



PLANNING MALAYSIA:
Journal of the Malaysian Institute of Planners
VOLUME 15 ISSUE 3 (2017), Page 93 – 104

DUPLICATION OF URBAN PLANNING FUNCTIONS IN A NIGERIAN STATE: UNCOVERING THE CAUSALITY

Oluwole Daramola¹, Olorunfemi Olojede², Akintayo Ojo³, & Oluwaseun Olowoporoku⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Department of Urban and Regional Planning
OBAFEMI AWOLowo UNIVERSITY, ILE-IFE, NIGERIA

ABSTRACT

This study examines the duplication in urban planning functions in Osun State of Nigeria. Data for the study were sourced from questionnaire administered on the directors of all the 35 planning agencies in the state. Data collected include respondents' characteristics and the operation of the planning agencies and these were analysed using frequency distribution. The study revealed that the agencies experienced conflict of interest and the reason for that was mostly jurisdictional. Also, the agencies seldom related with one another. The study concluded that the structure of urban administration in the state causes duplication of urban planning functions and recommends, among others, legislative changes in urban administration of the state and Nigeria.

Keywords: administration, duplication, Nigeria, planning, urban

Date Received: 15th March 2017

Date of Acceptance: 21st September 2017

¹Corresponding Author: oluwoledaramola@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Several researchers have stated that cities of many developing countries, Nigeria inclusive, are not properly governed; a factor that accounts for their poor state and lack of significant contributions to the national economy (Pieterse 2000; UN-HABITAT 2001; Davoudi & Evans 2005; Swilling 2006; UN-HABITAT 2008; Falade 2010; Olawuni & Daramola, 2013). The resulting experiences include institutional fragmentation, multiplication of agencies, disparity of powers and responsibilities across different tiers and departments of governmental and non-governmental institutions and confusion over 'who does what' (Davoudi & Evans, 2005). A notable factor identified for the improper governance of these cities is lack of municipal administration (UN-HABITAT 2001; Davoudi & Evans 2005; Popescu, 2006; Falade 2010; UNDP/UN-HABITAT/NBS, 2011; Olawuni & Daramola, 2013).

Municipal administration refers to local administration authorities managing the entities defined as municipalities (Popescu, 2006). Popescu further put it that municipality has three distinctive characteristics: an area delimited by well-defined administrative boundaries; an area with a predominantly urban character; and an area governed by a local body of elected authorities, at a lower administrative tier. From the above, it is observable that municipal administration is applicable to cities and towns of all sizes and not to a division or fragmentation of a city or town nor the simple disaggregation of higher government tiers. In this context, municipal administration aims at achieving its mandate from the policies it has to implement and its effectiveness in serving the citizens and turning political intentions into reality (Popescu, 2006).

Historically, municipal administration is practised in Nigeria. Before Nigeria was colonised by Britain in 1861, city administration was provided by the paramount rulers or political heads of settlements as the *Obas* (among the *Yorubas* in the Southwest), *Obis* (among the *Ibos* in the Southeast) and *Emirs* (among the *Hausas* in the North). The Nigerian cities were characterised with self-governance in commerce, security and environmental sanitation. In the colonial era, Native Administrative Authority was introduced as an attempt to fit local administration to the traditional political structure (Falade 1985). The summary is that during these periods in Nigeria, cities were considered as centres of governance expected to generate revenue and perform urban functions on their own.

The practice of city-wide governance also extended to the Nigerian post-independence era that started in 1960. Notable in this regard is the formulation of the 1976 Guidelines for Local Government Reform. According to the 1976 Guidelines for Local Government Reform, regardless of population, no town or city should be split between two primary local governments; the whole planning area surrounding a town should be in the same primary local government. Also, any two or more towns, contiguous or not, which are close to each other as to

make up a conurbation, the whole should, with the planning peripheries, be in the same local government area (Federal Government of Nigeria, 1976). However, subsequent review of the reform negated the original idea and accorded no recognition for respect of city boundaries and their population size in creating urban local governments.

