



RESEARCH REPORT

URBAN LAND, PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS IN NIGERIA

JULY 2015

JESSICA LAMOND

University of the West of England

KWASI BAFFOUR AWUAH

University of the West of England

EMMA LEWIS

ICF International

ROBIN BLOCH

ICF International

JOHNSON B. FALADE

Foundation for Development and Environmental Initiatives

URN URBANISATION
RESEARCH
NIGERIA



Rights and Permissions



Except expressly otherwise noted or attributed to a third party, this report is © 2014 ICF International, under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-ShareAlike CC BY-NC-SA.

Please cite as follows: Lamond J., Awuah B. K., Lewis E., Bloch R., and Falade B. J. (2015) *Urban Land, Planning and Governance Systems in Nigeria*. Urbanisation Research Nigeria (URN) Research Report. London: ICF International. Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-ShareAlike CC BY-NC-SA.

Comments or enquiries related to this report should be addressed to robin.bloch@icfi.com

Cover photo: Makurdi, Nigeria; Nikolaos Papachristodoulou.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	3
URBAN LAND, PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE REGIMES	5
THE PRE-COLONIAL ERA	5
THE COLONIAL ERA.....	5
POST-COLONIAL ERA	6
THE CURRENT URBAN PLANNING PRACTICE.....	7
Federal Government - National Level Policy	8
State-led Urban Planning	10
CHALLENGES FOR THE URBAN LAND ADMINISTRATION, PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE SYSTEM	10
URBAN DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS: FORMAL AND INFORMAL	13
FORMAL AND INFORMAL URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES	13
CRITIQUE OF FORMAL AND INFORMAL URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES	15
RECENT INITIATIVES TO IMPROVE URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES AND THEIR OUTCOMES	18
THE PERSPECTIVES OF URBAN STAKEHOLDERS	21
DISCUSSION OF STAKEHOLDERS' PERSPECTIVES	21
SUMMARY	31
CONCLUSION	34
REFERENCES	38
ANNEX: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	42

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank all the people who availed their precious time to this research project, and shared their diverse perspectives. Many thanks to colleagues at the Federal University of Technology, Minna and at the University of Ibadan. We acknowledge the comments of Stephen Berrisford as the reviewer. The support of Jose Monroy, Nikolaos Papachristodoulou and Leticia Correa was vital to the delivery of the final report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The narrative of rapid urbanisation in relation to inadequate planning, governance and management regimes in Nigeria is well-rehearsed. The combination of customary and colonial practices, outdated policies and plans and entrenched attitudes is typically regarded as a problem without clear or universal solutions. The aim of this report is to elucidate the urban land administration and planning debate in the country by examining the issues based on literature review and views of key urban sector stakeholders from six cities obtained through interviews.

The historical development of land administration, planning and governance regimes in Nigeria is seen to contribute to the failure of the current development system because of an evolution from two distinct paradigms. This leads to confusion and a lack of engagement with formal systems thereby limiting the potential for well-conceived national and state urban development goals from being realised within cities that are not observing the planning frameworks. Colonial segregational policies have been superseded by a succession of policies that increasingly recognise, but cannot enforce, participation, equity, sustainability and climate change adaptation.

Simultaneously, massively-scaled urban development continues under a variety of guises to meet the demand for space for urban accommodation, business and services from a diverse population with huge division between the wealthy and the urban poor. There is a growing need to categorise and understand this diversity of development in order to develop policies that adopt the positive aspects of informal development while pursuing national and state development goals and providing healthy and economically viable urban environments for all.

It is shown that new development forms such as new towns, developer-built estates and owner built housing are large factors in the foregoing regard as they are in other sub-Saharan African urban areas. In addition, large scale infrastructural development has also led to ribbon and satellite development that takes advantage of the massive investment in national assets. These development forms are far superior to the slum conditions traditionally associated with the term “informal” and they may benefit from some of the “legal” attributes of formal planned developments such as ownership rights and even locally-prepared plans.

The advantages of such developments in the vacuum created by the inadequacies of the formal planning system seem self-evident. However, it is apparent that these developments suffer from deficiencies in the provision of infrastructure and services and may also put an intolerable strain on nearby infrastructure and services designed to cope with the much smaller population anticipated by formal planning. Equally, the increasing commodification of lands especially those delivered through the informal system in the face of rapid urbanisation and rising demand are driving land and rental prices to unsustainable levels and out of the reach of essential key workers and the urban poor. This, coupled with the

tendency for the governance arrangements under the informal system to crumble in the face of urbanisation, could potentially displace people that would be considered entitled under the urban land administration and planning system in Nigeria. Furthermore, lack of formal governance and management of housing developments can place people at risk from unhealthy and overcrowded living conditions. This could also empower unscrupulous land owners and developers to prescribe their own governance and management framework, which may result in exploitation of innocent purchasers.

The report also examines recent initiatives at national, state and local levels. It concludes that some initiatives have been met with a measure of success and that these are typified by a flexibility that applies global principles at a local level and that canvas the needs and observes the contexts of local populations.

INTRODUCTION

Urbanisation in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) is reshaping the political, economic, spatial and environmental landscape. Globally, more than 50 percent of the world’s population now reside in urban areas, placing pressure on resources and challenging traditional approaches to development, as well as spurring the next generations of citizens to re-imagine, re-design and re-work how urban areas are established, function and managed. Nigeria, the most populous African country and avowedly on the fast-track of rapid urbanisation, is confronted with the development challenge to provide appropriate places, spaces and economic and social opportunities for all residents.

Nigeria’s urban environment is characterised by settlements formed through unplanned, rapid urban expansion despite the attempts of governments and agencies to promote planned developments since its independence. This has resulted in multiple urban challenges such as proliferation of informal settlements, urban poverty, informality, significant levels of inequality among different socio-economic groups, limited land access options for the marginalised such as women and the poor, and unmet needs for infrastructure and other basic services (Ogbazi, 2013).

Furthermore, the research consensus suggests that the inadequate land administration, planning and governance systems are partly to blame for urban development problems (Egbu *et al.*, 2008; Adeloje and Rustum, 2011; Ogbazi, 2013). Conversely, continuing urban growth and spatial expansion demonstrate that considerable resources channelled largely through informal processes lead to increased wealth for some sectors of society.

Experts have proposed pluralistic paradigms that emphasise multi-level processes and procedures based on engaging community level action, civic leaders, NGOs and the private sector to deliver sustainable solutions (Ogu, 1999, 2002; Ogbazi, 2013; UN-Habitat, 2014). Assessment of the potential for these or any other policy recommendations requires an examination of drivers and barriers to change within the Nigerian urban land management, planning, and governance situation as represented by the main sections of this report:

1. Urban land, planning and governance: An understanding of the historical factors which underpin Nigeria’s urban land administration, planning and governance system, and the current arrangements under the system including its challenges;
2. Emerged urban development systems: Examine formal and informal urban development processes and outcomes as they exist and function in Nigeria, their strengths and weaknesses and recent urban development and management initiatives;

3. Discussion of views of key urban sector stakeholders' from six Nigerian cities: Discuss the views in the context of the literature and recent initiatives and developments within the cities; and
4. Conclusion: Contribution to policy debates and directions for future research.

This report represents the first stage of the research under Theme D of the Urbanisation Research Nigeria programme. It is based on a desk study by Nigerian and UK-based researchers and analysis of the results from a semi-structured interview survey of stakeholders in the six Nigerian cities, the schedule for which is annexed here. Future research under the theme will address the issues through a carefully planned series of projects.

URBAN LAND, PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE REGIMES

THE PRE-COLONIAL ERA

According to Adeniyi (2013), land was held under communal ownership in Nigeria during the pre-colonial era. It was managed on the basis of the customs and traditions of the various ethnic groups that formed the country. Traditional rulers and family heads were vested with the right to manage land in accordance with the political, socio-economic, cultural and traditional norms that existed at that time. Community members had only use rights. The use rights were heritable and partible inheritance was common among male children, with few ethnic groups allowing females to inherit.

Land use patterns and urban development and governance outcomes also manifested political, socio-economic and cultural considerations (Chorkor, 1993; Ogu, 1999; Arimah and Adeagbo, 2000). Cities varied in their outlook depending on the major considerations that underpinned their development. These included settlements that surrounded the King’s (Oba) palace such as Benin City, reflected Muslim customs and traditions like Kano and Zaria, and those that started as war camps like Ibadan, which had no regard for orderly development as such but clustered around natural defences (Ogu, 1999; NITP, undated).

THE COLONIAL ERA

The colonial period witnessed the imposition of British land administration laws on customary land tenure systems. In Northern Nigeria, the indigenous land tenure system as of 1804 had already been replaced by tenure system based on Muslim Maliki Law that vested ownership and control of land into the ruling class. However, the British colonial administration passed the Land and Native Proclamation Ordinance in 1910 converting all lands into public lands to be held and administered by the colonial governor for the benefit of natives (Adeniyi, 2013).

Conversely, family lands and lands under the ownership of lineages in the south of the country were upheld, but their acquisition by outsiders required the approval of the Governor. Regulations, such as Ordinance No. 9 (1914), were also passed to enable the colonial government to undertake compulsory acquisition of land for public purposes.

Formal urban planning began with British colonial urban development activities particularly in Lagos in the late nineteenth century (Home, 1983; NITP, undated). These urban development activities included public works such as the construction of new dock facilities and a railway into the interior of the city in the 1890s and the passage of ordinances for Town

Improvement (1863) and Public Health (1904). The 1928 Planning Ordinances created the Lagos Executive Development Board with the responsibilities of swamp reclamation, slum clearance, market planning and the development of suburban estates for African employees (Home, 1983). Similar urban planning activities subsequently took place in Enugu, Zaria and Kano.

These colonial planning activities promoted spatial segregation. Three distinct types of urban settlement developments were created and governed with the assistance of the Township Ordinance No. 9 of 1917, namely European residential areas, non-European reservations and native communities (Home, 1983; Mabogunje, 1990; Ogu, 1999).

Two structures of local administration subordinate to the colonial government were also created. First, there was administration based on the indirect rule system, which relied on the Native Authorities and Native Treasuries by means of traditional chiefs who were responsible for the native communities (Home, 1983). Second, forms of government supervised by colonial administrators. Townships and Municipal administrations (Home, 1983) were responsible for colonial urban areas, both European residential areas and non-European reservations. Unlike the native areas, the colonial urban areas were governed based on British urban development standards and were provided with the requisite infrastructure (Mabogunje, 1990).

Following the promulgation of the Commonwealth Development and Welfare Act (1940), which sought to promote reconstruction of Great Britain and her colonies, urban planning was given further impetus in Nigeria. The Town and Country Planning Ordinance No. 4 of 1946 was passed. The ordinance for the first time considered planning as a comprehensive activity of government with the provision for re-planning, improvement and development of different parts of Nigeria. The Ordinance was modelled along the lines of British Town and Country Planning Act(s) of the era and promoted a modernist approach with the use of master plans, planning authorities and planning schemes. However, implementation of the Ordinance was usually restricted to European residential areas, and the Ordinance did not encourage integrated and participatory planning approaches (Ogu, 1999; NITP, undated).

POST-COLONIAL ERA

After independence in 1960, colonial land policies subsisted with traditional land tenure arrangements until the passage of the Land Use Decree (LUD) in 1978 (Birner and Okumo, 2012; Adeniyi, 2013). The Decree is now the basic framework for land administration in Nigeria (Butler, 2009; Aluko, 2011; Adeniyi, 2013). It was designed to unify land policies in Nigeria, to curb land speculation in urban areas, and to promote agricultural investment through secured land rights (Adeniyi, 2013).

Land holdings in Nigeria are now broadly classified into public/state, private and communal (Adeniyi, 2013). Public/state lands are lands owned by government comprising federal, state and local governments and their agencies. Private lands are defined as those whose ownership is vested in private individuals, families, and lands under customary tenancies.

Communal lands are lands which have their ownership vested in communities. These lands are usually administered by community leaders mainly chiefs with the assistance of their councils of elders.

