

A Reader in Urban planning & Management

BUILDING LIVEABLE CITIES AND REGIONS THROUGH PLANNING

A Festschrift in honour of:

Malam Idris Dauda Suleiman FNITP

Table of Contents

INFORMAL SETTLEMENTS AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA: THE CHALLENGE TO URBAN PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT.....	7
Background	7
Introduction	7
What is an informal settlement?.....	9
Characteristics of Informal Settlements.....	11
The Challenges of Informal Settlements	11
Informal Settlements in Katsina	12
Recommendations	18
Conclusion.....	19
Bibliography	19
AFRICAN URBANIZATION IN THE URBAN CENTURY: THE ROLE OF PARTICIPATORY PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT.....	22
ABSTRACT.....	22
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	22
2.0 THE NEED FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT	24
2.1 NATURE AND CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS	26
2.1.1 BASIS AND CATEGORIZATION OF PARTICIPATORY URBAN DEVELOPMENT	28
2.2 CRITIQUE AND MEASURE OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION.....	29
2.2.1 Measuring Outcomes of Public Participation and the Way forward.....	31
2.3 CONCLUSIONS	37
REFERENCES	37
SOCIAL EXCLUSION: ISSUES FOR URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING.....	49
1.0 Introduction	49
2.0 Meaning and Definition of social exclusion	50
2.2 Types of Social Exclusion.....	52
2.3 Indicators of Social Exclusion	53
2.4 Social Exclusion in History.....	53
3.0 Relationship and Relevance of Social Exclusion to Urban and Regional Planning Practice	57
3.1 Planning for who and with who?	57
3.2 The Issue of Participatory Planning.....	58
3.3 Plan Implementation: Gentrification and Social Exclusion	59
4.0 Implications of “Social Exclusion” for Urban and Regional Planning Education	59
4.1 Avoiding Easy Victories	60

5.0 Conclusion.....	61
References.....	61
BETWEEN IDEALISM AND REALISM: A REVIEW OF THE ADOPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NIGERIAN URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING LAW, 1992	65
ABSTRACT.....	65
1.0 INTRODUCTION	66
2.0 BACKGROUND TO PLANNING LEGISLATION IN NIGERIA	67
2.2 CONTENT OF THE NIGERIAN 1992 URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING LAW	71
3.0 DISCUSSION.....	79
3.1 CENTRALISATION OF AUTHORITY.....	80
3.2 PROVISIONS OF THE LAW	81
4.0 CONCLUSION	86
REFERENCES	88
CHALLENGES OF PLAN IMPLEMENTATION IN NIGERIA: A REVIEW	91
Abstract	91
1 Introduction	91
2 Plan Implementation.....	92
3 Methods.....	94
4. Plan Implementation in Nigeria	94
4.1 Internal Factors Affecting Plan Implementation in Nigeria	97
4.2 External Factors Affecting Plan Implementation in Nigeria	98
5 Planning Success	105
6. Way Forward	106
References.....	107
PLANNING STANDARDS AS WORKING TOOLS FOR PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND MANAGEMENT.....	115
1.0 INTRODUCTION	115
2.0 CONCEPT OF PLANNING STANDARDS	116
3.0 PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT TOOLS.....	121
3.1 Participation of three tiers of government in Development Plans to achieve Planning Standards 123	
3.2 Establishment and jurisdiction of Development Control Department	124
3.3 Establishment of certain bodies for development control and effective management	125
3.5 Power to revoke acquired right of occupancy	125
3.6 National Urban Policy.....	125
3.7 Land Use Decree 1978	126