The divergence from the practice of city-wide is also embedded in the operative 1999 Constitution of Nigeria and the earlier enacted 1992 Nigerian Urban and Regional Planning Act. Constitutionally, Nigeria practises the federal system of government comprising federal, state and local governments. However, the Nigerian constitution makes town planning strictly a residual matter. This indicates that only the state governments that can legislate on town planning. Also, the constitution gives no clear mandates on urban planning to the local government. The main objective of the 1992 Nigerian Urban and Regional Planning Act is the promotion of land use planning and development control functions of the three-tier government structure in the country (Federal Government of Nigeria, 1992). The act sets up a commission at the federal level, a board in each of the 36 states, and a local planning authority in each of 774 local government areas. The act provides that development plans such as regional plan, sub-regional plan, urban plan and subject plan could be prepared by bodies at the three levels. In the same vein, all these bodies are saddled with the responsibility of carrying out development control within their areas of jurisdiction.

The realisation of the problem of uncoordinated urban planning in Nigeria has led to the creation of State Capital Development Authority by some state governments. This is to ensure the coordinated planning of the metropolitan area of the state capitals known as state capital territory. Nonetheless, the approach has created conflicts between the state and local government areas in the territory, with the latter accusing the former of hijacking their constitutional roles. For example, it is a common occurrence for development permit granted by the local planning authorities to be considered illegal by the State Capital Development Authority. Also, different state agencies have been created to perform constitutional roles of local governments such as construction and maintenance of access roads, streets, street lightings, drains and other public highways, parks, gardens and open spaces. If these trends continue unabated, Nigerian cities will lack coordinated urban planning that is necessary for their efficient and effective functioning.

A number of studies have been conducted on the necessity for city-wide administration in the quest for efficient and effective cities (Sharma, 1989; UN-HABITAT 2001; Davoudi & Evans 2005; Popescu, 2006). However, a review of the available literature has shown that only a few surveys relating to Nigeria and its federating unit exist on urban planning, and specifically the proliferation of planning agencies. Moreover, in Nigeria, most of the studies conducted were on sustainability of the cities (Falade, 2010), assessment of good urban governance

(UNDP/UN-HABITAT/NBS, 2011) and provision of environmental amenities (Olawuni & Daramola, 2013). Again, these past studies have focussed on residents and local government areas. Thus, no known previous studies have been conducted to provide information on the functions of planning agencies and the effects of that on urban planning. It is against the foregoing background that this study was conceived to assess the effects of city governance on the proliferation of planning agencies and duplication of planning functions in Osun State of Nigeria. To address this main goal, four research questions were formulated and they are specified as follows: What levels of planning agencies are in the state and what are their key activity areas? What is the relationship between the planning agencies belonging to same and different levels of government? What are the causes of conflict of functions, causes of the conflict and rate of conflict? What operations are make the planning agencies work together?

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study area is Osun State, which was created in 1991 with Osogbo as the state capital. The state is made up of 30 local government areas (LGAs) and one autonomous local government area office. According to the latest 2006 national population census in Nigeria, Osun State had 3,423,535 people (National Population Commission, 2006). It is widely acclaimed as one of the most urbanised states in the country. It has many cities and towns with several of them governed by multiple local governments. For instance, Osogbo, the state capital, has three local government areas while cities such as Ile-Ife, Ilesa and Ede have two local government areas with their respective agencies. Also, offices of both state and federal governments are located in these cities.

In Osun State, there are planning agencies attached to the three tiers of government in Nigeria. These include a state office of Federal Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development; Osun State Ministry of Lands, Physical Planning and Urban Development; Osun State Capital Development Authority; Osun State Property Development Corporation; and 31 local planning authorities in the 30 local government areas and the autonomous area office. Altogether, there are 35 planning agencies in Osun State comprising one federal planning agency, three state planning agencies and 31 local planning authorities. These planning agencies have their different planning functions.

The first one, the state office of the Federal Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development, is saddled with the responsibility of development control on 'Federal lands' and right-of-way of federal roads and railway lines. The office is responsible to the national headquarters in Abuja. For the state planning agencies, the State Ministry is expected to perform all planning functions across the state while Osun State Capital Development Authority is tasked with the development matters in the state capital territory. The state capital territory is made up of Osogbo township and the adjoining areas as delineated by

the state government. Likewise, the Property Development Corporation plans and controls development in some public housing estates across the state. All these state bodies are directly responsible to the state government. The local planning authorities carry out their planning functions within the territories of the local government areas of their location. Each of the local planning authorities is a division or department of the local government council. For instance, it is the responsibility of the local council to finance the local planning authority and certain planning activities, such as demolition of illegal development, can be carried out only with the consent of the local government chairman. Summary on the planning agencies in Osun State and their responsibilities is given in Table 1.