The LUD classifies all lands in Nigeria into urban and rural lands. Exempting lands that come under the control of the federal government, the Decree further vests urban lands with state governors and rural lands with local governments (Butler, 2009; Birner and Okumo, 2012; Adeniyi, 2013).

This means that the responsibility for the administration and management of urban land, in the main, lies with state governments which results in the necessity for the creation of elaborate land bureaucracies and administrative procedures. According to Butler (2009) the Decree established statutory rights of use which may be alienated in market transactions only with the consent of Governors. State governments, therefore, undertake allocation of and/or give consents to urban land grants and issue certificate of occupancy or formalise/register land transactions. These are undertaken by relevant state government agencies. A typical system for a state ministry involved in land administration is a Department of Land Services with divisions for: allocation, acquisition, valuation, land use and housing; a surveying and mapping department; and a deeds registry.

Several specific urban planning, development and governance initiatives including passage of regulations at both federal and state government levels have been undertaken since independence by successive post-colonial governments (see Filani, 2012; Ogbazi, 2013; NITP, undated). However, the Town and Country Planning Ordinance (1946) continued to be the main planning legislation in Nigeria until the passage of the Urban and Regional Planning Decree (No.88) of 1992 (Arigbigbola, 2007; Aluko, 2011). The Decree was expected to revamp planning activities and make them more responsive to the socio-economic development needs of the country (Aluko, 2011).

However planning practice has not been seen by analysts to depart from the colonial planning philosophy (Egbu *et al.*, 2008; Arigbigbola, 2007; Ogbazi, 2013) and the spatial configurations of planned urban environments have not been transformed. The next section, therefore, takes a detailed look at the current urban planning practice in Nigeria.

THE CURRENT URBAN PLANNING PRACTICE

The historical context of urban land management and planning practice was set out in the preceding sections. This, in part, frames the complexity and tensions that currently exist among and between the actors, and urban planning and land development processes in Nigeria. As noted above, since independence two major laws have been passed on urban planning and land development in Nigeria. These are the LUD (1978), which focuses mainly on land and its management, and the Urban and Regional Planning Decree (1992) which was revised in 1999. In accordance with the country's federal government system, the Urban and Regional Planning Decree sought to allocate land use planning and development control the three-tier governmental structure in the country (Federal


Republic of Nigeria 1992). The Decree, thus, provided for the establishment of :

- A National Urban and Regional Planning Commission known as the ‘Commission’ to deal with federal matters; and
- A State Urban and Regional Planning Board known as the ‘Board’ to deal with all state matters. Each state is also required to set-up an Urban and Regional Planning Tribunal to adjudicate over planning appeals; and a Local Planning Authority known as ‘Authority’ as well as area councils.

Essentially, the combined effect of the LUD and the Urban and Regional Planning Decree is to make the federal government responsible for planning at the national level. Conversely, the state and local governments are to be responsible for planning at the state and local levels (Aribigbola, 2007; Ikejiofor, 2009). The responsibilities for each tier particularly with respect to plan making are set in Figure 1. All plans are supposed to be duly approved by the approving bodies.

The responsibilities of the federal and state governments are further elaborated in the ensuing sub-sections. However, government’s inability to set up the requisite bodies continues to be one of the challenges to the implementation of the decrees. For example, only Lagos State has been able to set up a Urban and Regional Planning Board and the Planning Authorities.

Figure 1: Urban plan making responsibilities



Source: Adapted from Falade (2010). Based on 1992 Urban and Regional Planning Act. The CC license does not apply to this figure.

Federal Government - National Level Policy

The main planning function of the federal government is national level policy formulation. This is undertaken by the National Planning Commission, and often focuses on medium and long term economic

development plans. These policies permeate all other aspects of government including budgetary support and appropriate legislative and policy making at the state and local government levels, to ensure the long term sustainability and development of the country. The federal government is, thus, positioned as setting the development trajectory for the country with full cognisance of its developmental challenges and identifies ‘enabling’ or ‘catalysing’ features that should, in theory, be pursued and realised through state and local government initiatives. An example of such national level policy is the recently formulated Nigeria Vision 20:2020. The Nigeria Vision 20:2020 Document as a key structuring document to direct government policy hinges on a transformation agenda. The document comprises three pillars namely:

- Guaranteeing the well-being and productivity of the people;
- Optimising the key sources of economic growth; and
- Fostering sustainable social and economic development.

The spatial manifestation of this vision and implementation arrangements remain a key issue for the long term development of Nigeria, and are supposed to be reflected and supported by the requisite plans set out in Figure 1 above. These plans establish a long term development framework for the country. In this capacity, this approach is further extended through principles that seek to harness the private sector to deliver many of the infrastructure needs that are seen as critical to support growth and poverty reduction.

For the realisation of Nigeria’s Vision 20:2020, the vision for urban development is one of “functional cities for rapid economic growth” and the vision advocates that priority should be given to promoting the good governance of the planning system in the country. To achieve this, the document recommends that strategies should focus on promoting smart and functional cities to achieve environmental sustainability, which are to contribute to achieving the goals of promoting fast economic growth and social welfare of the Vision 20:2020.

The policies which affect urban governance include the National Urban Development Policy and the Housing Policy among others. The first National Urban Development Policy was passed in 1992 and was revised in 2012. The revised National Urban Development Policy states the goals, objectives and strategies for achieving sustainable urban development. It also recognises the role of multiple tiers of government in promoting effective urban development and sustainable human settlements, as well as it provides for the autonomy of the three tier governments in discharging their roles under the policy provisions.

Under the revised National Urban Development Policy, the Federal Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development is empowered to encourage state governments to perform a range of functions. These functions include the establishment of Urban and Regional Development Boards (URDB) charged with the responsibility for the overall planning, monitoring and management of urban development in the state. The URDB is also responsible for formulating urban development policy, preparing the requisite plans as specified above and building capacity of local governments for urban development.

The National Urban Development Policy also provides that all local governments shall be encouraged to act within the context of the State Urban Development Policy and shall establish a Local Planning Authority to prepare and adopt requisite plans. With regards to the revised National Housing Policy 2012, the roles of the local governments include: providing residential site and service layouts; maintenance of urban infrastructure and environmental sanitation; and, in partnership with government agencies and private sector companies, delivering housing.

State-led Urban Planning

Nigeria has 36 states and one territory, the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), and 774 local government areas. Tensions exist between federal and state governments (see World Bank 2002, UNDP 2011). The Second Schedule of the 1999 Constitution has only served to compound this, as most powers accorded to the states are exercised concurrently with the federal government.

In addition, while their functions are specified in the Fourth Schedule, local governments can only exercise their authority in accordance with enabling legislation passed by the states. This situation ensures there are large variations in the roles and functions that LGAs play and to the level of oversight they are afforded.

Notwithstanding this complex environment, efforts towards facilitating urban development and developing urban planning solutions to the pressing needs of urban residents occur. And as stated above, local governments are responsible for planning and development control at the local level.

CHALLENGES FOR THE URBAN LAND ADMINISTRATION, PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE SYSTEM

The urban land administration and planning system in Nigeria is confronted with a number of challenges. The formal land administration system is unable to deliver adequate lands for development resulting in an excess of demand over supply and access to urban lands for development especially by marginalised groups such as women and the poor is problematic (whereas the wealthier often have better access to these lands). The majority of the urban population relies on the informal land delivery system¹ to acquire land for development or squats on/occupies government acquired lands (Rakodi 2006; Ikejiofor, 2006; Egbu *et al.*, 2008).

Another challenge is the existence of large tracts of unutilised compulsorily acquired lands in urban areas for which full compensations have not been paid. The LUD provides that secure tenure is based on obtaining either statutory or customary rights of occupancy and that, in cases of revocation

¹ Refer to the next section for a detailed discussion.

of ownership, only land owners with statutory or customary rights shall be entitled to compensation. The decree also prohibits unauthorised development and stipulates that no compensation shall be paid for their removal. It is evident that the Decree does not recognise the rights of tenants on land.

Furthermore, security of tenure is also a widespread problem. The current legal framework for land administration in Nigeria recognises both statutory and customary rights to land. However, group rights within informal settlements in urban areas, like women’s rights, are not recognised (Adeniyi, 2013; Deininger *et al.*, 2014). Formalisation is usually recommended as a means to secure informal land rights (Birner and Okumo, 2012) but this brings its own challenges. Most urban lands have not been properly surveyed and demarcated, and numerous actors and bureaucratic processes and procedures are also involved in land acquisition and formalisation of urban land rights.

Coupled with the above is the lack of clarity of the mandate for the several government bureaucracies involved in land rights formalisation (Agunbiade and Rajabifard, 2013; Adeniyi, 2013). This leads to further delays in formalisation (Akindgbade *et al.*, 2012). In addition, the cost is high. Costs comprise statutory fees and extra out of pocket payments for government bureaucracies and professional fees to surveyors and lawyers among others (Birner and Okumo, 2012; Adeniyi, 2013; Deininger *et al.*, 2014). Compounding the above problems is the multiple sales of the same parcels of land by customary land owners. The foregoing problems have resulted in a low rate of formalisation of land rights in Nigeria, which is estimated by one analyst at only 3 percent (Adeniyi, 2013).

The colonial legacy which prescribes a technical framework and relies on top-down government bureaucratic agencies to the exclusion of urban sector stakeholders (Ogu, 1999, 2002; Ogbazi, 2013) has resulted in the system not being informed by the culture and traditions of the country (Chorkor, 1993; Ogbazi, 2013). The system can also fail to integrate stakeholders such as NGOs, CBOs, the informal and the private sectors in the planning process (Ogbazi, 2013). Lack of integration continues to create tension between traditional authorities and government planning authorities.

The majority of the urban population, it is argued, are not aware of urban planning processes and regulations in the country (Arigbigbola, 2007). This is exacerbated by unrealistic and restrictive planning and land development requirements (Egbu *et al.*, 2007) often associated with high costs of compliance (Egbu *et al.*, 2008). This has led to a lack of transparency and undermined the legitimacy and relevance of urban planning so that planning is often restricted to selected areas in the outer sections of cities to the exclusion of the inner indigenous sections (Ogu, 1999). Consequently, urban planning authorities are often seen as “alien” authorities by these communities rendering the communities unreceptive to modern planning arrangements such as re-development or renewal proposals.

Additionally, planning institutions in Nigeria often do not have the capacity to plan and enforce development regulations due to weak legislation, lack of skilled human and material resources and political interference

(Arigbigbola, 2007). City plans are incomplete or out of date in many cases, and processing of planning documentation is usually undertaken manually which results in delays.

Egbu *et al.* (2008), for example, established that it took over one year and 32 steps for a development right to be granted in Nigeria. The World Bank (2014) estimates that the number of procedures for obtaining construction permits reduced from 19 in 2006 to 15 in 2010, almost equalling the average figure for SSA and that of OECD countries. The time taken decreased from 302 days to 85 days while the costs of a transaction reduced from USD 1,450 to USD 505. Despite this improvement, Nigeria is still known for delays and high cost of processing of construction permits and land transactions. The Bank notes that out of 183 countries, Nigeria ranks 84th for processing construction permits and 180th for registering a property.

Expectation of delays often leads to extra out-of-pocket payments by applicants to officials of planning institutions to facilitate the processing of planning documents. There is also lack of co-ordination and collaboration among planning institutions (Ogu, 1999), and apathy on the part of public planning officials towards modern planning theories and models that emphasise more pluralistic approaches (Ogbazi, 2013).

In addition to the above challenges is the concern with climate resilience. Nigeria is classified as a high risk country in regard to climate change impacts (African Development Bank Group, 2013) due to the concentration of assets and industries in low-lying areas and in climate sensitive sectors. Climate related hazards with particular importance for Nigeria include sea level rise (Fashae and Onafeso, 2011), intense rainfall, desertification and drought (Department for International Development, 2009). This is predicted to result in increased risk from flooding and water shortages that will lead to disease, environmental degradation and associated social hardship, disruption and conflict (Department for International Development, 2009; Sayne, 2011).

