

Assessment of Development Control Practices in Ogun State, Nigeria: Public Perceptions and Challenges to Planning Regulation Enforcement

Peter Bolaji Oladeji^{1*} & Abdulbasit Tommy Hamzat²

¹Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Faculty of Environmental Design and Management, Lead City University, Ibadan

²Ministry of Physical Planning and Urban Development, Abeokuta, Ogun State

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100900371>

Received: 21 September 2026; Accepted: 26 September 2026; Published: 12 October 2026

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the enforcement of planning regulations on physical development in Ogun State, Nigeria. The study examined the existing legal and institutional framework, compliance levels, factors influencing compliance, and challenges affecting enforcement. A mixed-methods research design was adopted, with data obtained through questionnaires, interviews, field observations, and document review. A total of 180 respondents were selected from Abeokuta South, Ado-Odo/Ota, and Sagamu Local Government Areas. The findings revealed that 80.0% of respondents were aware of planning regulations, while compliance was predominantly moderate (55.6%), with 35.6% reporting low compliance. The major development control violations were encroachment on setbacks (37.2%), building without approved plans (31.1%), and land-use conversion (22.8%). Lack of logistics and transportation (Mean = 4.333), inadequate manpower (Mean = 4.217), and corruption among officials (Mean = 4.111) were identified as the major challenges to effective enforcement. The study concludes that although planning regulations and institutional structures exist, enforcement effectiveness is constrained by operational and institutional weaknesses. Strengthening planning institutions, improving logistics and manpower, and ensuring transparent and consistent enforcement are recommended to improve compliance and promote sustainable physical development in Ogun State.

INTRODUCTION

Across the globe, planning regulations are designed to guide physical development by controlling land use, infrastructure provision, building standards, and environmental management. Urban planning serves as the backbone of sustainable development, ensuring that the spatial organization of cities balances competing land uses while promoting economic growth, environmental protection, and social well-being (United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2022). These regulations are intended to achieve serenity in the built environment by preventing haphazard growth, reducing urban risks, and creating cities that are functional, aesthetically pleasing, and resilient. Central to this process is the enforcement of planning regulations by government agencies, as weak enforcement has often been linked to urban sprawl, informal settlements, traffic congestion, and ecological degradation in rapidly growing cities (World Bank, 2021).

The concept of physical development encompasses all human activities that alter the natural or built environment, including construction, land subdivision, and infrastructural expansion (Angel et al., 2021). Planning regulations, on the other hand, are statutory instruments that provide guidelines on how land should be used, developed, or conserved to ensure orderliness and sustainability (OECD, 2020). Enforcement of these regulations refers to the mechanisms by which governments monitor compliance, penalize offenders, and implement corrective measures to maintain an orderly physical environment (Dodman & Archer, 2022). Without adequate enforcement, the intentions of urban planning remain theoretical, as physical development often deviates from approved standards and results in negative consequences for urban livability and resilience.

Globally, cities are experiencing rapid population growth, and this surge intensifies the pressure on land,

infrastructure, and urban services. The United Nations projects that by 2050, nearly 70 percent of the world's population will reside in urban areas, with much of this growth occurring in Africa and Asia (Ibrahim & Akinola, 2022). These dynamics have heightened the need for effective urban governance and stricter enforcement of planning laws. Many countries have adopted smart growth policies, land-use zoning, and technology-driven monitoring systems to ensure compliance with regulations, highlighting the central role of government enforcement in shaping sustainable cities (Bello & Fadeyi, 2021).

In developing regions, particularly Africa, challenges in enforcing planning regulations are more pronounced due to weak institutional frameworks, corruption, limited resources, and political interference (United Nations, 2023). This often leads to uncontrolled physical development, proliferation of informal settlements, and encroachment on environmentally sensitive areas. The consequences are evident in increased flood risk, poor sanitation, inadequate housing quality, and overstretched infrastructure, which collectively undermine the goals of sustainable urban development (Eze & Okafor, 2021). Effective enforcement of planning regulations is, therefore, not only a technical requirement but also a governance issue that reflects the state's capacity to manage urbanization.

Nigeria, as one of the most urbanized countries in Africa, exemplifies these challenges. The country's urban population has been growing rapidly, with cities like Lagos, Ibadan, and Abeokuta expanding beyond their planned boundaries (Olajide & Agbola, 2022). Although Nigeria has planning laws such as the Nigerian Urban and Regional Planning Law of 1992, enforcement has been inconsistent, leading to widespread illegal developments, weak development control, and inadequate urban services (Adebayo & Nwankwo, 2022). This situation reflects broader governance gaps where regulations exist on paper but are not effectively applied in practice, thereby undermining urban planning objectives.

The consequences of poor enforcement in Nigeria are far-reaching, including congestion, environmental degradation, traffic chaos, and increased disaster risks such as flooding in major cities (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2022). Despite efforts by planning authorities to implement development control measures, political interference, lack of technical manpower, and insufficient funding often weaken the process (Aluko, 2022). These issues make the Nigerian context a critical case study for assessing how government enforcement of planning regulations affects physical development, urban resilience, and well-being quality of life.