Data for the study were sourced from administration of questionnaire in all the 35 planning agencies in the state (one federal planning agency, three state planning agencies and 31 local planning authorities). The reasons for selecting all the planning agencies were two. First, the sampling frame is small, hence selections of sample size was considered unnecessary for the study. In the 31 local planning authorities, questionnaires were administered on the directors, while in the state and federal agencies the respondents were the heads of departments. Where any of these officers were not available, the most senior official available was sampled. The questionnaire contained questions on gender, designation, highest educational qualification and professional membership of the respondents. These were obtained to know the characteristics of the respondents and to establish the authenticity of information obtained from them. Other questions include scope of operation of the planning agency, cases and types of undue external influence in discharge of duties, relationship with other planning agencies, cases and rate of conflict of interest among the agencies.

Data analysis was carried out using frequency distribution. This was mainly determined by the sample size (35) which is considered insufficient for rigorous statistical analysis.

Table 1 Planning Agencies in Osun State and their Responsibilities

Type of Agency	Name of Agency	Responsibilities
Federal	State Office of Federal Ministry of Land, Housing and Urban Development	Development control on 'Federal lands' and right-of-way of federal roads and railway lines; Report to the national headquarters in Abuja.
State	Osun State Ministry of Lands and Urban Development	Preparation of urban development plans in the state; Development control in the state other than on 'Federal lands' and right-of-way of federal roads and railway lines; Report to the state government.

	Osun State Capital Development Authority		Development control in the state capital territory; Report to the state government.
	Osun State Property Development Corporation		Development control in public housing estates in the state; Report to the state government.
Local	Local Planning Authority		Development control in local government area of jurisdiction; Report to the local government.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study revealed that, out of the 35 respondents interviewed in all the planning agencies, 94.3% of the respondents were male with only 5.7% of them being female. This indicates that the planning agencies were male dominated. Also, 48.6% of the respondents were the heads of their planning agencies while the remaining 51.4% were senior officers in the agencies. Among these heads and senior officers, 17.1% had Higher National Diploma, 40.0% had first degree while 42.9% had postgraduate degree as their highest educational qualification. Also, as town planners, 62.9% of the respondents were registered with relevant professional bodies (Nigerian Institute of Town Planners and Town Planners Registration Council of Nigeria); the remaining 37.1% were yet to be members of the professional bodies. All these results indicate that these respondents are capable of giving reliable information on their planning agencies. This is because they occupy positions that allow them to be abreast of the operations of the planning agencies, such as development control, policy formulation on urban planning and preparation of urban development plan.

Findings on the key activities area of the planning agencies are as contained in Table 2 with the percentage values in parenthesis. It is discovered that 34 (97.1%) of the planning agencies carried out development control activities while only one did not. Findings further revealed that 21(60.0%) of the planning agencies engaged in policy formulation while 27 (77.1%) planning agencies carried out development plan preparation. Lastly, only three (8.6%) planning agencies provided urban facilities; the remaining 32 (91.5%) did not engage in provision of urban facilities.

These analyses show that the planning agencies in the state primarily carry out basic physical planning activities such as development control, preparation of development plans and policy formulation. This is can be linked to the fact that most of the planning agencies are local planning authorities and, in Nigeria, local planning authorities usually focus on basic planning functions. Nevertheless, the planning agencies such as the Ministry of Lands, Physical Planning and Urban Development; Osun State Capital Development Authority and Osun State Property Development Corporation are also capable of providing urban facilities.

Table 2 Key Activity Areas of the Planning Agencies

Key Activity Area	Yes	No	Total
Development control	34(97.1)	1(2.9)	35(100)
Development plan preparation	27(77.1)	8(22.9)	35(100)
Policy formulation	21(60.0)	14(40.0)	35(100)
Provision of urban facilities	3(8.6)	32(91.5)	35(100)

Information presented in Table 3 revealed that duplication of functions exists in the domains of the planning agencies. As contained in the table, seven planning agencies (20.0%), which are either state or local planning agencies, had duplicated planning functions in their territories with the federal agencies. Likewise, 19 (54.3%) of the 35 planning agencies had their functions duplicated by different state planning agencies in their areas of jurisdiction and four (14.3%) of the planning agencies duplicated functions with the local agencies. Besides, five planning agencies (14.3%) declared that both federal and state planning bodies performed planning functions with them in their precincts. These indicate that none of the planning agencies had exclusive control of planning activities in their territory. And it can be deduced that at least five planning agencies in the state experienced two other planning agencies conflicting with their functions.