Predictions of the impact of these issues on the Nigerian economy range from 6 to 30 percent of GDP, which represents up to \$460 billion by 2050 (Building Nigeria's Response to Climate Change, 2011a). However, in common with many developed and developing countries, much of the focus of previous climate adaptation strategies for climate change impacts have predominantly concentrated on structural solutions to the neglect of non-structural measures and emergency planning (see Adedeji *et al.*, 2012, Adelekan, 2010).

URBAN DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS: FORMAL AND INFORMAL

FORMAL AND INFORMAL URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES

It is now evident that formal approaches to land administration and urban planning and governance in Nigerian cities, as outlined above, have had significant constraints. Coupled with a fourfold increase in population since the 1950s, these constraints have culminated in a complex urban situation with a number of urban ills such as uncontrolled developments and disregard for development regulations. Multiple commentators (Gandy 2005, Falade 2012, Bloch 2014, Sawyer 2014) also cite the absence of strategic planning processes, the lack of production, implementation and enforcement of detailed land use plans, environmental degradation and inadequate and/or absent urban infrastructure as some of the underlying causes. However, two main forms of urban developments, formal and informal, have emerged as a result of the current urban land administration, planning and governance arrangement.

Formal developments are developments produced through formal land administration, planning and governance processes. As shown in the preceding section, the main legal framework for land administration in Nigeria is the LUD. The Decree vests urban lands in state governors and converts old forms of estate into rights of occupancy meaning that the existing right of occupancy has to be covered by a Certificate of Occupancy issued by a state governor (Ikejiorfor *et al.*, 2004). Also, the Decree together with the Urban and Regional Planning Decree (1992) have made state and quasi-state institutions like local governments responsible for survey, planning and provision of infrastructure, as they have to ensure that urban lands are properly surveyed, planned and serviced. The formal development process, thus, entails execution of these activities by the required public institutions, and allocation of land and/or grant of certificate of occupancy over customary lands and permissions for development.

In contrast, there are several possible definitions of informal development or settlement. For example, development either under legal or illegal tenure (Wekesa *et al.*, 2013) is usually characterised as being located in places of lowest environmental quality such as railway setbacks, damp sites and marshy land; lacking security of tenure; consisting of inadequate dwelling units; not following planning and urban development regulations; having questionable construction quality; and lacking basic infrastructure.

The above definition, however, raises queries about how to classify quality developments in better areas, which do not follow formal urban

development processes. Therefore the ongoing discussion considers informal developments or settlements as developments on land to which their occupants have no legal claim or developments that defy land use planning and building permit requirements. It is development that disregards official laws on occupation of land, its use, sub-division standards and, conveyance and which further may sidestep the requirement for building permits (Adam, 2014) regardless of quality. Informal developments can be further classified into squatter and unauthorised developments. Squatter developments mean illegal occupation of land or developments without permission whereas unauthorised developments are those with land rights but without planning and building permissions (Adam, 2014).

The informal/alternative forms of urban land delivery and development comes in two main forms: (i) non-commercial grants from the customary land owning group – community, family or clan to members of the group, or as inheritance from members of land owning groups who had previously been allocated land; and (ii) purchase of land from customary land owning groups or private land owners who had previously purchased large tracts of land and sub-divided them (see Ikejiorfor *et al.*, 2004; Ikejiorfor, 2006). The private land owners are usually land and estate brokers (Ikejiorfor *et al.*, 2004). Perhaps a third form is encroachment on or sale of public lands or compulsorily acquired lands (see Adeniyi, 2013). Sale of such lands are sometimes made possible due to non-payment of compensation by government to expropriated owners who often feel empowered to sell these lands under the circumstance.

Formal, government-sanctioned, predominantly infrastructure-led or large scale estate development, is supported through access to land and/or concessions. In contrast, smaller scale infilling within urban centres and small to medium scaled development at the expanding edges of the city are often realised through informal means and outside the formal planning system (Sawyer, 2014). The inner cities continue to grow through unplanned, in-filling development schemes manifested by conversion of every space into development often without adequate infrastructure and social amenities. However, urban developments whether formal or informal in Nigeria are also driven by a number of actors.

Sawyer (2014) contends that there are three main groups that are driving the demand for development: people seeking rental accommodation; the landowners, developers and home-owners; and the industries and manufacturers. These categories are useful when considering urban dynamics and the form of development taking place but it is also important to note that these categories are not homogeneous and that within each there will be different requirements.

The range of needs exhibited by people seeking rental accommodation highlights this variability. Newly arrived residents often look to find affordable and shared accommodation within the central part of the city while networks and further options are explored. Those in regular employment may chose to live in the outer areas and either commute or source rented shared accommodation during the week (Sawyer 2014). These different dynamics affect the supply and form of residential accommodation.

CRITIQUE OF FORMAL AND INFORMAL URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES

Unlike formal developments, the ongoing informal developments and their processes in Nigeria, like those in other SSA countries, are often criticised as being a nuisance. However, some analysts (see Rakodi, 2006; UN-Habitat, 2010, 2014) suggest that these developments constitute the larger proportion of all urban developments in Nigeria and are the main source of accommodation for housing and other activities for the majority of urban residents. They further suggest that informal urban land development processes could offer useful lessons for formal urban development processes. Indeed, the formal urban development arrangements in the country have not been able to cope with the demands of the majority of urban residents for developable lands and services especially in the face of rapid urbanisation. Therefore as pointed out previously, this has given rise to alternative forms of land delivery and development – informal developments (see Arimah and Adeagbo, 2000; Ikejiorfor et al., 2004; Ikejiorfor, 2006; Nkurunziza, 2008; Egbu et al., 2008; Adam, 2014).

The practices adopted to deliver lands and development as shown above, are sometimes implemented with the assistance of public officials, either legally or illegally. In other cases, customary land owners engage their own surveyors and planners who survey and plan their lands for allocation or sale. Ikejiorfor *et al.* (2004), for example, identified such practices in Achara and Emene in Enugu, where the local planning authority was contacted by the customary landowners to prepare a planning scheme for the former community while private surveyors and planners were engaged by the latter community for a similar exercise.

However compared to the physical environments delivered through the formal urban development channels, which are mostly planned and provided with infrastructure and services, informal developments are perceived to be unplanned and not provided with infrastructure and services. Consequently, there is often a lack of development controls resulting in breach of development regulations, connection to sub-standard infrastructure, and losses in government revenues (further hindering cost-effective extension of infrastructure and services, and siting of developments on unsuitable locations such as flood-plains) (Rakodi, 2006).

These sub-standard informal developments are indeed common in Nigerian urban environments (Aribigbola, 2007; Yadau, 2012; Eko *et al.*, 2012; Amao, 2012). Yadau (2012), for example, established in his study in the Makoko area of Lagos that 52% of the 254 households studied lived in plank or bamboo houses. Even Abuja, arguably the best planned urban settlement in the country, is experiencing massive expansion with satellite informal settlements such as Bwari, Gwagwalada, Kubwa, Kuje, Nyanya, Karu, Lugbe and Suleja, characterised by poor infrastructure and other urban services such as waste collection (Abubakar, 2014).

Nonetheless, some informal developments are good developments, well laid-out, covered by some form of planning scheme and with connections to basic infrastructure and services. The examples of Achara and Emene in

Enugu, where the local planning authority was contacted by the customary landowners to prepare a planning scheme for the former community while private surveyors and planners were engaged by the latter community for a similar exercise are instructive. Not only do these communities have planning schemes, but are also connected to basic services such as electricity and pipe-borne water. These practices are not limited to Nigerian cities; they are also found in other cities in sub-Saharan Africa such as Kampala in Uganda (Nkurunziza, 2008) and Dar es Salaam (Magigi and Majani, 2006).

It is also argued that the formal urban land delivery and development system provides certainty in information and also ensures some form of security to land and development (Ikejiorfor *et al.*, 2004; Rakodi, 2006). For example, the LUD (1978) together with the Urban and Regional Decree (1992) are backed by a judicial system, which allows aggrieved persons to seek redress (Ikejiorfor *et al.*, 2004).

Conversely, the informal land delivery and development system are often not documented. Furthermore, they are usually characterised by inadequate record keeping and with no established and documented administrative processes. This sometimes leads to multiple sales of the same parcels of land. Ikejiorfor *et al.* (2004) also point out that there are situations where aggrieved members of land owning groups could prevent development on sold parcels of land through harassment and demolition of any form of construction on the land. These are potential threats to security of title to lands and developments produced through the informal system.

The informal system has nonetheless developed workable mechanisms over time. According to Ikejiorfor *et al.* (2004) an informal information system exists, which ensures that members of the public become aware of available lands for sale, and the roots of title to the lands. This information is often channelled through relatives and friends of land owners and local land brokers. Land owners also engage local surveyors who survey their land and mount beacons to separate the boundaries of different parcels.

Furthermore, allocation notes are given to purchasers of land with various agreements which are witnessed by community leaders. Conflict over land ownership and development protocols are thus resolved by community elders. Similar mechanisms also exist in cities such as Kampala in Uganda (Nkurunziza, 2008) and Bahir Dar City in Ethiopia (Adam, 2014). A setback to these mechanisms is that they tend to crumble in the face of increasing urbanisation and rising demand for land (Ikejiorfor, 2006). This requires a caution with regard to urban informal development processes.

It is also pertinent to point out that while studies such as Arimah and Adeagbo (2000) demonstrate that awareness of some formal development regulations in Ibadan is high, it is generally believed that the majority of the urban population in Nigeria are not aware of such regulations including those on the availability of formal lands for allocation. Aribigbola (2007), for example, reports that most of residents in Akure, Ondo State's capital, are not aware of the city's master plan let alone of the need to comply with its provisions. The regulations are also restrictive – including costs of compliance in terms of delays and actual financial payments taking into account the socio-economic conditions of the majority of the urban

populace (see Egbu *et al.*, 2008). Furthermore, public institutions established for urban land administration, planning, development and governance are often weak and inefficient (Aluko, 2011).

Conversely, informal development is more flexible. Aribigbola (2007), for example, reports that as at 2006-2007 the number of residential layouts approved in the city of Akure under the informal system were 641 compared to those approved by public institutions, which were 20. The number of plots on government layout schemes was 2,924, in a city of over 380,000 population with over 28,864 buildings. The challenge of accessibility to formal lands for the majority of the urban population is accentuated by the fact that such plots are usually allocated to the elite in society (see Ikejiorfor *et al.*, 2004; Ikejiorfor, 2006; Egbu *et al.*, 2008).

However the challenge with some of the planning schemes prepared for informal developments is in fact their inability to incorporate the broad socio-economic development vision of urban areas and their regions. In addition, there may always be the likelihood for customary or informal land owners to overlook some ancillary land uses such as community parks, green belts, schools and social centres due to profit considerations or perceptions of their irrelevance. For example, out of the 104 layouts prepared by residents in Minna comprising 7,893 plots (7164 residential plots, 151 commercial plots and 528 industrial development plots) no provision was made for civic and cultural, educational and institutional land uses (Sustainable Housing Strategy in Niger State, 2014).

Unlike the formal system, women's access to urban lands is said to be limited under the informal system due to customs which mostly allow for male inheritance of land. This is not in line with prescriptions of the LUD, which give women the same rights as their male counterparts to own urban land. Evidence even shows that with rapid urbanisation and commodification of land rich women could acquire their own lands for development (Ikejiorfor *et al.*, 2004; Ikejiorfor, 2006). The acid test, therefore, rests with affordability.

Despite its weaknesses, informal development still constitutes the largest proportion of development across the cities and urban areas in SSA, Nigeria not being an exception (see Ikejiorfor *et al.*, 2004; Ikejiorfor, 2006; Egbu *et al.*, 2008). It is estimated that between 50 and 80 percent of developable lands are supplied through this system and serves as the major avenue for the urban poor to access land for development (Rakodi, 2006; Nkurunziza, 2008). More worryingly, it is believed that while the informal system provided lands for the marginalised such as the urban poor, recent evidence suggests that it is unable to do so due to escalating prices of land resulting from rapid urbanisation and the commodification of land (Ikejiorfor, 2006). The foregoing suggests that access to land by the urban poor and title to the same are increasingly becoming insecure under the informal system.

