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This study was undertaken to evaluate the extent of existing residential park facilities provision in Seri Manjung New Town, Perak Darul Ridzuan in fulfilling users’ recreation needs. Basically, this study answered four objectives namely, to compare the provision of existing park facilities with the Planning Standard requirement, to describe current use pattern of residential parks in Seri Manjung New Town, and to estimate users’ recreation needs based on the Importance Performance Analysis of residential park facilities.

The data was successfully collected through park observations and questionnaire survey. The response rate for questionnaire survey was good whereby all 420 questionnaires from sample respondents were successfully collected. Descriptive analysis and Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) were applied as the main instruments to evaluate park facility performance. The use pattern of residential parks in the study area was described based on nine items namely income, frequency of park visit, age group, gender, visiting time, guardian permission, night park visit, popular recreation activity, and responsibility towards park facility. The IPA assessed the park facilities performance in fulfilling users’ needs.

The outcomes of this study generally showed that Manjung Municipal Council failed to meet the standard requirement in the provision of park facilities in the study area.
Among the seven parks, only one park achieved 67% compliance rate, four (4) parks at 50% and two (2) parks managed to comply only 25% of the standard requirement. Findings on the IPA indicated that among the seven residential parks, three parks needed attention (high importance but low performance) while the rest were rated as good work (high importance and high performance).
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1.1 **Overview of Malaysian Scenario in Park Management**

The management system of the Government of Malaysia composed of three tiers that are the Central Government, the State Government and the Local Authority. The central government is the policy maker for the whole country and the state government is obliged to accept and translate these national policies into state policies. In the process of translating these policies, the state government is entitled to amend and revise the policies to suit local needs. Then, the state government will instruct the local authorities to implement these policies within their areas. In relation to park management, the local authorities are the responsible bodies to implement relevant policies adopted by the state government, in the form of park development for public utilization. In view of the fact that parks provision are meant for public use, their needs should be incorporated in the parks development stage. Torkildsen (1992) also highlighted that the performance of parks management not only depends on the administrative relationship, which is between central government, state government and local authority but should also include the consideration for users’ needs.
1.2 Evolution of Residential Park Management

Parks fall within the open space category as stipulated within the legal definition under the Malaysian laws. In view of this understanding on open space the term ‘parks’ instead of open space will be used throughout this thesis. Residential parks are open spaces allocated within housing areas for purpose of conducting recreation activities.

The provision of parks for recreation activities took a significant step forward through its inclusion in the statutory planning procedures, the Town and Country Planning Act (Amendment), Act A933 in 1995. The effect on planning procedures was the introduction of terms of reference for planned provision of space in which standard and hierarchies of parks became the conditions in layout plan approvals. The central government has imposed conditions on every local authority to ensure the provision of parks in the development through planning applications, where developers must indicate that 10% of the total development area is for parks development and surrendered to the related local authorities upon completion of the parks. According to the Planning Standard for Open Space and Recreation (1997; 2000) these parks are allocated for the purposes of recreation and leisure activities where the public are allowed to enter free of charge.

These residential parks are managed by the relevant local authorities serving the particular residential area, specified in the directive given in Section 63 of the Local Government Act, Act 171. Local authorities as the management bodies are responsible to manage their parks in line with relevant policies formulated at the national level by the central government. Basically, park management at local