Ogun State provides a particularly relevant example, as it is experiencing rapid urbanization due to its proximity to Lagos, Nigeria's commercial hub (Ogun State Government, 2022). Towns and cities within Ogun State, such as Abeokuta, Ota, and Ifo, Sagamu, Ijebu Ode are expanding at unprecedented rates, creating pressure on land and infrastructure. Physical development in the state has often outpaced the capacity of planning authorities to regulate it, resulting in unapproved structures, encroachment on public lands, and poor urban aesthetics (Okunola & Fashola, 2023). The government, through the Ogun State Urban and Regional Planning Board and related agencies, has the statutory responsibility to enforce planning regulations, but effectiveness has remained a concern (World Bank, 2023).

Physical planning remains an essential tool for promoting orderly growth, sustainable development, and livable environments across the globe. Despite its centrality, the enforcement of planning regulations continues to pose challenges in many developing nations, where rapid urbanization often outpaces institutional capacity and regulatory frameworks. Several studies have highlighted the relationship between weak regulatory enforcement and issues such as urban sprawl, inadequate infrastructure, and poor environmental quality (Agboola & Oduwaye, 2020).

The issue of compliance with planning regulations has also received attention in literature. Studies (Aluko, 2022; Aluko, 2021) highlight that residents and developers often disregard planning laws due to weak monitoring and enforcement mechanisms. Similarly informal practices and socio-cultural factors contribute to low compliance in Nigerian cities (Oni & Igwe, 2022). While these works underline the prevalence of poor compliance across the country, they do not adequately explore the peculiarities of compliance levels in Ogun State (Umeokafor & Nwosu, 2022). This research seeks to bridge this gap by examining the extent to which developers and residents in the study area comply with existing planning regulations.

Several studies (Fadamiro & Akintoye, 2022; Nduka & Akanni, 2022) have also recognized the challenges associated with the enforcement of planning regulations. For instance (Adegbile & Adebayo, 2023) argues that corruption, political interference, and institutional weakness undermine enforcement efforts in many Nigerian cities, while Falade emphasizes the lack of adequate human and financial resources within planning agencies. Although these findings offer important perspectives, there has been little systematic research into how these challenges manifest in Ogun State, where rapid population growth and development pressures intensify enforcement difficulties (Adekola & Abioye, 2023). This study responds to this gap by analyzing the challenges affecting the enforcement of planning regulations in the study area.

Attempts at proposing strategies for strengthening planning enforcement have been made by scholars (Adekola & Abioye, 2023), who advocate for community participation, digital monitoring tools, and stronger institutional collaboration. However, these recommendations are often presented in broad terms and rarely tailored to the specific realities of different states (Oladipo & Ajayi, 2023). Ogun State, with its proximity to Lagos and increasing development pressures, requires more context-specific strategies that reflect its unique challenges and opportunities. This study fills that void by proposing strategies for strengthening enforcement and improving physical development outcomes in the state. This study therefore fills the gap by offering a location-specific analysis, integrating field observation, stakeholder interviews, and review of planning documents to assess enforcement efficiency, identify bottlenecks, and recommend reforms.

Study Area

Ogun State, created in 1976, is located in the South-Western geopolitical zone of Nigeria. It shares borders with Lagos to the south, Oyo and Osun to the north, Ondo to the east, and the Republic of Benin to the west. With an estimated population of over 7 million (National Population Commission, 2022), the state serves as a critical industrial and residential hub, especially for overflow populations from Lagos. The state comprises twenty Local Government Areas, with major cities such as Abeokuta (the capital), Ijebu-Ode, Sagamu, and Ota. Economic activities include manufacturing (with key industrial estates in Agbara and Sagamu), agriculture, real estate development, and services. The influx of people and investment has increased land speculation and unregulated development, particularly along Lagos border towns like Ifo and Ado-Odo/Ota.

Administratively, Ogun State is divided into 20 Local Government Areas (LGAs) as shown in Figure 1.2, each with distinct socio-cultural and economic characteristics. These LGAs encompass a mixture of urban centers, peri-urban settlements, and rural communities, all of which present unique challenges and opportunities for physical planning. The complexity of managing development across these different contexts underscores the importance of effective planning regulations and enforcement. However, weak institutional frameworks, non-compliance by developers, and challenges in monitoring sprawling settlements have often undermined planning efforts. Against this backdrop, Ogun State provides a critical case study for understanding the dynamics of planning regulation enforcement in Nigeria, especially within a rapidly urbanizing and economically significant region.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Physical development is the change in land brought about by people, including building houses, industries, roads, and other public facilities. It is a tangible expression of urban development and planning choices, influencing people's relationship with their surroundings (Ademola, 2019). The concept extends beyond the building to the spatial arrangement of buildings, roads, open spaces, and how these relate to the urban form and function (Olayiwola & Adeleye, 2018). There is a direct link between physical development and population growth and socio-economic change because as population of cities increases, there is an increased demand for houses, places of work, infrastructure and services (Falade, 2017). The rapid urbanisation in Ogun State has been affected by population growth and increasing development pressures that has led to sprawl and mixed land use, which sometimes may not be in line with planning requirements (Ogun State Government, 2020). There are also environmental implications of physical development. The encroachment of natural and agricultural land into urban areas can lead to environmental degradation, flood, erosion and loss of ecological resources, highlighting the importance of sustainable planning and development control (UN-Habitat, 2020). Physical development is also a socio-political process, that is, one involving government, private developers, communities and other stakeholders. Various policy options, institutional structures, economics and individual