RECENT INITIATIVES TO IMPROVE URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES AND THEIR OUTCOMES

Apart from the major urban development and governance policies discussed in the preceding sections, there have been other recent initiatives in Nigeria such as the adoption of the Sustainable Cities Programme (SCP) by cities including Ibadan, Enugu and Kano (Ogbazi, 2013) to improve urban development processes and outcomes. Indeed, since 2007 Nigeria has also been partnering with UN-Habitat to prepare structure plans for cities (ICF, 2014). This alliance has seen the adoption of a participatory slum upgrading framework and rapid urban sector profiling methodologies. So far several cities in the states of Anambra, Nasarawa and Osun have benefited from this programme. The cities include Awka, Onitsha and Nnewi (Anambra State), Lafia, Karu, Keffi and Doma (Nasarawa State) and Osogbo, Ede, Ejigbo, Ikire, Ila-Orangun, Ilesa, Ile-Ife, Iwo and Ikirun (State of Osun)(ICF, 2014).

The structure plans include rapid urban profiling to aid plan and decision making. Profiling is helpful in consolidating and updating disparate and outdated basic data with regard to population and environmental conditions. This information is seen as crucial for communities, professionals and leaders alike to build a realistic picture of ‘their’ city. Falade *et al.* (2010) contend in their evaluation of the participatory slum upgrading programme (PSUP) that the rapid and strategic profiling of the city is its integral feature and the ‘success’ of the programme. There is an emerging appetite for preparing master plans, for example the National Planning Commission’s 30 years infrastructure master plan.

It is interesting also to note Lagos’s efforts for improved governance and planning. In 2004 Lagos was apart of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) Cities programme which aimed at promoting good governance. Under this, an action plan was prepared and led to the World Bank funded Lagos Metropolitan Governance Project (UN-Habitat/FGN, 2011). This project was deemed a success for reviving the culture of adopting strategic land use development plans (ibid).

Although a positive development and advancement in practice, there are only a small number of states where this work is done. What remains is a long list of outdated urban plans lacking the necessary situational analysis and resourcing to be implemented. The widely noted capacity constraints of officials at all tiers of government but most pronounced within the urban sphere at state and local levels limits the practice of planning.

From the mid-1990s, the country also implemented pilot projects on sustainable cities which brought to the fore the various challenges of urban governance. In 2001, UN-Habitat, in collaboration with the Government of Nigeria, launched the Good Urban Governance (GUG) campaign in Abuja (Federal Ministry of Housing (2001). The GUG campaign was launched towards achieving the goal of the Habitat Agenda on achieving ‘sustainable human settlements development and management in a rapidly urbanizing world’. In particular, this campaign was to sensitise and strengthen the capacities of local governments (LGAs) and

metropolitan authorities to promote the norms of good governance in administration, service delivery and urban poverty reduction.

One of the recommendations of the launch was to carry out yearly monitoring of its impact. Unfortunately, such monitoring was not done, leaving a huge information gap as to progress made so far. Consequently, due to the concerns of the federal government, the Oslo Governance Centre (OGC), UNDP Nigeria and UN-Habitat approved a project to carry out a GUG assessment for the country (Federal Government of Nigeria, 2009).

The GUG assessment focused on assessing the performance of local government across five elements: effectiveness; equity; participation; security; and accountability. This body of work sought to provide a snapshot of the current state of affairs and facilitate home-grown governance mechanisms to address the identified shortfalls. Some evidence (see Ogbazi, 2013) suggests that progress is being made in terms of broad based inclusiveness regarding negotiation and prioritisation of issues of concern, preparation of cities' profiles for wider understanding of interrelationships of development activities and the environment to address urban challenges, and building of consensus for collective action among others. However, these could be improved.

Responsive planning documents, a key element of the UN-Habitat methodology, include community engagement and preparation of 'action oriented' plans. This thinking coincides with the burgeoning environmental agenda of improving conditions, responding to climate change and the adoption of sustainable development principles (as with the advancement of Agenda 21). In this regard, Nigeria benefitted from the Sustainable Cities Project (previously noted) of the Global Urban Management Programme (UMP) by UNDP, World Bank and UN-Habitat, which involved the three cities of Ibadan, Enugu and Kano (1995-2003).

In broad terms, therefore, recent urban development and governance initiatives in Nigeria have sought to promote integrated approaches to urban development with emphasis on participation and inclusion of all urban sector stakeholders. It is believed that with integrated approaches the potential of both the formal and informal urban development and management models could be harnessed and their unsuitable aspects discarded.

However, integration and participation are not all that are required to improve urban development in Nigeria; strategic planning is also important, most notably as the spatial expression of longer-term development objectives. The current expansion and transformation of Nigerian cities needs to be understood spatially and, as contended in Angel et al (2011) and the 'making room' paradigm, cities and towns need to prepare for their own growth and expansion. Urban expansion is happening and the choice for Nigerian policy makers is whether it will continue to be piecemeal, or will greater efforts be made to expand strategically and cohesively. If the latter, then the question becomes how strategic planning can be realised through flexible master plans and how the resources and energy present in the informal systems and private sector can be channelled through more formal processes to enhance urban environments and reap greater benefits for all sectors of society.

To help proffer additional insights and validate findings from the literature the next section discusses the views of some key urban sector stakeholders from Abuja, Lagos, Ibadan, Minna, Calabar and Enugu obtained through semi-structured interviews.

THE PERSPECTIVES OF URBAN STAKEHOLDERS

To validate, extend and complement findings from the literature, as noted earlier, it is necessary to seek multiple perspectives on the challenges and potential future visions for urban planning and management. Therefore, semi-structured interviews with some key stakeholders across six selected cities were conducted. The cities were: Abuja, Lagos, Ibadan, Calabar, Minna, and Enugu. Findings from the interviews are discussed in relation to aspects of recent specific developments and initiatives within the cities as identified from the desktop study. By taking the perspectives of diverse but influential groups across more than one city within one study common debates were explored in more depth.

The stakeholders were mapped and categorised into four main groups: the public sector agencies stakeholder group (PSAG); the community/civic leaders and NGO/CBOs stakeholder group (CNCG); the private sector stakeholder group (PSG) and the professional bodies stakeholder group (PBG). The PSAG comprised relevant officials from government ministries, department and agencies such as lands, survey and town planning, while CNCG was made up of community heads and leaders of community-based organisations (CBOs) and non-governmental organisations (NGOs). The PSG consisted mainly of commercial real estate developers. Lastly, PBG drew on practising members of professional bodies like Nigeria’s Institute of Town Planners and Institute of Surveyors.

The interviews were transcribed after which the transcripts were coded and analysed with the aid of NVIVO software.

DISCUSSION OF STAKEHOLDERS’ PERSPECTIVES

The perspectives drawn from interviews are structured under four themes: land holdings and acquisition/access; urban planning and development; challenges and problems of urban development; and suggested solutions.

Land holdings, acquisition, registration and equity of access

Although expressed in several ways, there appears to be a strong agreement among all the stakeholder groups that urban land could be broadly categorised into public and private lands in common with the generally accepted definitions. However, the composition of landholdings across the selected cities is not uniform, with Abuja acknowledged as a unique case, and with other differences also recognised between Northern, Southern and Eastern states.

There was also the recognition by all the stakeholder groups that only government is vested with the authority to manage lands. However, while members of the PSAG and PBG stakeholder groups referred to the authority conferred through the Land Use Decree of 1978, members of the

other groups, in particular community leaders, seemed unaware of the specific arrangements.

The majority of respondents knew that land for urban development under normal circumstance should be acquired from government. Members of the PSAG and PSG stakeholder groups offered further categorisation of the sources for accessing urban lands for development. They said that other means of access to urban lands are subsequent transactions: 1. The sale of lands from government to third parties; 2. The sale of lands acquired from customary/traditional land owners to third parties.

One customary stakeholder stated that:

“For me there is one main way of acquiring land for development. That is, from government. All the other ways are alternatives.” However, there were some indications that customary or informal alternatives might be preferred by groups feeling excluded from the formal process (particularly some members of the CNCG) with one observing as follows:

“When government acquires land from the community, the community lose. The land goes to government to use and to own and government allocates the way it wants. That reduces the available quantum of land to that community.”

“I think, since that day, the traditional institutions in FCT has nothing to do with any land administration, instead we are just an eye watch to see what the policy is all about, just like what I told you, we can’t fight the government, but we can try to persuade the authority and certain things especially when it regards to our community where we are living.”

Notwithstanding, members of all the stakeholder groups seemed to agree that land acquisition from government had the benefit of certification. Stakeholders across the categories highlighted that the inherent bureaucracy and delays in the formal system and obtaining certification. As such, the majority of the urban population are seen to access lands from alternative sources.

On the detail of acquisition, the interviews revealed strategies that are employed to achieve formalisation. PSAG and PBG stakeholders explained that government land allocations are usually under a three-stage leasehold arrangement. These leases are mostly for a term of 99 years and required interim Right of Occupation (R of O) documents and ultimately Certification of Occupation (C of O), which more or less constitutes registration of the leasehold transaction. Shorter (25 or 50 year) leases may often be granted on commercial and industrial lands. Conversely, they observed that duration for land grants by customary land owners vary and recipients of such grants apply directly for certification, but the certificated transactions are often back-dated to the period before the LUD (1978) thereby shortening the lease term. For example, a stakeholder from the CNCG observed that:

“If you buy from community sometimes they give you 77 years sometimes they give you 99 years. They give you a specific time after which you have to renew or the thing goes back to them. But probably it will be renewed because you would have developed it.”

Members of CNCG stakeholder group explained that the rationale behind the back-dating of the land transactions is to prevent breach of the LUD in

which case they will not be regularised. However, there was a consensus among all the stakeholder groups that most of the grants by the customary land owners are not certified due to challenges of the formal registration system stated previously. Therefore, they are often not secured despite efforts being made by customary administration to protect such grants as noted by one of the stakeholders:

“Registration of land should start with the local chiefs before it reaches the Local Government and proceed to the State level for the final paper (certificate). To prevent trespassing on land sold by family, the date on the paper issued by the Chief (mai-angwan) should be checked to determine who bought the land first and mai-angwan or his representative should be appointed to serve on the committee set up by the state government on land matters”.

The balance between the two (formal and informal land grants) was neatly encapsulated by one PSG member who explained, in practical terms, why development land is predominantly acquired informally:

“Land registration with the government is slow for both the formal and informal lands but the security of tenure of formal land is more guaranteed than the informal land where cases of double selling and encroachment are rife. Formal lands are secured but ease of acquisition lies in the informal market.”

Although often silent on details about terms for customary land grants, findings from the literature, in particular, Ikejiorfor *et al.* (2004), Ikejiorfor (2006), Aribigbola (2007) and Adeniyi (2013) concur with the above quotation and the other views of the stakeholders such as on types of urban lands and the authority with their management responsibility; source of urban lands for development; and strategies employed to regularise customary land grants.

In terms of equity of access to urban land there was a consensus among members of all the stakeholder groups that it is difficult for the poor to acquire and hold land. This is despite the view that there are no policies that discriminate against the poor in acquiring formal lands and that political and family connections can be equally important in securing land allocation. Nevertheless, stakeholders highlighted a number of barriers that impede long term ownership of land by the poor in practice. For formal acquisition, these barriers included awareness of procedures, facilitating payments and long delays as well as the perception that the poor would not be able to develop any allocated land to the required standards and therefore would not apply for land in good areas.

For informal acquisition, the major barrier was seen to be rising prices due to high demand for informal lands. According to the stakeholders, all lands are expensive to come by and the allocation procedure for developable lands disadvantages the poor further by reducing the amount of informal land available while often making the urban poor landless. One stakeholder observed:

“until recently, the local lands were easily affordable to the urban poor..... due to the low prices associated with them caused by the absence of infrastructure such as roads and power. However, the high demand for land in..... has affected the prices”.

