear and comprehensive procedures and process in
OSC mechanism shortened the time required for processing the development proposal approval/application process either through Build Then Sell (BTS) Concept or Sell Then Build (STB) Concept (The Sun, 2007, April 16). Nonetheless, several problems still persist in many areas of the One Stop Center (OSC) mechanism implementation in development proposal approval/application process. In particular, the problems were presented concerning timeline, efficiency and effectiveness (Refer to Table 1.1).

Table 1.1: Summary Problem Persist of One Stop Centre (OSC) Implementation In Terms of Timeliness and Effectiveness of the Approval Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures &amp; Application</th>
<th>1. Discrepancies still exist in the procedure of Planning Approval application among Local Authorities (LA).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some LA permits feedback up to 3 months given by technical apartments in comparison to the 14 days’ timeline stated in the procedures by MHLG. This will make the approval process 6 months or more in comparison to original 3 months;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• OSC submission checklist issued by LA is sometimes unclear and confusing as well as constantly changing. Confusion among consultants was also created as a result of imposed additional condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e.g. LA were required 6 sets of drawing plans comparison to checklist by MHLG requests only 4 sets of such plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pre-submission discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prior to the official submission to OSC, discussion on unofficial pre-submission is proceeded jointly by the Principal Submitting Persons (PSP) and the relevant technical departments for most LAS. Acceptance of submission is based upon agreed decision made by all technical departments. This is the precondition for the acceptance of submission, resulting in time-consuming pre-submission checking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Comments from Technical Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Within 14 working days, comments on the part of all related internal and external departments should be submitted upon submission of plans to OSC. However, additional and new comments by the very apartments could occur after resubmission of the plans to comply with the first list of comments. This time-consuming and repetitious process will negatively affect the efficiency regarding the approval timeline for OSC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. To submit building plans for BOMBA approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Additional time is required on the part of Bomba to assess the building plans and 14 working days is often too short. When Bomba failed to meet the deadline, OSC receive ‘sokongan letter’, from other departments instead, an OSC meeting on the building plan application will be held. Bomba will be asked to give on-the-spot opinion in the meeting and Bomba may reject the plan, leading to the forfeited processing fees. This has negative influence on the developer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Requirements of copies of title, title search and quit rent may lead to waste of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Delay to approval process may be caused by the interference on the part of Planning Department in OSC concerning the building plan application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Among Members On Rehda Malaysia
Table 1.1: Summary Problem Persist of One Stop Centre (OSC) Implementation In Terms of Timeliness and Effectiveness of the Approval Processes (Continue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lengthy approval process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approval process is time-consuming despite the fact that OSC set the 6 months’ timeframe (for Sell-Then-Build project). Simultaneous submission does not lead to simultaneous approval issuing time. Time to obtain approval might be longer than 1 year in some cases from the date of submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It has become more complicated to obtain approval as Building Plan approval is based on the approval on both internal and external departments. It takes longer time on the part of external departments. The same situation may happen to some departments of LA to process the application and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Endorsement of plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It takes more than 2 months for some local authorities concerning endorsing and issuing Planning Approval letter as it has to be tabled in the OSC meeting first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Notice of meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very short notices (often 1 day notice) are given to Developers, Consultants and Architects in attending OSC meeting carried out by LA and without listing the agenda of meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Validity period of approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The date of OSC meeting marks the first day of the 1 year validity for any approval. Developers need to appeal as this given time is not enough in comparison to the time needed for the actual approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timeliness And Effectiveness**

1. Longer approval process even with pre-submission meetings prior to OSC submission. 14 days’ time frame is given to each technical department to submit their comments for tabling in the OSC meeting. However, after being approved by OSC meeting, there is no control on the time frame for issuance of formal approval to applicants.

2. While LA requires applicants to revert by a stated time period or face penalty/cancellation, the letters issued are often received after the deadline given.

3. The effectiveness of OSC is still questionable since OSC only plays the role of coordinator and application receiver. They are unable to control time frame or to advice on what is required by each technical department for submission.