4.0	Further discussion in relation to development control in Kebbi State	127
4.2	Suggestions	129
5.0	CONCLUSION	129
	REFERENCES	129
URBAN GOVERNANCE AND THE PROVISION OF URBAN SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN NIGERIAN CITIES: TIME FOR A RETHINK.....		132
	ABSTRACT	132
1.0	Introduction	132
2.0	Theoretical Underpinning and Literature Review	134
2.1	Improved Public Sector Performance through Decentralization	134
2.2	The Dangers and Pitfalls of Decentralization	136
2.3	Urbanization, Urban Local Services and the Role of Urban Local Governments	138
2.3.1	Typology of Urban Local Services and Financing Mechanisms	139
2.4	Urban Service Delivery: Enabling and Constraining Factors	143
3.0	Urban Governance in the Context of the Governance Framework in Nigeria.....	144
3.1	Implications of the Urban Governance Framework on Urban Service Delivery in Nigeria.....	147
4.0	Conclusion and Recommendations.....	150
	References.....	151
TRACING PATHS TO OUTCOMES: INFORMAL TRANSPORT SYSTEM AND URBAN MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS (1960-2020)		156
	Abstract	156
1.0	Background	156
2.0	Attributes of Informal Transport Sector of Nigeria	159
3.0	Methodology.....	162
4.0	Informal Transportation in Nigeria through the Eras	164
4.1	The pre – SAP era (1960 – 1985).....	165
4.2	SAP era (1986 – 1993).....	171
4.3	The Post – SAP era (1994 – Date).....	179
5.0	Descriptors of Paths to Outcomes in Informal Transport Sector of Nigeria.....	183
6.0	Conclusion.....	188
	References.....	189
RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES ON URBAN MORPHOLOGY AND CRIME PATTERN IN URBAN AREAS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF LITERATURE		195
	Abstract:	195
1.0	Introduction	196
2.0	Methods and Materials.....	198

3.0	Literature Review: Concepts and Theories explaining crime pattern in urban areas	199
3.1	Concept of Urban Morphology	199
3.2	Crime and Urban morphology	201
3.3	Theories Explaining Crime Pattern in Urban Areas	202
	Table 1: Theories Explaining Crime Pattern in Urban Areas.....	204
4.0	Emerging Wave of African Urban Ecological Theories of Crime	206
5.0	Findings and discussions	207
5.1	Perspectives of Researches on Urban Morphology and Crime Pattern	207
5.2	Limitations of researches on Urban morphology and Crime pattern	211
	Conclusion.....	217
	REFERENCES	217
	THE SPATIAL GROWTH DYNAMICS OF CITIES AND IMPLICATION ON URBAN MANAGEMENT	227
1.0	INTRODUCTION	227
2.0	URBAN GROWTH AND EXPANSION OF CITIES.....	227
3.0	THE PATTERN OF GROWTH AND EXPANSION IN KANO METROPOLIS	232
4.0	CHARACTERISTICS OF SPATIAL GROWTH OF KANO METROPOLIS 1983-2015	233
4.2	Spatial Growth of Kano to the Northwest Axis	235
4.3	Spatial Growth of Kano to the Northeast Axis	235
4.4	Spatial Growth of Kano to the Southeast Axis	236
4.5	Growth of Kano to the Southwest Axis	237
5.0	FACTORS OF SPATIAL GROWTH OF KANO METROPOLIS	238
5.1	Population Increase	239
5.3	Accessibility to Land	241
5.4	Physical Planning Input	243
6.0	THE PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES CONFRONTING NIGERIAN URBAN CENTRES.....	245
	CONCLUSION	246
	REFERENCES	246

AFRICAN URBANIZATION IN THE URBAN CENTURY: THE ROLE OF PARTICIPATORY PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

*Aliyu Mohammed Kawu
Centre for Human Settlement & Urban Development
Federal University of Technology Minna*

ABSTRACT

The 21st century urbanization emerged with opportunities and challenges for urban planning and management alike. However, due to the importance of public participation in planning and the management of urban infrastructures, prospective beneficiaries' involvement is usually encouraged. This has necessitated the need to extend the review of the increasing avenues in which participatory planning has expressed or is expressing greater acceptance and application. With literatures short of expressing the diversity inherent in this all-encompassing input to present urban phenomenon particularly in the less developed countries like Nigeria; this work enlisted scenarios in which researchers, urban managers, and policy makers and implementors can assess current trends of participation in effective and efficient urban infrastructure provision and management in a fast-urbanizing world. Most often hindrances like individual and communal poverty levels are overrated thereby denying assessors the full grasp of existing and potential inputs to urban development from environments easily categorized as low-income slums of despair. Hence, concerted efforts should be on the peculiarities of joint efforts that sees beneficiaries as viable stakeholders that can keep cities working, and whose participatory input in planning and management, as evident in Asia and southern America, can aid in achieving present and future Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Keywords: CBOs, Cities, development, participation, urban infrastructure, urban management