The corollary to this is that, contrary to expectation, gender was not seen by most as a significant barrier to land access. This may be because, usually, the major determinant of access to land is financial capacity. Nonetheless, some of the stakeholders especially those from the CNCG expressed the possibility of the existence of such discrimination. A stakeholder from this group, for example, stated that:

“I believe there is marginalization. In the past government allocation goes to men. However the women started applying and when they started becoming members of land allocation committee I think the problem started to come down. At the moment government allocates land to individuals – men or women. For the informal market I would say that men have access more than women because in most communities before you can buy land you have to present a man either as a co-owner or as a witness”.

The views expressed by the stakeholders on the urban poor access and security of title to land for development is in tandem with the literature as discussed in the previous section. Thus, contrary to the view that the informal land acquisition system protects land rights of the urban poor it appears such a protection is crumbling. The stakeholders’ views also partly support section of the literature, which claims that discrimination against women in terms of access to land and security of title is decreasing.

Urban planning and development

Members of the PSAG and the PBG often gave a comprehensive view of the ideals of urban planning. Apart from their stance on inclusion of economic, social and environmental issues in urban planning, some also emphasised the need for planning to involve the community and other stakeholders and deliver infrastructure and amenities. One of the stakeholders from the PSAG group opined as follows:

“I will consider urban planning to be a systematic approach or task or endeavour that engages in the organisation of human activity in space to create a functionally efficient and aesthetically pleasing urban environment for living working and recreation and provision of services and infrastructure are integral parts of urban planning, provision of housing is integral part of urban planning, enforcement of rules and regulations these is what the control department does and then role of community and private sector, yes this I also consider while we talk about stakeholder building and community engagement so all of these I consider as urban planning”.

Members of the PSG and the CNCG former groups predominantly saw urban planning more narrowly as physical arrangement of land uses and enforcement of rules and regulations to achieve harmonious land use as well as provision of physical infrastructure. A stakeholder from the PSG group, for example, conceived urban planning as:

“..... spatial and physical planning of the land for a harmonious land use by different users and the enforcement of rules and regulations that guide such planned uses”.

Some of the stakeholders from CNCG, however, stated that they did not understand what urban planning meant while a stakeholder from the same

group understood it to include economic and social planning not mere land use allocation.

Although there seemed to be consensus among all the stakeholders groups that urban planning to a greater extent in Nigeria is a government stakeholder activity they also acknowledged, particularly within the CNCG, the existence in some cities of indigenous planning. Stakeholders from PSAG and the PBG explained that delivery of urban planning involves a number of government agencies, and for formal development to occur, planning schemes together with infrastructural facilities must first be in place and developers have to obtain certification/register their lands.

A shared understanding of formal and informal development was exhibited. However, in contrast to the land acquisition debate, there was a sharper divide in the perception of relative advantages and disadvantages of the formal and informal developments, with one of the stakeholders from the CNCG noting that:

“Yes it is informal because I have no paper to show. Therefore, if I am developing it according to my taste I think since it is an ancestral home I can upgrade it the way I want until when the authorities come to my aid and that’s what we are all doing”.

While visionary master planning and provision of infrastructure was seen as a benefit by all, the detailed rules and regulations and their enforcement were to a certain extent resented by CNCG who were inclined to regard this as ‘alien’ interference. This finding and the findings on how urban planning is understood, institutions involved in planning, and the strengths and weaknesses of the formal and informal planning systems to a larger extent also correspond with the findings from literature as discussed in the earlier sections of this report.

There was also consensus among all the stakeholder groups that informal developments were rife across all the cities. It was further acknowledged that such new developments are often located at the peripheral areas of the cities and are not usually provided with infrastructure and amenities. Where infrastructure and amenities are provided, they are often not of high quality. This according to some stakeholders was contrary to formal developments, which are more likely to have good infrastructure often provided by government. It was, however, acknowledged across the stakeholder groups that community self-help is sometimes used to provide basic infrastructure for informal developments. NGO assistance is also often leveraged in this regard.

The huge preponderance of informal developments was attributed to a number of factors. There appeared to be agreement among all the stakeholder groups that these include strong demand for developable land, poor development control practices, weak planning and control institutions, lack of logistics including master plans, corruption, political interference in urban planning, and cost, delays and inconveniences associated with compliance with development regulations. This corroborates findings from the literature. One of the stakeholders actually stated that:

“People engage in informal development because they do not wish to spend money in the expensive and time consuming process of acquiring a

development permit. The cost of securing building permit could get up to N200,000 for a bungalow. The bureaucratic delay in registration is a big deterrent. So people prefer to invest their money before it depreciates regardless of the consequence of contravention. To secure building permit, it could take up to two years. Many government departments now want to get involved in issuing building permit”.

There appeared to be mixed outcomes with regard to stakeholder perception on community engagement in urban planning. While some members of each of the stakeholder groups suggested that there have been instances where planning authorities have involved communities or the private sector in planning and urban development, others within each group did not recognise this scenario and reported that they are not involved in planning at all.

From one PASG respondent:

“Our experience shows that the involvement of stakeholders will enrich the process and product of urban planning. It helps to balance the vision of the State Government with that of the people. The response from the stakeholders also encourages acceptability of the plan.”

Yet in another setting a CNCG respondent commented:

“I don’t have the idea, since urban planning is not practiced here?.....If they visit our community, it is only then we can know their activities.”

Similarly, with regards to integrated development, efforts towards such development were acknowledged by some while a contrary view was expressed by others.

Challenges and problems of urban development

The stakeholders confirmed the challenges and problems associated with urban land, planning and governance as identified by the literature. The stakeholders suggested that informal lands are not secure since they are usually not registered. Besides, they are associated with multiple sales and unreasonable terms and harassments. One of the stakeholders, for example, noted that:

“If you buy from community...To maintain the tenancy you have to pay certain amount of money regularly to the government and you also have to pay regularly to the community. Sometimes they levy at will so you are at their mercy and they can harass you a lot if you waste time in paying. So sometimes you own land but you are not at rest with the land”

Another also observed that:

“The biggest problem of getting land from the community is that you don’t know the rightful owner because at times there are people that don’t want to pass through [the] palace. You may meet some agents and you may not know somebody may put his number in the name of an agent, and you will follow him to go and buy land and you may not know if you are buying land from a wrong person, that is the disadvantage, you may end up buying nothing. They show you the land on the ground, you don’t know maybe the owner doesn’t want to sell it, but they have shown you. So that is the disadvantage of buying land from the natives because there is no title

document for you to verify. You will just go with your agreement not knowing you are buying a wrong thing”.

Furthermore, the majority of the stakeholders across the groups agreed with the notion that urban planning and development institutions are weak, under-resourced, riddled with corruption and often suffer political interference in the execution of their duties. Besides, their procedures, processes and requirements are associated with bureaucratic delays and cost. One stakeholder from PSAG, for example, made the observation that:

“The personnel and equipment to work are insufficient. We need skilled and professional staff. We don’t have pay loaders, inspection vehicles even sledge hammers. Our job is risky.”

A developer (PSG) also noted that:

“Our challenges have to do with the complexity of the officials who engage in manipulations of allocation papers, so the government has to look in-house to purge itself of the bad elements. They’ve been trying but they have to do more”.

Similarly, there was acknowledgement of lack of awareness of urban planning and development processes and regulations. Connected to this is the lack of master plans and periodic review of existing ones. The stakeholders also questioned the type and form of master plans, recognising some benefits of ordered layouts but doubting whether they were culturally sympathetic.

However, PSAG respondents were quick to identify political interference in urban planning and management, logistical constraints, weak institutions, lack of staff training and inefficiencies as challenges. They thus observed that planners needed to defend good urban design in terms of drivers wider than economic growth, even mentioning the lack of understanding of basic human land use needs such as land for cemeteries. In contrast, PBS, PSG and CNCG appeared to identify challenges such as the cost of compliance with regulations, administrative delays and bureaucratic complexities arguing that they are disincentives to compliance. One community leader, for instance, observed as follows:

“There are areas they call carved-out land; you can run into serious difficulties because for land that is carved-out you are likely to be involved in legal tussle for many years.”

In comparative terms, the three later stakeholder groups further observed that informal development was straightforward and easy to realise.

Strict enforcement was occurring in some cities and areas and CNCG stakeholders could take advantage of formal planning laws. This can be seen in the remarks of one of the community leaders below:

“and we have stopped them and the minister has been instructing us very well to make sure that we do not allow anybody to come into our midst and do such a thing and we are monitoring seriously based on his own advice”

Opinions differed on whether it is a sensible option to require demolition on the grounds of illegality once a development has emerged whether formally or informally. In rapidly expanding cities where inward migration is resulting in all types of informal practice, and economic necessities

dictate that extra workers are welcome, the conflicting interests of various stakeholder groups result in tensions.

One PASG noted the type of informal settlement is critical, and obliquely appealed for a sense of proportion in judging when:

“They live on land that has been set aside as either acquisition area or committed land in the State. The dire need for such land by the State always results in the move to demolish all the ramshackle structures on the land. Where government takes the extreme decision of removing such encroachment, non-governmental organisations, United Nation agencies UN-Habitat, the populace etc. always sympathise with the inhabitants of these land and weep in sentiment by referring to such act as government as been an act of marginalization.”

In practice this means that the urban poor are effectively marginalised through the circumstances of poverty rather than as a result of discrimination. Although not across all the cities, there was also concern among all the stakeholder groups regarding non-payment of compensation to expropriated land owners, which has somewhat empowered them to encroach on government lands.

Perhaps the greatest challenge recognised by all the stakeholder groups was the lack of infrastructure. Infrastructure was seen to be lacking in informal settlements by all stakeholders and existing infrastructure was said to be at risk from encroachment by unplanned informal development. One of the stakeholders noted as follows:

“infrastructures are not provided and then all you have is self-help by people who live in those areas wherein they try to grade the roads to their respectively settlements, try to provide boreholes or well that are sunk in order to provide water and they also have generators to provide power.”

PSAG and PSG respondents further identified that infrastructure may also be non-existent or of poor quality in formal settlements despite the stipulations of master plans and good intentions of responsible parties. PBG had a nuanced view of how allocation of responsibilities could cause issues around perceived responsibility for provision of infrastructure and services.

Additionally, there was overall recognition across all the stakeholder groups that the current urban development system does not augur well for sustainable urban development and management. All the stakeholder groups recognised that there is a tendency for climate change issues to be associated with flood risk, microclimate impacts and general environmental concerns. On the issue of climate change, it appeared that individuals in all the stakeholder groups acknowledged that urban planning could be relevant in terms of addressing the causes and challenges of climate change. However, planning in their area was seen as ineffective in that regard. Poor planning was identified as a contributing factor by some individuals but differing views on the links between climate and development are not aligned with different types of respondent.

Suggested solutions

Several solutions to the urban land, planning and governance problems were suggested by stakeholders across the groups.

The call for formulation and implementation of policies to ensure transparency in land allocation process and make formal lands affordable and accessible to all categories of people was unanimous. It was, for example, recommended that land allocation committees should be made-up of representatives from the various classes in society.

There appeared to be an appetite for structured planning of settlements with consistent application of sensible rules across all stakeholder groups. Respondents, including CNCG, were almost unanimous in their support for master plans and clear communication of those plans. This stemmed from the recognition that unplanned settlements lack suitable infrastructure and ad hoc arrangements lead to inequitable distribution of land and resources. A feeling was prevalent that lack of structured plans can also increase the tendency for different rules to apply for the rich and powerful.

PBG and PSAG stakeholders also supported master planning but went further to suggest greater finance and resources to build capacity to enable implementation of plans. Also, payment of compensation on government land acquisitions and enforcement measures to ensure development control were suggested. Greater professionalism and use of ICT was called for by PBG. Some specific governance proposals, for particular cities, were also put forward by PSAG and PBG.