Table 3 Operational Parameters of the Planning Agencies

Parameters	Frequency	Percentage
Other Agencies Duplicating Planning Functions		
Federal	7	20.0
State	19	54.3
Local	4	11.4
Federal and State	5	14.3
Total	35	100.0
Causes of Conflict of Interest		
Jurisdictional Matter	32	91.5
Policy formulation	3	8.5
Total	35	100.0
Rate of Conflict of Interest		
Often	5	14.3
Occasionally	18	51.4
Rarely	12	34.3
Total	35	100.0

Subsequent to the duplication of functions, it was discovered that all planning agencies experienced conflict. One notable area was in granting of development permit. Some of the developers interviewed informed that some

state planning agencies have declared their development illegal after they have got approval for development from the local planning authority. Mostly, the reason for conflict of interest was jurisdictional with 32 (91.5%) of the planning agencies giving this as the cause of conflict of interest with other planning agencies. For instance, the jurisdictional conflict occur when the federal or a state planning agency duplicates the planning functions already carried out in in the jurisdiction of a local planning authority. This occurs especially when the planning function generates income, such as granting of development permit. However, the remaining three (8.5%) planning agencies had policy implementation as the cause of their conflict of interests. The conflict due to policy implementation involves activities such as development control monitoring and granting of development permit.

In the third section of Table 3 are findings on rate of conflict with other planning agencies in the territory of each of the planning agencies. For easy analysis, the data on rate of conflict were grouped into three: often, occasionally and rarely. Occurrence of conflict weekly (once, twice or more) was considered often. Occurrence of conflict once in a month or every other month was considered occasional. The rate of conflict of was considered rare when it occurred once in three months or more. Based on these categories, findings revealed that 5 (14.3%) of the agencies often experienced conflict of interest, 18 (51.4%) of them experienced conflict of interest occasionally, while 12 (34.3%) of the planning agencies rarely experienced conflict of interest with other planning agencies in the state. These findings further established that there is duplication in the activities of these planning agencies leading to conflict among them, although with varying rates.

Table 4 Relationship with Other Planning Agencies

Areas of Relationship	Yes	No	Total
Policy formulation	7(20.0)	28(80.0)	35(100)
Reporting	1(2.9)	34(97.1)	35(100)
Funding	9(25.7)	26(74.3)	35(100)
Supply of manpower and equipment	9(25.7)	26(74.3)	35(100)
Development plan preparation	12(34.3)	23(65.7)	35(100)

Table 4 contains information on the issues in relationship with other planning agencies with the percentage values in parenthesis. These include policy making, reporting, funding, supply of manpower and equipment and preparation of development plan. Findings revealed that only seven (20.0%) planning agencies related with other planning agencies based on policy formulation. Only one (2.9%) planning agency reported its activities to another planning agency. This planning agency is the state office of the Federal Ministry of Lands, Physical Planning and Urban Development which reports to the headquarters in the

Federal Capital, Abuja. However, other planning agencies both at the state and local levels did not report to any planning agency. Furthermore, nine (25.7%) of the planning agencies related with other planning agencies both in funding and supply of manpower and equipment; 26 of them did not. Likewise, only 12 (34.3%) of them related with other planning agencies in preparation of development plan.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has shown that that good urban planning is a function of effective urban planning administration. This is established based on the proliferation of planning agencies and the consequent duplication in urban planning functions, using Osun State as a case study. The study revealed most of the planning agencies in the state carry out basic physical planning functions. These functions in order of priority are development control, preparation of development plans, policy formulation and provision of urban facilities.

Nonetheless, the study found that duplication of functions exists in the domains of the planning agencies. None of the planning agencies had exclusive control of planning functions in its territory resulting in regular conflict of conflict of interest with one another in performance their planning functions. The common reason for the conflict was jurisdictional matter. Likewise, the relationship between the planning agencies was poor pertaining to policy making, reporting, funding, supply of manpower and equipment and preparation of development plan.

