

Original Paper

Non Implementation of the Greater Jos Urban Master Plan: Options and Strategies

Samuel Danjuma Wapwera^{1*}

¹ Department of Urban & Regional Planning, Faculty of Environmental Sciences, University of Jos, Jos City, Nigeria

* Samuel Danjuma Wapwera, Department of Urban & Regional Planning, Faculty of Environmental Sciences, University of Jos, Jos City, Nigeria

Received: June 6, 2018 Accepted: September 7, 2018 Online Published: September 30, 2018

doi:10.22158/uspa.v1n2p263 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/uspa.v1n2p263>

Abstract

This paper seeks to review the non-implementation of the Greater Jos Urban Master plan, considering some options and strategies. It was carried out by examining the current master planning approach and master planning-cum-spatial planning. The research strategy used is “mixed method” with a deductive-inductive reasoning. Multiple sampling methods were adopted; the snowball to get 30 Town planners working in the 9 case studies (planning authorities) to be engaged in the face-to-face interview, Purposive and Convenience sampling methods were employed to select over 90 documents on planning authorities and implementation of master plan in Jos, metropolis, Nigeria. The instruments employed were face-to-face interviews and review of archived documents on the implementation of master plans and other options. The data obtained through the face-to-face interviews and the 90 archive documents were analysed using the thematic and content analyses. The results obtained revealed that the implementation of the proposed greater Jos Urban master plan was affected by unproved legislations, the plethora of planning authorities covering the planning region and inadequate funding as well as its phasing. Hence the consideration of the strategies to employ for the implementation of plans which concluded with the recommendations to help practitioners (Town Planners), policy makers (Legislators in the area of planning) and the academia.

Keywords

Greater Jos Urban Master Plan, implementation and strategies

1. Introduction

The approach of planning practice adopted by Federal, State and Local government areas in Nigeria and most developing countries is a major problem in physical planning administration (Wapwera, 2014). Planning authorities with few qualified Town Planners leading to little impact in promoting efficient urban and regional development (Oyesiku, 2004). It is undoubtedly clear that the practice of urban and regional planning in Nigeria has not succeeded in the amelioration of the physical planning problems of the Metropolitan cities. This could be seen in most cities in Nigeria where the tools employed to manage the regions are highly inadequate. The master planning approach is still the planning method being adopted at both State and Local Government Areas in Nigeria as observed by Oyesiku (2004) and Jiriko (2007).

Nyambo (2010) observed that the inability to bring about sustainable development has always been affected by the lack of sustainable urbanisation and an appropriate planning approach which is not suitably implemented. The major problems have always been rapid urbanisation, growth of slums and urbanisation of poverty, as well as poor conservation of natural environment. Nigeria (Abuja) has the highest level of urbanisation in Africa; hence due to the proximity of Jos metropolis to Abuja, the spill over effect is being experienced, which has a direct bearing on the socio-economic, demographic and cultural characteristics.

The current institutional framework of urban and regional planning system (Master planning) in Nigeria and Jos, Metropolis to be specific cannot adequately address the urban problem of urbanisation and its physical characteristics (Oyesiku, 2004; Agbola, 2004; Alabi, 2008). This is necessitated by the social, economic, environmental and political constraints in the urban planning procedures in the metropolis. Hence, an effective urban planning system is required to address the urban sprawling and its characteristics in the metropolis. Good governance brings about good planning and helps in achieving the millennium Development Goals (2015) leading to Sustainable Development Goals (2016), through the effective implementation of the urban and regional plans, particularly where land is adequately supplied for development, accommodating investment and working with the less privileged to improve the standard of living for the people.

The physical planning strategies are geared towards identifying and targeting development, by conserving the available priorities, risk, opportunities and gaps in the urban and regional areas. It is not a static blueprint plan, but an attempt to understand the social, economic and environmental resources within each jurisdiction, linkages within and between urban and regional areas and upgrade of infrastructure. Effective planning and management of most urban and regional areas would help in bridging the dichotomy that exists between the rural and urban by increasing accessibility between rural to urban areas and increasing opportunities that exist.

A strong planning system, based on up to date plans, emerging from current information is needed to address the situation in most African countries because of its dynamic nature. Hence, sprawling conditions characterised by fast slums occurring making the problem grow rather than diminish

(Amanda, 2009). A plan that identifies and brings forth adequate quantities of land for development into safe and accessible location is most appreciated.

The era and legacy of failed master plans that are rigid and fixed have left cities, urban areas, residents and the surrounding environment poorly equipped to cope with the exploding urbanisation levels (Jiriko, 2008). These cities are important to Africa and Nigeria in particular; having poor growth and haphazard development, but due to poor provision of the needed infrastructure such as sophisticated management and effective leadership, it has been robbed of standard and effective plan-led modernisation and growth (CAP, 2005; Litman, 2011).

The underlying theories in this paper are; Institutional deficiency theory and the theory of planning practice, this is confirmed in the elements of the institutional deficiency theory which are evident and bringing about the non-implementation of the Greater Jos Urban Master Plan due to the following; Inadequate man-power, High level of corruption, Bureaucratic Bottle-Neck and Red Tape, Delay and negligence of responsibility amongst others. The theory of planning practice is also made manifest in all the planning authorities, a good organisation for industrial experience for interns at various levels, having gone a long way to enriching the town planning courses in tertiary institutions where training takes place and where the planning authorities sends employees for industrial experience for different durations.

Also constraints have been identified as a framework to analyse the current institutional framework within which the planning authorities exist in Jos Metropolis, Nigeria and how the constraints have affected the functionality of the framework towards the implementation of the Greater Jos Urban Master Plan 2008-2025 and other related plans within the metropolis leading to a non-functional framework.

Furthermore, the government needs to ensure participation by all and sundry, by working with the less privileged and marginalised groups such as the women and children (the urban poor). A conscious involvement of the public sector by: placing much emphasis on traditions, legislation and methods of urban and regional planning; and bringing about the reduction in the dichotomy of the distribution of resources across regions. Good governance brings about good planning because it is vital to the design and implementation of any plan, because the market forces usually are not to be relied on. However, the solution is always in effective public sector action, as the government plays a vibrant role in stabilising the economy by providing the needed infrastructure. A good planning approach has a great tendency to contribute to Nigeria's development, because it possesses the technical capacity to deliver pro-poor planning from the Local, State and National, as well as the Regional levels to bring about sustainable development in Jos Metropolis, Nigeria and West Africa.

It is against this background that this paper seeks to examine the non-implementation of the Greater Jos Urban Master Plan 2008-2015, with a view to making recommendations by considering its best options; and identifying and examining planning strategies adopted to address the physical planning problem.

1.1 What Is a Master Plan?

Okeke (2002) considered master planning as a process of doing orderly and managed sequences of actions to achieve the targeted goal or goals. It is any pursuit that is intended to cater for the present requirement which might not be adapted for the future, such activity will have to be carried out in such a way that it responds to future occurrences. In other words, it is defined as a foresight in formulating and implementing programmes and policies generally focused on resource allocation over a time period. Successful planning is generally guided by past experience to solve the problem (Webber, 1968; McLounglin, 1979).

Different systems of planning exists and are applied at different places for different reasons to meet different kinds and types of problems, with different dimensions and coverage. For instance, district plans, development plans, strategic plans, master plans, spatial plans, action plans and subject plans, amongst other plans. For the purpose of this paper, emphasis would be on the master plan.

A Master plan could be defined as a comprehensive long range document (Plan) intended to guide growth and development of a community or region. Emphasizing its included analysis, recommendations, and proposals about the community's population, economy, housing and basic infrastructure, as well as land use. It is based on public input, surveys, planning initiatives, existing development, physical characteristics, and social and economic conditions (Mabogunji, 2001).

According to Suleiman (1986) the advantage of the master plan lies in its physical components, land use; circulation, housing, provision of facilities, utilities and services; open spaces and urban design. A further advantage of the plan is that History has it that 1920 and 1960 were eras of "Blueprint" comprehensive master plans as the rule (Agwu, 1998; Jiriko, 2008). Hence, the idea was obtained from the comprehensive master plans that were prepared for cities such as London, Rome and Washington D.C amongst others. These conventional conceptual ideas and approaches were imported to Nigeria and some other developing countries when colonised and used as a spatial planning strategy (Agbola, 2004).

Nigeria has a high rapid rate of urbanisation, with high and uncontrolled birth-rates; thereby making the urban master plans inapplicable since they were not originally meant for application in dynamic environments. Planning is an evolving process concerned with constantly changing societal and environmental problems. This singular reason has made a case for the consideration of concepts and paradigms to change, in order for planning to be relevant in most cities of developing countries as observed by Mabogunji (2002) and Jiriko (2008).

Professional town planners in Nigeria are supposed to be dynamic and adaptive in their approach towards addressing a planning problem identified. Being dogmatic about a specific planning system on which the success of the urban planning practice virtually hinges should not be thought of. These rigid town planners tend to be enthusiastic about urban master planning which after being prepared, are kept on shelves to gather dust. This is regrettably counterproductive as argued by Falade (2002) and Oyesiku (2004).

Agwu (1998) considered the pros and cons of urban master planning judging from past experiences, and concludes that it is wishful thinking to encourage a planning authority in Nigeria to go into master planning. It was further justified by the fact that despite the so-called innovations draft on the master plan approach, the main tenets of the conventional urban master plan approach remains unchanged (Mba, 1992; Local Government Association, 2001; Falade, 2002; Jiriko, 2008). Furthermore, Okeke (2002) argues that changing socio-economic conditions in the country has encouraged the review of the University master plans as the National Universities Commission has recommended strategic planning as an alternative planning approach to restructure the university system to match prevailing circumstances.

Based on the observations raised, master planning has its weaknesses, even though it has been a working tool for the planner at different levels in Nigeria. This has brought about development as the whole, as it is the planning system employed in the country to ensure that some form of planning is incorporated into the system to bring about growth and development. The main aim of the next section is to examine the application of master planning to the metropolitan/urban cities in Nigeria, with a view to assessing its implementation, options and strategies to the system of planning over time.

The United Nations' policy advised on how master planning could be used to address the problems of housing, urban development and planning in different cities in the developed and developing countries such as USA, Australia, Singapore, Malaysia and Nigeria. The situation in Nigeria revealed that cities of developing countries (Asia and Africa inclusive) were growing and changing very fast than the European cities did during the industrial revolution. However, planning methods or systems are insufficient to guide the development in such countries and master planning has actually imparted very little on their growth (Mabogunji, 2002; Jiriko, 2008). Jiriko (2008) also observed that town planners had become very unpopular, stressing out the failures of master plans, of which the planners were unable to identify the immediate causes. Koenigsberger (1982) observed that the planning approach was inappropriate for the tropical countries, pointing that it was unsuitable since it was developed for a different type of society with a high demand for other alternatives (Egbu, 2007).

Devas (1993) opines out that during and after the colonial era, many ideas and concepts applied in developing countries like Nigeria, were derived from the practice of town planning in Britain. Many of these practices were transferred wholesomely. Oyesiku (2004) observed that this physical planning approach has found increasing disfavour in developed countries but was exported into many less developed countries during the 1950s and early 1960s where it is being used till date. Developing countries with cities such as Delhi, Madras, Karachi and Dhaka amongst others have adopted master planning systems for several cities, but yet are almost useless. They usually involve wildly accurate population projection, and land use zoning that deviate dramatically from reality. It also has inflexible conditions that are not adjustable as the conditions change.

Furthermore, master planning approach has been observed to be of almost a static nature, attuned to a scenario of slow urban growth; in which investments in infrastructure such as roads, services and other

public investment could be carefully planned in the context of a finite long term plan. Rapid population growth, lack of infrastructure and service, shortage of funds and staff in the typical developing country city, requires a more dynamic planning process in which priorities have to be continually assessed and reassessed in the light of the available resources (Jiriko, 2008; Litman, 2009).

Farvacque and Mc Auslan (1992) argued that master plans take unnecessarily long time to be prepared and seldom offer guidance on the phasing and techniques of implementation; they seldom evaluate cost of development they propose or try to determine how they could be financed. These master plans also pay little or no attention to the necessary resource allocation and financial feasibility of policies and programmes. Both criticisms shows that master plans are seldom based on realistic appraisals of the city's economic potential or likely population growth; and also that communities, community leaders and implementation agencies are seldom meaningfully involved in the master planning process. These scenarios are evident in our city (Jos Metropolis, Nigeria)—Check our Greater Jos Urban Master Plan (2008-2025). Master plans are expected to be constantly updated but for their static nature cannot keep with the dynamic process of the city growth in most developing countries, with Nigeria inclusive.

Cullingworth (1982) argues that the failure of master planning in America is attributed to the fact that there is a defeat in the concept (Master Planning) and that the process of urban and regional planning as practised in the United States for many years is faulty. This fact has been up held in Nigeria for so long to the flaws of the end-state master plan in vogue. On the factual performance of the master plan city plans, Branch (1974) revealed that few master plans have significantly shaped the development of cities in United States of America. Further illustrations show that just one year after the master plan publications are printed, they usually outmoded in importance respect and significantly less relevant, not to considered it been kept for a long time not even pass in to law for over ten years as it is the case of Jos Metropolis, Nigeria currently; not forgetting the fact that development is never static in the last ten years and even more. Master planning has been a wishful rather than productive enterprise, as it and imaginary constructs, which represent physical objects and both their external and internal relationships in space: the emphasis is restricted to analysis of the spatial structure, urban form and land use patterns as argued by Rose (1974).

The master planning approach has tended to pay scant regard to the ecological, social, economic and political processes which together make up the environment of man, be it urban, regional, national or supra national for the achieving the Millennium Development Goals (2015), leading to Sustainable Development Goals (2016-2030) (Jiriko, 2008; Chaolin, Xiaohui, & Jing, 2010).

1.2 Options: Spatial and Master Planning

The advance learners Dictionary, 6th Edition, 2000 defines option as something that can choose to have or do; freedom to choose what you do. There are various options open to planners to address the problems in most urban areas. One of the choice planners make when using varying planning approaches could be spatial planning. It is the choice which is thought to be the best and involves less effort and difficulty and achieving a set goal.

In the United Kingdom (Britain), spatial planning is being adopted as a system of planning and it is characterised by the following: Dynamic and timely policy and decision making, Inclusive and effective community engagement and collaboration, integration and joining-up, positive, evidence-based reasoning, Urban sustainable development and Climate change and the numerous interventions (ODMP, 2006). This is aimed at addressing the menace and the implication of urban problems. The role of spatial planning is in the investment and provision of basic infrastructure required for growth and development of urban areas in different regions of both developed and developing countries, which is achieved by the adoption of spatial planning principles.

Local Government Association (2001) and National Assembly for Wales (2004) defined spatial planning as the act of making available what is supposed to be where it should be in any given physical environment. This is made possible through the strategic growth point considered through the governance and management. Hence, Healey (2004) also reiterated the fact that spatial planning is succeeding and flourishing in Britain, because it is without some changes in political, culture and institutional design. Hence, it is worth the while, if Nigeria would borrow a leave.

The experience of most developing countries about urban planning is different, as the urban master planning system approach is widely adopted or utilised. It is a comprehensive long range plan intended to guide growth and development of a community or region. It emphasises on proposals about the community's population, economy, housing and basic infrastructure as well as land use which are analysed and included, and recommendations are made. It is based on public input, surveys, planning initiatives, existing development, physical characteristics, and social and economic conditions. The master planning system over the years has proven to be highly insufficient to guide physical development in Nigeria (Oyesiku, 2001; Anderson, 2001; Agbola, 2004; Aluko, 2004; Olatubara et al., 2004; Stewart, 2006; World Bank, 2009; United Nations, 2010). Master planning has actually imparted very little on their growth and town planners had become very unpopular and stressed out (frustrated) as the master plans have failed and they were unable to identify the immediate causes.

The chronology of planning events in Nigeria was carefully considered and a number of issues identified giving the characteristics of the colonial and post-colonial eras with the plethora of planning agencies, adoption of ad hoc committees to do the task that is meant for the professionals in the built and physical planning environment. A careful consideration of the constraints that have affected the planning system would go a long way in bringing about the effectiveness of the system over time and the factors that have placed most developing countries under an undue disadvantage.

Goldratt (2004) and Vidal (2008) observed that constraints affects the goal of any programme whether internal or external. There are different types of internal constraints (Equipment, people, plans and policy) and external constraints this is true for the planning system under scrutiny. Goldratt (2004) observed that constraints generally limit the output of a solution and in this case the urban master plan. The following are some forms of constraints identified; Political constraints, Cultural Constraints, Institutional constraints, Legal Constraints, Knowledge Constraints and analytical constraints as well as Physical

constraints experienced by many countries, organisations and authorities amongst others in trying to implement their policies (Gupta, 2001; Goldratt, 2004; Dung-Gwom, Hirse, & Pwat, 2008).

Effectiveness in the planning system is dependent on the following key areas: Overall planning component, Staffing process, Development planning, Career development planning, Planning for and management replacement and restaffing, Job assignment, Process of supervision, Training, Needs of the organisation, Organisational activities, Legislation, Conflicting internal priorities, Master plan, Quality improvement in the design and implementation of the policies (Baker & Branch, 2002; Egbu, 2007; Elbana, 2009).

Selection of the appropriate basis for assessing organizational effectiveness presents a challenging problem for planners in the planning authorities. There are no generally accepted conceptualisations prescribing the best criteria for the measurement of effectiveness. The situations in planning authorities—pertaining to the performance of the planning structure, human resources, and the impact of the organisation's activities—requiring different criteria to meet the main objectives of the master planning system in Jos metropolis, Nigeria.

Cunningham (1998) after reviewing the relevant literature concluded that there are seven major ways (using models) of evaluating organisational effectiveness which include: rational goal model, systems resource model, managerial process model, organisational development model, the bargaining model, the structural functional model, and the functional model are the major model of measuring effectiveness.

There are requirements for the evaluation of different aspects of effectiveness. For the purpose of this paper the emphasis would be on systems resource (Human and natural resources), managerial process (expertise, experience, staffing and funding) and structural functional (Planning authorities in Jos Metropolis, Nigeria). The strong hold on the traditional master planning system to achieve growth and development is common to most Nigerian cities such as Lagos, Enugu, Kaduna and even Abuja the capital city of the nation (Mabogunji, 2002; Oyesiku, 2004; Jiriko, 2008). So therefore to address the physical planning problem that is dynamic and complex in nature, identified in most Nigerian urban centres, there is a dearth need for the adoption of a planning system that is dynamic and complex in nature. This planning system should employ appropriate or adequate plans or policies to address the dynamic problems in the dynamic environment to bring about an efficient, effective and a well-structured (adequate vertical and horizontal coordination of planning activities) administrative framework for urban and regional planning development in Nigeria (Giddens, 1979; DiMaggio, 1988; Mabogunji, 2002; Oyesiku, 2004; Wong, 2006; Ekop, 2007; Healey, 2007; Jiriko, 2008; Martin, 2008; Rydin, 2011).

Furthermore, to give the distinction between Master planning and spatial planning, ten measures were considered to illustrate the difference between these physical planning approaches, see Table 1.

Table 1. Comparison of Ideal Type Master Planning and Spatial Planning

SN	Measure of Difference	Master Planning (MP)	Spatial Planning (SPG)
1	Purpose	Regulating land use and development through designation of areas of development and protection, and application of performance criteria.	Shaping spatial development through the coordination of the spatial impacts of sector policy and decisions.
2	Form	Schedule of policies and decision rules to regulate land use for the administrative area Mapping of designation of areas and sites for development purposes and protection.	Strategy identifying critical spatial development issues and defining clear desired outcomes across functional areas Visualisation of spatial goals, and key areas of change. Principles and objectives that will guide coordinated action.
3	Process	Discrete process leading to adoption of final blueprint plan. Confrontational process, instigated through consultation on draft plans and political negotiation. Stakeholders using the process to protect and promote their interests.	Continuous process of plan review and adjustment. Mutual learning and information sharing, driven by debate on alternatives in collaborative political process. Stakeholders using the process to achieve their own and mutual goals.
4	Ownership and policy community	A document of the planning authority providing guidance to other professional planners promoting and regulating development.	A corporate document of the local authority in shared ownership with communities and other stakeholders, partnerships and NGOs.
5	Procedural safeguards	Final plan determined through adversarial inquiry on parts of plan subject to objections.	Final plan determined by inquisitorial examination of the soundness and coherence of the whole plan.
6	Methods	Mapping of constraints and collection of sectoral policy demands. Bargaining and negotiation with objectors and other stakeholders, informed by broad planning principles. Checking of proposals through sustainability	Building understanding of critical spatial development trends and drivers, market demands and needs social, economic and environmental impacts of developments. Analysis of options through visioning and strategic choice approaches. Generation of alternatives and options

		appraisal/strategic environmental assessment.	assisted by sustainable strategic environmental assessment.
7	Delivery and implementation	Seeks to direct change and control investment activity in land use through prescriptive regulation, whilst mitigating local externalities through conditions and planning agreements.	Seeks to influence decisions in other sectors by building joint ownership of the strategy and a range of incentives and other mechanisms including land use regulation and planning agreements.
8	Monitoring and review	Measures conformance of the plans, policies and proposals with planning control outcomes. Data provides portrait of plan area as general context for implementation of proposals. Having infrequent review of whole plan.	Measures performance of the plan in influencing sector policy and decision-making. Data informs understanding of spatial development and the application of the strategy. Regular adjustment of components of plan around consistent vision.
9	Perspectives; Use	Traditional, land use planning.	Spatial planning goes beyond traditional, land use planning.
	Integration	Does not integrate policies for the development.	Bring together and integrate policies for the development.
	Enhancement	Does not use land with other policies and programmes policies which can impact on land use.	Use of land with other policies and programmes policies which can impact on land use.
	Influence	Influence the nature of places but not how they can function.	Influence the nature of places and how they can function.
	Duration	Comprehensive long range plan intended to guide growth and development of a community or region.	Non comprehensive short range plan intended to guide growth and development of a community or region.
	Emphasis	Emphasizing its included analysis, recommendations, and proposals about the community's population, economy, housing and basic infrastructure as well as land use.	While it emphasizes its included analysis, recommendations, its proposals are about where the community's population, economy, housing and basic infrastructure should be in the arranged land use for sustainable urban development.

Inputs	It is based on government input, surveys, planning initiatives, existing development, physical characteristics, and social and economic conditions.	It is based on public input, surveys, planning initiatives, existing development, physical characteristics, and social and economic conditions.
10 Components of Plans	Master plan lies in its physical components, land use; circulation, housing, provision of facilities, utilities and services; open spaces and urban design.	Spatial plan lies in its physical components, land use; circulation, housing, provision of facilities, utilities and services; open spaces and urban design. It also considers Sustainability and Climate Change.

Source: Compile by Author from (ODPM, 2005, 2006; Jiriko, 2008).

Albrechts (2001, p. 1) sees spatial planning as: not a single concept, procedure or tool. It is a set of concepts, procedures and tools that must be tailored to whatever situation is at hand if desirable outcomes are to be achieved. It would be very important at this juncture to state the main rationale for adopting spatial planning. It is to ensure utilisation and its implementation to meet the need of the present and future generation. Adopted in both developed and developing countries to address physical planning problems arising as a result of urbanisation as most urban environments are decaying at a rapid pace. Spatial planning plays a lead role in addressing the issues at various levels. The role of spatial planning as enumerated by NEPA, 2011 are; firstly create the condition for an enhanced quality of life, secondly fulfil the aims of efficiency and democracy through public participation and thirdly to meet the challenge of sustainable development (Local Government Association, 2001; Yasin, 2003).

Spatial planning is characterised by the following; having the ability to give a geographical expression to the economic, social, cultural and ecological policies of society. It is a scientific discipline, an administrative technique and a policy. CEMAT (1983) and RTPI (2011) observed that it helps in the physical organisation of space according to an overall strategy and also used as a method by the public sector to influence the distribution of people and activities in spaces at various scales. Wyatt (2009) in his study observed that spatial planning involves twin activities: the management of the competing uses for space; and the making of places that are valued and have identity. Spatial planning can be considered as many different things, depending on the purpose for which it is being considered. For instance, it could be considered an intervention, a framework, a tool, a method and a strategy amongst others. Its function are very vital as it has the ability to create the condition for an enhanced quality of life, fulfil the aims of efficiency and democracy through public participation which meets the challenges of sustainable development and climate change (CEMAT, 1983; National Assembly for Wales, 2004; RTPI, 2011).

Albrechts (2001, p. 1) and Wyatt (2009) observe that spatial planning is a discrete professional discipline which involve land use planning, urban planning, regional planning, transport planning and

environmental planning. It also relates to areas that are important, such as economic planning and community planning. Hence, based on this diversity it is not devoid of the challenges of institutional capacity and resources in terms of staffing, expertise, funding and experience amongst others as observed by Healey (1997), Vigar et al. (2000), Local Government Association (2001) and Yasin (2003).

For the purpose of this paper Spatial Planning (SP) is defined as a strategic activity that is concerned with the allocation and management of natural and human resources across space (competing uses for space of various scales), bringing about competition for space at various scales, creating value by making places and distributing the activities (social, economic, political and environmental), bringing to bear the interaction of different policies and practice for future development of any delineated geographical area and in this case the Jos metropolis, Nigeria.

Based on the characteristics of master plan and that of spatial planning two things are evident, the later has Dynamic and timely policy and decision making, Inclusive and effective community engagement, Collaboration, integration and joining-up, Positive, evidence-based reasoning as well as Delivery and outcomes and in addition sustainable development and Climate Change, which is clearly absent in the former.

2. Method

The mixed method strategy is adopted for this paper using the multiple case studies within the Jos Metropolis, Nigeria with a master planning tool to control physical development. The reasoning used is both deductive-inductive. Multiple sampling methods were adopted; the snowball, Purposive and Convenience sampling methods were employed for the Face-to-face interview, documents and nine planning authorities respectively. The qualitative based evidence from 30 semi-structured face-to-face interviews with Town planners working in the 9 case studies (planning authorities). This was to gather the opinion and views of Town planners within the Jos Metropolis, Nigeria working in the nine planning authorities. Over 90 documents obtained from these planning authorities operating within Jos Metropolis, Nigeria were also reviewed, all these were to explain the non-implementation of the Greater Jos Urban master plan. The data obtained through the face-to-face interviews and the 90 archive documents were analysed using the thematic and content analyses.

3. Result

3.1 The Implementation of the Proposed Greater Jos Urban Master Plan (2008-2025) and Other Master Plans

Once Master Plans are in place, they should give way to local plans which should provide a more detailed basis for development control within the local area. Most urban areas have uncontrolled development in need of urgent attention. Increased traffic problems in urban areas and transport planning and management should similarly, be given prompt attention, as observed by Dung-Gwom, Hirse and Pwat (2008). The data from interviews with registered town planners revealed that 90% of

the respondents were aware that the master plan had not been passed into law and the bill yet to be considered. This clearly implies that there still isn't a legitimate document for use, ten years after the proposal was lodged with the courts.

Bad governance over the years has affected urban development in the country. Plateau State, for example, has shown a tendency to disregard national policies and programmes, because it has not made any effort to adopt and implement them in the State. This was confirmed by the majority of the respondents and also reaffirmed by the work of Dung-Gwom, Hirse and Pwat (2008), who stated that there is no urban development policy for the Jos Metropolis between the years of 1975-2005; therefore, the Greater Jos Urban Master Plan is still being used as the only legitimate document in existence.

Similarly, the Master Plans for major urban areas (Greater Jos Master Plan, Riyom Urban Master Plan and Angware Urban Master Plan) have either not been reviewed or not implemented. Presently the Government is making effort to consider the formulation of new policies and a review of existing policies to bring about controlled urban development and management. The Government has assisted urban development and housing through the adequate provision of funds in the annual budgets for state and local governments. The government has to source funds from other bodies, such as; UN-Habitat, United Nations Development Programmes, NEPAD, African Development Bank, the European Union and bilateral assistance from friendly countries, as observed by Dung-Gwom, Hirse and Pwat (2008). Further pointing out that the assistance received in form of grants and other packages from Multi-lateral Development Banks (MDB's) and bilateral bodies are not used efficiently to ensure that essential infrastructure is provided to trigger urban development and management.

Development Control (DC) remains a huge problem in Jos Metropolis and other urban centres in the state. The impact of the Planning Authorities (JMDB and others) in terms of development control in Jos Metropolis is negligible to say the least, while in other urban centres, no system for development control actually exists (local government). This is due to the magnitude of other mitigating factors such as; inadequate manpower, equipment, land tenure, outdated and obsolete plans, conflicting roles of public agencies and planning authorities, and even hostile confrontation with the urban local any form of loan or support. This haphazard growth has been captured by Figures 1 & 2 where uncontrolled urban development and management can be seen.



Figure 1. High Tension Cable Passing Over Plot

Source: Authors Field work (2014).



Figure 2. Marking a Building with X by JMDB

Source: Authors Field work (2014).

Any development by the general public are always termed illegal due to the non-availability of land documents that could be used as legal document for a titled property which in turn, could be used as collateral. Titled properties continue to increase without due documentation, hence, the implementation of the proposed Greater Jos Urban Master Plan (GJUMP) remains a mirage. This was encouraged by the simple fact that such considerations were not factored into the master plan since the stakeholders (property owners and population) were not included or consulted, and because the planning approach is not interventionist-oriented (rigid) and makes no provision for unforeseen, external occurrences which have crippled the performance of the urban planning system.

The implementation of Plans is usually structured in phases, marked after planned approval within specific periods of time either in months or years for easy coordination and management. The implementation of Master Plans is always the joint responsibility of the Governments at any level (Federal, State, Local) and the Private Sector, within other settings are saddled with the responsibilities could be the PPP (Public Private Participation) all geared towards sustainability. However, Legislation, Planning Authorities, Funding and Phasing are very essential for the implementation to be successful.

The role of the State government in the implementation such state law which prevents situation of governing one metropolis with 6 local governments, it could be seen through the planning authorities, using the legislation (Plans) and the funding of the implementation in phases, because the local governments fall within the jurisdiction of the metropolis. This pattern of law was adopted from the colonial masters (Britain) who left a structure for proper implementation of regional plans and now master plan.

3.2 Legislation

The Legal sections (legal documents) of the urban planning system becomes effective when the emphasis is placed on the planning legislation, using the following regulations and laws addressing the physical planning problems identified in the urban areas (Obateru, 2004; Oyesiku, 2004; Ekop, 2007; Ekop & Uyanga, 2007). The component is made effective when the suitable documents are adequately used for the regulations and control of development. These documents include; Development Control Standards, Constitution of the Federal republic of Nigeria (1999) amended, Land Use Decree 1978 (LFN, Cap 5., 2004), Acceptable and Responsive Physical Planning Laws and Regulations, 1992 Urban and Regional Planning Law, National Building Code, Master plans, Development Control Measures;

Zoning Regulations, Density Control, Building Line Regulation, and Height Control Act. The usage of these documents is mostly manifested in a controlled development. Enactment of the Greater Jos Urban Master Plan into a law of Plateau State to guarantee its implementation has not been carried out.

Finally, it can be concluded that most of the Planning Legislation expected to assist in the control of Urban Development and Management in Jos Metropolis, Nigeria have not been adequately employed as their usage have been constrained by one factor or the other. The State has not made any attempt to adapt legislation such as the; 1992 URP Law, GJUMP 2008-2025, Riyom Urban Master Plan, Angware Master Plan, Climate Change Initiatives, Urban Sustainability Issues and many more, to suit the region, Therefore, it is impossible to ascertain what Planning Legislation applies in the state which is in a very serious condition of uncertainty for future physical development?

The relationship between the numerous planning legislations and constraints might be insignificant based on quantitative analysis, yet the legislations are not addressing the problem of uncontrolled development in the study area. Based on the aforementioned, it could rightly be concluded that the Planning Legislations are the best available means for addressing different issues that concern Urban Development and Management, which might be constrained, but not significantly. The legislations, either good or bad can be made to address the problems for which they were formulated. The government should therefore provide an enabling environment for the legislations to function adequately, ensuring controlled Urban Development and Management.

These planning legislations have not encouraged urban development and management but have encouraged uneven development in Jos Metropolis, Nigeria. Other studies have shown that access to and control of land is a major constraint to sustainable urban development. Other measures should be considered or else, the master plan and its good intentions will remain on paper and never be more than an illusion. The question is: what is physically manifesting in the Greater Jos Urban Master planning area? What are the reasons behind such physical development?

3.3 Planning Authorities

Presently, there are a plethora of institutions in the state that perform overlapping functions and work at cross purposes rather than addressing different issues and problems. For example, there is: (1) the Ministry of Land, Surveys and Town Planning (MLSTP); (2) Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (MHUD) now Ministry of Physical Development (MPD) (3) Jos Metropolitan Development Board (JMDB); and (4) Lands Sections in the six Local governments areas carved into the Jos metropolis, Nigeria. The counterparts of these planning authorities at the federal level are also crowding for the same functions, roles and responsibilities. Table 2 shows the functions, roles and responsibilities of the four planning authorities involved in development control in the metropolis and used as case studies in this study.

Table 2. Roles, Functions and Responsibilities of the Planning Authorities in Jos Metropolis, Nigeria

Planning Authorities	Functions	Responsibilities	Roles	Functions			Responsibilities			Roles		
				1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Ministry of Lands Survey and Town Planning (MLSTP)	28	11	1	19	12	10	9	3	6	1	1	1
Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (MHUD)	14	9	1	11	5	9	7	6	2	1	1	1
Lands Section in Six LGA	5	6	1	5	5	-	6	6	-	1	1	-
Jos Metropolitan Development Board JMDB	8	5	1	6	5	5	6	3	4	1	2	

Source: Wapwera and Egbu (2013).

3.4 The Challenges of the Planning Authorities

The following are challenges faced by the Planning Authorities (PA) in the Nigerian urban planning system. See Figure 3.

- ✚ Inability of the PA to live up to their responsibilities which has attracted the attention of the planners over the past one decade.
- ✚ PA are be leagues with insufficient man-power particularly shortage of professional physical planners
- ✚ PA lack administrative autonomy to perform efficiently as they relied mainly on the directives and instructions from their respective ministries or bureau of land and housing or the state agencies in charge of planners.
- ✚ PA lacks the initiative/innovation of planning schemes or any form of developmental plans to address the planning problems.
- ✚ Uncooperative stands of local government councils as well as federal and state government parastatals within the area of jurisdiction of the authorities.
- ✚ Local government councils contend that they have local status and based to operate within the area just like the authorities but employ different regulations and laws.
- ✚ The operation of the local government authorities and the local government often run at the cross-purposes thereby limiting the effectiveness of the authorities at the local level.

Figure 3. Challenges of the Planning Authorities

Source: Oyesiku, 2004; Authors field work, 2012; Wapwera & Egbu, 2013; Wapwera, 2014.

One major problem envisaged here is that the master plan did not clearly name a specific planning authority that would handle the implementation of the master plan as 80% of the respondents present that fear. This has made it very difficult for the master plan to be implemented, reviewed, updated and adjusted to control planning within the urban metropolis.

The major problem is that the Board of Directors of many planning authorities dictates to the Urban Manager how to manage the processes and procedures for ensuring effective control of development. The budget provided no detailed information but it was clear that the board was not properly funded as 90% of those interviewed presented the same issue of inadequate funding. Equipment required for different tasks are highly inadequate, vehicles for distribution of relevant notices and the policies of the government also hindering a number of actions, and this affects the output and performance of the Planning Authorities.

Finally, all the administrative heads of all the Planning Authorities are politically appointed. The ministries are headed by commissioners, the board is headed by a politically appointed manager and the chairman of the local government council is either elected or appointed without ensuring that they have a controlled Urban Development and Management.

3.5 Funding

From the past administrations till date, there has been the problem of inadequacy of Funding and Commitment by the Governments. It has to scale its funding to urban development and housing through adequate provision in the annual budgets for the state and local governments. Government has to source for other funds from other bodies, national and international for the sectors. The Cost Implication for each aspect of the Plan Implementation could only be determined at the level of the detailed design by subsequent consultants.

Global Monitoring Report 2014/2015 observed that sources such as the UN-Habitat, United Nations Development Programmes, NEPAD, African Development Bank, the European Union and bilateral assistance are from friendly countries. Assistance in form of grants and other packages from these multi-lateral and bilateral bodies are not used adequately to ensure the needed infrastructure is provided to trigger the needed urban development. As a move towards achieving the SDGs it requires moving from billions to trillions in resource flows. Such a paradigm shift calls for a wide-ranging financing framework capable of channeling resources and investments of all kinds—public and private, national and global. There is no substitute for concessional resources, especially for the poorest, most fragile or conflict-torn countries. But marshalling other types of financing at the levels needed will demand greater efforts to unlock, leverage, and catalyze more public and private flows. Financing from private sources, including capital markets, institutional investors and businesses, will become particularly important. Countries also need to improve their institutional and policy environments to attract more private investment and financing, at the same time as they pursue truly sustainable and inclusive growth, so prosperity translates into poverty reduction and social progress.

Furthermore International Financing Institutions (IFI's) are well-positioned to assist member countries in creating such an enabling environment. Guided by our institutional mandates and our member countries' own development goals, we are committed to helping raise an important part of the required flows, either through direct financing, leveraging our capital or catalyzing other resources. The global financing for development is determined to continue through the following:

- Combining our knowledge and experience with our member countries' perspectives, offering policy and technical advice tailored to local conditions;
- Building a global safety net by providing counter-cyclical support to economies affected by adverse shocks;
- Helping countries implement actions for climate change adaptation and mitigation and disaster risk management;
- Working to strengthen domestic financial markets and deepen financial inclusion;
- Promoting the highest social, environmental and governance standards;
- Attracting more concessional funding to provide grants and concessional lending to low-income, fragile and conflict-affected countries.

3.6 Phasing

The implementations of plans are usually structured in phases marked within specific periods of time either in months or years for easy coordination and management. The details of each stage are indicated in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of the Phasing after Plan Approval (2008-2025)

SN	Phase	Duration	Description of Activities
1	Phase I	9-12 months	i) Enactment of the Greater Jos Master Plan into a law of Plateau State to guarantee its implementation. ii) Establishment of Greater Jos Development Authority through the review of the extant law setting up Jos Metropolitan Development Board (JMDB). iii) Acquisition of land covered by the Greater Jos Master Plan. iv) Resettlement Scheme be put in place to absorb the inhabitants to be displaced from different parts of the Planning Area. v) Carry out the detailed Engineering Design of the Accelerated Sub-Sector for immediate construction. vi) Commission Town Planning Consultants for the detailed designs of at least one Sub-Sector.

			vii) Commission consultants for the design of the Ring Road and up- grading of the major Arterial roads.
2	Phase II	12 months after approval-Stabilisation	i) It covers the setting out of plots within the designed Sub-Sector in each Sector for physical implementation. ii) Construction of Ring Road and some selected Arterial Streets.
3	Phase III	After Stabilisation	The last stage of plan development shall cover the period between when the implementation process has stabilized up to the end of the plan period which is 2025.

Source: Greater Jos Master Plan, 2008-2025.

Phasing is a fundamental aspect of any plan as it is a stage in a process of change or development and in this case the implementation of the master plan. The Greater Jos Urban Master Plan has three phases; Phase I, Phase II and Phase III. No single phase has been achieved as the master plan itself has not been enacted into a law of Plateau State (12yrs after) to guarantee its implementation. The study area is the Jos Metropolis, Nigeria an old Tin-mining area that was inhabited by different Tin-mining companies in the 1904s and having a well-designed grid layout over the years. The metropolis now experienced a haphazard development, leading to the sprawling of the urban metropolis and the capital of Plateau state, Nigeria and it is in dearth need of a planning approach that would salvage the situation.

3.7 Strategies for Implementation of Plans

For and plan to be implemented effectively after identifying and adopting an option be it master plan or spatial plan a set of strategies need to be adopted. A strategy is an action that managers (in these case planners) take to attain one or more of the organisation's goals. Strategy can also be defined as "A general direction set for the company (Planning authority) and its various components to achieve a desired state in the future". Strategy results from the detailed strategic planning process as observed by Mintzberg, Ahlstrand and Lampel (2008).

The issue to be addressed here is how can (Spatial or Master) planning be applied as a strategies? Strategies is defined as an instrument use by the planning authorities in Jos Metropolis, Nigeria to address physical planning problems that are concerned with the provision of facilities utilities and services in plans to the more localised design in the organisation of towns, villages and neighbourhoods. It is against this backdrop that the following will be observed as ways in which it will be applied as a strategic tool;

- ✚ By adopting it for the organisation of space at various levels (RTPI, 2011).
- ✚ Considerations of a combination of various visions with short term actions (ODPM, 2004, p. 3).
- ✚ Common promotion of assets for development (capacity & resources-staffing, expertise, experience and funding) (Local Government Association, 2001; Yasin, 2003).

- ✚ Involvement of stakeholders and becoming more active in planning, e.g., Community (Vigar et al., 2000; ODPM, 2004).
- ✚ As a sustainable framework for regulating the development, management and the use of Land (Harris, Hooper, & Bishop, 2002).
- ✚ A plan for the protection of fresh water resources, etc. (Carter, 2007).
- ✚ As a tool to influence environmental quality, generate and resolve the environmental problem (Harris, Hooper, & Bishop, 2002).
- ✚ To solve local development framework problem (Wyatt, 2009).
- ✚ To bring about sustainable development (ODPM, 2004, p. 3).
- ✚ Bringing about integration of policies for the development of the use of land and other policies and programmes which influence how they function eg the land use act and the master plans (Vigar et al., 2000; National Assembly for Wales, 2004; RITP, 2011).
- ✚ Applied as a guide to change in land used as rights in any given geographical area, guide public investment infrastructure (Yin & Muller, 2010).
- ✚ As a new instrument of practice (National Assembly for Wales, 2004; Elbanna, 2008, p. 786).
- ✚ Essential national infrastructure networks and supply systems, including those for energy, IT, water, knowledge, training and health, cut across the boundaries of established administrative regions and cannot be planned on a local, or even regional, basis. For instance without a national framework it would be very difficult for government's key goals be met (Carter, 2007).
- ✚ Strategic thinking in the business which will be used to broaden the scope of the concept and European strategic practices (Albrecht, 2004).
- ✚ Tackling Climate Change and the associated problems arising from it as it relates to physical planning at various levels and scales (Carter, 2007).

Thorough planning processes are involved in the linkages between the options and their strategies as tools. Policies are made at the national level, at the state level the plans are offshoots of the policies and programmes are made to implement these plans. For instance the national framework involves other components of the entire nation, the urban and regional section form part of the policy (National Physical Plan) as observed by Khakee (1985). Furthermore, at the state level this policy now are carried out or broken down in to plans (strategies). Plans such as (Urban Master Plan) are now been implemented as options, for instance, Environmental sanitation, urban regeneration and road rehabilitation/reconstruction amongst others. In Nigeria this is reflected in the report of the national planning office setting up a policy guideline with a breakdown at every level and at various fields. The States translate and operate by making different plans, urban master plans which also translate into programmes to address the problems identify at the local government levels. All these are related in terms of the physical planning.

Furthermore, Mintzberg, Ahlstrand and Lampel (2008) enumerated ten strategic schools in their Book Strategic Safari. These strategic schools include: Planning, Cognitive, Environmental, Power, Enterprise,

Positioning, Cultural, Configuration, Design and learning schools. All these schools are all characterised by a deliberate approach to planning, whereby there are pre-determined objectives to be achieved. The plans are aligned with the activities to be involved in and need to be realised in the objectives for each of the options.

Each one of these (school of thought) approaches is related to urban and regional planning in its unique way. By placing them in the context of their background, the design school sees strategic management as a process of attaining a fit between the internal capabilities and external possibilities of planning authorities. It is different from the planning school, which extols the virtues of formal strategic planning and arms itself with SWOT analysis and checklists because even though there are possibilities for the planning authorities there is an analysis of strengths and weakness to be able to strategized (Ricardian concept). The positioning school is very important because the three tiers of government with the planning authorities and having different roles, functions and responsibilities found at every level helps in addressing the problems at every level as well as specific issues. The enterprise school helps the planning authorities to play their roles of design and implementing the physical development plans (master plan).

The cognitive school helps in considering the minds of those who put forth strategies for implementation and try to see the rationale behind the decision taken. The learning school, which sees strategy as an emergent process, ensures that strategies emerge as the planning authorities come to learn about the physical planning problems as well as their strength dealing with it. The power school, which views strategy emerging out of power games within the organisation and outside it. By virtue of the law establishing it no single planning authority exist without powers and authority no matter the level within which it operates.

The cultural school, views strategy formation as a process rooted in the social force of culture, i.e., the way of life of the people involved in the planning system considering their norms and values. The environmental school believes that a planning authority's strategy depends on activities in the environment and the planning authority's reaction to these activities as planning is an activity-led process. Finally, the configuration school, views strategy as a process of transforming the organisation it describes the relative stability of strategy, interrupted by occasional and dramatic leaps to new ones.

Drawing from all the various threads together, every strategic process has a link with other strategies enumerated in the various schools of thought. The plethora of planning authorities in most cities in Nigeria and many developing countries cannot be devoid of the adoption of multiple strategies in their jurisdictions to address the "wicket and dangerous problems" Rittle and Webber (1966) observed.

Some of those plans or activities are at organisational level, variously known as strategic plans; some of these activities are at operational level. Most organisational strategies following the strategic planning school, with the approach describe above. The examples typically found in most government national, state or local organisations follow the strategic plans, for instance; the master plan, spatial plan and development plan amongst others.

Elbanna (2008, p. 786), define strategic planning practice as “the extent to which an organisation uses strategic planning”. And that the use of strategic planning as an indicator of the practice of strategic planning provides more objective evidence of this practice. Although this cannot be enough in itself to completely measure strategic planning practice. Planners work with a mission and/or vision, long-term objectives and strategies. Hence, strategic planning practice becomes their watch worth; the intent is to convey that a planning authority strategic planning process involves some strategies which are explicitly used to put the strategic planning concept into action.

Finally, the following are examples of strategic planning tools that could be considered by different planning authorities using either a Master Plan or Spatial Plan: spreadsheet “what if” analysis; analysis of critical success factors; portfolio analysis; competitor analysis/competitive intelligence; SWOT analysis; strategic planning software; economic forecasting models; stakeholder analysis; value chain analysis; Porter’s five-forces analysis; Boston consulting group matrix or General Electric matrix; scenario construction/analysis; PEST analysis; experience curve analysis; Delphi technique; PIMS analysis; benchmarking; gap analysis; product life cycle analysis; balanced scorecard; outsourcing analysis; pro forma financial statements (e.g., cash flow, income statement and budget); cost benefit analysis; and cognitive mapping amongst others.

4. Conclusion

This paper has set out to examine the non-implementation of the Greater Jos Urban Master Plan 2008-2025 with a view to make recommendations by considering its best options and identifying and examining planning strategies adopted to address the physical planning problem. It observed the following;

- 1) Implementation of master plan is in phases but in the Greater Jos Urban Master Plan 2008-2025 this has not been enacted into law to make it viable law or document to be utilizes to control urban growth and development in Jos and its environs. The implication of these is that the phase has not even been started 10 years after the preparation of the plan.
- 2) It is at a cost. The funding sources for the implementation of this plan are not clearly spelt out and as such it has remained very difficult to for anything to be done concerning the master plan. It was mentioned that the Public Private Partner (PPP) would be adopted to fund the implementation of the plan. Considering the processes such that the acquisition of land from the planning area, paying compensation, demolition of structure wrongly places in any sector of the plan.
- 3) The plethora of planning authorities in Jos metropolis makes it difficult for the master plan to be implemented as there is always clash of interest owing to the legislation that backs their establishment as to which planning other has the right and legal backing to implement the plan.

- 4) The plan has not been enacted into law to be used as a planning document. It is not a legislation and yet the physical development in the urban environment that needs a plan to guide its development.
- 5) It is evident that the coverage of the metropolis (Greater Urban Master Plan) is wide making it difficult to be implemented for the following reasons;
 - a. It is carved from 6 Local Government Areas; Jos North, South, East, Bassa, Barkin Ladi and Riyom.
 - b. Other Local Governments Areas have their master plan eg Angware -Jos East and Riyom.

4.1 Recommendation

After a comprehensive discussion throughout this paper, a number of recommendations have become very pertinent amongst which are;

- 1) There is need for a comprehensive and all-encompassing institutional framework to facilitate and encourage a centrally controlled Urban Development and Management in Jos Metropolis and its environs within which the Urban Planning System operates. This can be achieved through collaboration, integration and linkage between all the planning authorities and a unified and all-encompassing administrative structure and planning legislations which could be obtained from the spatial planning option.
- 2) To abolish alleged inefficiency in the planning authorities, a top-tier administrative body for centrally coordinating Planning Authorities is proposed. It can be made up of elected executives and members of the House of Assembly with powers of scrutiny.
- 3) Conflict between the Planning Authorities, in Greater Jos Metropolis, and local government authorities within the Planning Ministries and Board regarding area jurisdiction can be avoided by locating both sections under one functional, umbrella division.
- 4) In Jos Metropolis, Nigeria there are less than 40 registered and practicing Town Planners. This is grossly inadequate for monitoring and ensuring controlled Urban Development and Management in Jos Metropolis with a population of over 1million people. More planners and other experts in the built environment should be employed. There is general lack of suitably qualified man power in all the Planning Authorities hence, the task of development control, or even handling the implementation of the master plan within their domain, is a problem and,
- 5) There should be collaboration and integration of all the Planning Authorities and planners in the process of preparing the Master Plan in order to obtain the views and opinions of all the stake holders.

References

- AGWU, E. I. C. (1998). Politics and Master Planning in Nigeria' in Ilesanmi. In F. A. (Ed.), *Master Planning Approach To Physical Development: The Nigerian Experience*. Paraclete Pub., Yola.
- ALABI, M. O. (2008). *Urban Sprawl, Pattern and Measurement in Lokoja, Nigeria Owei, Ede, ObinnaAkarolo (2008): Land Market Distortions in Nigerian Cities and Urban Sprawl*. 44th ISOCARP Congress Land market distortions in Nigerian cities and urban sprawl: The case of Abuja and Port Harcourt.
- ALBRECHTS, L. (2001). In pursuit of new approaches to strategic spatial planning. A European perspective. *International Planning Studies*, 6, 293-310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13563470120026514>
- AMANDA, B. (2009). Ten geographic facts about Vancouver: Vancouver, British Columbia1-581. *American heritage Dictionary of English Language, 2009*.
- ANDERSON, L. (2000). *Planning the Built Environment*. Planners press American planning Association Washington DC.
- BARKER, N., & TIM, S. (2008). Improving governance through local coastal partnership in the Uk. *The Geographic Journal*, 174(4), 344-360. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4959.2008.00303.x>
- BRANCH, M. C. (1974). *Planning Urban Environment, Hutchinson and Ross, Dowden, Pennsylvania*.
- CAP. (2009). *Commonwealth Association of Planners*.
- CARTER, J. G. (2007). Spatial Planning, Water and the Water Framework Directive: Insights From Theory and Practice. *The Geographic Journal*, 173, 330-342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4959.2007.00257.x>
- CHAOLIN, G, XIAOHUI, Y., & JIN, G. (2010). *China's master planning system in transition: Case study of Beijing*. 46th ISOCARP Congress.
- COHEN, S. (1988). *The Effective Public Manager: Achieving success in Governance*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, London.
- CULLINGWORTH, J. B. (1982). *Town and Country Planning in Britain, George Allen and Unwin*. London.
- DE SOTO, H. (2001). *The Mystery of Capital. Why capitalism Triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else*.
- DEVAS, N. (1993). Evolving approaches. In N. Devas, & C. Rakodi (Eds.), *Managing Fast-growing Cities: New Approaches to Urban Planning and Management in The Developing World* (pp. 63-102). Longman, Harlow.
- DUNG-GWOM, HIRSE, & PWAT. (2008). *Four year strategic plan for urban development and housing in Plateau state (2008-2011)*.
- DUNG-GWOM, J. Y. (2007). *Urban Renewal in Jos—Bukuru Metropolis*. Paper Presented at the MCPD Workshops organized by the Nigerian Institution of Estate Surveyors and Valuers, October 25th, Jos, Plateau State, Nigeria.

- DUNG-GWOM, J. Y. (2008). *The Nature of Peri-Urban Developments in Jos, Nigeria*. Paper Presented at the XXXVI World Congress on Housing Science, National Housing Programme, Kolkata, India.
- EGBU, A. (2007). *The Impact of Land Use Planning on Urban Land Markets in sub-Saharan Africa: A Case Study of Nigeria* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). School of Engineering and the Built Environment, University of Wolverhampton, Wolverhampton-United Kingdom.
- EKOP, O. B. (2007). Policy, institutional and administrative Discordance: The TraidTrategy and Future of physical planning in Nigeria. In *A book Chapter in Physical Development of Urban Nigeria*. Emerging Trends and Challenges.
- EKOP, O. B., & Uyanga, J. (2007). Physical planning in a Democratic Governance: The challenge of institutional arrangement in Nigeria. In *A book Chapter in Physical Development of Urban Nigeria*. Emerging Trends and Challenges.
- ELBANNA, S. (2006). Strategic decision making: Process perspectives. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 8(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2006.00118.x>
- ELBANNA, S. (2007). The nature and practice of strategic planning in Egypt. *Strategic Change*, 16, 227-243. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsc.797>
- ELBANNA, S. (2008). Planning and participation as determinants of strategic planning effectiveness: Evidence from the Arabic context. *Management Decision*, 46(5), 779-796. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740810873761>
- FADARE, O. (2004). *Administrative Framework for Planning in Nigeria* (pp. 525-539). Readings in Urban and Regional Macmillan Nigeria Publishers Limited.
- FALADE, J. B. (2002). *Administrative Structure for Effective Governance*. Paper presented at the NITP, Annual Conference, Illorin.
- FARVACQUE, C., & Mc AUSLAN, P. (1992). Reforming Urban Land Policies and institutions in Developing Countries. In *Urban Management Programme Policy Paper 5*. World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- GIDDENS, A. (2000). *The Third Way and its critics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- GOLDRATT, E. M. (2004). *Essays on the Theory of Constraints*. North River Press.
- GUPTA, D. K. (2001). *Analysing Public Policy. Concepts Tools and Techniques*. CQ Press A division of Congressional Quarterly Inc., Washington, DC.
- HALL, P. (2002). *Urban and Regional Planning* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- HAYES, M. T. (2001). *The Limits of Policy Change: Incrementalism, Worldview, and the Rule of Law*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- HEALEY, P. (1997). *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies*. London, Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-25538-2>

- HEALEY, P. (2004). The Treatment of Space and Place in the New Strategic Spatial Planning in Europe. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(1), 45-67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0309-1317.2004.00502.x>
- HEALEY, P. (2009). The pragmatic tradition in planning thought. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 28, 277-292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X08325175>
- HULL, A. (1995). New models of implementation theory: Striking a consensus on windfarms. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 38(3), 285-306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09640569512887>
- JIRIKO, K. (2008). *Urban Master Planning Paradigm in Nigeria: What future (pp. 1-378)?* Kaduna: Mba Prints+Graphics.
- JOS METROPOLIS DEVELOPMENT BOARD. (2006). Development Control Standards and Regulations for Development in the Jos-Bukuru Metropolitan Area. In JMDB (Ed.), *Town Planning*. Jos Plateau State, Nigeria.
- KOENIGSBERGER, O. (1982). Action Planning. In B. Mumtaz (Ed.), *Reading in Action Planning* (Vol. 1). D.P.U .University of London.
- LITMAN, T. (2011). *Land Use Impacts on Transport How Land Use Factors Affect Travel Behavior*. Victoria Transport Policy Institute with Rowan Steele.
- LORD, A. (2012). *The Planning Game. An information Economics Approach to understanding urban and environmental management*. Routledge 2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203127445>
- MABOGUNJI, A. L. (2001). *Abuja: The Dream, concept and the product, in Ministry of Federal Capital Territory*. The Review of Abuja Master Plan, Abuja.
- MABOGUNJI, A. L. (2002). *Knowledge, Planning Effective Urban Governance*. Proceeding of the N.I.T.P. Annual conference, Ilorin, October/November.
- MALLO, M., & ANIGBOGU, N. (2009). *Housing Quality Between Residential Neighbourhoods In Jos, Nigeria*. The paper was presented at International Sociological Association (ISA) Conference, September 1-4, 2009, Glasgow, UK. Retrieved from <http://www.gla.ac.uk/events/housing>
- MBA, H. C. (1992). Urban Planning: Perspectives and Emerging Concepts. In H. C. Mba, J. U. Ogbazi, & K. O. Efobi (Eds.), *Principle and Practice of urban and regional Planning in Nigeria* (pp. 2-11). Mekslink Publications Awka.
- MC LOUGHLIN, J. B. (1978). *Urban and regional Planning: A systems Approach*. Faber, London and Boston.
- MINTZBERG, H., AHLSTRAND, B., & LAMPEL, J. (2008). *Strategy Safari: The Complete Guide Through The Wilds Of Strategic Management*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- NALLATHIGA, R. (2008). *Metropolitan Urban Governance Approaches and Models: Some Implications for Indian Cities Paper presented at the Third international conference on Public policy and Management*. Urban Governance and Public-Private Partnerships, Indian.

- NATIONAL URBAN DEVELOPMENT POLICY*. (2006). Fed. Rep. of Nig.
- OBATERU, O. (2004). Planning and Administration. In O. Tunde et al. (Eds.), *Readings in Urban and Regional Planning* (pp. 1-595). Ibadan: Macmillan Nigeria Publishers Limited., Institute of Management, Bangalore.
- ODMP. (2006). *The Role and Scope of Spatial Planning—Literature Review 28 Integrating sectoral policies through spatial planning*.
- ODPM. (2004). *Creating Local Development Frameworks A Companion Guide to PPS12*.
- OKEKE, D. C. (2002). Urban Master planning Approach in Nigeria; A case for Reconsideration. In Amole et al. (Eds.), *the city in Nigeria: Perspectives, issues, challenges and strategies*. Proceedings of a National Conference, Faculty of environmental Design and Management, O.A University, Ile-Ife.
- OLA, C. S. (1984). *Town and country Planning and Environmental Laws in Nigeria* (2nd ed.). Ibadan: University Press Limited.
- OYESIKU, O. K. (2004). *Town and Country Planning Law and Administration in Nigeria* (pp. 481-520). Readings in Urban and Regional Macmillan Nigeria Publishers Limited.
- PINTO, M. R. (2000). *Metropolitan City Governance in India*. Sage Publications, New Delhi.
- PROPOSED GREATER JOS MASTER PLAN*. (2008-2025).
- QUI, M., FREDENDALL, L., & ZHU, Z. (2002). TOC or LP? [production control]. *Manufacturing Engineer*, 81(4), 190-195. <https://doi.org/10.1049/me:20020411>
- RATCLIFFE, J., STUBBS, M., & SHEPHERD, M. (2002). *Urban Planning and Real Estate Development* (2nd ed.). Spon Press, Tay & Francis Group, London & New York.
- RICHARD et al. (2009). Measuring Organizational Performance: Towards Methodological Best Practice. *Journal of Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308330560>
- ROSE, E. A. (1974). The Philosophy and Purpose of Planning. In J. Bruton (Ed.), *The spirit and Purpose of Planning*. Hutchinson, London.
- RTPI. (2011). *Remarkable Group.co.uk/localism-blog/rtpi [Online]*. Retrieved August 31, 2011, from <http://www.consultationonline>.
- RYDIN, Y. (2011). *The purpose of planning creating sustainable towns and cities*. The policy press, University of Bristol, UK. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1t89bnc>
- TATYANA, P. S., & KATHERINE, A. S. (2000). *Beyond Economic Growth*. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/THE WORLD BANK 1818 H Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20433, U.S.A.
- VIGAR, G. (2000). *Planning, Governance and Spatial Strategy in Britain*. An Institutional Analysis, New York: St Martin's Press.
- WAPWERA & DUNGWOM. (2009). *Implication of climate change on Rural & Urban Environments of the Jos Plateau, Nigeria*. Conference proceedings on climate change and the Nigerian Environment at University of Nigeria Nsukka.

- WAPWERA, S. D., & AND EGBU, C. O. (2013a). Planning Authorities: A Review of Roles, Functions and Responsibilities in Jos Metropolis. *The Journal of the Built & Human Environment Review*, 6, 30-45.
- WAPWERA, S. D., & EGBU, C. O. (2013B). Master Planning System: Constraints for Planning Authorities in Jos Metropolis, Nigeria. *Journal of the Built & Human Environment Review*, 6, 61-81.
- WAPWERA, S. D., PARSA, A., & EGBU, C. O. (2011). Financing low-income housing in Nigeria. *Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction*, 16(3), 283-301. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13664381111179242>
- WEBBER, M. M. (1968). The new Urban Planning In America. *Journal of the Royal Town Planning Institute*, January.
- WORLD BANK GROUP Flagship Report. (2015). Ending Poverty and Sharing Prosperity. In *Global Monitoring Report 2014/2015*. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank 1818 H Street NW, Washington DC.
- YASIN, O. (2004). *Modern Management Theories and Practices*. A paper presented at the 15th East African central Banking course.
- YIN, L., & MULLER, B. H. (2010). Regional governance and hazard information: The role of co-ordinate risk assessment and regional spatial accounting on wildfire hazard mitigation. *Journal of Environment Planning and Management*, 53, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09640560903414639>
- YIN, R. (2009). Case study research: Design and method. In *Applied social research methods series* (4th ed.). SAGE Publication Limited.
- ZHAO, M., & YI, F. (2003). City overall planning and urban development strategic planning research. *Urban Planning Periodical*, 2003(1), 16.