“There is the requirement for capacity building on the part of the practitioners, not only to leverage their capacity to bring them in tune with the present day reality and challenges in cities but to also increase the quantitative capacity in order to ensure effective coverage of all the areas”

From all stakeholders the notion of community involvement and engagement was a suggested step forward to improve urban planning and management: *“Planning should be built around people”*. However there were different perspectives on what this actually entailed. The paternalistic tone adopted by the majority of PSAG and PBG suggested a need to educate and instruct communities - *“Consultation with the community through advocacy”* in pursuit of pre-planned goals. *“Each of the documents makes provision for consultation with stakeholders, publication of the intention of the government and objection where there is need”*.

This is in contrast with the more pro-active role forseen by the CNCG and PSG. CNCG and PSG respondents put forward the suggestion that greater participation and integration between formal and informal systems would be helpful in solving the challenges in urban planning because:

“...every other person you see today no matter the power he has from the government, comes from a village, and the people in the village have respect for their leaders...”

It was argued here that some traditional leaders may be experienced in the formal system and that all can make a meaningful contribution to the debate.

The other major proposed improvement measure, integration of formal and informal planning systems means, different things to different stakeholders.

Integration was seen as a way to reduce bureaucracy by PSG and PBG. However CNCG saw integrated planning systems as a way of keeping

traditions and traditional spaces within planned communities and community leaders as the holders of valuable local knowledge.

PSAG on the other hand would prefer to streamline the formal system rather than seek to integrate formal and informal systems. However there appears to be some recognition of the supporting spontaneous development to achieve higher standards and legitimacy.

The policies of regularization and ‘village excision’ are used by Lagos State Government to grant title to the informal land developers. In other cases of illegal structures within setbacks, the government and its officials remove the structures.

“My view on the use of ,integrated procedure/practice is that both policies of ‘land regularization’ and ‘village excision’ are being implemented effectively in Lagos State. The policies have helped to integrate what hitherto could have remained informal developments without title.”

In particular, integration was seen in terms of successful examples of providing planning layouts to developments that were not allocated by government in response to community approaches thereby avoiding the necessity of acquiring and allocating land. Oversight and countersigning of local land transfer agreements were also mentioned within a receptive community development.

Apart from the foregoing suggestions, the stakeholders also identified specific developments and initiatives across some of the six cities that could present opportunities and at the same time pose challenges for effective urban planning and development. These included the proposed Centenary City Project in Abuja, Lagos Urban Transport Project (LUTP); and the Summit Hills Project in Calabar.

These recent developments cut across housing, commercial and transport infrastructure development, and climate change adaptation programmes that will among others provide accommodation and job opportunities, and ensure effective and efficient functioning of the cities to promote socio-economic development. The Abjua Centenary City Project, for example, promises to create 50,000 jobs. However, there is little indication on how such development could address the needs of urban residents who are unable to access it for either accommodation or employment. Meanwhile, developments are still being undertaken under the Master Plan for the city extending to where the proposed project is to take place. One stakeholder, for example, observed that:

“I can mention some districts within the metropolis like Mabuchi, Kado, Kantampe. Kantampe has just been awarded on a PPP arrangement”.

In Kantampe, the expected land value uplift of the superior municipal services anticipated from the delivery of the PPP project will be captured in increased leasehold charges. But the availability of other demarcated residential zones growing in areas outside the master plan in satellite towns - such as Kubwa - raises the question of why existing allocations are neglected and perhaps suggested that land value and lack of infrastructure may be large factors:

“Durumi is within the centre of the city but there has not been infrastructure for the past 20 years but they will leave the land and create

another district then award infrastructure immediately for such areas and neglecting what we have within the town”.

The idea of the Lagos Urban Transport Project to develop a comprehensive integrated and multi-modal transport system for the mega city region is laudable. However, the transformative impact that such projects can have in unleashing development opportunities and providing greater and more functional transport options needs to also be considered against the planning process they operate within. The support for reform to achieve broader social and economic objectives sits within the need to integrate these policies with spatial plans for Lagos to adequately coordinate across boundaries and allocate resources. The political will for change and ‘delivering results’ has created momentum for practitioners and officials to ‘link-up’ and prioritise the preparation of more integrated spatial plans (see Lagos Metropolitan Governance Project).

Similarly, the idea to redevelop Makoko, a place which is devoid of infrastructure to supply water, waste water management, solid waste and social services, could attract and cater for the burgeoning middle-class.

The medium and large scale developer-built estates and the commercial developments with retail facilities, such as the Legacy Estate, and Palms Ibadan in Ibadan, offer opportunities to increase the housing stock and economic activities in a planned environment. This applies to similar such developments and infrastructure, as for example in Calabar, Summit Hill and Monorail and Minna

However, these new and emerging developments, massive in scale and undertaken in partnership with government via joint venture agreements, have implications for the wider planning and development process. Cities such as Lagos and Ibadan that are experiencing this type of new town and private estate development, are operating within the ‘formal’ planning process. While these developments are examples of urban transformation and tremendous real estate development occurring in Nigerian cities, they are not fully responsive to the diversity of needs across an urban area, city or region (see Gandy 2005, Sawyer 2014, Bloch 2014).

The production of low-rise middle-class oriented development does not necessarily address the wider development issues emerging for Nigeria’s urban residents. Nowhere this is more evident than in transport projects such as the Lagos MRT or the Ibadan-Expressway that highlight the vast volume of movement to and from employment locations and the high demand for a range of housing types to accommodate existing and newly arrived residents (see Sawyer, 2014). These issues traverse administrative boundaries, alter the urban form and extent of cities and often highlight the tensions arising in state-to-state cooperation as well as state-to-federal relations.

SUMMARY

In broad terms, the results from the interviews provided strong validation for the findings in the literature. However, the interviews prepared some new insights and in some cases highlighted areas of contention. There was actually a correspondence between the outcome of the interviews and literature regarding types of land holdings and how they are brought

forward for development. Similar correspondence is noted in the area of formal land grants.

Nevertheless, unlike the literature, this study demonstrates that terms for informal land grants vary partly because of backdating practices.

Furthermore, although the outcome from the interviews corroborates the literature on land governance arrangements both within the formal and informal set-ups and the discrimination against the poor in terms of access to formal lands, there is a question around the established view of discrimination against women that warrants further investigation as it is indicated that this is a rapidly changing area. Indeed, the study suggests that the key denominator for access to formal land is financial capacity and influence. This has been said to extend increasingly to the informal system.

The interviews also show that stakeholders from PSAG and PBG, in the main, gave a comprehensive view of urban planning and pointed to the need for it to include social, economic and environmental issues. They also demonstrated full knowledge of the laws, institutions, procedures and processes involved land acquisition, planning and development.

Although the members from the other groups showed some awareness, the study has made it evident that some prominent and influential stakeholders in the urban development processes may after all not be aware of the extant planning and development arrangements. Therefore there is a need for more communication to generate wider awareness if ideals of urban planning are to be achieved.

What is even more striking is that, despite the comprehensive conception of urban planning by PSAG and PBG, planning in practice is limited to land use distribution issues and enforcement of regulation, and even these functions are not pursued rigorously. This signifies the presence of an inertia, which may be connected to the challenges, such as political interference, lack of resources and corruption among others, identified by the interviewers.

The outdated nature of the majority of urban plans gives the formal system a lack of relevance to urban populations and contributes to a feeling that state and local authorities lack vision and a coherent plan. This has led to dissatisfaction with the authorities on two major planning and governance issues.

First, provision of local infrastructure and municipal services are seen to be driven by inadequate planning and therefore lack of provision reduces the incentive for communities and developers to interact with the formal system. While the literature suggests that planned areas are provided with good infrastructure and informal ones are not, the picture emerging from this case study analysis is that the position is far from clear cut and that settlements driven by communities and developers, taking advantage of major infrastructure, and covered by local plans, are just as likely to be well serviced. However this pattern may render the major infrastructure obsolete due to underestimation of capacity.

Second, the vision and strategic direction in terms of cultural and environmental issues and climate change is seen as a clear advantage of masterplans that communities and developers expect – with the proviso that such visions are consistent with the needs and cultural expectations of

the population. Climate issues are poorly understood across all stakeholder groups and while there is some appreciation of the benefits of mitigating pollution, urban heat and greenhouse gases, the adaptation perspective is hardly voiced.

Through the breadth of cities considered by the study, the interviews were able to identify mixed outcomes within all the stakeholder groups regarding community/stakeholder participation in urban planning and development and its extension to integrated development. This demonstrated different experiences regarding the amount of efforts that are being made to increase greater participation. Although the suggestion that examples abound on efforts towards greater stakeholder participation supports the literature, the outcome of interviews demonstrates that there are differences in experiences and such efforts to increase participation may be uncoordinated and lack uniformity. This may not augur well for integrated development in the short term but points to an opportunity and willingness to develop innovative systems from a diversity of examples of good practice.

This optimistic scenario was reinforced by the variety of suggested solutions to the problems ranging from high level revisions of structures and decrees to more local level organic change. While this could be seen as a challenge in terms of building consensus, it presents greater opportunities for policy makers to formulate inclusive and responsive policies for sustainable urban development and management.

Finally, the outcome from the interviews on the challenges and problems of urban land, planning and development reaffirms sentiments in the literature. This suggests that research into the problems with the view to prescribe sustainable solutions is imperative.

CONCLUSION

The challenges facing Nigeria, in terms of population growth, spatially expanding cities and provision of attendant infrastructure, against a backdrop of a changing climate and increased vulnerability, present both issues of policy and of delivery. This report has examined the land development and urban planning systems within Nigeria and highlighted examples of development taking place. The exercise has endeavoured to build a greater understanding of the dynamics of physical development in Nigerian cities and towns.

In order to understand today's situation, this report has revisited past practice and history. This contextualisation and presentation of change over time has enabled the complexity of access to land, formal planning systems and governance structures to be described. Through this, the current duality – in formal and informal terms – of land administration, urban planning and governance systems has been emphasised.

Contemporary planning practice recognises the iterative nature of planning both in the process of plan making and governance. The contribution that this research makes to the policy debate for Nigerian cities centres around developing a deeper picture of the development practice and relating this to future policy making.

There is a clear reform agenda emerging that needs to be supported to enable greater access to land and adequate provision of housing and infrastructure. The national urban development policy recognises the current deficiencies of what is deemed the 'planning system' and the need to develop the capacity of each tier of government.

As noted earlier in the report, the need for metropolitan scale planning, regional planning and cross-boundary cooperation is central to the sustainable future of Nigerian cities. In order to achieve inclusive development and maximise economic productivity, development should not take place in isolated islands or piecemeal. Rather, as the pace of urbanisation continues, policy makers will need to consider how to address existing deficits while at the same time allowing for growth and future demands.

Policy considerations for now can thus be considered across three primary themes all interrelated and relevant to wider URN research: governance and implementation arrangements; sustainability; and engagement and participation.

Governance and implementation arrangements constitute a large and multifaceted area. It considers both the role and function of each tier of government in conjunction with how responsibility is discharged. The introduction of the 1978 Land Use Decree, the 1992 Urban and Regional Planning Decree and the review and revision of the national urban development policy all seek to clarify, simplify and improve access to land and urban planning functions.

However, capacity for either state or local government to fulfil their obligations remains problematic. The emergence of large-scale private sector oriented developments that are supported, often through joint

venture agreements between state governments and developers, against a backdrop of inadequate provision of infrastructure in existing and informal developments, has confirmed the need for an examination of the sustainability of such developments.

There is a need to examine in greater detail state and local government roles in realising development objectives. This includes the relationship between strategic planning and municipal infrastructure provision. If private sector development (supported by state government) is the dominant focus for development, who should provide and maintain the municipal infrastructure, how should it be financed and does this focus on private sector led outcomes disadvantage the urban poor? What then is the role for local government in the provision of basic services and how urban planning and management practices need to adjust to better serve the wider needs of residents?