Therefore, the study concluded that the administration of planning is responsible for proliferation of planning agencies and consequently the duplication of planning functions in the state, nay, Nigeria. Thus, with a view to achieving effective urban planning propelled by efficient urban administration in Nigeria, the following recommendations are proffered:

First, a major legislative change is recommended. Town planning should cease to be a residual matter in the Constitution of Nigeria but be listed on concurrent list. This will give both the federal and the state government power to legislate on town planning. This has two implications. This constitutional reform will enable the federal government to enact a planning law with national coverage. Thus, initiating planning proposals that cut across state and/or regional boundaries will be a possibility. Also, the state governments will be able to enact their own planning laws within the ambit of the national law to cater the peculiarities of each state.

Second, despite the fact that the provisions of 1976 Guidelines for city government have been compromised, the importance of such cannot be denied. Therefore, since mayoral system is not practised in Nigeria, a city-wide governance structure should be ensured by creating a Metropolitan Local Government Council for every metropolitan area while retaining the existing

urban Local Governments as District Local Government Councils. The need for such is being confirmed by the creation of State Capital Development Authorities and the designation of two or more Local Governments as a Planning Area in cities like Onitsha, Lafia and Port-Harcourt in the preparation of their development plans. This new body will redress the problems of duplication of metropolitan-wide functions such as development plan preparation, development control, transportation and water supply.

Besides, there is the need for a review of good practices in urban administration based on Nigeria's pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial experiences. In pre-colonial era, city government was the practice by the traditional paramount rulers. In the colonial era, Native Administrative Authority was introduced as an attempt to fit local administration to the traditional political structure. And after independence from Britain, Nigeria still practised city government which was legislatively reinforced by the 1976 Guidelines for Local Government Reform. These experiences will serve as useful advocacy reference points in the efforts to promote urban planning agenda in Nigeria.

REFERENCES

- Davoudi, S. and Evans, N. (2005). The challenge of governance in regional waste planning. *Environment and Planning* 23(4): 493–519.
- Falade, J. B. (2010). Governing Nigerian Cities for Sustainability. A Commissioned Paper presented at the 40th Annual General Meeting of the Nigerian Institute of Town Planners, held in Kano, October 28-30.
- Federal Government of Nigeria (1976). *The Local Government Reform Act*. Lagos: Federal Government Press.
- Federal Government of Nigeria (1992). *The Nigerian Urban and Regional Planning Law* Lagos: Federal Government Press.
- National Population Commission (2006). 2006 Population Census. Abuja: National Population Commission
- Olawuni, P. O. and Daramola, O. P. (2013). Urban Governance and Access to Environmental Sanitation Services: An Example from Ile-Ife, Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Technology in Environmental Sanitation, Volume 3, Number 1*, pp 43-48.
- Popescu, I. (2006). The role of municipal policy on urban development. *Adminstratie si Management Public*, pp 162-170. Accessed online on 15th November, 2013 at http://www.ramp.ase.ro/en/_data/files/articole/7_10.pdf
- Pieterse, E. (2000). *Participatory Urban Governance*. Urban Management Programme Working Paper No 25, UNCHS/UNDP/World Bank. Accessed online in June 2011 at

- <http://ww2.unhabitat.org/programmes/ump/documents/UMP25.pdf>
- Sharma, S. K. (1989). Municipal management. *Urban Affairs Quarterly – India*, 21, pp 47–53.
- Swilling, M. (2006). Sustainability and infrastructure planning in South Africa: A Cape Town Case Study. *Environment & Urbanization* 18(1): 23–50
- UNDP/UN-HABITAT/NBS (2011). *Draft Final Consolidated Report on Assessment of Good Urban Governance in Nigeria*. Presented in Consolidated Report Workshop held in Lagos on 18th – 19th May, 2011.
- UN-HABITAT. (2001) *The Global Campaign on Urban Governance: A Concept Paper*. Nairobi. United Nations Human Settlement Programme. Available at www.unhabitat.org/downloads/docs/2099_24326_concept_paper.doc
- UN-HABITAT (2008). *The State of the World's Cities 2008/2009; Harmonious Cities*. London: Earthscan.

Oluwole Daramola, Olorunfemi Olojede, Akintayo Ojo, & Oluwaseun Olowoporoku
Duplication of Urban Planning Functions in A Nigerian State: Uncovering The Causality

This page intentionally left blank