interests shape the location and modality of development (Aluko, 2010). Thus, a planning regulation capable of balancing competing interests and allowing development to promote functional, safe and sustainable communities is required. If the development is not well planned, it can lead to overcrowding, insufficient infrastructure, traffic congestion, and environmental issues, while a well-planned development can help enhance accessibility, housing, public services, and quality of life (Aina, 2010). Urban and regional planning is the management of land use and spatial development that aims to create orderly, functional and sustainable communities. It involves the formulation of policies, strategies, plans and development guidelines that guide the allocation of land to residential, commercial, industrial, recreation and infrastructure development (Oyesiku, 2019). The goal of planning is to reconcile contradictory land use interests while working to maximize social well being, economic development, environmental protection and efficient urban space use. Planning is the urban component that focuses on residential, employment, transportation and public facilities and at regional scale, it is concerned with balancing development and interconnection between towns and cities and their surrounding rural spaces (Okewole, 2019). As with all urban areas, good planning is essential in fast-growing regions, where unchecked development can lead to congestion, insufficient services, environmental damage, and inefficient land use (World Bank, 2020). Public participation is also important in planning as community involvement and stakeholder engagement can enhance the responsiveness and acceptability of planning decisions. Limited institutional capacity, inadequate resources, poor coordination and weak implementation of planning policies can, however, compromise planning processes (Oni, 2017). In Nigeria, these have led to development taking place outside approved plans and regulations. Planning, therefore, is both a technical and an administrative process in which governments attempt to direct physical development in the context of their wider social, economic and environmental goals (Aribigbola, 2018). Planning regulations are rules, standards and guidelines that are set to regulate land and building use and development. They offer the legal basis to ensure orderly development, public safety, environmental protection and provision of appropriate infrastructure (Falade, 2017). Typically, planning regulations address issues of zoning, building standards, land subdivision, building setbacks, development density, environmental protection, and infrastructure requirements (Oyesiku, 2019). These requirements set out by planning authorities can help to direct development to where it belongs and help to avoid incompatible uses. The Ogun State Urban and Regional Planning Law has a statutory framework which helps to regulate physical development and planning compliance in Ogun State (Ogun State Government, 2020). The government is a key player in development control, helping to control the way land is allocated, developed and used. The government is responsible for planning through relevant planning authorities; granting planning approval; overseeing construction; inspection and compliance with planning standards (Oni, 2017). It is the responsibility of the developers to secure appropriate planning permission before they begin construction to ensure that their proposed development is in accordance with the approved land-use plan, zoning requirements, building standards and other relevant planning regulations (Oyesiku, 2019). The government is also responsible for supervising development and corrective measures are to be taken if violations are found. These can be in form of notice, penalty, sealing of building, demolition of illegal structures or other enforcement action as provided in relevant planning laws (Ogun State Government, 2020).

The effectiveness of planning regulations is very dependent on their enforcement. Inadequate monitoring and enforcement can lead to developers and landowners ignoring planning regulations, leading to illegal development, encroachment, inadequate infrastructure development and environmental issues (Aluko, 2010). The effectiveness of the development control can further be decreased by inadequate manpower, inadequate funding, weak institutional capacity, poor coordination, and other administrative problems (Oni, 2017). Political and socio-economic interests can also impact on planning and compliance, so it is important that there is consistent and transparent compliance to ensure planning objectives are met (Aina, 2010). Hence, the enforcement of planning regulations is crucial for sustainable urban development. It helps to promote orderly land use, protect environmentally sensitive areas, ensure adequate infrastructure, improve public safety, and reduce conflicts between incompatible land uses (UN-Habitat, 2020). It can also facilitate provision of adequate housing, transportation, public facilities and other urban services needed for increasing population (Federal Ministry of Works and Housing [FMW&H], 2022). Regular enforcement can lead to more predictable development environment, promote compliance, safeguard public interests, and enhance quality and performance of the built environment (World Bank, 2020). Planning regulation in Nigeria has been developed from traditional systems of land management to statutory planning systems. Prior to colonial rule, land was primarily governed through customary systems and the traditional leaders and communities were significant in

the allocation of land and settlement organization. As urbanization and pressures of development increased, formal planning institutions and legal frameworks were needed to direct land use and physical development. With the advent of modern legislation on planning, government gained more powers in regulating development and setting standards in land use, building construction, infrastructure and environmental management (Oyesiku, 2019). Current planning in Nigeria thus has a mix of statutory planning and social and institutional norms with the overall aim of orderly, sustainable, safe and functional physical development (FMW&H, 2022).