Consideration of how Nigerian cities respond to a changing climate is also important for policy makers. Current national level activity is promising for furthering the debate and increasing the awareness of climate issues but the extent to which this is applied at the local level is limited, with mitigation and adaptation planning still needing to be mainstreamed into urban planning procedures and instruments.

In this report, examples of development taking place across Nigeria have been provided as well as recent work undertaken in partnership with UN-Habitat and others to prepare city profiles, structure plans and good governance assessments. Interviews highlighted that many of the challenges identified in the literature are recognised by stakeholder groups as obstacles to better urban environments.

The interviews emphasised that questions around equity, particularly around increasing poverty divides, gender issues and climate adaptation or environmental concerns are emerging as priorities. Lack of resources faced all participants in the face of rapid urban growth and the need to regain control over development to ensure settlements retain basic living standards was recognised as desirable by all.

However, there is a lack of detailed understanding and acceptance of formal processes among community stakeholders even though there is a general consensus that planned development is preferable to haphazard urban growth. The chief difficulties identified by each stakeholder group related to their particular roles in development with political and economic pressures recognised more by official and professional groups and practical compliance issues dominating the discourse of private and community stakeholders.

There is also a general willingness to move towards more integrated and participatory approaches in order to boost resources and increase compliance. Stakeholders from all groups expressed here again that there is a gulf between detailed perception of potential participants of the potential roles and the major benefits that could accrue from such processes. In addition, issues related to the equity of access to urban land need to be tackled not only in order to facilitate the access to land by the poor through financial capacity but also in a way to strengthen women's right to land ownership, consequently contributing to decrease gender inequalities. As highlighted in one of the interviews, the government is

progressing in allocating land for both men and women. However, the existing informal market still requires a man to be co-owner or a witness when women try to acquire land.

From the discussion, it appears that sustained engagement with communities in the form of participatory approaches has led to better development outcomes. However, it still remains necessary to consider how urban governance and management practices will promote inclusiveness on a more regular basis and ensure that the wider developmental needs of urban residents, particularly those in the informal sector, can be met.

Efforts towards policy review should therefore look at or consider a re-think of the policy, mechanisms and arrangements for urban land, planning, and governance in Nigerian cities. In doing so, due regard should be paid to:

1. The need for co-ordinated urban, planning, development and governance as well as to desirable development outcomes.
2. The need to satisfy different socio-economic groups – in terms of processes and outcomes.
3. The need to address the inadequacies of the formal system.
4. The need to incorporate the workable aspects of the informal development system.

As the Table below illustrates, it is aimed to cover these issues by URN Theme D projects in Years 2, 3, and 4 of the programme:

Theme D: Urban land, planning, and governance in Nigerian cities	To investigate and assess how the land development process operates, and the contribution of urban planning and governance mechanisms to outcomes.
Planning, management and governance of informal urban developments in Nigeria	To examine the system of planning, management and governance for informal urban development to gain a deeper understanding of the system to aid formulation of suitable urban planning, management and governance arrangements in Nigeria.
State governments as laboratories of democracy	This research will assess a number of state level reform initiatives and their contribution to more accountable and democratic political and economic outcomes.

<p>Abuja as fastest growing Nigerian city: special circumstances of the federal capital in comparative perspective</p>	<p>To investigate the way in which large-scale city- and suburb-building is occurring in Abuja, and how this is planned, managed and governed.</p>
<p>Adaptation of urban infrastructure to enhance climate resilience</p>	<p>To explore the potential to adopt integrated flood and water management concepts in Nigerian urban systems to reduce future flood risk and drought through understanding the vulnerability and resilience of communities at risk.</p>
<p>Delivering municipal services through effective procurement of local infrastructure</p>	<p>To investigate the capacity building needs of local and state authorities to achieve value for money, transparency and sustainability in local infrastructure procurement for delivery of essential municipal services.</p>

REFERENCES

- Abubakar, I.M. (2014) Abuja City Profile. *Cities*, 41, 81-91.
- Adam, A.G. (2014) Informal Settlements in the Peri-urban Areas of Bahir Dar, Ethiopia: An Institutional Analysis. *Habitat International*, 43, 90-97.
- Adama, O. (2007) Governing from Above Solid Waste Management in Nigeria's New Capital City of Abuja. (Doctoral thesis. Stockholm University), Sweden.
- Adedeji, O. H., Odufuwa, B. O. & Adebayo, O. H. (2012) Building capabilities for flood disaster and hazard preparedness and risk reduction in Nigeria: need for spatial planning and land management. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* 14.
- Adelekan, I. O. (2010) Vulnerability of poor urban coastal communities to flooding in Lagos, Nigeria. *Environment and Urbanization* 22, 433-450.
- Adeloye, A.J. and Rustum, R. (2011) Lagos (Nigeria) Flooding and Influence of Urban Planning. *Urban Design and Planning, DP3*, 175-187.
- Adeniyi, P. (2013) Improving Land Sector Governance in Nigeria. Implementation of the Land Governance Assessment Framework. A Synthesis Report. Department of Geography, University of Lagos.
- Adinna, E. N., Enete Ifeanyi, C and Okolie, T. (2009) Assessment of urban heat island and possible adaptations in Enugu urban using landsat-ETM. *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*, 2(2), 030-036.
- African Development Bank Group (2013) Federal Republic of Nigeria Country Strategy Report 2013-2017.
- Agbola, T. and Agunbiade, E.M. (2009) Urbanization, Slum Development and Security of Tenure: The Challenges of meeting Millennium Development Goal 7 in Metropolitan Lagos Nigeria. Available Online at: www.populationenvironmentresearch.org/workshops.jsp#W2007 (Accessed: 27/10/2013).
- Agunbiade, M.E. and Rajabifard, A. (2013) Analysing Inter-agency integration for land delivery in Nigeria: Data, Process and Policy Integration. Proceedings of Global Geospatial Conference, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, November, 4-8.
- Akingbade, A., Navarra, D., Zevenbergen, J. and Georgiadou, Y. (2012) The Impact of Electronic Land Administration on Urban Housing Development: The Case Study of the Federal Capital Territory of Nigerian. *Habitat International*, 36, 324-332.
- Ali, A. N. (2010) An assessment of the quality of intra-urban bus services in the city of Enugu, Enugu State, Nigeria. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, 6(15), 74-91.
- Aluko, O. (2011) Sustainable Housing Development and Functionality of Planning Laws in Nigeria: The case of Cosmopolitan Lagos. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 4(5), 139-150.

- Amao, F.L. (2012) Housing Quality in Informal Settlements and Urban Upgrading in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Developing Country Studies*, 2(10), 68-80.
- Angel, S.; Parent, J.; Clvco, D. L.; Blel, A. M. (2011) Making Room for a Planet of Cities. Policy Focus Report: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Aribigbola, A. (2007) Urban Land Use Planning, Policies and Management in Sub Saharan African Countries: Empirical Evidence from Akure, Nigeria. Report presented at the 4th World Bank Urban Research Symposium, Washington, DC [June, 2007].
- Arimah, B.C. and Adeagbo, D. (2000). Compliance with Urban Development and Planning Regulations in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Habitat International*, 24, 279-294.
- Birner, R. and Okumo, A. (2012) Challenges of Land Governance in Nigeria: Insights from Case Study in Ondo State. International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Bloch, Robin. (2014) "Africa's New Suburbs." In Hamel P., Keil R, eds., *Suburban Governance. A Global View*, University of Toronto Press. Toronto.
- Butler, S.B. (2009) Improving Land Policy for Private Sector Development in Nigeria: Lessons and Challenges Ahead. Report presented at the World Bank Conference on Land Governance in Support of the MDGs, March 9-10, Washington, DC.
- Chorkor, B.A. (1993) External European Influence and Indigenous Social Values in Urban Development and Planning in the Third World: The Case of Ibadan, Nigeria. *Planning Perspectives*, 8(3), 283-306.
- Deininger, K., Hilhorst, T. and Songwe, V. (2014). Identifying and Addressing Land Governance Constraints to Support Intensification and Land Market Operation: Evidence from 10 African Countries. *Food Policy*, 48, 76-87.
- Department for International Development (2009) Impact of Climate Change on Nigeria's Economy. Final Report. Retrieved from www.erm.com.: DFID.
- Egbu, A.U., Olomolaiye, P. and Gamerson, R. (2007) A Quantitative Model for Assessing the Impact of Land Use Planning on Urban Housing Development in Nigeria. *International Development Planning Review (IDPR)*, 29(2), 215-239.
- Egbu, A. U., Olomolaiye, P. and Gameson, R. (2008) A Neo-institutional Economic Critique of the System for Allocating Urban Land and Development Rights in Nigeria. *Habitat International*, 32,121-135.
- Eko, A.J., Ayama, O.R., Eni, D.I., Eja, E.I. and Esien, O.E. (2012) The Effects of Urban Sprawl on Peripheral Agricultural Lands in Calabar, Nigeria. *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(2), 68-76.
- Falade, J. B. (2009) Report of the Vision 2020: National Technical Working Group On Urban and Rural Development

- Falade, J. B. (2012) The Contributions of Land Use Planning to National Development. Paper delivered at the 5th annual lecture of the School of Environmental Technology, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria, held on 16th august 2012.
- Fashae, O. A. & Omafeso, O. D. (2011) Impact of climate change on sea level rise in Lagos, Nigeria. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 32, 9811-9819.
- Filani, M.. (2010) A City in Transition: Vision, Reform and Growth in Lagos Nigeria. Cities Alliance. 34
- Fourchard, L. (2003) The case of Ibadan Nigeria. Ibadan: Institut francais de Recherche en Afrique (IFRA) University of Ibadan.
- Gandy, M., (2005) Learning from Lagos. *New Left Review*, 33, 36-52.
- Home, R.K. (1983) Town Planning, Segregation and Indirect Rule in Colonial Nigeria. *Third World Planning Review*, 5, 165-175.
- ICF International (2012) A Review of Environmental and Social Impacts, Traffic, Tariffs and Revenue for the Red Line Concession: Scoping Report Prepared for Marina Express Consortium
- Ikejiofor, U. (1997) Planning and the Political Process: Sifting some underlying issues in the Development of Abuja, Nigeria's new capital.
- Ikejiofor, U. (2006) Equity in informal land delivery: Insights from Enugu, Nigeria. *Land Use Policy*, 23, 448-459.
- Ikejiofor, U.C. (2009). Planning within a Context of Informality: Issues and Trends in Land Delivery in Enugu, Nigeria. Available Online at: www.unhabitat.org/grhs/2009 (Accessed: 27/10/2013).
- Ikejiofor, C.U. Nwogu, K.C. and Nwanunobi, C.O. (2004) Informal Land Delivery Processes and access to Land for the Poor in Enugu. Informal Land Delivery in African Cities Working Report 2, University of Birmingham, School of Public Policy, International Development Department, Birmingham.
- Imam, A., Mohammed, B., Wilson, D.C. and Cheeseman, C.R. (2008) Solid waste management in Abuja, Nigeria. *Waste Management*, 28, 468-472.
- Mabogunje, A.L. (1990) Urban Planning and the Post-Colonial State in Africa: A Research Overview. *African Studies Review*, 33(2), 121 -203.
- Magigi, W. and Majani, B.B.K. (2006) Community Involvement in Land Regularization for Informal Settlements in Tanzania: A Strategy for Enhancing Security of Tenure in Residential Neighborhoods. *Habitat International*, 30(6), 1066-1081.
- Mohammed, L.N. Aboh, H.O. and Emenike, E.A. (2007) A Regional Geoelectric Investigation for Groundwater Exploration in Minna Area, Northwest Nigeria. *Science World Journal*, 2(3), 15-19.
- Nkurunziza, E. (2008) Understanding Informal Urban Land Access Processes from a Legal Pluralist Perspective: The Case of Kampala, Uganda. *Habitat International*, 32(1), 109-120.