Source: Survey Among Members On Rehda Malaysia

Based on the persisting problems exist in One Stop Center (OSC) mechanism can be stated that the efficiency and effectiveness of the development proposal approval/application process with implementation of OSC mechanism still questionable. Perhaps, the government have solved the numeral problems arising in development proposal approval/application process with implementation of OSC mechanism through process re-engineering, process restructure, reinvention and
reorganization but the remaining problems cannot be fully addressed. On the similar note, the issue of delay or lengthening of the time required for getting the planning approval still arises in certain development projects. According to the Hambleton et al. (1995), the same situation also occurs in UK in the process of implementing one stop shop concept in local authorities. The effectiveness and accountability of the inter-professional working is also in question. This was also discussed by Illsley et al. (2000) in highlight that several problems arose in UK for one stop shop concept implementation: conflicting advice given by different officers and departments, lack of co-ordination between officers from different departments, officers participating in development control committee meetings who have not been involved and lack of staff back-up.

Because of the above-mentioned problems in development proposal approval/application on the implementation of the One Stop Center (OSC) mechanism, the government departments have adopted the technology to further enhance the development proposal approval/application process. According to the World Bank and IFC (2013), more than 100 of the 183 economies conducted electronic systems for their services ranging. That is to say Governments around the world are making greater use of technology to improve the effectiveness of their processes execution. Market leads to gradual evolution of ICT and technology which in turns causes the evolution of the e-governance, e-service and digital information. With the development of the internet, the government started to enable their land administration system on the internet as they became more service oriented (Williamson et al., 2005; Rajabifard et al., 2007). As a result, the OSC Online was officially launched in 4 Jan 2011 as an instrument to further enhance the development proposal approval/application process and solve the emerging problems. The OSC online is a transformation of the OSC mechanism via the internet. The alternative view to look at OSC Online is to regard it as an online platform for submission and processing application for development proposal. Other than that, one of the main purposes to carry out government OSC online is to replace the application in manual mode of OSC mechanism which was seen as much burdened and complicated for local authority parties and for the applicants. Because of this, the OSC Online system enables PSP/SP to submit the applications directly to the concerned government departments at anytime and anywhere. This system
involves two main modules which are e-Submission and e-Processing and includes eight (8) additional modules such as e-application, e-service request, e-reference, e-guide, e-enquiry, e-complaint, e-payment and e-report card. The main objective of transformation from OSC mechanism to OSC online is to reduce the transaction time by half, enable an online comprehensive land database collection and make the application process more efficient, effective and systematical.

However, the implementation of the OSC Online system also cannot fully address the previous arising issues. The major weaknesses still lie in the development proposal approval/application process of both implementation of OSC mechanism and OSC online. The government organization fail to realize that i) the number of approval/application process steps remains the same as this online platform merely acts as a platform with little help in expediting the development proposal approval/application process (other words, OSC online still depending on the approval/application process and procedures), ii) still depending on the person in charge (such as the department in charge late given the comments or approval/endorsement, OSC online platform cannot do anything and will not facilitate the expedition of the development proposal approval/application process), iii) System still not stable and in on going updating, iv) all the data will be lost if system is hacked by virus, v) if the system breaks all the process will be delayed and damaged, resulting in more time in the application process, vi) more applicants even in related person in charge (government staff) are still not so familiar with the system, which will add additional burden to their work, and vii) the system might be less secure if someone know the user PIN number or the system is hacked by someone else even that the system protected by public key infrastructure technology.

In light of that, the enhancement of development proposal approval/application process still needs further investigation. Even after the transformation by government from before OSC mechanism implementation to OSC implementation until OSC online implementation, persisting problems still exist, especially in the form of development proposal approval/application process performance (efficiency and effectiveness of the process) and lengthy time required for getting the planning approval. It might also be good for government to adopt the other countries’ experience to further investigate issues in this regard. A case in point is that the best
practice in places like Hong Kong SAR, China, it takes only 6 procedures and 71 days in the time required for getting the planning approval. While, for Georgia it only takes 9 procedures and 73.5 days. Even in countries like Singapore, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates and Taiwan, China, it took only 11 procedures, 12 procedures, 12 procedures, 10 procedures and 26 days, 60 days, 44 days, and 94 days respectively in the time required for getting the planning approval. According to the Luis Guillermo Plata (former minister of commerce, industry and tourism of Colombia) stated that: “every country is unique and all different, however each country can go through the certain things, certain key lessons and apply those lessons and see how other country work in their environment” (World Bank and IFC, 2013). However, even though the Malaysia government attempts to adopt the certain things, certain key lessons and apply the lessons based on the other country to enhance the development proposal approval/application process but the efficiency and effectiveness in the development proposal approval/application process is still unsatisfactory and cannot help much in reducing the time required for getting the planning approval. This is because of the development proposal approval/application process in Malaysia is comprises three level of government, viz. level 1: national planning, level 2: regional/state planning and level 3: local planning and these would cause lengthy time required for getting the planning approval if compare to the other country.

Other than that, based on the development proposal approval/application process can be seen as the enhancement with much more emphasis on the elements of i) “People” [the development proposal approval/application process always involves “a multiplicity of decisions and actions” (Drewett, 1973) and “presented as a set of decision chains” (Donnelly et al., 1964; Weiss et al., 1966) as well as the key decisions of the development proposal approval/application process with regards to what decisions will be given, who make them at the various stages (Drewett, 1973) and each decision is as unlocking to the next stage of the process (Gore and Nicholson, 1991)], ii) “Technology” (evolution of ICT, greater use of technology device, OSC online and etc. To enhance the development proposal approval/application process), iii) “Processes” (specific processes, process re-engineering, restructure and redesign for helping in enhance the development proposal approval/application process), iv) “Physical Facilities” (working
environmental, e-Readiness and etc. which would influence the development proposal approval/application process performance) and “Equipment” (computer equipment and office equipment which insufficiently provided will slow down the development proposal approval/application process performance) (MHLG, 2008; Ng S.Y, 2008; Mohamad Fariz, 2009; Lee J.Q, 2010; The World Bank and IFC, 2012).

Therefore, it is evident that the development proposal approval/application process performance are strongly influence by the element of people, technology, processes, physical facilities and equipment to achieve better, more efficient and effective approval process. Moreover, each of these elements is usually interdependent on each other. This is the reason why even several ideas and initiative providers from government organization for development proposal approval/application process enhancement also cannot obtain desirable results due to the expectation setting in government organizations. In other words, most of the ideas and initiative propose by government organizations only focus on particular element such as process re-engineering, restructure, improvement, redesign, upgrading IT infrastructure and system, enhancing employee competency, common utility trench/ service protocol, upgrading GIS, manpower redeployment and etc (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992; Frederickson, 1996; Durst and Newell, 1999; MHLG, 2013; Abdul Jalil, 2004) and the government organizations failed to realize that each of these elements are basically interdependent on each other. Therefore, it is necessary for government to raise awareness in this regard.

For these reasons and in order to bridge this gap, there is a need to understand and involve the service in development proposal approval/application process enhancement. Looking from the theory, concept and foundational of service perspective, the service delivery system should take into consideration the interdependent indicators among people, technology, processes, physical facilities and equipment by which the service is created and delivered (Heskett, 1987; Chase and Bowen, 1991). All of these mentioned are always a concern in the development proposal approval/application process enhancement. Therefore, by adopting the service perspective in development proposal approval/application process enhancement would play an important role to achieving better, and more efficient and effective on the development proposal approval/application process. However, the ideas of interaction between each element, adoption of service perspective as a
way for enhancement as well as knowledge according to the service perspective to create an enhancement in development proposal approval/application process is still rare among the government organizations. As a result of this, government organizations should put emphasis on this service perspective in order to enhance the development proposal approval/application process performance and its effectiveness.

Basically, the service elements are becoming increasingly important in many developed countries, and most of the organizations starting to put emphasis on this service perspectives. By focusing on this service perspective, it will enable the organization to improve their understanding on the customers’ needs and expectations so as to achieve the organization’s goal as well as for better enhancement in organization activity and planning. Therefore, many sectors started to venture into this idea by incorporating the service elements into organization improvement. Other than that, the processes of re-engineering, restructuring, improving, redesigning, reinventing, reorganizing, administrative reform and modernization commonly used as a method to enhance the government organization activities, but perceived as inefficient and ineffective (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992; Frederickson, 1996; Durst and Newell, 1999). Because of this, the role of the service perspective as a new way of exploring the government organization improvement cannot be overlooked. Machuca et al (2007) stated that service industry played an important role with contributions between 60% and 80% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and was recognized as an important contributor to the economy in many developed countries. The same was true in economic sector, industry sector and public sector, manufactured, financial, marketing, consumer behavior, human resource management, telecommunications and operations (Johnston, 1994). These paradigms are showing that most of the organizations started to put emphasis, concern, shifting as well as adoption on service perspectives in organization improvement. Thus, this great role of service perspective cannot be denied in the real estate sector.

Hence, the global competition, market liberalization, devolution and information revolution, service element, service delivery system and service operations management in the 21 century are bringing unprecedented changes to
government organizations and their employees (Mary and Tatiana, 2003). In line with that, most of government organizations began to include the service perspective or service management concept in real estate sector. Despite the increasing research on service perspective in global context, relatively little research applied the idea of service perspective at Malaysia government organization in real estate sector especially in terms of the development proposal approval/application process. Based on the discussion above, the service perspective is playing a key factor for development proposal approval/application process enhancement and among the most crucial resources in enhancing and affecting the development proposal approval/application process performance. However, these service perspectives still obtain less concern as a way to enhance the government organization activity in development proposal approval/application process compared with other cases or fields. In other words, the Malaysia government organizations are yet to investigate the service perspectives as a way for measuring or enhancing the government performance within the development proposal approval/application process. As a result of this, it is necessary to bring government organization’s attention to service perspective since it is still under research in real estate field especially at development proposal approval/application process.

Furthermore, in contemporary time, most of the organizations in developed nations started to put emphasis on service perspectives and began to adopt them in organization improvement. The service design and service delivery system success framework or model has addressed the user satisfaction and applied in many areas by the researchers (Chase, 1987 & 1981; Lovelock, 1983; Schmenner, 1986; Shostack, 1987; Wemmerloev, 1990; Silvestro et al., 1992; Kellog and Nie, 1995; Tinnilae and Vepsaelaeinen, 1995; Lovelock and Yip, 1996; Collier and Meyer, 1998). However, there are yet appropriate framework or model looking at service perspectives proposed as a tool for the development proposal approval/application process enhancement currently exist. Therefore, the current study tried to explore in this aspect to fill up the existing gap in order to enhance the development proposal approval/application process enhancement and reduced the time required in the timeframe setting. Based on the discussion above, the development proposal approval/application process enhancement mostly are focused on studying particular elements such as process re-engineering, restructure, improvement, enhancing
employee competency and etc (MHLG, 2013; Abdul Jalil, 2004; Ng S.Y, 2008; Lee J.Q, 2010; Mohamad Zahirin, 2010; Nina, 2010; Mohamad Zamri, 2010; Mohamad Khasri, 2010; Mohamad Sabri, 2010; Lim L.L, 2011; Tan J.H, 2011) but the government organizations failed to realize that basically the elements of people, technology, processes, physical facilities and equipment are interdependent on each other. Because of this, the Malaysia government organizations have not given enough concern in this area in order to enhance the development proposal approval/application process performance (MHLG, 2013). From this, it is evident that most of the presented works done of development proposal approval/application process enhancement are only concerned in specific process or technology. All of these not covered in the scientific study. Therefore, this current study attempts to bridge this gap to develop a “conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP” from the service perspective in order to enhance the development proposal approval/application process performance and reduced the time required in the development proposal approval/application process timeframe setting.

To sum up, the problem statement in this research can be divided into three major issues.

(i) Most research on service perspective were seen in economic sector as well as in industry sector which focused on the manufactured good, financial services, marketing, consumer behavior, telecommunications and operations (Johnston, 1994; Lovelock, 1983; Sasser et al, 1978; Zeithaml et al, 1985). Moreover, the service perspective is playing a key success factor for development proposal approval/application process enhancement and as among the most crucial resources in enhancing and affecting the development proposal approval/application process performance and effectiveness. However, little attention has been paid to real estate sector even lesser in development proposal approval process. Therefore, this study aims to increase government awareness in this service perspective since it is still under research for development proposal approval/application process enhancement.

(ii) Lack of knowledge and experience at development proposal approval/application process enhancement on service perspective. Based on the
literature search, the development proposal approval/application process basically put much emphasis on the elements of people, technology, specific processes, physical facilities and equipment. According to the service perspective, each of these elements should be interdependent on each other to achieve the better, more efficient and effective in development proposal approval/application process. However, interaction between each element of service perspective as well as knowledge to create an enhancement in development proposal approval/application process is still rare. For these reasons and in order to bridge this gap, this study attempts to highlight the service perspectives factor to create an enhancement for development proposal approval/application process.

(iii) Lack of appropriate framework or model according to service perspective for development proposal approval/application process enhancement. Generally, there are still several weaknesses in the development proposal approval/application process despite several improvement initiatives propose by the government. In addition, based on the literature search, the development proposal approval/application process basically relies on the service perspective and the service perspective is among the most crucial resources in enhancing and affecting the development proposal approval/application process performance. However, there are few framework or model on the service perspective proposed for development proposal approval/application process enhancement. Thus, in order to fill up this gap, this study aims to develop a “conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP” concerning the service perspective so as to enhance the enhancement performance and reduce the time required in the timeframe setting.

1.3 Research Gaps

Based on the discussion above and review in chapter 2 and 3, research gaps have along with a potential research area emerged. In the real estate field, there are yet investigations on the services perspective as a tool in enhancing the development
proposal approval process. The theoretical reviewed prove that the development proposal approval process rely on the service perspective in evaluation of the process performance. Additionally, service perspectives are among the most crucial resources in enhancing and affecting the development proposal approval process (DPAP) performance and helping reduce the time required in development proposal approval process (DPAP) timeframe setting. Because of this, the service perspective is playing an important role in development proposal approval process enhancement. Therefore, the researcher believes that an investigation into the service perspective with development proposal approval process enhancement may open new avenues of opportunity to enhance the DPAP performance and reduce the time required in DPAP timeframe setting. Other than that, it creates a new potential area for research that links the service perspectives with the development proposal approval process enhancement.

1.4 Research Questions

The main research question in this study is identified as “How the DPAP enhancement can be explored from the service perspective in order to enhance the DPAP performance and reduce the time required in DPAP timeframe setting?” Based on this context, this research seeks to understand the relationship in between the DPAP enhancement with the service perspective. As a result of this, the study aims to provide answers to the following pertinent questions:

(i) What are the elements of development proposal approval process (DPAP) enhancement based on the service perspective?
(ii) How to evaluate the existing model of development proposal approval process (DPAP)?
(iii) How could a practical conceptual enhancement model of the development proposal approval process (DPAP) be developed?
(iv) How could the practical conceptual enhancement model of the development proposal approval process (DPAP) be validated?
1.5 Research Aim

The aim of this research is to develop a practical conceptual enhancement model of the development proposal approval process (DPAP) to enhance the DPAP performance and reduce the time required in DPAP timeframe setting.

1.6 Objectives of the Research

In response to the above research problems, gaps and questions, this study focuses on the following objectives:

(i) To identify elements of development proposal approval process (DPAP) enhancement based on the service perspective.
(ii) To evaluate the existing model of development proposal approval process (DPAP).
(iii) To develop a practical conceptual enhancement model of the development proposal approval process (DPAP).
(iv) To validate the conceptual enhancement model of the development proposal approval process (DPAP).

1.7 Research Contribution

The contribution of this study can be divided into four important areas:

i) Open New Avenues of Opportunity for DPAP Enhancement

This research provides valuable reference for DPAP enhancement regarding how to employ the services perspective as a tool in enhancing the development proposal approval process. There are lacks of research, knowledge, experience, framework and model on the service perspective for DPAP enhancement in current literature. Therefore, this research may provide professional practices for
DPAP enhancement and open a new avenue of opportunity to enhance the DPAP performance and reduce the time required in DPAP timeframe setting.

ii) Academic and Knowledge

To date, in academic filed few research investigate the services perspective as a tool in enhancing the development proposal approval process. Therefore, this research will add value to the current academic and knowledge for DPAP enhancement. This research also creates a new potential area for research that links the service perspectives with the DPAP enhancement. In future investigation, the developed conceptual model can be modified and act as the foundation for model development in other cases or field with the similar perspective and characteristic.

iii) Government Department Responsibility in DPAP

Basically, service perspectives are among the most crucial resources in enhancing and affecting the DPAP performance and effectiveness. Therefore, throughout this study the concerning government departments will realize and understand the importance of service perspective in DPAP. Other than that, the research provides the concerning government departments a tool to enhance the DPAP performance and reduce the time required in DPAP timeframe setting. By adapting the conceptual model developed, the concerning government departments can make the decision more easily and smoothly with the DPAP. Moreover, developed conceptual model also help to solve or reduce the unnecessary problem arising in the DPAP. Overall, “a practical conceptual enhancement model for the development proposal approval process” based on the service perspective will provide a valuable reference for concerning government departments in enhancing the DPAP performance and reducing the time required in DPAP timeframe setting.
1.8 **Scope of Research**

The scope of this study covers three major aspects as described in the following:

(i) The research focuses on the service perspectives in DPAP enhancement in order to enhance the its performance and reduce the time required in DPAP timeframe setting.

(ii) The target respondents in this research only focuses on ‘OSC Department’, ‘Planning Department Local Authority’ and ‘Building and Engineering Local Authority’ that are familiar with the development proposal approval process.

(iii) Only the Johor State was selected as the research area of this study.

1.9 **Overview of Research Methodology**

In this study, to accomplish the research objectives, the research is divided into five stages as follows:

(i) Literature review

(ii) Identification of the elements of development proposal approval process (DPAP) enhancement based on the service perspective

(iii) Evaluation the existing model of development proposal approval process (DPAP)

(iv) Developing a conceptual enhancement model of the development proposal approval process (DPAP)

(v) Validation of conceptual enhancement model of the development proposal approval process (DPAP)

In this chapter 1.10 the research methodology are briefly explained and the detail research methodology was illustrated in chapter 4. Then, the Figure 1.1 below illustrates the overview of research methodology.
RESEARCH ISSUE:

1. The service perspective to DPAP enhancement remains insufficiently investigated
2. Lack of knowledge and experience on the connection between the service perspective and DPAP
3. Lack of practical conceptual enhancement model for DPAP based on the service perspective
4. The performance of DPAP still inefficient and ineffective
5. Lengthy time required in DPAP

RESEARCH AIM:

The aim of this research is to develop a practical conceptual enhancement model for the development proposal approval process (DPAP) to enhance the DPAP performance and reduce the time required in DPAP timeframe setting.

Figure 1.1 Summary of Research Methodology
1.9.1 Literature Review

A comprehensive literature review is done to examine the overall development proposal approval process (DPAP) and discuss the existing knowledge related to DPAP enhancement via the service perspectives. The four (4) most relevant theories in DPAP enhancement based on the service perspective are, namely: Unified Service Theory (UST), Knowledge Management Theory, Decision Theory and Information Processing Theory were review. The detailed illustration of the literature review was provided in chapters 2, 3 and 4.

1.9.2 Identification of the Elements of Development Proposal Approval Process Enhancement based on the Service Perspective

In this stage, the elements of the development proposal approval process (DPAP) enhancement based on the service perspective are determined through primary and secondary sources such as interviews with Assistant Director in Division of Local Government Policy and Improvement at Ministry of Housing and Local Government (MHLG), interviews with “Inspectorate and Quality Team” at the MHLG and Department of Town and Country Planning (DTCP), existing researches, journals, articles, bulletin, newspaper articles, government documents, government initiative, World Bank Doing Business Report, book and thesis. The comprehensive literature search identifies and confirms the elements of DPAP enhancement based on the service perspective which included core processes, common practices and activities. These elements were adopted to develop a conceptual enhancement model of the development proposal approval process (DPAP).

1.9.3 Evaluation the Existing Model of Development Proposal Approval Process (DPAP)

Stage III is to review and evaluate the existing model related to the development proposal approval process (DPAP) model. This stage began by
overviewing the alternative modelling techniques, evaluating the modelling techniques then selecting the most appropriate and capabilities modelling technique to fit the purpose in developing the “conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP”. The mathematical modelling technique, logic modelling technique and process modelling technique were reviewed and discussed. In ‘process modelling technique’, five (5) most relevant modelling techniques, viz.: Integrated Computer Aided Manufacturing Definition (IDEF0), Petri Net (PN), Data Flow Diagram (DFD), Role Activity Diagrams (RAD) and Process Flow Chart (PFC) were further comprehensively reviewed. Then, each of the relevant modelling techniques was evaluated based on the DPAP modelling objective, perspective and characteristic. In the end of this stage, the most appropriate modeling technique was selected to construct the DPAP model. The detail illustration was provided in chapters 3.

1.9.4 Developing a Conceptual Enhancement Model of the Development Proposal Approval Process (DPAP)

According to the elements being identified in Stage II, the “conceptual enhancement model of the development proposal approval process (DPAP)” is developed based on the modelling technique selected in Stage III. In this case, the Process Flow Chart (PFC) modelling technique is employed. The reason Process Flow Chart (PFC) was chosen as the model techniques in this case was that the Process Flow Chart (PFC) was the most appropriate modelling technique in matching the required perspectives, characters and the modelling objective setting in this study. This modelling technique is also supported and confirmed by most of the researchers (Heskett, 1987; Chase and Bowen, 1991; Ballantyne et al, 1995; Shostack, 1987; Kingman-Brundage, 1992; Kim & Kim, 2001; Lynch & Cross, 1995; Shieff & Brodie, 1995). Besides this, together with these Process Flow Chart (PFC) modelling technique and the identification elements, “a conceptual enhancement model of the development proposal approval process (DPAP)” was developed based on the step approach proposed by the Galloway (1994). The main outcome of this stage was to develop “a conceptual enhancement model of the development proposal approval process (DPAP)”.
1.9.5 Validation of Conceptual Enhancement Model of the Development Proposal Approval Process (DPAP)

The purpose of this stage is to validate the conceptual enhancement model of the development proposal approval process (DPAP). Along with this purpose, verification, effectiveness study and feasibility study were conducted to ensure the conceptual model developed to fulfil its intended purpose. First and foremost, the DPAP conceptual enhancement model was verified through the experts’ interview. A comprehensive questionnaire is developed and fifteen respondents in Planning Department Local Authority at Johor state were selected as the subjects of this study. Ultimately, the conceptual model was revised based on the experts’ comments and opinions. The main outcome at this verification was an improved version of the “conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP”. After this, an effectiveness study is carried out to explore whether effectiveness of the conceptual model could enhance the DPAP performance and reduce the time required in DPAP timeframe setting. In line with this purpose, a survey method was employed. In this case, fifteen of the respondents in Building and Engineering Local Authority at Johor state were selected as the subjects of this effectiveness study. Consequently, effectiveness of the “conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP” in enhancing the DPAP performance and reducing the time required in DPAP timeframe setting was determined based on the analysis results obtained. Lastly, a feasibility study is conducted to evaluate the potentiality of the conceptual model developed would be accepted by the industrial needs and also to ensure that the research is establishing the right model. A comprehensive feasibility survey form is developed and submitted to the relative OSC departments at Johor state that participating in this feasibility study. Eventually, the analysis results obtained from the respondents’ feedback would be able to confirm the feasibility of the “conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP”.
1.10 Thesis Outline

This study consists of six (6) chapters. The contents in this section are provided with a brief description on the overall image in this study. The individual chapters are as follows:

Chapter 1 presents the introduction, general background as well as overview overall image of this research. It introduces the whole ideas of the study, nature of problem investigated, aim of study, objectives and scope of study along with the methodology used. A brief research contribution, research process and outline of each chapter are also discussed in this chapter.

Chapter 2 provides a comprehensive literature review on existing knowledge related to development proposal approval process enhancement. The philosophy and the background of Malaysia development proposal approval process, World Bank Doing Business expectation, development proposal approval process transformation, the scholarly literatures, government initiative, service perspectives and concept, relationship between the service perspective, World Bank expectation and DPAP as well as related theories, framework and model are reviewed. Conclusively, this chapter illustrates a clearer understanding between the relationship of service perspective and DPAP, contemporary times of DPAP enhancement and the challenges in developing the conceptual model.

Chapter 3 sets up and highlights the development proposal approval process enhancement based on the service perspective regarding the related theory and take into consideration of the five (5) domain elements (core process) including people, technology, physical facilities, equipment and the specific processes. The five (5) domain elements (core process) were further examined and explored to the development proposal approval process enhancement based on the service perspective framework in identified associated common practices and activities. Through this exploration, the identified elements were adopted as foundation to develop the “conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP”. Furthermore, this chapter also reviews and identifies the most appropriate modelling techniques for developing the “conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP”. In the end of the
chapter, a “conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP” was developed based on the selected techniques and the identified elements.

Chapter 4 illustrates the processes and methodology to achieve the research objective in this study. This consists of research design, research strategy, research method, research procedures, flowchart of the research procedures as well as analysis method, findings and discussion from both primary and secondary data.

Chapter 5 details the process of verification, effectiveness study and feasibility study towards the “conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP”. It includes the procedures of expert interview, instruments, data inquiry designation and data analysis method. In the end of chapter, the conceptual model is verified; an improved version of “conceptual enhancement model of the DPAP” is formed; the effectiveness of the conceptual model in enhancing the DPAP performance and reducing the time required in DPAP timeframe setting is tested; and the feasibility of the “conceptual enhancement model for DPAP” is ensured.

The final Chapter 6 presents the overall conclusion, achievement of objectives, limitation and recommendation for further investigation.
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