Gaps Identified from Literature

Even though many books and articles have been written concerning physical development, urban planning and planning laws, there are still important gaps. The current studies have concentrated mainly on the existence and significance of planning regulations and little attention has been paid to the factors that influence the effective implementation and enforcement of the planning regulations in Ogun State. There is a need to undertake empirical studies of problems like insufficient manpower, funding, institutional capacity, lack of inter-agency coordination and political interference.

Moreover, few investigations have been conducted on the link between weak enforcement and the actual development in physical terms, such as illegal development, incompatible land use, environmental degradation, and the lack of infrastructure. The roles of developers, communities and other stakeholders in increasing planning compliance are also not well addressed. This study aims to bridge these gaps and therefore, the effectiveness of the planning regulation enforcement and physical development implication in Ogun State is examined.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a mixed-methods research design, integrating both quantitative and qualitative approaches, in order to provide a more robust and comprehensive analysis of planning regulation enforcement in Ogun State. This approach is justified because the research problem involves both measurable patterns (such as levels of compliance and frequency of enforcement actions) and subjective dimensions (such as stakeholder experiences, institutional challenges, and perceptions of effectiveness), which cannot be fully captured using a single method. The quantitative component, through the administration of structured questionnaires, enabled the collection of standardized data from a broad range of stakeholders, thereby facilitating statistical analysis and generalization of findings. The questionnaire was subjected to face and content validity by experts in Urban and Regional Planning to ensure that the items adequately captured the study objectives and variables. Their observations and recommendations were incorporated into the final version of the instrument. In contrast, the qualitative component, including key informant interviews and field observations, provided in-depth insights into the underlying factors influencing enforcement practices and compliance behavior. The population for this study included government planning officials in urban and regional planning departments at the state and local levels; and developers, landowners, and residents in selected urban areas.

The sampling frame for this study comprises all twenty (20) Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Ogun State, namely: Abeokuta North, Abeokuta South, Ado-Odo/Ota, Ewekoro, Ifo, Ijebu East, Ijebu North, Ijebu North East, Ijebu Ode, Ikenne, Imeko-Afon, Ipokia, Obafemi-Owode, Odeda, Odogbolu, Ogun Waterside, Remo North, Sagamu, Yewa North, and Yewa South. These LGAs represent the administrative jurisdictions where planning regulations are implemented and enforced. Due to limitations of time, cost, and logistics, it was not feasible to cover all LGAs. Therefore, a purposive sampling technique was adopted to select three (3) LGAs Abeokuta South, Ado-Odo/Ota, and Sagamu.

Three communities in each LGAs were selected out of which a random sample of 20 residential buildings were drawn, making a total of 60 buildings per LGA and 180 buildings across the three LGAs. The choice of 20 buildings per community is supported by the principle of cluster sampling adequacy, as Cochran and Krejcie & Morgan suggested that 20-30 units per cluster are sufficient to generalize findings when working within heterogeneous populations. This sample size also remained logistically feasible for fieldwork while ensuring sufficient coverage for meaningful statistical analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents an analysis of the socio-economic characteristics of respondents involved in the study. Understanding these characteristics is crucial as they provide context for interpreting respondents' behaviors, attitudes, and levels of compliance with planning regulations. Key variables such as age, gender, educational qualification, occupation, income level, and length of residence or involvement in development activities are examined to provide insights into the demographic and socio-economic profile of the study population.

Table 1: Socioeconomic Data Characteristics

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent (%)
Occupation	Civil Servant	64	35.6
	Artisan	56	31.1
	Entrepreneur	52	28.9
	Others	8	4.4
	Total	180	100
Gender	Male	122	67.8
	Female	58	32.2
	Total	180	100
Age	18–30	8	4.4
	31–40	91	50.6
	41–50	79	43.9
	51–59	2	1.1
	Total	180	100
Educational Qualification	No Formal Education	15	8.3
	Primary School	7	3.9
	Secondary School	25	13.9
	OND/HND	73	40.6
	B.Sc.	38	21.1
	Postgraduate	22	12.2
	Total	180	100
Years of Experience	Less than 5 Years	7	3.9
	5–10 Years	72	40
	11–20 Years	72	40
	Above 20 Years	29	16.1
	Total	180	100
Monthly Income (₦)	Below 70,000	17	9.4
	70,000–100,000	72	40
	101,000–150,000	37	20.6
	151,000–200,000	32	17.8
	Above 200,000	22	12.2
	Total	180	100
Marital Status	Single	11	6.1
	Married	156	86.7
	Divorced/Separated	12	6.7
	Widowed	1	0.6
	Total	180	100

Table 1 presents the socio-economic characteristics of the 180 respondents surveyed. The variables considered include occupation, gender, age, educational qualification, years of experience, monthly income, and marital status. These characteristics are important because socio-economic attributes can influence people's perceptions, experiences, participation in urban development processes, and responses to planning and development control issues. Socio-economic characteristics such as age, gender, education, occupation, and income are commonly considered important variables in understanding differences in urban experiences and access to opportunities and services (UN-Habitat, 2022; World Bank, 2021).

In terms of occupation, civil servants constituted the largest proportion of respondents, with 64 respondents (35.6%). This was followed by artisans, with 56 respondents (31.1%), and entrepreneurs, with 52 respondents (28.9%). Respondents classified under other occupations accounted for 8 respondents (4.4%). The relatively high representation of civil servants may be relevant to the study because employment and institutional exposure can influence awareness of planning regulations and interactions with government agencies. Urban governance and effective planning are influenced by the relationship between institutions, residents, and other urban stakeholders.

Regarding gender, males constituted the majority of the respondents, with 122 respondents (67.8%), while females accounted for 58 respondents (32.2%). The difference indicates that the study had a higher representation of male respondents. Gender composition is relevant in urban planning research because men and women may experience urban spaces, infrastructure, housing, and planning services differently. Inclusive urban planning therefore requires consideration of the needs and experiences of different gender groups (UN-Habitat, 2022).

The age distribution shows that respondents aged 31–40 years constituted the largest age group, accounting for 91 respondents (50.6%). This was followed by respondents aged 41–50 years, who accounted for 79 respondents (43.9%). Respondents aged 18–30 years represented 8 respondents (4.4%), while those aged 51–59 years accounted for only 2 respondents (1.1%). Thus, the respondents were predominantly adults between 31 and 50 years. This age structure suggests that the findings largely reflect the perceptions of economically active adults who are likely to have direct experience with housing, land development, employment, and interactions with planning authorities. Urban development and planning policies need to respond to the changing demographic and socio-economic characteristics of urban populations (OECD, 2020; World Bank, 2021).

With respect to educational qualification, respondents with OND/HND qualifications formed the largest group, with 73 respondents (40.6%). This was followed by respondents with a B.Sc. degree (21.1%), secondary school education (13.9%), postgraduate qualifications (12.2%), no formal education (8.3%), and primary education (3.9%). The relatively high level of educational attainment among the respondents may contribute to their ability to understand planning regulations, development requirements, and interactions with planning authorities. Education can influence awareness and understanding of regulatory requirements, including compliance with development control measures.

The distribution of years of experience indicates that respondents with 5–10 years of experience and those with 11–20 years of experience each accounted for 40.0%, representing the largest categories. Respondents with more than 20 years of experience constituted 16.1%, while those with less than five years of experience represented only 3.9%. Therefore, a substantial proportion of the respondents had considerable work or professional experience. This is useful for the study because respondents with longer experience may have had greater exposure to urban development activities, planning procedures, development control mechanisms, and changes in planning practices over time. Institutional experience and enforcement capacity are important considerations in the implementation of planning regulations.

For monthly income, respondents earning ₦70,000–₦100,000 constituted the largest category, with 72 respondents (40.0%). This was followed by those earning ₦101,000–₦150,000 (20.6%), ₦151,000–₦200,000 (17.8%), and above ₦200,000 (12.2%). Respondents earning below ₦70,000 represented 9.4% of the sample. The income distribution indicates that the respondents were predominantly within the lower- to middle-income categories. Income is an important socio-economic factor in urban development because household economic capacity can affect access to adequate housing, ability to comply with development requirements, and capacity

to obtain formal planning approvals. Economic constraints can also contribute to informal development and difficulties in complying with planning regulations (Okunola & Fashola, 2023; Bello & Odumosu, 2023).

Finally, marital status shows that married respondents constituted the overwhelming majority, with 156 respondents (86.7%). Single respondents accounted for 11 respondents (6.1%), while 12 respondents (6.7%) were divorced or separated and only 1 respondent (0.6%) was widowed. The predominance of married respondents may indicate that most participants have household responsibilities that can influence their decisions concerning housing, land development, neighbourhood conditions, and access to urban infrastructure.

The table shows that the respondents were predominantly male, aged 31–50 years, married, and relatively well educated, with substantial work experience and mostly middle-range incomes. These characteristics provide useful background for interpreting the subsequent findings on planning and development control in the study area. However, the socio-economic profile should be considered when generalising the findings, particularly because males and respondents within the 31–50-year age groups are more strongly represented in the sample.

Table 2: Respondents' Perceptions of Planning Regulations and Development Control

Variable	Response/Category	Frequency	Percent (%)
Awareness of Planning Regulations	Yes	144	80
	No	36	20
	Total	180	100
Planning Regulation/Law Known	Ogun State Urban and Regional Planning Law	102	56.7
	Planning and Development Permit Regulation	37	20.6
	Building Production Management Regulation	31	17.2
	Others	10	5.6
	Total	180	100
Effectiveness of Planning Regulations	Ineffective	25	13.9
	Fairly Effective	54	30
	Effective	88	48.9
	Very Effective	13	7.2
	Total	180	100
Experience of Planning Regulation Problems	Yes	51	28.3
	No	129	71.7
	Total	180	100
Frequency of Planning Regulation Problems	Very Often	29	16.1
	Often	68	37.8
	Rarely	82	45.6
	Never	1	0.6
	Total	180	100
Level of Compliance with Planning Regulations	High Compliance	6	3.3
	Moderate Compliance	100	55.6
	Low Compliance	64	35.6
	No Compliance	10	5.6

	Total	180	100
Common Development Control Violations	Building without Approved Plan	56	31.1
	Encroachment on Setbacks	67	37.2
	Conversion of Land Use	41	22.8
	Illegal Extension or Additional Building	11	6.1
	Poor Adherence to Building Codes	5	2.8
	Total	180	100

As shown in the Table 2, 144 (80.0%) respondents knew about planning regulations, and 36 (20.0%) did not. The most familiar law was the Ogun State Urban and Regional Planning Law (56.7%) followed by the Planning and Development Permit Regulation (20.6%). As far as effectiveness is concerned, 88 respondents (48.9%) said the regulations were effective, 54 (30.0%) said they were fairly effective and 37 (20.0%) said they were not effective. In addition, 129 respondents (71.7%) reported no planning regulation issues, while 51 (28.3%) reported having experienced planning regulation issues. Of the problems identified, 45.6% were rare, 37.8% were often, and 16.1% were very often. Planning regulation compliance was primarily moderate (55.6%) with 35.6% reporting low compliance. Only 3.3% indicated high compliance. Encroachment on setbacks (37.2%), building without an approved plan (31.1%) and conversion of land use (22.8%) were the most common development control violations. Poor adherence to building codes was the least reported (2.8%) and illegal extensions or additional buildings accounted for 6.1%. Overall, the results indicate that a high awareness of planning regulations exists among respondents, but this awareness has not yet been matched by a high level of compliance; moderate and low compliance are still the dominant responses.

Table 3: Challenges Confronting Enforcement of Planning Regulations

S/N	Statements	N	Minimum	Mean	Mean Deviation (MD)	Rank
1	Inadequate manpower limits the ability of agencies to enforce planning regulations.	180	1	4.217	0.347	2
2	Lack of logistics and transportation hinders site inspections and monitoring.	180	2	4.333	0.463	1
3	Insufficient funding weakens the effectiveness of planning authorities.	180	1	3.667	0.203	6
4	Political interference negatively affects enforcement activities.	180	1	3.711	0.159	5
5	Public resistance or hostility discourages planning officers from enforcement.	180	2	3.578	0.292	7
6	Weak institutional coordination hampers effective enforcement.	180	1	3.544	-0.326	8
7	Corruption among officials reduces compliance with planning regulations.	180	2	4.111	0.241	3
8	Penalties for non-compliance are effective deterrents.	180	1	3.8	-0.07	4
Total				3.8701		

The findings in Table 3, reveal that lack of logistics and transportation (Mean = 4.333; MD = 0.463) ranked highest, indicating that inadequate mobility and operational facilities constitute the most critical challenge affecting effective site inspections and monitoring activities. This was followed by inadequate manpower (Mean = 4.217; MD = 0.347), suggesting that insufficient personnel significantly reduce the capacity of planning agencies to enforce regulations effectively. Corruption among officials (Mean = 4.111; MD = 0.241) ranked third, implying that unethical practices among enforcement officers negatively influence compliance with planning regulations. Furthermore, penalties for non-compliance are effective deterrents (Mean = 3.800; MD = -0.070) ranked fourth, indicating that respondents moderately agreed that sanctions can discourage

violations when properly implemented. Political interference negatively affects enforcement activities (Mean = 3.711; MD = 0.159) ranked fifth, suggesting that interference from political actors undermines enforcement operations and institutional independence. Insufficient funding weakens the effectiveness of planning authorities (Mean = 3.667; MD = 0.203) ranked sixth, showing that inadequate financial resources also hinder enforcement effectiveness.

In addition, public resistance or hostility discourages planning officers from enforcement (Mean = 3.578; MD = -0.292) ranked seventh, reflecting that negative public attitudes and resistance affect enforcement activities to some extent. Weak institutional coordination hampers effective enforcement (Mean = 3.544; MD = -0.326) ranked eighth, making it the least perceived challenge among the identified factors, although respondents still generally agreed that it affects enforcement efficiency. The findings demonstrate that operational and institutional limitations particularly lack of logistics and transportation, inadequate manpower, and corruption among officials constitute the major challenges confronting effective planning regulation enforcement in the study area. The high Mean score and low Mean Deviation indicates that respondents generally agreed to the identified statements and vice versa.

Table 4: Factors Influencing Non-Compliance with Planning Regulations

The distribution of responses regarding the most influential factors affecting compliance with planning regulations from Table 4.16 shows that socio-economic status (30.6%) and awareness of regulation (26.7%) are the leading factors, followed by strict enforcement (16.7%), access to permits (15.6%), and cultural practices (10.6%). This suggests that both economic capacity and knowledge of regulations significantly shape developers' compliance behavior in Ogun State.

Responses	Frequency	Percent
Awareness of Regulation	48	26.7
Socioeconomic Status	55	30.6
Cultural Practices	19	10.6
Access to Permit	28	15.6
Strict Enforcement	30	16.7
Total	180	100

Developers with higher socio-economic status are more likely to comply due to their ability to afford permits, hire professional services, and navigate regulatory processes, while those with lower economic resources may find compliance challenging. Awareness of regulations directly affects compliance, as developers who understand the legal requirements and consequences of non-compliance are more likely to adhere. Strict enforcement and accessibility to permits also play a crucial role, as effective monitoring and simplified permit acquisition can incentivize compliance. Cultural practices, though less influential, may still affect decisions regarding land use and building norms, particularly in areas where traditional practices conflict with formal regulations.

These findings indicate that enhancing public awareness, improving access to permits, strengthening enforcement mechanisms, and considering socio-economic realities are essential strategies to promote adherence to planning regulations and ensure orderly physical development in Ogun State.

Roles and Responsibilities of Town Planning Officers

Interviews were conducted with Zonal Town Planning Officers (ZTPOs) from the three selected Local Government Areas (LGAs) Abeokuta South, Sagamu and Ado-Odo/Ota. The officers provided in-depth insights into the enforcement of planning regulations, challenges, and potential strategies for improving compliance. Their responses are summarized below according to the interview guide questions.

Town Planning practice in Abeokuta is structured around development control and spatial regulation aimed at achieving orderly urban growth. Core responsibilities include the issuance and assessment of building plan approvals, monitoring of physical developments within designated planning zones, and enforcement of

compliance with approved layouts and statutory planning standards. Officers also coordinate development activities to ensure that land use conforms to zoning regulations and approved development plans. Through these functions, planning authorities play a critical role in guiding urban form, preventing haphazard development, and maintaining functional urban environments within the metropolis.

Town Planning practice in Sagamu is centered on ensuring compliance with established planning standards and promoting orderly physical development within designated planning jurisdictions. Core responsibilities include monitoring development activities, regulating land use in line with approved zoning plans, and enforcing adherence to statutory space and land-use standards. Through these functions, planning authorities in Sagamu seek to prevent incompatible land uses, reduce spatial disorder, and guide urban growth in a controlled and sustainable manner.

Town Planning activities in Ota are fundamentally oriented toward development control and spatial order. Core responsibilities include monitoring physical development within designated jurisdictions, ensuring compliance with approved development standards, providing technical advice to developers on land use, and enforcing zero tolerance for illegal developments. These responsibilities collectively aim to promote orderly urban growth, prevent unauthorized land-use changes, and safeguard public access, safety, and environmental quality.

CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

The study makes a contribution to the knowledge because it gives empirical evidence of the relationship between the socioeconomic characteristics, planning regulations and development control perceptions of respondents and challenges faced in enforcement of planning regulations in Ogun State, Nigeria. Existing research on planning regulation enforcement has focused on institutional and regulatory aspects of enforcement, whereas this research takes into account the perspective and the socioeconomic profile of the respondents, thus offering a more holistic view of development control practices. The study also highlights certain factors that limit effective enforcement, which can help guide planning authorities and policymakers in enhancing regulatory compliance, institutional capacity and improve urban development. The findings also give a context specific reference to researchers interested in planning regulation enforcement and development control in fast urbanizing areas in Nigeria.

AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Comparative studies of planning regulation compliance and enforcement between other local government areas and urban centers in the same state of Ogun can be conducted in the future to ascertain possible differences. The voices of planning officials, developers, property owners, community leaders and other interested parties should also be included in future studies to gain this more comprehensive understanding of enforcement challenges. Moreover, GIS and spatial analysis tools can be used to identify the spatial distribution of development control issues and explore their association with urban development and land-use. It is also recommended that longitudinal studies are carried out to identify trends in compliance and enforcement over time and the effectiveness of government policies and interventions over time in planning regulation enforcement.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The study concludes that the enforcement of planning regulations in Ogun State remains constrained despite relatively high public awareness of planning regulations. While 80.0% of respondents were aware of planning regulations, compliance was largely moderate, with significant violations including setback encroachment, construction without approved plans, and land-use conversion. The findings further indicate that inadequate logistics, insufficient manpower, and corruption constitute the major barriers to effective enforcement. Based on the findings, the study recommends that the Ogun State Government should strengthen the capacity of planning authorities through adequate provision of logistics, transportation, manpower, and funding. Planning agencies should also adopt digital monitoring technologies to improve development control and site inspections. Furthermore, corruption and political interference should be reduced through stronger accountability mechanisms, while public awareness and stakeholder engagement should be enhanced to

improve compliance with planning regulations.

REFERENCES

1. Adebayo, R., & Nwankwo, I. (2022). Revisiting land use and planning regulations for sustainable cities in Nigeria. *Urban Forum*, 33, 567–584.
2. Adediran, A., & Oyenuga, A. (2023). The role of institutions in shaping urban development outcomes in Nigeria. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 45(5), 721–738.
3. Adegbile, B., & Adebayo, S. (2023). Assessment of planning authorities' enforcement of development control regulations in Nigeria. *Journal of Planning Research*, 42(4), 512–529.
4. Adekola, A., & Abioye, O. (2023). Institutional challenges in urban planning enforcement in Nigeria: Evidence from Ogun State. *Urban Forum*, 34, 221–239.
5. Agboola, T. B., & Oduwaye, A. A. (2020). *Urban and regional planning in Nigeria: Contemporary issues and challenges*. University of Lagos Press.
6. Akinmoladun, F., & Oyewole, W. (2021). Urban governance and physical planning in Southwestern Nigeria: Policy and practice gaps. *Cities*, 118, 103–123.
7. Akinyemi, F., & Ojo, O. (2024). Assessment of urban planning policies in Nigeria: Lessons from Ogun State. *Journal of Planning Practice*, 10(2), 150–167.
8. Aluko, O. A. (2021). The effectiveness of development control mechanisms in Nigerian urban centres. *Journal of Contemporary Urban Studies*, 4(2), 45–62.
9. Aluko, O. B. (2022). The role of planning regulations in shaping urban development in Nigeria. *Journal of Urban and Regional Analysis*, 14(1), 89–106.
10. Angel, S., Blei, A., & Lamson-Hall, P. (2021). *Planet of cities revisited*. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
11. Awosusi, O., & Adebisi, K. (2024). Developers' compliance with building control regulations in Nigeria: The case of Ogun State. *Journal of Urban Management*, 13(1), 88–105.
12. Bello, A., & Fadeyi, K. (2021). Challenges of development control and physical planning in Southwestern Nigeria. *African Journal of Sustainable Development*, 12(3), 78–94.
13. Bello, O., & Odumosu, F. (2023). Planning and development control in Nigeria: Addressing gaps in implementation. *Land Use Policy*, 128, 106–122.
14. Dodman, D., & Archer, D. (2022). Urban resilience and climate change. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 47, 235–256.
15. Eze, C., & Arowolo, M. (2023). Urban planning regulations and challenges of implementation in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Planning Practice & Research*, 38(2), 167–184.
16. Eze, C. C., & Okafor, G. O. (2021). Urban sprawl and weak development control in Nigerian cities. *Journal of African Cities*, 5(2), 119–134.
17. Fadamiro, J., & Akintoye, A. (2022). Physical development and planning regulation in Nigeria: Insights into institutional effectiveness. *International Journal of Built Environment and Sustainability*, 9(1), 14–29.
18. Ibrahim, R., & Akinola, O. (2022). Urban planning and sustainable development in Nigeria: A policy reappraisal. *Journal of Contemporary Urban Affairs*, 6(1), 45–61.
19. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). *Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press.
20. National Population Commission. (2022).
21. National Space Research and Development Agency. (2025).
22. Nduka, I., & Akanni, E. (2022). Developers' attitude toward building regulation compliance in Nigeria. *Journal of African Built Environment Research*, 8(2), 66–83.
23. OECD. (2020). *Cities in the world: A new perspective on urbanisation*. OECD Publishing.
24. Ogun State Government. (2022). *Ogun State urban and regional planning law 2022*. Ministry of Physical Planning and Urban Development.
25. Okafor, E., & Usman, I. (2023). Physical development control in Nigerian cities: Towards sustainable urban futures. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 50(6), 1259–1277.
26. Okunola, A., & Fashola, J. (2023). Development control and informal settlements in Southwestern Nigeria: A planning dilemma. *Habitat International*, 124, 102615.
27. Olajide, O., & Aborisade, R. (2021). Institutional frameworks for urban land management in Nigeria: A

- critical appraisal. *Land Use Policy*, 109, 105–121.
28. Olajide, O. A., & Agbola, T. A. (2022). Governance and urban land management in Nigeria: The case of Lagos and Ibadan. *Cities*, 120, 103480.
 29. Oladipo, K., & Ajayi, T. (2023). Building regulation compliance and residents' perceptions in Southwestern Nigeria. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 38(1), 95–113.
 30. Oni, A., & Igwe, C. (2022). Compliance with urban development regulations in Nigerian cities: An empirical assessment. *Habitat International*, 120, 102–118.
 31. Salami, A., & Nwachukwu, C. (2024). Urban planning enforcement in Nigeria: Lessons from institutional failures. *Habitat International*, 135, 103–122.
 32. United Nations. (2023). *The sustainable development goals report 2023*.
 33. United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. (2023). *African urbanization futures 2050: Trends and implications*.
 34. United Nations Human Settlements Programme. (2022). *World cities report 2022: Envisaging the future of cities*.
 35. Umeokafor, N., & Nwosu, C. (2022). Legal instruments and urban development control in Nigeria: Effectiveness and constraints. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 23(3), 367–385.
 36. World Bank. (2021). *Urban development overview*.
 37. World Bank. (2023). *Resilient cities: Building inclusive and sustainable urban futures*.