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**ABSTRACT**

This study was carried out to examine the impact of urban and regional planning on socioeconomic development of Nigeria using Abuja Metropolis as case study. To achieve this 2 research questions were formulated. The survey design was adopted and the simple random sampling techniques were employed in this study. The population size comprise of all the all the members/staffs of federal ministry of housing and urban development Abuja. In determining the sample size, the researcher purposively selected 35 respondents while 30 respondents were validated. Self-constructed and validated questionnaire was used for data collection. The collected and validated questionnaires were analyzed using frequency tables and percentage.

The result of the findings reveals that; there is a significant relationship between urban and regional planning and socioeconomic development; Urban and regional planning has an impacts on the socioeconomic development of Abuja city.

Based on the findings, the researcher recommends that all department/ministries which are responsible for Urban and regional planning should be charged by the federal Government to ensure a maximum execution of their duties. This will enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of urban and regional planning in Nigerian.

**CHAPTER ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**

The phrase ‘better city, better future’ is the motto of the ongoing World Expo in China. The World City Expo started in 2002 as a way of mobilizing world community towards using the urban centers to mobile resources to eliminate all forms poverty among people and to harness international cooperation and prevailing technology in governing cities. The phrase becomes relevant in examining the experience of Nigeria in urbanization. It is relevant to state that while urbanization is not foreign to Nigeria before colonialism, colonial rule with its attendant economy nationalized urbanization in Nigeria. This is because urbanization became extended beyond its traditional areas of Yoruba land, Hausa-Fulani land and Borno land. This nationalization did not ensure a sufficiently urbanized Nigeria but it laid foundation for what followed after independence in 1960 to the transformation of human settlements in Nigeria.

Within the 50 years of Nigeria’s independence, the fact of high level of urbanization has been established by many authors (Mabogunje, 1968, Mabogunje,1974, Mabogunje, 1981, Ojo, 1981, Lawanson 2006, Fabiyi, 2006, Kofowomo, 2008 and Olujimi, 2009,). These studies have demonstrated that Nigeria is experiencing accelerated urbanization.

Existence of large urban settlements has always been part of Nigeria’s history. During the periods before the incursion of the British colonial masters into the coasts of Nigeria, a number of large cities had emerged on the landscape. Prominent among these were Sokoto, Bauchi, Kano, Zaria and Katsina in the North;

Oyo, Ibadan, Ilorin, Ijebu-Ode, Iseyin, Ogbomoso, Abeokuta and Shaki in the West. Others included Benin in the Mid-West and city – states like Opobo, Warri and Calabar in the coastal areas. According to estimates by explorers such as Richard Lander, Barth and Clapperton, as comprehensively documented by Mabogunje (1968), Sokoto had about 120,000 people when it became the religious capital of Outhmandan Fodio’s Muslim caliphate, Kano had about 30,000 and Zaria’s population was put at between 40,000 and 50,000. In the same vein, Guglar and Flanagan (1979) estimated the population of Ibadan to be between 70,000 and 100,000, Abeokuta (60,000) and Oyo (25,000) However, these cities were medieval in outlook, organic in their growth and agro dependent for their survival in contrast to the industrial cities of the western world. As succinctly captured by Guglar and Flanagan (ibid.) “the Yoruba cities, for instance, presented an odd picture to those who were accustomed to the character of urban areas in Europe and America. The cities contained such large numbers of farmers and the buildings were so village-like that to the foreign eye, they seemed no more than dense rural settlements”. Colonialism affected the original urban settlements and incorporated them into global urbanization. The colonial urban heritage has continued to thrive. In looking at the planning and management of Nigerian urban centers in the last 50 years, it can be stated that projects have impacts beyond the project sites. Urban planning and development, in particular, has regional implications. The city is not alone, it is located in a region; it affects the region as much as it is affected by the region. The city offers hope for itself and its region while the rural land is repository of resources beneficial to the city. In Nigeria, as in other parts of the world, the rural and urban centers are not in competition; they complement each other and are in continuum rather being sharply divided. Indeed, to some extent, ‘ center-periphery convergence’ (Gren, 2003) is taking place in the rural-urban continuum in Nigeria. These realities are observable in Nigeria in varying levels of resolution. It is also to be added that both rural and urban areas face similar challenges; the challenges of basic needs, of gainful employment for self- support and the challenge of resource conservation. The planning and development of rural and urban areas have also reflected the political and economic fortunes of the country. They have therefore been shaped by experiences of cash crops-based economy, oil- boom of the late 1960s to mid 1970s, the Civil War of 1967 to 1970, the economic down-turn of the 1980s and 1990s and the attendant economic reforms, political crisis of 1992 to 1998 and relative increased revenue and relative political stability of 1999 to 2010 which has allowed more relaxed thinking and positive actions. In other words, the planning and the conditions of rural and urban centers in Nigeria cannot be dissociated 2 form the country’s economic and political experiences; although in most cases analysts take little account of the influence of the macro environment on the development of rural and urban areas. In this presentation too, the general role of the cities in national development is also well recognized. Analysts recognize the role of cities in creating opportunities

and stimulating growth and development (North, 1955, 1956, Carter (1981, Todaro (1973, Mabogunje, (1974, 1980.). The city “furthers efficiency in economic activity” and serves as a place where new forms of economic of economic organization are evolved’ (UNCHS, 1994). While there are shades of opinion about the external effects of cities, there is a consensus that ‘strong urban economies are the backbone and motor of the wealth of nations’ (Gantsho, 2008). The nature of Nigerian urbanization offers unique opportunities for achieving this social objective. In practice, the city is the center of the territory to which all activities gravitate. Thus, they remain ‘the focal points of any economy’ (Olufemi and Oluseyi (2007).

**1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The general pattern of economic development in the region has tended to favor locations surrounding the more urbanized areas thereby introducing spatial inequalities and neglect of the more other urban places in the same city.

**1.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

In North-eastern Nigeria has been one of the least developed since independence. The series of geopolitical reorganizations since 1967 which lead to the gradual and consistent decentralization of the processes of social, economic and political transformation and the reduction of spatial inequalities in development within the country appeared to have little impact on urban development in the region. The concern of this paper is to determine the pattern of urban development achieved in the region as a single administrative entity, to explore the specific and theoretical factors that were responsible for the existing pattern of urban development, and make suggestions on how to guide future planning to influence pattern of urbanization in the region, in the desired manner.

**1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The objectives of this research include but not limited to;

1. To evaluate the relationship that exists between urban and regional planning and socioeconomic development.

2. To determine if urban and regional planning impacts on the socioeconomic development of Abuja city.

**1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

In order to achieve the above stated objectives, the following questions were asked;

1. Is there a significant relationship between urban and regional planning and socioeconomic development?

2. Does urban and regional planning impacts on the socioeconomic development of Abuja city?

**1.6 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES**

* There is no significant relationship between urban and regional planning and socioeconomic development.
* There is significant relationship between urban and regional planning and socioeconomic development.
* Urban and regional planning does not impact on the socioeconomic development of Abuja city.
* Urban and regional planning impacts on the socioeconomic development of Abuja city.