- The Nigerian Institute of Town Planners (NITP) (Undated) The State of Town Planning Report.
- Ogbazi, J.U. (2013) Alternative Planning Approaches and the Sustainable Cities Programme in Nigeria. *Habitat International*, 40, 109-118.
- Ogu, V.I. (1999) Evolutionary Dynamics of Urban Land Use Planning and Environmental Sustainability in Nigeria. *Planning Perspectives* 14(4), 347-368.
- Ogu, V.I. (2002) Urban Residential Satisfaction and the Planning Implications in a Developing World Context: The Example of Benin City, Nigeria. *International Planning Studies*, 7(1), 37-53.
- Ogwueleka T. (2013) Survey of Household Waste Composition and Quantities in Abuja, Nigeria. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 77, 52-60.
- Ojigi, L.M. (2012) An Evaluation of the Efficiency of the Land Use Act 1978 of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and its Implications in Minna and Environs. A Report Presented at FIG Working Week, Rome, May 6-12.
- Rakodi, C. (2006) State-Society Relations in Land Delivery Processes in Five African Cities:
- Sawyer, L. (2014) Piecemeal Urbanisation at the Peripheries of Lagos, African Studies, DOI: 10.1080/00020184.2014.925207
- Sayne, A. (2011) Climate Change Adaptation and Conflict in Nigeria. United States Institute of Peace.
- The Economist (2012) Destroying Makoko: One of Africa's oldest and best-known slums is being dismantled (Aug 18th edition).
- UN-Habitat (2005) Final Report: Documentation of lessons learnt in the Sustainable Cities Programme in Nigeria. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
- UN-Habitat (2008) The Sustainable Cities Nigeria Programme (1994-1996): Building Platforms for Environmentally Sustainable Urbanisation. Nairobi, UN-Habitat.
- UN-Habitat (2010) The State of African Cities 2010: Governance, Inequality and Urban Land Markets. London: Earthscan.
- UN-Habitat (2014) The State of African Cities 2014:Re-imagining Sustainable Urban Transitions. London: Earthscan.
- Wekesa, Steyn, G.S. and Otieno, F.A.O. (2013) A Review of Physical and Socio-economic Characteristics and Intervention Approaches of Informal Settlements. *Habitat International*,, 35(2), 238-245.
- World Bank (2002) State and Local Governance in Nigeria. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Yadua, O. (2012) Determinants of Urban Poor Housing in Makoko Area, Lagos. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 14(6), 1520-5509.

ANNEX: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Interview schedule for semi structured interviews : Urban Land, Planning and Governance in Nigerian Cities		
<p>Pre-amble: Thank you for agreeing to take part in this interview. I hope you have had the chance to read the information sheet and are happy to proceed. This interview is concerned with urban land, planning and governance in your city or state. We will start with questions relating to land access and move on to talk about urban planning and finally urban development issues.</p>		
Main Question/Theme	Prompts/clarifications use any or all	Requests for detailed information use any or all if response to question indicates appropriate
<p>A. Can you tell me what you know about the types of urban land holdings (State/public, private (family/individual/customary tenancies) and communal) and access to urban land for development in INSERT RELEVANT WORDS?</p> <p>Nigeria/ Cities: Abuja, Minna, Enugu & Ibadan/ State: FCT, Niger, Enugu & Oyo</p>	<p>You might like to think about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Differences between types of urban landholdings in Nigeria? 2. How urban lands are brought forward for development (formal and informal land markets)? 3. The types of grants usually given for the various urban landholdings? 4. Rights associated with the various types of grants? 5. How the rights are secured? 6. Differences (or not) for the marginalised such as the urban poor and women? 	<p>Have you any documents that show how policy relates to this or has changed in this regard</p> <p>Can you give any specific examples</p> <p>How does this relate to other cities/states/national</p>

	<p>7. Individuals and institutions involved in urban land acquisition and security of land rights (tenure) in the formal and informal land markets, and the role they play?</p> <p>8. The reasons for the emergence of informal land markets?</p> <p>9. Rules, regulations and practices governing urban land acquisition and security?</p> <p>10. How they are implemented?</p> <p>11. How effective they are?</p>	
<p>B. What do you think are the problems of urban land acquisition and security in INSERT RELEVANT WORDS</p> <p>Nigeria/ Cities: Abuja, Minna, Enugu & Ibadan/ State: FCT, Niger, Enugu & Oyo</p>	<p>You might like to think about:</p> <p>1. The biggest problems of access to formal lands?</p> <p>2. The biggest problems of access to informal lands</p> <p>3. Land registration problems?</p> <p>4. Security of tenure problems?</p> <p>5. Advantages and disadvantages of accessing and securing formal and informal lands?</p>	<p>Have you any documents that show how policy relates to this or has changed in this regard</p> <p>Can you give any specific examples</p> <p>How does this relate to other cities/states/national</p>
<p>C. Can you suggest any potential ways that can help to resolve</p>	<p>For any suggestions:</p>	<p>Do you have any evidence</p>

<p>these problems in INSERT RELEVANT WORDS?</p> <p>Nigeria/ Cities: Abuja, Minna, Enugu & Ibadan/ State: FCT, Niger, Enugu & Oyo</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why do you think that will help? 2. How might that work in practice? 3. Are there any barriers to making this work? 4. What would that mean for you and your role? 5. How would you evaluate your new approach to tell if it was working? <p>Otherwise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. What do you think about increasing stakeholder participation? 6. Are there possibilities to incorporate useful procedures, processes and practices from the informal land market? 7. Have any of these been tried in your area? 9. Can you tell me about the experience? 	<p>that this will help</p> <p>Can you give specific examples where it has helped</p> <p>Do you have any evidence that this would/would not work</p> <p>Can you give any specific examples</p>
<p>D. What do you consider urban planning (town planning/town & country planning/land use planning/spatial planning/physical planning) to be/cover?</p>	<p>You might like to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision of services/infrastructure? 2. Provision of housing? 3. Enforcement of rules and regulations? 4. Role of the community and private sector? 	

<p>E. Can you tell me how urban planning (town planning/town & country planning/land use planning/spatial planning/physical planning) has evolved and the current state of its practices in INSERT APPROPRIATE WORDS?</p> <p>Nigeria/ Cities: Abuja, Minna, Enugu & Ibadan/ State: FCT, Niger, Enugu & Oyo</p>	<p>You might like to think about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How urban planning was introduced? 2. How urban planning is practiced? 3. Participants and institutions involved in urban planning and their role? 4. Rules, regulations and practices that govern urban planning practice? 5. How the rules, regulations and practices are implemented? 6. Effectiveness of these rules, regulations and practices? 7. The involvement of all stakeholders in urban planning? 8. Contribution of urban planning to sustainable development and alleviation of climate change effects? 	<p>Have you any documents that show how policy relates to this or has changed in this regard</p> <p>Can you give any specific examples</p> <p>How does this relate to other cities/states/national</p>
<p>F. What do you think are the problems of urban planning ((town planning/town & country planning/land use planning/spatial planning/physical planning) in INSERT APPROPRIATE WORDS?</p> <p>Nigeria/ Cities: Abuja, Minna, Enugu & Ibadan/</p>	<p>You might like to think about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The biggest problems of urban planning? 2. Political interference in urban planning? 3. Advantages and disadvantages of reliance on colonial planning approaches? 4. Advantages and disadvantages of 	<p>Have you any documents that show how policy relates to this or has changed in this regard</p> <p>Can you give any specific examples</p> <p>How does this relate to other cities/states/national</p>

<p>State: FCT, Niger, Enugu & Oyo</p>	<p>native/customary/traditional planning approaches</p>	
<p>G. Can you suggest any potential ways that can help to resolve these urban planning (town planning/town & country planning/land use planning/spatial planning/physical planning) problems in INSERT APPROPRIATE WORDS?</p> <p>Nigeria/ Cities: Abuja, Minna, Enugu & Ibadan/ State: FCT, Niger, Enugu & Oyo</p>	<p>For any suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why do you think that will help? 2. How might that work in practice? 3. Are there any barriers to making this work? 4. What would that mean for you and your role? 5. How would you evaluate your new approach to tell if it was working? <p>Otherwise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6 What do you think about increasing stakeholder participation? 7. Has this been tried in your area? 8. Can you tell me about the experience 	<p>Do you have any evidence that this will help</p> <p>Can you give specific examples where it has helped</p> <p>Do you have any evidence that this would/would not work</p> <p>Can you give any specific examples</p>
<p>H. Can you tell me what you know about formal and informal urban land development and governance in INSERT APPROPRIATE WORDS?</p> <p>Nigeria/ Cities: Abuja, Minna, Enugu & Ibadan/ State: FCT, Niger, Enugu & Oyo</p>	<p>You might like to think about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The processes involved in formal and informal urban land developments? 2. Where formal and informal urban land developments usually occur and why? 3. The participants and institutions involved in 	<p>Have you any documents that show how policy relates to this or has changed in this regard</p> <p>Can you give any specific examples</p> <p>How does this relate to other</p>

	<p>both types of developments and their role?</p> <p>4. How infrastructure is provided/extended to both types of developments?</p> <p>6. The role of urban planning in both types of developments?</p> <p>7. How government and its officials influence both developments?</p> <p>8. Your thoughts on attempts by both development approaches to use integrated procedures/practices and how those attempts are implemented?</p> <p>9. What are the rules, regulations and practices that govern both types of developments?</p> <p>10. How are these rules, regulations and practices implemented?</p> <p>11. How effective are these rules, regulations and practices?</p> <p>12. How formal and informal approaches involve the poor and women?</p> <p>13. What are the levels of participation of all stakeholders and transparency in both formal and informal urban land development and governance approaches?</p>	<p>cities/states/national</p>
--	---	-------------------------------

<p>I. What do you think are the impacts of urban land developments including on climate change in INSERT APPROPRIATE WORDS?</p> <p>Nigeria/ Cities: Abuja, Minna, Enugu & Ibadan/ State: FCT, Niger, Enugu & Oyo</p>	<p>You might like to think about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The biggest problems of urban land development and management? 2. Costs and cost implications of urban land developments 3. Advantages of formal and informal approaches? 4. The link between formal and informal developments and climate change? 5. The most important aspects of climate change 6. The link between developments and effects such as flooding and drought? 7. Why these urban land development problems continue to exist? 8. How sustainable are formal and informal approaches? 9. What impact they have on the marginalised? 	<p>Have you any documents that show how policy relates to this or has changed in this regard</p> <p>Can you give any specific examples</p> <p>How does this relate to other cities/states/national</p>
<p>J. Can you suggest any potential improvements to urban land development and management in INSERT APPROPRIATE WORDS?</p>	<p>For any suggestions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why do you think that will help? 2. How might that work in practice? 3. Are there any barriers to making this work? 	<p>Do you have any evidence that this will help</p> <p>Can you give specific examples where it has helped</p>

<p>Nigeria/ Cities: Abuja, Minna, Enugu & Ibadan/ State: FCT, Niger, Enugu & Oyo</p>	<p>4. What would that mean for you and your role?</p> <p>5. How would you evaluate your new approach to tell if it was working?</p> <p>Otherwise</p> <p>6. What do you think about increasing stakeholder participation in urban land development and management?</p> <p>7. Has this been tried in your area?</p> <p>8. Can you tell me about the experience</p> <p>9. What are the main barriers to the adoption of integrated approaches to address urban land development and management problems?</p>	<p>Do you have any evidence that this would – would not work</p> <p>Can you give any specific examples</p>
<p>K. Would you like to be informed about the findings? (YES/NO)</p>		
<p>L. Would you be prepared to be identified in the final report? (YES/NO)</p>		
<p>M. Would you be prepared to take part in a follow up workshop / interviews?(YES/NO)</p>		

Urbanisation Research Nigeria (URN) is delivering research accompanied by data collection on key themes concerning urbanisation, urban development and the provision of infrastructure. URN will produce and disseminate thorough, relevant, interesting and readable research outputs which will contribute towards the evidence base for better urbanisation strategy, urban policy, and urban programming and management in Nigeria.

URN falls within the four-year DFID-supported Urbanisation and Infrastructure Research and Evaluation Manager (UIREM) – Nigeria programme. It is implemented by a consortium led by ICF International.

This research has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies.