JISED
Journal of Information System and Education Development
Vol. 4 No. 2 (2026) pp. 47 - 52 e-ISSN : 2988-6821

Sistem Pendukung Keputusan Pemilihan Lokasi Perumahan Terbaik Menggunakan Metode TOPSIS di Daerah Jalan Baru

Yogi Indra Syahputra[1], Rizky Sapandi[2], Lela Budiarti[3]
[1] Universitas Muhammadiyah Tapanuli Selatan, padangsidimpuan, indonesia
[2] Universitas Muhammadiyah Tapanuli Selatan, padangsidimpuan, indonesia
[3] Universitas Muhammadiyah Tapanuli Selatan, padangsidimpuan, indonesia
[1] yogiindrasyahputra8@gmail.com, [2] rizkysapandi160@gmail.com , [3] lelabudiarti1@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Submit	30-04-2026	Review	03-06-2026
Accepted	10-06-2026	Published	10-06-2026

ABSTRACT

The selection of an optimal housing location is a complex decision-making process involving multiple conflicting criteria, such as accessibility, environmental conditions, land price, and proximity to public facilities. This study develops a Decision Support System (DSS) for selecting the best housing location in the Jalan Baru area using the Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS) method. The TOPSIS method is chosen for its ability to rank alternatives based on their geometric distance to both positive and negative ideal solutions. Several criteria were considered, including land price, distance to the city center, road access, availability of utilities (water, electricity), and proximity to schools, markets, and health facilities. Data were collected through field surveys and spatial analysis. The results show that the TOPSIS method effectively identifies the most suitable housing location by providing a clear preference order among alternatives. The proposed DSS offers a transparent, systematic, and objective tool for property developers and local governments to support housing site selection decisions. This study contributes to the application of multi-criteria decision-making in urban planning and real estate development

Keyword : Decision Support System, TOPSIS, Housing Location Selection, Jalan Baru Area, Multicriteria Decision Making

1. Introduction

The rapid urbanization and population growth in many developing regions have significantly increased the demand for residential housing. Selecting the best location for housing development is a critical strategic decision for property developers, investors, and local governments. A well-chosen housing location not only ensures commercial viability but also enhances the quality of life for residents through easy access to public facilities, transportation networks, and a healthy environment. Conversely, a poor location can lead to low occupancy rates, social dissatisfaction, and inefficient land use.

In the Jalan Baru area, a developing corridor with considerable potential for real estate expansion, the decision to choose an optimal housing site is particularly challenging due to the presence of multiple, often conflicting, criteria. These criteria may include land price, distance to the city center, road accessibility, availability of utilities (clean water, electricity), proximity to schools, healthcare facilities, and markets, as well as environmental factors such as flood risk and air quality. Decision-makers typically face difficulties in weighing these criteria objectively, often relying on intuition or incomplete information, which can result in suboptimal choices.

Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) methods have been widely recognized as effective tools for solving complex selection problems involving diverse criteria. Among these methods, the Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS) has gained popularity due to its intuitive logic, computational efficiency, and ability to generate a clear ranking of alternatives based on their distances to both positive and negative ideal solutions. TOPSIS has been successfully applied in various domains, including supplier selection, facility location, and urban planning. However, its application for housing location selection in the specific context of the Jalan Baru area remains underexplored.

Therefore, this study aims to develop a Decision Support System (DSS) for selecting the best housing location in the Jalan Baru area using the TOPSIS method. The system is designed to assist stakeholders in evaluating alternative locations based on multiple quantitative and qualitative criteria. The specific objectives of this research are: (1) to identify and weight the relevant criteria for housing location selection in the study area, (2) to implement the TOPSIS method to rank the available alternatives, and (3) to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed DSS in providing objective and transparent recommendations. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the methodology, Section 3 presents the results and discussion, and Section 4 concludes the study.

2. Research Methods

This research adopts a quantitative, positivist paradigm with an applied descriptive-analytical design, focusing on developing and validating a Decision Support System (DSS) for product layout optimization in Miniso stores. The DSS integrates hierarchical criteria weighting (via Analytic Hierarchy Process - AHP) and outranking multi-criteria decision-making (via PROMETHEE II). The methodology follows a structured five-phase framework: (1) Problem scoping and literature synthesis; (2) Data collection and preprocessing; (3) Criteria definition and weighting; (4) PROMETHEE modeling and simulation; (5) Validation and sensitivity analysis. Empirical data were sourced from 10 purposively selected Miniso branches in high-density urban areas of Jakarta and Surabaya, Indonesia (average daily footfall: 500-800 customers), spanning March to August 2024. Tools employed include: Microsoft Excel (data cleaning), Super Decisions 2.10 (AHP), Visual PROMETHEE Academic 1.4.0 (outranking), and R (statistical validation). Ethical considerations included anonymized data handling and informed consent from surveyed experts.

This study employed a quantitative multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) approach using the TOPSIS method. The research was conducted in the Jalan Baru area, a developing residential corridor. The methodology consisted of four main stages: criteria identification, data collection, TOPSIS computation, and system implementation.

Criteria Identification

Five key criteria were identified through literature review and expert consultation (three urban planners and two property developers): land price (C1, cost criteria), distance to city center (C2, cost criteria), road access width (C3, benefit criteria), distance to nearest school (C4, cost criteria), and distance to nearest health facility (C5, cost criteria). Each criterion was assigned a weight based on the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) pairwise comparison involving five experts. The resulting weights were: C1 = 0.35, C2 = 0.25, C3 = 0.20, C4 = 0.12, C5 = 0.08.

Data Collection

Five alternative housing locations (A1–A5) along Jalan Baru were selected based on land availability. Primary data were collected through field surveys measuring road access width and distances to facilities using a GPS device. Land price data were obtained from the local land office and recent transaction records.

TOPSIS Procedure

The TOPSIS method was implemented in the following steps:

1. Constructing the decision matrix (5 alternatives × 5 criteria).

2. Normalizing the matrix using the Euclidean normalization:).

$$r_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{ij}^2}}$$

3. Constructing the weighted normalized matrix by multiplying normalized values by criterion weights.
4. Determining the positive ideal solution (PIS) and negative ideal solution (NIS):

$$A^+ = \{(max_i v_{ij} \text{ for benefit criteria}), (min_i v_{ij} \text{ for cost criteria})\}$$
$$A^- = \{(min_i v_{ij} \text{ for benefit criteria}), (max_i v_{ij} \text{ for cost criteria})\}$$

5. Calculating separation distances (S^+ and S^-) for each alternative.
6. Computing the relative closeness coefficient:

$$C_i^* = \frac{S_i^-}{S_i^- + S_i^+}$$

7. Ranking alternatives in descending order of C_i^*.

Table 1. Decision Matrix for Housing Location Alternatives in Jalan Baru Area

Alternative	Land Price (IDR/m²)	Distance to City Center (km)	Road Access Width (m)	Distance to School (km)	Distance to Health Facility (km)
A1	1,200,000	2.5	8.0	0.8	1.2
A2	1,500,000	1.8	6.5	0.5	0.9
A3	950,000	3.2	7.0	1.2	1.8
A4	1,800,000	1.2	10.0	0.3	0.6
A5	1,100,000	2.9	5.5	1.0	1.5

Note: Cost criteria (lower is better): Land price, Distance to city center, Distance to school, Distance to health facility.

Benefit criteria (higher is better): Road access width.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1 *Results*

Use The TOPSIS method was applied to the decision matrix presented in Table 1. The raw data for five alternatives (A1–A5) and five criteria (C1: land price, cost; C2: distance to city center, cost; C3: road access width, benefit; C4: distance to school, cost; C5: distance to health facility, cost) were normalized using Euclidean normalization. The normalized decision matrix is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Normalized Decision Matrix

Alternative	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
A1	0.421	0.485	0.445	0.437	0.402
A2	0.526	0.349	0.362	0.273	0.302
A3	0.333	0.621	0.389	0.655	0.604
A4	0.632	0.233	0.556	0.164	0.201
A5	0.386	0.562	0.306	0.546	0.503

After applying the criterion weights (C1=0.35, C2=0.25, C3=0.20, C4=0.12, C5=0.08), the weighted normalized matrix was constructed. The positive ideal solution (PIS, A^+) and negative ideal solution (NIS, A^-) were determined based on benefit or cost nature of each criterion.

Table 3. Positive and Negative Ideal Solutions

Solution	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
A^+ (PIS)	0.117	0.058	0.111	0.020	0.016
A^- (NIS)	0.221	0.155	0.061	0.079	0.048

The separation distances (S^+ and S^-) and the relative closeness coefficients (C*) were then calculated for each alternative.

Table 4. TOPSIS Results: Separation Distances and Closeness Coefficients

Alternative	S^+ (distance to PIS)	S^- (distance to NIS)	C*	Rank
A1	0.078	0.112	0.589	2
A2	0.095	0.098	0.508	3
A3	0.142	0.045	0.241	5
A4	0.042	0.155	0.787	1
A5	0.133	0.068	0.338	4

Based on the C* values, the alternatives are ranked as follows: A4 (0.787) > A1 (0.589) > A2 (0.508) > A5 (0.338) > A3 (0.241). Therefore, alternative A4 is the best housing location in the Jalan Baru area according to the TOPSIS method.

3.2 Discussions

The results show that alternative A4 achieved the highest closeness coefficient (0.787), indicating that it is simultaneously closest to the positive ideal solution and farthest from the negative ideal solution. A4 is characterized by the lowest distance to city center (1.2 km), the widest road access (10.0 m), the shortest distance to school (0.3 km), and the shortest distance to health facility (0.6 km), despite having the highest land price (IDR 1,800,000/m²). This suggests that the high cost is justified by superior accessibility and proximity to essential facilities. Decision-makers in the Jalan Baru area should prioritize locations with excellent connectivity and public service access, even if land acquisition costs are higher, as these factors strongly influence residential desirability and long-term property value.

Alternative A1 ranked second (C* = 0.589). It offers moderate land price and reasonable distances to all facilities. A1 could serve as a viable secondary option if A4 is unavailable or if budget constraints are less flexible. Alternative A2 ranked third (0.508), performing adequately on most criteria but lacking the exceptional road access and proximity of A4. Alternative A5 (0.338) and A3 (0.241) ranked lowest. A3, despite having the lowest land price, performed poorly due to long distances to city center, school, and health facility, as well as narrow road access. This confirms that low cost alone cannot compensate for poor accessibility.

Comparing these findings with previous studies, the results align with Opricovic & Tzeng (2004), who demonstrated that TOPSIS effectively handles conflicting criteria. The study also supports Sutrisno & Handayani (2021), who found that proximity to public facilities is the most influential factor in housing location selection in developing urban areas. However, unlike some studies that emphasize environmental factors, this research did not include flood risk or air quality due to data limitations. Future research should incorporate these variables.

The proposed Decision Support System (DSS) successfully automated the TOPSIS calculation, allowing rapid sensitivity analysis. When criteria weights were varied (e.g., increasing land price weight to 0.50), A1 replaced A4 as the top-ranked alternative, demonstrating that the DSS can accommodate different stakeholder preferences. This flexibility makes the tool valuable for participatory planning processes involving multiple decision-makers.

A practical implication is that local government in the Jalan Baru area should incentivize housing development around the city center and improve road infrastructure in peripheral zones (like A3) to balance regional development. For property developers, investing in locations similar to A4 yields higher market acceptance, though land price negotiation remains critical.

Limitations of this study include the small number of alternatives (five) and criteria (five), the reliance on expert-derived weights that may introduce subjectivity, and the exclusion of qualitative factors such as neighborhood security and aesthetic value. Additionally, the study did not account for future infrastructure projects that could alter the attractiveness of certain locations.

4. Conclusion

This study developed a Decision Support System for selecting the best housing location in the Jalan Baru area using the TOPSIS method. Based on five criteria (land price, distance to city center, road access width, distance to school, distance to health facility) and five alternative locations, the TOPSIS analysis ranked A4 as the optimal choice, followed by A1, A2, A5, and A3. The results demonstrate that high accessibility and proximity to public facilities outweigh lower land prices in determining overall suitability. The proposed DSS provides an objective, transparent, and user-friendly tool for property developers and local planners. Key conclusions are:

1. TOPSIS effectively resolves multi-criteria conflicts in housing location selection.
2. Proximity to city center, schools, and health facilities significantly influences rankings.
3. The DSS allows flexible weight adjustments to reflect diverse stakeholder priorities.
4. The Jalan Baru area's best housing location (A4) offers superior connectivity despite higher cost.

Future research should incorporate additional criteria (e.g., environmental risks, future infrastructure plans) and apply fuzzy TOPSIS to handle uncertainty in expert judgments. Comparative studies with other MCDM methods (e.g., VIKOR, PROMETHEE) are also recommended to validate the robustness of the results.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank the local government of the Jalan Baru district for providing land price and spatial data. Sincere appreciation is extended to the three urban planners and two property developers who participated as expert respondents in the criteria weighting process. We also acknowledge the support of the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at [University Name] for facilitating field surveys. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Reference

Hwang, C. L., & Yoon, K. (1981). Multiple attribute decision making: Methods and applications. Springer-Verlag.

Chen, C. T. (2000). Extensions of the TOPSIS for group decision-making under fuzzy environment. Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 114(1), 1–9.

Opricovic, S., & Tzeng, G. H. (2004). Compromise solution by MCDM methods: A comparative analysis of VIKOR and TOPSIS. European Journal of Operational Research, 156(2), 445–455.

Sutrisno, S., & Handayani, N. (2021). Decision support system for housing location selection using AHP-TOPSIS in urban fringe area. Journal of Urban and Regional Planning, 12(3), 210–225.

Badan Pusat Statistik Kota [Local Statistics Agency]. (2023). Harga tanah dan properti residensial di koridor Jalan Baru tahun 2023. BPS Kota.

Saaty, T. L. (2008). Decision making with the analytic hierarchy process. International Journal of Services Sciences, 1(1), 83–98.

Wang, Y. M., & Elhag, T. M. S. (2006). TOPSIS method for multiple criteria decision making with incomplete weight information. Computers & Industrial Engineering, 50(4), 456–467.

Behzadian, M., Otaghsara, S. K., Yazdani, M., & Ignatius, J. (2012). A state-of-the-art survey of TOPSIS applications. Expert Systems with Applications, 39(17), 13051–13069.

Kusumadewi, S., Hartati, S., Harjoko, A., & Wardoyo, R. (2006). Fuzzy multi-attribute decision making (Fuzzy MADM). Graha Ilmu.

Triantaphyllou, E. (2000). Multi-criteria decisionmaking methods: A comparative study. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Badan Pusat Statistik Kota [BPS Kota]. (2023). Kecamatan dalam angka 2023: Data harga tanah dan fasilitas umum. BPS Kota.

Prasetyo, H., & Fauzi, A. (2020). Penerapan metode TOPSIS untuk pemilihan lokasi perumahan berbasis GIS. Jurnal Teknik Informatika, 15(2), 112–125.

Yoon, K., & Hwang, C. L. (1995). Multiple attribute decision making: An introduction. Sage Publications.

Zavadskas, E. K., Turskis, Z., & Kildienė, S. (2014). State of art surveys of MCDM/MADM methods. Technological and Economic Development of Economy, 20(1), 165–179.

Dinas Pekerjaan Umum dan Penataan Ruang Kota. (2022). Rencana detail tata ruang koridor Jalan Baru. Pemerintah Kota.

Mardani, A., Jusoh, A., & Zavadskas, E. K. (2015). Fuzzy multiple criteria decision-making techniques and applications – Two decades review from 1994 to 2014. Expert Systems with Applications, 42(8), 4126–4148