**1.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The study was limited by two major factors; financial constraint and time. Insufficient fund and time tends to impede the efficiency of the researcher in sourcing for the relevant materials, literature or information and in the process of data collection (internet, questionnaire and interview).

**1.8 SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

The study focuses on the impact of environmental planning on rural development using Abuja metropolis as a case study.

**1.9 DEFINITION OF TERMS**

**Planning:** Is the process of making plans for something.

**Urban Area:** This is the region surrounding a city.

**Urban and Regional planning:** This is a professional discipline which embraces management of the physical spaces and the environment.

**Socioeconomic Development:** Is the process of social and economic development in a society.

**CHAPTER TWO**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**INTRODUCTION**

Our focus in this chapter is to critically examine relevant literature that would assist in explaining the research problem and furthermore recognize the efforts of scholars who had previously contributed immensely to similar research. The chapter intends to deepen the understanding of the study and close the perceived gaps.

Precisely, the chapter will be considered in four sub-headings:

* Conceptual Framework
* Chapter Summary

**2.1 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

**Region**

The reciprocal relationships of economic growth, regional development, urbanization and the human conditions are obvious. As nations continue advancing and as they adopt new technologies and management methods, as new sources of energy (including atomic power), new modes of transportation and new sources of livelihood appear, regional inequalities and urbanization will tend to attain a highly explosive stage. In these conditions, comprehensive regional planning and sufficient investment in social and physical infrastructure at an early stage may help to guide the development of industrial complexes and residential agglomerations, of zones of intensive cultivation and of centers of essential activities into patterns suitably distributing and linking to one another settlements and people, in territorial entities that are cities in the socioeconomic sense and regions in the geographic and administrative sense and regions in the geographic and administrative sense. The “city-region” concept suggests itself as a practical approach to the task of moulding an environment in which nature’s ecological balance is preserved and its beauty enhanced, in which material growth, human progress and culture can develop and benefit man and community. Any developing area or “growth pole” can be the starting point. In some cases, the aim may be the concentration required for development. At other times it may be a loosening of urban agglomerates for higher efficiency or simply for obtaining a “human quality of life”. The cityregion can take any shape and structure that geography, technology and human ingenuity can produce. Its main characteristics, however, should always be total flexibility and a capacity to respond to the human need for dignity, freedom, and continued growth. From a static art of “projecting”, regional planning must shift to dynamic “action planning” sensitive to rapid advances in science and technology, fast rising productivity and to the growing amount of resources and time the average citizen will have for leisure, learning and culture. Most of all, what is suggested here is not a prescription or a static image of a glorified “city of the future” but “ground rules” for a dynamic process of balanced socioeconomic and environmental development.

**REGIONAL PLANNING**

As already quite generally practiced, regional planning combines analytical and graphic methods to project economic, social and physical development in a given geographic area, for a given period of time, and presumably also for the benefit of the region’s population in addition to and beyond the “national” benefit to which all regions contribute. The regional plan is also capable of regulating the timing and sequence of execution for specific projects and programs; and projects national linkages and inter-relationships among them. Thus, it may help to bridge the gap between “national development” in terms of “objectives” and the effects on “local communities” in terms of “actual” development. Also, the many services and facilities furnished in a given area by central, local and regional authorities can be so planned on the regional scale as to attract investments from many other sources; and finally, the region offers a framework within which development projects of national significance and those based on local initiative and aspirations can be suitably integrated for mutual benefit of the region and the nation. Like the input/output method, linear programming, or the critical path method in the economic sphere, regional analysis and regional planning can not substitute themselves for the political process of decision-making. But they can help to conceive a broadly based balance among development projects and programs initiated at the different levels of government by eliminating conflicts in requirements for land and location, or conflicts claims on scarce resources, or conflicts in the pace and sequence of implementation. They can also facilitate the choice of “best” (optimal, most convenient or least opposed) alternative and promote the execution of the adopted course of action. Thus, the region emerges as the physical, economic, social and institutional environment in which development process can react upon each other productively and further both the development of “local economies” and “national development”.

**URBAN PLANNING**

Land use for residential, commercial, industrial and other purposes has become of great concern as it is usually the focus of urban research. This has been confirmed through the works of many urban researchers like Burgess and McKenzie (1925) on American cities, particularly Chicago; Mabogunje (1968) on Lagos: Ayeni (1968) on Jos; Frishman (1977) on Kano; Olaore (1981) on Kaduna; Okpala (1981) on Enugu and Onitsha. Most of those studies show that urban areas are of enormous political, social, economic and cultural importance in numerous places in which they are located.

Urban planning as the name implies can be very broad or very narrow, comprehensive in focus, system oriented or problem oriented. However, the essential feature that distinguishes urban planning from other types of planning is its concern for geographical space in the urban environment. According to Hall (1974:7), urban planning refers to planning with a spatial or geographical component in which the general objective is to provide for the spatial structure of activities or of land use which in some way is better than the pattern existing without planning. However, this view of urban planning is not without critics. Indeed, Hall (1974) envisaged human geography as the basic discipline of urban and regional planning, while other conceive of geographical space (or land use) as too limited a concept to provide a proper comprehension of spatial planning. As Chadwick (1971: 79) has argued that: the physical construction heritage of the planning profession has resulted in an overwhelming concentration upon ‘containers’, rather than upon the processes which involve and use such physically adopted spaces, and a reorientation, planners well have to use increasingly, the tools of mathematics, of information services, and of social sciences in general.

Urban planning, by whatever discipline it may be given, is an emerging paradigm, and provide a broader view of relationships between the use of space and the consequences of using it is a particular fashion. It is an important administrative action aimed at sustaining and improving the aesthetic nature of a town (Amujiri 2001: 404). On this background, urban planning as used here refers to making choices among alternative as it regards the ordering and use of land and sitting of buildings and communication routes so as to secure the maximum practicable degree of economy, convenience and beauty.

**URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING**

Urban and regional planning is a notion that encompasses the whole set of social activities aimed at anticipating, representing and regulating the development of an urban or a regional area. It thus articulates intellectual activities of study and prospective, of social and economic forecasting with more concrete activities such as infrastructure programming, land reservation and land use regulation. Planning operates at different scales: neighborhood, city or region. Generally speaking, the smaller the area addressed, the more precise and coercive planning regulations are. Under the post-war Keynesian-Fordist compromise, a relatively static Capital required the intervention of the State and its public policies in order to stabilize the workforce and to constitute homogeneous national economic spaces where standardized products could be sold. During this post-war period and until the late 1970's, urban and regional planing policies were an element of these demand-side policies. They were aimed at stabilizing the workforce by providing a cheaper access to housing and enlarging the access to urban collective consumption goods to a larger part of the urban population. The principal tools of this Keynesian-Fordist version of planning were the mass production of social housing, the provision of collective infrastructures, the public acquisition of land and the regulation of estate speculation. From this prospective, elected officials and public planners were the dominant figures of planning and comprehensive land-use regulation plan was the most common tool used to enforce these redistributive objectives. The concept of governance has subsequently been used to describe the devices through which urban and regional plans were elaborated and implemented following the end of the Keynesian-Fordist consensus and the new objectives set for these devices. According to neomarxist and regulationists scholars, the 1970's economic crisis is the sign of the entrance of Western economies into a new era where competition between firms is no longer based on their proximity to raw material sources or their ability to build masses of standardized products but on their ability to diversify their production and to incessantly innovate. Thus, firms are less dependant on public demand-side policies. On the contrary the fiscal burden of these policies hinder the profitability of their business in the international competition. The same rupture occurred at the urban and regional level. In a new context where growth has been slowing, where State transfers have rarified and where firms have become increasingly mobile, the objectives of urban and regional planning have been changing. Shifts from a demand-side policies to supply-side policies and from a redistributive stance to a competitive and marketing stance have taken place. The central aim of plans is not to regulate economic growth and its effects on urban and regional territories but rather to activate it. As a consequence, planning practices and the very forms of plans have been changing. Rather than comprehensive land-use regulation plans, plans are taking the shape of marketing weapons. The vogue of strategic plans launched in the mid-1980's is the most obvious example of this. These plans do not intend to regulate growth and redistribute it throughout the territory through land-use regulations. Instead, they identify the strengths and the weaknesses of the city or the region, the opportunities which it can take advantage of and the threats to which it could be faced and, on this basis, try to define strategies in terms of economic development or urban renewal. In a context of governance, on one hand plans are less precise in that they do not intend to set up regulations for each space of the city. On the other hand, they are more precise in that they focus on strategic areas that can be valorised and on which specific policies should be implemented. The inspiration of these plans is more neo-liberal than reformist in that re-distributive objectives are relegated to the background, whereas issues like competitiveness, economic attractiveness are much more pushed to the fore since the plan is not principally aimed at setting up obstacles to market dynamics. In terms of planning practices, these new plans give a much more important place to economic actors and social elites. The plan is not conceived as the mere outcome of the public planners expertise but as the result of bargains between public and private actors and between different levels of public authorities. The political effectiveness of the plan is no longer expected to stem from its regulatory status but rather from the consensus that the elaboration process of the plan has enabled to build up between a plurality of stakeholders. This interpretation of the recent story of urban regional planning as a clear-cut example of the invasion of neoliberal recipes and the giving up of any public ambition to control territorial dynamics has been challenged by several scholars. Some of them doubt whether new forms of planning, such as strategic plans, can be interpreted as simply giving up of public ambitions on the evolution of cities and regions. For Healey (Healey et al., 1997), the new forms of planning practices using networks, interactive, iterative and incremental decision-making processes are also aimed at producing institutional capital, i.e. a set of cognitive, relational and identity resources that will enable to create a common rationale for the interventions of different actors on the territory. The rise of strategic plans is the sign of a communicative turn in planning. Planning is not only about elaborating the graphic representation of a substantive vision of the territorial common interest whose definition is set only by officials and public planners. Instead, it is about managing processes of political mediation, enabling mutual comprehension between different social interests, the outcome of which will be the sharing of a common vision of the future of a territory. Strategic planning may be a sign of a new form of territorial governance where public expertise and actors are not omnipotent but do not inevitably promote a neoliberal agenda. If neo-marxists and regulationists defend a substantive definition of governance as a policy content, other scholars (cf. Le Galès, 2002 ; Pinson, 2002) propose a definition of governance as a research agenda that can help understand the recent evolution of urban and regional planning. If recent evolution like globalization, construction of regional ensemble like the EU or devolution trends have modified the way urban and regional development is steered, this does not necessarily mean that planning systems are promoting neoliberal agendas. Rather these evolution have modified the way social and territorial change is organized, and, in particular, the division of labor between political/bureaucratic, market and civil society regulations in the governance of territorial development. However, in this approach, the term "governance" does not presume the neoliberal policy-content deriving from these new arrangements. Governance is rather presented as a new research agenda for the understanding of collective actions aimed at controlling and promoting urban and regional development.

**THE ROLE OF TOWN PLANNERS AND PROFESSIONAL BODIES IN URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING**

Urban and regional planning in Nigeria since the colonial interregnum had borrowed heavily from the British planning philosophy and practice. Lord Lugard introduced the statutory control of land in Northern Nigeria (though he claimed that this was to protect natives’ rights to land). Subsequent land laws were to lay the foundation for the ‘nationalization’ of land under the controversial 1978 Land Use Act. (see James 1972, Dung-Gwom 1991). The 1917 Township Ordinance was the first attempt at introducing spatial orderliness in the land use pattern of Nigerian cities. It created different classes of townships and gave them different competences, and legalized the segregation of European and non European residential areas (**Twenty-Five Years of Physical Planning in Nigeria**, 1991: 5-6). In 1928, the Lagos Executive Development Board (first Urban Development Authority in Nigeria) was established. In 1946 the Town Planning Ordinance was promulgated which was the first comprehensive planning legislation in Nigeria giving powers for planning schemes to be initiated either in urban or rural areas, whether the land was developed or not and for the improvements and re-planning of existing towns. The ordinance was based on the British 1932 Town and Country Planning Act.

Thefirst indigenous town planners were therefore British trained. When the Nigerian Institute of Town Planners was formed in 1966, there were only 35 town planners in the country. The figure rose to 39 in 1968 and 108 in 1988, (**NITP at 30**: 13-14). The numbers of registered town planners entitled to practice as published by TOPREC in 2007 were 1589. It is estimated that today (2011) the figure of registered town planners is about 2000, while the number of professional town planners (members of the Institute, MNITP) is 3000. The number of town planners in the country has therefore significantly increased since 1966. This is still very low for a country of about 150 million people, which gives a ratio of about one professional town planner to 50,000 people.

Agbola (2005) and Onorkerhoraye (2006) have commented extensive on the roles of town planners in urban and regional planning in national development. Both agree that town planners have not seized the opportunities at their disposal to turn around the fortunes of the profession and planning practice. They made a clarion call for re-training and the acquisition of new skills by planners in a fast changing world and the challenges posed by rapid urban growth and urbanization in Nigeria.

Town planners have however contributed in the following areas:

* Preparation of National Developments Plans, particularly the third and fourth NDP.
* Preparation of Urban Master Plans, other physical development plans, transportation plans, etc.
* Preparation of layout schemes and land subdivision plans.
* Formulation of national and regional policies in the areas of environment, housing, infrastructure, transportation, etc poverty reduction, disaster management, etc.
* Production of EIAs and EIAR (Environmental Impact Assessment Reports).
* Involved in processing of applications for the grant of R of O and public titles.
* Development Control, approval of building plans, advertisement controls, etc.
* Research and training in the tertiary institutions and other specialized agencies.

Planners have contributed both in the public and private sectors of the economy. There are planners in diverse organizations such as airports, river basin authorities, Nigeria Ports Authority, PHCN, Banks, the Universities and Polytechnics, etc.

Formal training of town planners started at the Ibadan Technical College which later became The Ibadan Polytechnic in 1962, (Agbola, 2007); followed by Yaba College of Technology (now Yaba Polytechnic in … ) and Kaduna Polytechnic in …. Agbola (2007) has also noted that due to demand for professional qualifications the NITP stated external professional exams in the 1970s. Professional training at the masters’ level commenced in Zaria in 1973. There are today in Nigeria over 100 universities and over 50 polytechnics, many of which offer programmes in urban and regional planning. In terms of training and the quality of town planners, there are many challenges today. The institutions that offer training have increased quite significantly, however, their facilities have declined in quality and continues to decline due to poor funding by government and lack a qualified professional staff. The curricular of most Nigerian institutions is not responding adequately enough to changing situations globally and nationally, for example, challenges of globalization, uncontrolled urbanization especially in the developing countries, climate change, developments in ICTs, increasing poverty, urban violence, changing attitudes and tastes, etc.

**Consultancy Firms**

In 1990, the Association of Town Planning Consultants (ATOPCON) was formed, and this ushered in marked changes in the consultancy landscape of Nigeria in the area of urban and regional planning. Hitherto, planning consultancy was dominated by foreign firms, who though may have the technical competency and skills, lacked knowledge of the social and cultural context in which they were preparing their plans. No wonder, therefore, that most of the plans produced by them in 1970s and 1980s have remained unimplemented or in fact were unimplementable. The 2007 Directorate of Registered Town Planners in Nigeria published by TOPREC listed 99 consultancy firms in Nigeria. A close examination of the list reveals that most of these firms are based in Lagos and Ibadan, followed to a less degree in Abuja and Owerri. They firms are making appreciable impacts in various facets of planning services, for example, all the six regional strategic plans were given out to indigenous firms. Some state governments still prefer to use the services of foreign firms however, like in Lagos and River States.

**Professional Bodies.**

The history, objectives and functions of professional bodies is well covered in NITP publications, like **Twenty Five Tears of Physical Planning in Nigeria** (NITP, 1991),  **NITP at 30** (NITP 2007); Sanni (2006), Onorkerhoraye (2006) Agbola (2007). As mentioned earlier, the NITP received its charter on the 5th September 1966 as professional body. Its objectives include the advancement of town and country planning in Nigeria through educations, training and practice; dissemination of town and country information through conferences, seminars, meetings, exhibitions, and publications; enforcement of professional code of conduct; etc. The Institute has over the years organized annual conferences on topical issues in the country dealing with urban and regional planning. It publishes an occasional newspaper and has an academic journal. Besides the National Executive Council, there are state branches which are also very active within their areas on jurisdiction. It has moved to its purpose built offices in Garki, Abuja and to meet the demands on its expanding membership, it has launched a website, [www.nitpng.com](http://www.nitpng.com). and has an email, niitp@yahoo.com

Commenting of the performance of the Institute, Professor Andrew G. Onorkerhoraye ( 2006:21) has observed that;

…for the past forty years the Nigeria Institute of Town Planners has provided leadership in promoting the better planning of cities, towns and to some extent the adjoining communities, in order to sustain the environment, and to develop economic and social well-being.

Although Professor Onorkerhoraye has scored the Institute a pass mark, he has also offered wise counsel for it to adopt a new vision, liberalize its membership, promote spatial planning, equip its members with new skills, forge new affiliations with relevant professional bodies and endearvour to be relevant in the present society.

In conjunction with TOPREC, the Institute has instituted a mandatory professional training for its members, the MCPDP. Professional members are mandated to attend such training at least once every three years or else risk loosing their membership. While, this is in consonance with professional practice world wide, the quality of professional training has been very variables, and often venues have not been conducive. The NITP/TOPREC professional examinations continue to be very popular and new centres have been opened in Kaduna and Owerri, besides the initial centre at Ibadan.

**PLANNING TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS**

In this section, I will briefly examine various planning tools and instruments in vogue, these include;

* The National Physical Development Plan. (NPDP)
* Strategic Regional Development Plans (SRDP)
* Master/Structure Plans
* Public-Private. Partnership Plans (PPPP)
* Land Development Guides/Regulations

In this review, reference will be made to the various plans (which the reader could consult for more information. The Nigerian Vision 20:2020 blue print (2009) and the First Implementation Plan (2010 to 2013) will be reviewed in context to the NPDP and RSDPs.

**The National Physical Development Plan (NPDP).**

The 1992 NURP law makes provision for the preparation and approval of a NPDP. The plan was to be prepared by a Technical Committee appointed by the NURPC (National Urban and Regional Planning Commission). The plan was to be approved by the national assembly to give legal bite. Almost 30 years after the law was passed, the plan has not seen the light of the day (neither has the commission, in fact). The FMHUD has now stepped up efforts to prepare a NPDP. In 2010 it carried extensive sensitization and consultation on the plan, and contract may soon be awarded for its preparation. The plan should provide for urban and regional planning an arrow that Nigeria Vision 20:2020 is being promoted for the socio-economic development of the country in the next nine years. It would derive some of vision and mission from the Vision 20:2020 blue print, which has as its vision statement that:

Nigeria will have a large, strong, diversified, competitive, technologically enabled economy that effectively harnesses the talents and energy of its people and responsibly exploits its national endowments to guarantee a high standard of living and quality of life to its citizens (Nigeria Vision 20:2020 Draft Report 2009).

Vision 20:2020 had in fact germinated from the PDP governments’ campaing slogans based on the 7-Point Agenda, Vix:

* Power And Energy
* Food Security
* Wealth Creation
* Transport Sector
* Land Reforms
* Security
* Education

(The Niger Delta and has become adjuncts to these)

Important highlights of the Vision Blue Print are:

* GDP of not less than $900 billion in 2020.
* National per capita income of not less than $4,000 per year by the year 2020.
* The economy is growth at 13% p.a
* The critical priority areas identified for immediate attention were: decentralization of governance; creating a globally competitive economy, sustainability; electoral reforms; land use/property reforms; public service reforms; national security; human capacity development and critical infrastructure (with particular emphasis on power and transportation).
* On power supply, the government aims to generate 60,000megawatts (mw) of electricity by 2020.
* It projects that at current levels, Nigeria's population by 2020 would rise to over 200 million.

(see Dung-Gwom 2010a; Dung-Gwom 2010b; Nigeria Vision 20:2020 Draft report, Nov. 2009).

Other Countries in the world have used National Developing Planning to steer their rapid socioeconomic transformation, for example, Malaysia, Singapore; in Africa, Malawi, Botswana, Uganda, even Burundi. In Europe France has had a strong physical planning system. The trend in Europe today is that countries have adopted National Spatial Plans for provide a national framework for other plans, regional spatial plans, for example.

**Regional Plans and Strategic Regional Development Plans (SRDP).**

Elsewhere, I have tried to differentiate between regional development planning and regional planning (see, Dung-Gwom 2010a; and also Diejemaoh, 2008; and Adeyemi 2001). Regional development planning has dominated socioeconomic development planning in Nigeria, the preparation of National Development Plans (NDP) after independence, SAP, the rolling plans and perspective plans. Regional development Planning is mainly done by economist. Regional planning, which is essentially locational and spatial in nature only became fashionable in Nigeria from the 1970s. Most state governments prepared regional plans for their areas (see Kadiri 2010, ).

In the period under review, the regional plans that the author is aware of are those of the Niger Delta Regional Development Plan, 2004; the Ogun State Regional plan. The Niger Delta Regional Development had become imperative due to over four decades of oil and gas exploitation in the area, which had caused wide spread pollution and environmental problems resulting into militant activities by the youth. (see, Afinotan & Ojakorotu, 2009 on frustration-aggression theory). The plan is therefore quite comprehensive in nature dealing with issues of infrastructural developments, economic development and combating of poverty, social development through educations, training and skill acquisition, management of environmental problems and conflict resolution. The plan covers the 9 oil producing states in the Niger Delta including Ondo state. The plan was reviewed in 2006 to allow for more public participation in the process. The Niger Delta, expresses the Nigeria story very well, a regional rich in oil and gas, but very backwards in infrastructure, low in human resource development, and a terrain plagued by many natural disasters, flooding, etc. The regional plan has drawn in the various institutions in the region, the NDDC, Ministry of the Niger Delta, Oil Companies, International bodies, NGOs, States and Communities to the development needs and aspirations of the region. Recently the federal government was able to reach some amnesty with the restive youths who are currently going through rehabilitation and reintegration into civil society. This reveals the complexity of planning in such a diverse region, and emphasis must be on developing and sustaining decision networks. It is yet to be seen if the plan will address the needs and agitations of the area for social justice, equity, resource control which go beyond the realm of planning into politics and public administration (see also **Report of the Technical Committee (The Mittee Committee) on the Niger Delta**, 2008).

Strategic Regional Development Planning is quite novel in Nigeria. This could have arisen because of the continuous disparities between the urban and rural areas and regional differentials among states (see, for example, Jelili et al 2008). The aim of the plans according to the FMHUD was to promote balanced regional development and reduce regional disparities (ABUCONS, 2007:2). According the SRDP for the SW (page 3), the significance of the SRDP is to correct the existing imbalance, lopsided nature of development within states and among states in the region, or sub-region/zone by way of conscious integration of development and investment projects and a decision to redistribute the projects to create major new employment centres in areas of low, stagnant or declining economy. The SRDP is to be in harmony with state development plans and facilitate sustainable development.

The FMHUD in 2004 commissioned some indigenous consultancy firms for prepare the SRDPs for the six geopolitical zones of the country, as follows: North -West Zone ABUCONS Nig, LTD (Dept of URP Zaria)

North- East Zone Kadiri Associates

North -Central Urban Consultants and Onakanmi and Partners

South -West Zone Nobel Concepts and Associates

South -South Zone

South -East Zone

The author had access to four SRDPs (listed above) and from their scope, content and methodology, the followings comments can be made:

* The SRDPs do have a clear philosophy and methodology
* Their scope, length and quality was very variable (see Gyuse, 2010 on the scope and content of regional plans).
* Strategies developed were not sufficiently spatial in the nature and tended to be very vague and general.
* No attempt was made to develop optional regional strategies.
* The SRDP by ABUCONS for the NW Zone showed great methodological rigour by using SWOT to analyze the region’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats and combing these to develop regional strategies ( see Tables 3 to 6).
* None of the SRDPs attempted to carry a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of its policies and proposals, or Sustainability Appraisal (SA).
* None of the SRDPs examined regional housing situation and the location of future demand
* The use of ICT was scanty and no attempt was made to create a geospatial data base using RS and GIS.
* No recommendations were made as to who should implement the SRDPs. The one for the NW made passing suggestion for the institution of a **Joint Planning Commission.** Who will fund this and how it will function in the midst of state jealousies should have been explored further. The author had himself recommended for Technical Boards at the geopolitical zone level (see, Dung-Gwom, 2005).

These should not be seen as criticisms, but honest comments to an evolving system of plans in Nigeria. The Nigerian Vision 20:2020 and First Implementation Plan (which came after the SRDPs) make various recommendations on regional planning and development, For example, the development of industrial hubs, establishment of Regional Development Councils, each geopolitical zone to become a regional economic growth pole, community driven rural development, etc) (**see Nigeria Vision 20:2020 (2009) and Fist National Implementation Plan, 2010).**

**Urban Master Plans.**

Urban Master plans have been the traditional instruments for urban planning in Nigeria. They are long range comprehensive physical development plans. Some are for periods of up to 2025 years. Jiriko (2008) mentions the atrocious Kaduna Master plan which had a time span of 50 years (1967 to 2017). The 1970s were they golden years of urban mastering planning in Nigeria. Almost every state government commissioned (mostly foreign consultants) to prepare master plans for their capital cities and the major urban centres; Plateau, Bauchi, Adamawa, Kwara, etc.

Urban master have not gone out of fashion in Nigeria, for since 1999 many states have prepared new master plans or reviewed old and outdated ones. Plateau State, for example, commissioned Fola Consult to prepare anew master for the Greater Jos Area from the ashes of the Doxiades Greater Jos-Bukuru master plan. The state government also insisted on the 17 LGCs in the state to prepare master plans for their headquarters. This was to accommodate the government’s desire that each LGC must implement a five kilometer road programme. States like Imo, Rivers, Nasarawa, etc have followed suit.

The valued of master plans have long been queried. How do you master plan development in areas where changed is rapid and unpredictable. They have also been criticized for being rigid, technocratic, undemocratic and elites dominated, top-bottom. Jiiriko in his PhD thesis (Jiriko, 2004), which metamorphosed into his book (Jiriko, 2008:306-309) examined in detail in Enugu and Abuja master Plans and arrived at among others the following findings:

* The objectives of master plan have not and are not being achieved in Nigeria.
* Master Plan performance is below average, Problems billed to be solved remain unsolved and persist.
* Master planning approach is technocratic and elitist.
* It lacks inclusiveness as all stakeholders in the process are not carried along.
* The master plan’s perspective in Nigeria is still dominantly physical; social and econo-political perspectives are neglected. etc.

The earlier work of Illesannmi and others (1998) in their book, **Master Planning Approach to Physical Planning: The Nigerian Experience** have also made similar conclusions on the issue of credibility, comprehensiveness in comprehensive planning; that cognitive knowledge of the planner which is limited and so he cannot claim to plan comprehensively, being rigid and unable to deal with inevitable socio-economic issues that arise in then urban system, etc. They argue, however that the problem may not necessarily be with the plan, but its implementation, the implementers, the planning process or inadequate resources.

The issue of land tenure and control of land sales was observed to be a major issue that frustrated the implementation of the 1975 Greater Jos Bukuru Master Plan (Dung-Gwom and Hirse, 2008). In view of the above criticisms and the rapid rate of socio-economic changes in Nigeria, the Master Plan Approach (MPA) is not advisable. There is the need to turn to other instruments.

**Urban Master Plans.**

Urban Master plans have been the traditional instruments for urban planning in Nigeria. They are long range comprehensive physical development plans. Some are for periods of up to 2025 years. Jiriko (2008) mentions the atrocious Kaduna Master plan which had a time span of 50 years (1967 to 2017). The 1970s were they golden years of urban mastering planning in Nigeria. Almost every state government commissioned (mostly foreign consultants) to prepare master plans for their capital cities and the major urban centres; Plateau, Bauchi, Adamawa, Kwara, etc.

Urban master have not gone out of fashion in Nigeria, for since 1999 many states have prepared new master plans or reviewed old and outdated ones. Plateau State, for example, commissioned Fola Consult to prepare anew master for the Greater Jos Area from the ashes of the Doxiades Greater Jos-Bukuru master plan. The state government also insisted on the 17 LGCs in the state to prepare master plans for their headquarters. This was to accommodate the government’s desire that each LGC must implement a five kilometer road programme. States like Imo, Rivers, Nasarawa, etc have followed suit.

The valued of master plans have long been queried. How do you master plan development in areas where changed is rapid and unpredictable. They have also been criticized for being rigid, technocratic, undemocratic and elites dominated, top-bottom. Jiiriko in his PhD thesis (Jiriko, 2004), which metamorphosed into his book (Jiriko, 2008:306-309) examined in detail in Enugu and Abuja master Plans and arrived at among others the following findings:

* The objectives of master plan have not and are not being achieved in Nigeria.
* Master Plan performance is below average, Problems billed to be solved remain unsolved and persist.
* Master planning approach is technocratic and elitist.
* It lacks inclusiveness as all stakeholders in the process are not carried along.
* The master plan’s perspective in Nigeria is still dominantly physical; social and econo-political perspectives are neglected. etc.

The earlier work of Illesannmi and others (1998) in their book, **Master Planning Approach to Physical Planning: The Nigerian Experience** have also made similar conclusions on the issue of credibility, comprehensiveness in comprehensive planning; that cognitive knowledge of the planner which is limited and so he cannot claim to plan comprehensively, being rigid and unable to deal with inevitable socio-economic issues that arise in then urban system, etc. They argue, however that the problem may not necessarily be with the plan, but its implementation, the implementers, the planning process or inadequate resources.

The issue of land tenure and control of land sales was observed to be a major issue that frustrated the implementation of the 1975 Greater Jos Bukuru Master Plan (Dung-Gwom and Hirse, 2008). In view of the above criticisms and the rapid rate of socio-economic changes in Nigeria, the Master Plan Approach (MPA) is not advisable. There is the need to turn to other instruments.

**THE FUTURE FOR URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING IN NIGERIA**

This paper has showed that in last 11 years of democratic governance in Nigeria, some new thinking has emerged in the areas of national development and urban and regional planning. The 7 Point Agenda transformed from wishful political sloganring to a vision blue print to transform the country and enable it develop its vast natural and human resources to join the comity of nations in the world. New Strategic Regional Development Plans for the six geopolitical zones were prepared and things are on high gear for the preparation of a National Physical Development Plan almost 30 years when the idea first made inroad into our statute books. Many states have shown great vision and determination to turn things around through new instruments for urban and regional planning, through PPPs, for example..

The future is far from being bright, however, because the review of planning in last 11 years has also shown that plans prepared are not implemented and the image of the planners themselves remains dented in the eyes of the public, in spite of the good work that many are doing. So, the question that must be asked is, what is the future of urban and regional planning on Nigeria? I will offer some suggestions for the way forward (to use common parlance).

1. We as planners must learn from good and best practices in urban and regional planning internationally and nationally. Why, for example, is ‘Fashola working and Lagos is working’ and the rest of the country is at stand still or receding? If Fashola can do it for Lagos, and Goje for Gombe state, Donald Duke had done it for Cross River state, why can’t we not learn from these visionary leaders and pace setters and emulate their successes?.
2. Urban and regional planning is capital intensive and improving the lives of people needs sustainable and pro-people projects.. There is need for states to improve on their internal revenue generation (IRG) efforts. Lagos through its land use tax and other far reaching measures generates about 75% of its IGR. There is no reason why other states cannot introduce a similar tax, or property rating. Abuja FCC, for example, is being plagued with many problems and cannot continue to rely on funds from the federation account.
3. The current revenue allocation formula is skewed in favour of the federal government to the detriment of the states and the local governments. The federal governments takes more than 50% of the funds from the federation account leaving the rest to the states and local governments, which are unable to discharge their constitutional and statutory functions.
4. Corruption must be fought more tenaciously. About 60 to 70% of public funds leak to private pockets. This retards development and impoverishes the people even more. The cost of public projects in Nigeria is the highest in the world. Oversight functions of the National Assembly and other public agencies are not effective and must be stepped up.
5. No meaningful development and progress can occur where there is no peace. The infusion spread of urban and community violence is quite worrying. Lives, public infrastructure and private property are been destroyed senselessly. While government should tackle the trend, urban planning must search for new methods and techniques of developing harmonious cities.
6. Plans and policies should be pro-poor to combat increasing poverty, exclusiveness and marginalization, especially of the youth. Policies towards ensuring land security and tenure; provision of primary services in housing schemes, provision of affordable housing encouragement and the protection of the informal sector of the economy should be pursued.. Communities should be allowed to initiate and implement community plans.
7. Spatial planning should be adopted across the country which should de-emphasize states, LGAs and instead look at issues spatially, for example, climate change, drought, desertification, floods, gully erosion, coastal area management, river basin management, natural resources management, major infrastructure like airports, inland ports, free trade zones, science parks, techno cities, major highway developments, etc. (see excellent book by Dimitriou and Thompson, 2007).
8. SEA and EA should be introduced to ensure sustainable developments.
9. Fund and promote research into new methods for plan making and urban and regional management.

Planners, in an ever changing world or knowledge and technology must acquire new skills and constantly update them.

**2.2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

**SYSTEM THEORY**

The system theory is therefore used to make the necessary connection. The system approach was first developed in the biological and engineering sciences before it was adopted by social scientists in explaining social and organizational phenomena.

The major concepts involved in the system model can be summarized thus;

1. A system can be perceived as a whole, with its parts in inter- dependent relationship.

(b) A system has its boundaries and can be viewed in terms of its relationship with other systems.

(c) System have subsystems, and are a part of a supra system.

(d) A system can be regarded as either open or closed. In this case, cities or urban areas are seen as open systems, interacting with other systems.

The system theory is both relevant and appropriate to the study of sustainable urban planning and infrastructure, because it provides a flexible framework; one responsive to the issues of scale, and changing social and environmental conditions precipitated by the urbanization of urban areas overtime.

The system theory sees urban areas as emergent phenomena embedded within a spatial and historical context of interacting processes. It sees urban areas (cities) as complex evolving social systems that react and interact in unexpectedly complex ways to seemingly simple changes. Based on this, the urban area is seen as an on-going, ever-changing, primarily social system, comprising human activities and their inter-relationships with the flows of people, materials, and energy.

The theory highlights the interdependence of the ultimate physical limits placed on urban services and infrastructure and the rate of urban growth. This approach naturally lends itself to defining hierarchical systems, which are characterized by urban elements interacting horizontally with each other and vertically with larger organizing structures. In other words, urban areas can be characterised as open systems that inter-depend on the rural areas, or be more influenced by a larger network of other urban areas (Kay et al 1999:721, 1994:32; Ausubel 1988: 3).

The urban systems are self-organizing and can be thought of in terms of resilience (adaptability) and transformability (ability to fundamentally change state). As recipients of inflows, in terms of increased population and infrastructural developments, the urban area as a complex adaptive system naturally goes through phases of organization – explosion/growth, conservation, release and reorganization (Kay et al 1999:723)

**Application of the Theory**

Applying this theory to the study at hand, it helps to explain the forces that drive urban infrastructural development. In this approach, urban planning and infrastructure are linked to the spatial and usage patterns that impact human ecological processes. These processes influence more micro level phenomenon, such as human behaviour and activity which serves as feed back into landscape and social patterns in the urban area. Completing the loop, acknowledgement of change spurs policy development which acts as factors affecting further alterations of urban infrastructure. For example, the demand of water and other infrastructural services beyond the cities capacity, spurs sprawl development which affects the quality of water and other infrastructures. This results in policy changes affecting future distribution of infrastructural services and development patterns. Therefore planning decisions to extend urban services to meet the fast growing spread of development in the urban areas will precipitate demands on infrastructural facilities necessary to deliver and sustain it.

**The Primacy Theory and Concept**

The theory indicates that urban primacy; socio-spatial and individual inequalities increase initially then decrease over time as socio-economic and political development and modernization progress within a nation or region. Urban primacy or the concentration of a significant share of the urban population in few central cities will no doubt cause regional inequality. Thus, policies that reduce the importance of urban primacy are likely to contribute to greater regional equality. Many regional development experts such as Hirschman, (1958); Kuznets, (1963); Mera, (1965); El Shakhs, (1972); Mera, 1975; and Gilbert, 1976 have noted that, in any capitalist (market and mixed) society, regional inequality in all levels of national development in terms of income, investments, employment, human resources, education, health services, a generally accepted functional political and administrative system and city systems, is inevitable during the early period of socio-economic growth and political development. The imbalance, they argued, tends to diminish during the more mature and advanced stage of development due to the equilibrium forces of the market.

**Growth Pole Theory:**

Growth pole theory, as originally formulated by Perroux, assumes that growth does not appear everywhere at the same time, but it manifests itself in points or poles of growth. With variable intensities, the growth spreads by different channels and eventually affects the economy as a whole. It is widely argued that Perroux‘s initial concept of growth pole denoted an individual plant; one that occupied an abstract economic space, rather than a specific geographical space such as a city or region. Perroux refined his concept of growth pole as a dynamic unity in a defined environment. The relevance of these theories in this context is basically to explain the rationale behind the development of certain areas at the expense of others thereby creating room for inequality.

**CHAPTER SUMMARY**

In this review the researcher has sampled the opinions and views of several authors and scholars on Urban and regional Planning. The works of scholars who conducted empirical studies have been reviewed also. The chapter has made clear the relevant literature.

**CHAPTER THREE**

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**3.1 AREA OF STUDY**

is the capital and eighth most populous city of Nigeria. Located in the centre of the country within the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), it is a planned city built mainly in the 1980s. It replaced Lagos, the country's most populous city, as the capital on 12 December 1991 (Wikipedia).

**3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN**

Research designs are perceived to be an overall strategy adopted by the researcher whereby different components of the study are integrated in a logical manner to effectively address a research problem. In this study, the researcher employed the survey research design. This is due to the nature of the study whereby the opinion and views of people are sampled.

**3.3 POPULATION OF THE STUDY**

According to Udoyen (2019), a study population is a group of elements or individuals as the case may be, who share similar characteristics. These similar features can include location, gender, age, sex or specific interest. The emphasis on study population is that it constitute of individuals or elements that are homogeneous in description.

This study was carried out on impact of urban and regional planning on socioeconomic development of Nigeria using Abuja Metropolis as case study. Thus, all the members of the federal ministry of housing and urban development Abuja form the populations of the this study.

**3.4 SAMPLE SIZE DETERMINATION**

A study sample is simply a systematic selected part of a population that infers its result on the population. In essence, it is that part of a whole that represents the whole and its members share characteristics in like similitude (Udoyen, 2019). In this study, the researcher adopted the simple random sampling (srs.) method to determine the sample size.

**3.5 SAMPLE SIZE SELECTION TECHNIQUE AND PROCEDURE**

To determine the sample size of this study, the researcher adopted the purposive sampling techniques. Therefore, the researcher purposively selected 35 members of the federal ministry of housing and urban development Abuja as the sample size.

**3.6 SOURCES OF DATA COLLECTION**

The research instrument used in this study is the questionnaire. A 10 minutes survey containing 7 questions were administered to the enrolled participants. The questionnaire was divided into two sections, the first section enquired about the responses demographic or personal data while the second sections were in line with the study objectives, aimed at providing answers to the research questions.

**3.7 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS**

The responses were analyzed using the frequency tables, which provided answers to the research questions. While the hypothesis were tested using Pearson Correlation and Chi-square statistical tool SPSS v23.

**3.8 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE STUDY**

The reliability and validity of the research instrument was determined. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the reliability of the instrument. A co-efficient value of 0.68 indicated that the research instrument was relatively reliable. According to (Taber, 2017) the range of a reasonable reliability is between 0.67 and 0.87.

**3.9 ETHICAL CONSIDERATION**

Informed consent was obtained from all study participants before they were enrolled in the study. Permission was sought from the relevant authorities to carry out the study. Date to visit the place of study for questionnaire distribution was put in place in advance.

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This chapter presents the analysis of data derived through the questionnaire and key informant interview administered on the respondents in the study area. The analysis and interpretation were derived from the findings of the study. The data analysis depicts the simple frequency and percentage of the respondents as well as interpretation of the information gathered. A total of thirty five (35) questionnaires were administered to respondents of which thirty (30) were returned and validated. This was due to irregular, incomplete and inappropriate responses to some questionnaire. For this study a total of 30 was validated for the analysis.

**4.2 DATA PRESENTATION**

The table below shows the summary of the survey. A sample of 35 was calculated for this study. A total of 30 responses were received and validated. For this study a total of 30 was used for the analysis.

**Table 4.1: Distribution of Questionnaire**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Questionnaire** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Sample size | 35 | 100 |
| Received | 30 | 85.7 |
| Validated | 30 | 85.7 |

**Source: Field Survey, 2021**

**Table 4.2: Demographic data of respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Demographic information** | **Frequency** | **percent** |
| **Gender**  Male |  |  |
| 18 | 60% |
| Female | 12 | 40% |
| **Religion** |  |  |
| Christian | 30 | 100% |
| Muslim | 00 | 00% |
| Age |  |  |
| 20-30 | 08 | 27% |
| 30-40 | 10 | 33% |
| 41-50 | 12 | 40% |
| 51+ | 00 | 00% |
| **Education** |  |  |
| HND/BSC | 15 | 50% |
| MASTERS | 10 | 33% |
| PHD | 05 | 17% |
| Marital Status |  |  |
| Single | 11 | 37% |
| Married | 13 | 43% |
| Separated | 03 | 10% |
| Divorced | 00 | 00% |
| Widowed | 03 | 10% |

**Source: Field Survey, 2021**

**4.2 ANSWERING RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

**Question 1:** Is there a significant relationship between urban and regional planning and socioeconomic development?

**Table 4.3:** Respondent on question 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 17 | 56 |
| No | 06 | 20 |
| Undecided | 07 | 24 |
| **Total** | **30** | **100** |

**Field Survey, 2021**

From the responses obtained as expressed in the table above, 56% of the respondents said yes, 20% said no, while the remaining 24% were undecided.

**Question 2:** Does urban and regional planning impacts on the socioeconomic development of Abuja city?

**Table 4.4:** Respondent on question 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Options** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| High extent | 23 | 72 |
| Low extent | 03 | 13 |
| Undecided | 04 | 15 |
| **Total** | **30** | **100** |

**Field Survey, 2021**

From the responses obtained as expressed in the table above, 72% of the respondents said high extent, 13% said low extent, while the remaining 15% were undecided.

**TESTING OF HYPOTHESIS**

**Hypothesis One**

There is no significant relationship between urban and regional planning and socioeconomic development.

**Hypothesis Two**

Urban and regional planning does not impact on the socioeconomic development of Abuja city.

**Hypothesis One**

**There is no significant relationship between urban and regional planning and socioeconomic development.**

**Table 6: Pearson Correlation Table showing the relationship between urban and regional planning (UARP) and socioeconomic development (SED)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | UARP | SED |
| UARP | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .821\*\* |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
|  | N | 30 | 30 |
| SED | Pearson Correlation | .821\*\* | 1 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
|  | N | 30 | 30 |

Source: Survey data, 2021

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The Pearson Correlation result in Table 1 contains the degree of association between UARP and SED. From the result, the Pearson correlation coefficient, r, value of 0.821 was positive and statistically significant at (p< 0.000). This indicates that urban and regional planning (UARP) will result to socioeconomic development (SED).

Thus, UARP and SED are correlated positively.

**Hypothesis Two**

**Financial statement analysis does not aid banks in making lending decisions.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Observed frequencies** | **Expected frequencies (E)** | **O-E** | **(O-E)2** | **(O-E)**  **E** |
| Yes  No  Undecided | 22  05  03  30 | 10  10  10 | 12  -5  -7 | 144  25  -49 | 14.4  -2.5  -4.9  7.4 |

Degree of freedom = (row-1) (column-1)

= (3-1) (2-1)

= 3\*1

=2

At 0.05 level of significance, given the above degree of freedom, table value of X2 (ie X2t) = 5.991.

The decision rule is

Accept Ho if X2t>X2cal, and

Reject Ho if X2t<X2cal

Thus, since the X2t (5.991) less than X2cal (7.4), we reject the null hypothesis and accordingly accept alternate hypothesis. This implies that Urban and regional planning has an impacts on the socioeconomic development of Abuja city.

**HAPTER FIVE**

**SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**5.1 Introduction**

This chapter summarizes the findings into the impact of urban and regional planning on socioeconomic development of Nigeria using Abuja Metropolis as case study. The chapter consists of summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations.

**5.2 Summary of the Study**

In this study, our focus was to assess the impact of urban and regional planning on socioeconomic development of Nigeria using Abuja Metropolis as case study. The study specifically was aimed at evaluating the relationship that exists between urban and regional planning and socioeconomic development. And determine if urban and regional planning impacts on the socioeconomic development of Abuja city.

The study adopted the survey research design and randomly enrolled participants in the study. A total of 30 responses were validated from the enrolled participants where all respondent are active members of the federal ministry of housing and urban development Abuja.

**5.3 Conclusions**

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher made the following conclusion.

1. There is a significant relationship between urban and regional planning and socioeconomic development.
2. Urban and regional planning has an impacts on the socioeconomic development of Abuja city.

**5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the findings of this study, the study recommends that all department/ministries which are responsible for Urban and regional planning should be charged by the federal Government to ensure a maximum execution of their duties. This will enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of urban and regional planning in Nigerian.
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**APPENDIXE**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**PLEASE TICK [√] YOUR MOST PREFERRED CHOICE(S) IN A QUESTION.**

**SECTION A**

**PERSONAL INFORMATION**

**Gender**

Male [ ] Female [ ]

**Age**

20-30 [ ]

31-40 [ ]

41-50 [ ]

51 and above [ ]

**Educational level**

WAEC [ ]

BSC/HND [ ]

MSC/PGDE [ ]

PHD [ ]

Others……………………………………………….. (please indicate)

**Marital Status**

Single [ ]

Married [ ]

Separated [ ]

**SECTION B**

**Question 1:** Is there a significant relationship between urban and regional planning and socioeconomic development?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Options** | **Please Tick** |
| Yes |  |
| No |  |
| Undecided |  |

**Question 2:** Does urban and regional planning impacts on the socioeconomic development of Abuja city?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Options** | **Please Tick** |
| High extent |  |
| Low extent |  |
| Undecided |  |