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In all human societies, growth and development are goals in all socio-economic aspects of life. In this context, while growth is meant as accumulated increase, development is seen as a continuous positive change or largely a deliberate and

continuous process of economic, social and political transformation in a desired direction (Seers, 1969; Usman, 2004; Kawu, 2016; Ali & Pirog, 2019). When defined as the process of social, economic, political and physical transformation, development is then indicated by a quantitative improvement in the standard of living of people and encompasses all aspects of the socio-economic activities of people in both urban and rural communities (Seers, 1969; Rodney, 1972; Obasanjo and Mabogunje, 1991; Todaro and Smith, 2009; Jordan, 2013). However, as a physical unit and manifestation of development, infrastructure provision is the basic structural foundation of a society (Kindersley, 2007; Yunusa, 2013), and also regarded as the foundation and the life wire of the economy (Todaro and Smith, 2009; Daniel, 2014; Gandy, 2006). Hence, the effectiveness and the efficiency of infrastructure, besides its availability, are often seen as prerequisites of structural development in all human settlements (Collier, 2007; Jacobs, 2006), with participatory planning bringing together all stakeholders (the provider, prospective beneficiaries, financiers or donors) to ensure success and continuity of the endeavour. Here, participatory planning is a process by which a community undertakes to reach a given socio-economic goal by consciously diagnosing its problems and charting a course of action to resolve those problems. This is widely acknowledged to be crucial in both mitigation and reconstruction planning, as well as in community-based disaster risk reduction (CBDRR) and community-based disaster mitigation (CBDM) processes too (Paola Rizzi & Anna Porebska, 2020).

The 1960s and 1970s witnessed many African countries commissioning national development plans for infrastructure development through building and rebuilding of infrastructures and facilities like roads, urban water supply, educational facilities, and massive electrification (Olorunfemi, 1990; Yunusa, 1991; Yunusa and Ahmed, 2012). However, assessments has shown that many still lack the needed transformation in desired sectors and direction in the present urban century (Boly, Konte, & Shimeles, 2021; Mcdonald, Beatley, & Elmqvist, 2018; Ndebele-Murisa, 2011) and have largely accounted for the continent's embracing the 21st century barely the same manner it received the 20th century. The severity of inadequate infrastructure development is still evident in the lack of functional infrastructure in

Africa's burgeoning cities, towns and villages today and can be argued as the major cause of many ills of this fragile and increasingly urbanizing part of the world (Usman, 2004; Mabogunje, 2005; Ibem, 2009; Mohamed, 2009; Ayotamuno, Gobo and Owei, 2010; Hassan 2010). As a collective reaction to the failure of governments and institutions to adequately provide development infrastructure, individuals and groups are increasingly coming together to complement the efforts of governments to deliver and manage infrastructure (Kawu, 2014 & 2016). Based on this, self-help residents' organizations like Community Based Organizations (CBOs), and Residents' associations, trade and labour organizations were formed and continue to strife in urban communities of developing countries (Mabogunje, 1999; Cabannes, 2004; Ibem, 2009; Kawu, 2016).

2.0 THE NEED FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT

Participation is a term that has been defined by different individuals and organizations as a voluntary process by which providers, stakeholders and beneficiaries take part in, or contribute to achieve a stated goal, or influence public decisions and or actions (Warlick, 1973; Mabogunje, 1999; Schwarte, 2008; Cornwall, 2008; CAG, 2009; Mohamed, 2009; Ukoje, 2011; Claridge, 2013). It is due to its wide application and relevance, in urban planning in particular, that the term is often used synonymously with community participation, citizen participation, or residents' participation (Arnstein, 1969; George, 1999; Jinadu, 2007). The operational definition of the term, has in most cases been specific in highlighting the objectives of the stated engagement. For example, in governance, 'participatory governance is a term used when democratic government involves ample opportunities for citizens and their organizations to engage with government' (IIED, 2011:9). In the field of municipal waste management, collective participation is seen as a voluntary process by which stakeholders, CBOs, NGOs, formal and informal businesses, and households contribute to solid waste management (World Bank, 2005; Ukoje, 2011).

The definition of participation by experts (Rifkin and Kangere, 2002; Perenboom and Chorus, 2003; Ibem, 2009; Mohamed, 2009; Page and Mennel, 2011) as the

informed, autonomous and meaningful involvement of a community in influencing decision making and action, underlies the normative concepts and aspects of public engagements in recent time (Schwarte, 2008). As highlighted in the field of urban power structure and decision-making, 'participatory urbanism' is increasingly seen as 'the product of civil engagement' (Barnett, 2011:21). Whenever participation is viewed as an outlet where members of the public 'taking part in any of the processes of formulation, passage and implementation of public policies' (CAG, 2009:1); then, the concept of community participation has attained a wide-ranging definition which extends the emphasis of public participation beyond the development of policy, to decision-making and implementation (Green and Minchin, 2012). When viewed through the lenses of redistribution of decision-making powers (Ghiring, 1977; Yunusa, 1979; Schwarte, 2008), community participation becomes 'the means by which disadvantaged citizens can significantly take part in social reform, which enables them to share in the benefits of the affluent society' (Arnstein, 1969:216). These definitions mainly focused on the disadvantaged members of the society and thus further emphasizes that even if initial planning and project decision had excluded the less privileged members of the society (Nwankwo, 1998; Mabogunje, 1999; Baum and Gleeson, 2010), the management of the resultant infrastructure and facility should include the 'groups in the future and to enable them to play a role in determining the shape of that future' (Arnstein, 1969:216). However, how these roles are to be played, by who and to what extent and standard, often exclude the focus of many practitioners and scholars like (Usman, 2004; Mohamd, 2009; Kawu, 2016).

Participation is essential tool in all aspects of human endeavours, as it is always emphasized that inputs of the beneficiaries of any project should be involved in all aspects of the project (Mitlin and Satterthwaite, 2013; Satterthwaite and Mitlin, 2013). This makes participation to be reckoned with when far-reaching high benefits are expected for either individuals, groups or organizations in the community (Solis and Richardson, 2010; Ibrahim, 2012). Many agencies place high regards on community participation as it has demonstrated that development is not only a requirement, but also a condition for success, since communities that engage citizens and partners in community development raise more resources, achieve more results, and develop

faster and ultimately more beneficial to the people (Reid, 2000; Reid, 2005; Yunusa, 2015; Csefalvay and Webster, 2012). In other words, public participation enhances project resource mobilization and heighten positive outcomes economically and socially too (Cabbanes, 2004; Ibrahim, 2012; Reid, Chambwera and Murray, 2013).

2.1 NATURE AND CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

Associations of urban dwellers promote the socio-economic and environmental wellbeing as well as religious and tribal ideological affiliations underpinning the diverse interests that peopled every aspect of the immediate and larger community (Warlick, 1973; Cornwall, 2008). As a community can be seen as the smallest group in a territory and the smallest local group that can be a complete society in which each person knows all others; they share common social life, act together to provide or manage community projects (Brower, 2011). In many urban areas in Nigeria, Community Based Organizations (CBOs) are made up of people from diverse social backgrounds who have come together to live, share common challenges and resolve issues and as well provide livelihood activities (Olurin, 2006; Ibem, 2009).

It can be inferred that, in urban and regional planning and development, Community organizations are non-profit agencies that operate within localities, and provides public services. Their diversity has attributed to them many titles. For example, in developing countries, community organizations are often seen as voluntary associations or local institutions (Adeboyejo, 2008), civil societies, grass root associations, self-help groups, indigenous organizations, or community organizations. The common tag of Community Based Organizations – CBOs (Olurin, 2006) which is used to give the voluntary organizations a broad and unifying identity is a terminology that differentiate them from other organizations that provide outside technical support and financial aid to urban development and management such as the international donor agencies and governments.

The choice of encompassing name of CBOs was informed by the need to differentiate terminologies from certain associations with pronounced attachments to socio-economic and socio-cultural appendages rather than voluntary community development activities. As these urban associations represent people-centred

approach to the complex social and environmental development issues (Mitlin and Satterthwaite, 2013), and faced with the realities of globalized urban environment, it is significant to use and apply terminologies that portray the aspirations and objectives of the associations. In developed economies, CBOs are seen as providing 'public avenues of meetings of people based on co-operation between members of a community, to create and maintain buildings' (Sangregorio, 2000:11). In such scenario, the main drivers of Community Based Organizations are residents who are familiar with local history, conform to local customs, and have similar values and lifestyles (Mabogunje, 1999; Brower, 2011), as the associations are known to ease routine family challenges and practices in an increasingly complex and heterogeneous population (Atkinson, 1995; CAG, 2009). Hence, the concept of CBOs, seems to have emanated from strong inter-community relationships, whose principal function is to promote developmental activities for the benefit of the society. In doing this, CBOs share the objective of finding collective solutions to common problems.

Whereas in the developed countries CBOs emerged due to inter-personal relations and neighbourhood activities of child upbringing, social welfare, the provision and maintenance of education curricula and infrastructure (Mabogunje, 1999; Meredith & MacDonald, 2017), in urban communities of sub-Saharan Africa, the organizations represents organic response to the ineptitudes of the State and its agencies (Mallam, 1997; Mabogunje, 1999; Ukoje, 2011; McDonald, Blei, Civco, & Parent, 2020). This explains the continuous proliferation of CBOs in areas under-served with requisite urban infrastructure to take full advantage of city life and livelihood opportunities. CBOs have become prominent in certain areas of these urban communities that governments and others in the formal sectors have begun to include them in urban services delivery and governance (Satterthwaite, 2005, 2008; Mitlin & Satterthwaite, 2013); and many has demonstrated that with impressive results (Cabbanes, 2004; Mabogunje, 1999; Ukoje, 2011).

2.1.1 BASIS AND CATEGORIZATION OF PARTICIPATORY URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Community organizations are diverse and different from one another and have distinctive categorization. The main strain of categorization has been that of relating levels of participation to common divisions based on the groups' main activities or the socio-economic environment of their engagements. Urban CBOs accept members from the general public, thus, a general categorization can be based on membership recruitment modalities, to show the ease of participation in development activities by members. This type of categorization is helpful in addressing the issues of CBOs' participation in development projects, their capacity to complete or deliver community development projects, dialogue, collaborate with external bodies, and forecast future trends and challenges. In developing countries, there are diverse works on CBOs as much as the diversities of cities and the growing urban dynamics that warranted their formation, yet, a study of the categorization and the link of dominant CBOs' characteristics to perform and challenges the CBOs have in achieving set goals seems to have eluded the attention of previous studies. There seems to be equally little on the central issues of organization, operation, internal and external constraints, that present the main hindrances to achieving goals and objectives (Satterthwaite, 2004, 2011; Andres and Chapin, 2013). The existing detailed documentation of CBOs' activities are not only rural biased(Dasgupta et al., 2015; Hibbard & Lurie, 2012; Meredith & MacDonald, 2017),the model of engagement by the organizations has been shown to be divergent(Kawu, 2016; Mabogunje & Kates, 2004). This is more so where expectations of heterogeneous urban population is overwhelming and "getting people who have polarized views to sit together, listen to and learn from one another is a major challenge" Msuya and Salm (2010:33).

Full participation of prospective beneficiaries of development projects is a strong pre-condition for assistance, by making the essence of the participatory input 'the exercise of voice and choice', 'for the attainment of desired project goal' (Ukoje, 2011:24). Hence, Adedayo (2000:6) stressed that 'there can be no meaningful development in the country without effectively harnessing and integrating the

potentialities of the citizens with government efforts' particularly through participatory decision-making and transparency in development project execution (Few, Brown, & Tompkins, 2007; Iwaniec, Cook, Davidson, Berbés-Blázquez, & Grimm, 2020; Savini, 2011). Participatory decision-making and transparency can ensure that there exists formidable relationship between development project financiers and project beneficiaries. Public participation in urban development in Africa and other developing countries is growing with unprecedented urbanization. Even in highly individualistic societies of Europe and America, CBOs are known to 'keep residents informed' on issues of welfare and general development of interest; 'steps in when residents neglect their properties, and act as intermediary in dealing with outside organizations and agencies', hence, they are sometimes referred to as 'conduit for one voice' (Brower, 2011:32) by being decentralized and close to the people they serve.

CBOs make contributions to the wellbeing and the socio-economic development of the people and the environment as a whole as "they do not only have democratic content in their organizations and functions, they are very effective in mobilizing funds which have been used in executing urban physical development projects such as road construction and maintenance', and also the 'extension of electricity (and other facilities) to new areas of the city' (Adeboyejo, 2008:130). As a pre-condition for donor assistance, public participation has been used to gauge international interventions, as well as rating the success of programmes or projects by the government, the private sector or donor agencies (Arnstein, 1969; Warlick, 1973; Mabogunje, 2005; Satterthwaite, 2005; Kamat, 2006; Spore, 2012; Cooper, Kotval-K, Kotval, & Mullin, 2014; Hope, 2009). This has prompted the need to further examine the manners it elicits project outcome or hinder outcomes development projects.

2.2 CRITIQUE AND MEASURE OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Shortfalls in the mainstream theories of participation appear to be based on the urge for citizens to take control of facilities and services provided by both private and public agencies (Häikiö, 2012; Komendantova, Vocciante, & Battaglini, 2015); in

certain instances for the control opportunities (Brondizio et al., 2021; Franzoni & Allali, 2018; Kawu & Shuaibu, 2007). Arnsteins' ladder of citizen participation, on which many contemporary theories are based, illustrate the feelings and needs of beneficiaries and how these are met by the providers, by viewing beneficiaries as one homogenous group and not necessarily differentiated by socio-economic and spatial circumstances. However, present complexities of global urbanization demands the identification and distinction of players in all aspects of human endeavours (Borrini-Feyerabend, Pimbert, Farvar, Kothari, and Renard, 2004; Norius, 2011; Acemoglu and Robinson, 2012; Guillaume-Gentil, 2014), particularly, in cases where failure or under-performance of programme intervention often come with gross consequences on livelihood that affects even regions outside the activity centres (Robinson, 1949; Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012).

In addition to the definition, applications and underpinning theories of participation, measuring outcomes of participation have also become a fertile ground for academics cutting across fields; and has always had inestimable inputs in virtually all aspects and levels of urban planning, development and management. This was what Campanella (2011) contended has relegated planners and the planning profession to the background even in issues rooted in cities' planning and development; originating in when 'grassroots planning tends to assume a citizenry of Gandhian humanists. That most people (who are participating) - in the planning process including its initiation, contents, approval or otherwise, are motivated by self-interest, and;

'.....that is why it is a fool's errand upon citizens to guide the planning process. Most of these people are too busy, too apathetic, or too focused on their jobs or kids. So, the very citizens least able to make objective decisions about planning action are the ones who end up dominating the planning process, often wielding near-veto power over proposals' (Campanella, 2011:15).

This amplified position, even when supported by historical instances elsewhere, is evidently a variation of what obtains in areas with high inputs in project identification,

planning, execution and management from the perspectives of the beneficiaries (Andersson et al., 2019; Auma, 2012; Yahaya, 2002; Yomo, Villamor, Aziadekey, Olorunfemi, & Mourad, 2020). Works have shown that residents of ill-served neighbourhoods are often the initiators of such many schemes as issues at the heart of urban development needs contributions from different perspectives and commands more attention if it is initiated by the beneficiaries who suffer epileptic urban infrastructure and services. If the residents that live and work in the different neighbourhoods of cities are so interested as to commit their time and resources, then, they deserve to be given a place and recognition in planning process (Ndayako & Kawu, 2011; Kawu, 2016).

Criticisms notwithstanding, community participation brings together stakeholders to plan, share and execute projects in all-inclusive manner and to also ascertain levels of achievements and acceptance by the target groups, in addition to the need to evaluate the concept, the process and the most effective results of its application. This has been found useful as a pre-condition for donor assistance (Mabogunje, 2005; Satterthwaite, 2005; Spore, 2012), to gauge international assistance (Satterthwaite, 2005; Kamat, 2006), as well as ratting of achieved success by government (Davidson & Gleeson, 2018; Meredith & MacDonald, 2017; Warlick, 1973), the private sector or donor agencies (Arnstein, 1969; Warlick, 1973). This has disaggregated the understanding of the different aspects of participatory input that elicits beneficiaries' participation or hinder outcomes.

2.2.1 Measuring Outcomes of Public Participation and the Way forward

In many instances, issues of equity and the evaluation of the efficiency of programmes were behind the need to assess or measure public participation. Others highlights of socio-economic and cultural variables of community residents (Yunusa, 1979); as Warlick (1973) shows that the failure to reach all those for whom programmes are intended has made welfare advocates to demand a measure of target population's rates of participation in public assistance programmes using aggregate participation, population participation rate, and, expenditure participation rate. The downside of these approaches that assessed beneficiaries'

participation to determine effectiveness of programmes is that it excludes the durability and sustainability of the expected outcomes. For example, the 'population participation rates' indicates the proportion of the targeted population that receives project benefits and does not differentiate populations by levels of need and therefore ignores differences in economic circumstances of benefiting population. The expenditure participation rate indicates the percentage of benefits that is disbursed' and 'provides a measure of the degree to which the economic needs of the targeted population were met'. Yet, this too, has been shown to be inadequate predictor of how cost changes with increasing participation by volunteers and would-be beneficiaries (Sharma, 2007:14).

Other attempts at measuring participation could only be extended to the evaluation of extents of aid by donor organizations and often do not assess particular internal and external characteristics that increase outcomes of project interventions through the encouragement of innovations particularly by the benefiting community negating the fact that whenever there is community participation in a project, the good results are usually obvious and welcome (Newman, 2008; Montgomery, 2009; Newton, and Parfitt, 2011). However, having a universal template for measuring the outcomes of participation have often been impossible. At the larger global forum, 'a consensus has evolved that the outcomes of local community development organizations are not amenable to traditional evaluation methods and that local self-learning versus knowledge production is a necessary concession' (Norius, 2011). This stance has further been streamlined by works of Barder (2010) and Wang and Hofe (2010). Accordingly, Wang and van Hofe (2010:2) emphasized that 'responsible (participatory) planning entails a solid understanding and competence of the comprehensive and complex communication features including the physical, economic, and social factors that influence a community's future'.

The relevance of gauging public participation is well captured by Barder (2010) who emphasized that due to proliferation, community organizations do not require much assessment at present and emphasis should be on how to align their efforts with those of the people and the government at large. This direction is a move for more divergent and increasingly peculiar avenues for public participatory assessment in

urban Africa in ways that identifies potentials and limits inherent in her burgeoning human assemblage. For, by their overwhelming presence and potentials, CBOs in many instances became the only likely avenue for stakeholders, the public and private institutions to collaborate in sustainable development projects (Jordan, 2013; Clune & Zehnder, 2018; Löw, 2020). Given the present situation about the state of urban environment in developing countries, the end to the proliferation of CBOs is not here yet. Although, at present, issues of CBOs hardly top the agenda of many governments or government institutions and agencies, the growing potentials of the organizations are indications that most urban development activities are likely to be driven by the activities and successes of CBOs (Kawu, 2012, 2016; Nour, 2011). Further highlight of these issues is a potential striving avenue for the exploration of sustainable partnership between and within emerging players in urban development and management.

2.2.1.1.1 Participation Measured by Processes of Overcoming Barriers

Most often, measures of participation are tools that can be used to identify and gain greater insights into factors that require action in order to overcome barriers and constraints in participation. Women Empowerment in Agriculture Index, for example, measure women's role and involvement in the agricultural sector with five factors of 'decisions on agricultural production, access to productive resources, control of income use, leadership in the community and workload distribution, and, women's empowerment relative to men in their household' (Guillaume-Gentil, 2014:15) to overcome barriers. The more these are achieved, the higher is the expected participation that contrasts what is happening at present (Brito and Smith, 2012), where women only work on lands they don't own and hardly take part in how resources are accessed or what should be the priorities of the community. Similarly, it has been shown that success of community and regional development can be enhanced by highlighting obstacles and hindrances to social and political inclusiveness – as exemplified in poverty alleviation in many developing countries (Yunus, 2007 & 2008).) and local and regional security matters (Abbas, 2021; Ejemeyovwi, 2015; Momoh, Opaluwah, & Albeera, 2018).

2.2.1.1.2 Joint Projects with State Agencies and Other Organizations

Public participation through CBOs' relationship with external organizations like other CBOs, individual members, other private organizations, beneficiary groups, and government agencies particularly those mandated to complement efforts of the CBOs, can be crucial to the success of development projects within and outside urban areas. In this regard, measure of participation could focus on promoting good working relations, collective decision-making and the degree of sustainability of the collective actions. This sees community development as a joint effort procedure from decision-making to the sustainability of the projects and activities based on the participations rates, manner and values of inputs. It was this scheme of assessment that unearth the fact that community organizations are unable to achieve urban development projects, not because of widespread poverty or low-income (Kawu, 2016; Lawanson, Soyinka, & Omole, 2013), but due to their inability to effectively source fiscal inputs and manage mounting voluntary labour (Jackman, 2016; Kawu, 2016; Sunley & Pike, 2020)- a product arising from uninformed over-rating of poverty and other social hindrances in slum areas of towns and cities (Fotso, Ezeh, Madise, Ziraba, & Ogollah, 2009; Kawu, 2016; Satterthwaite & Mitlin, 2013).

2.2.1.2 Measurement by Access to External Agencies

In order to fit into urban governance structure, organizations participating in community development are often assessed by the rates at which they are able to draw external attentions and funding to finance development activities. This approach sees CBOs as mediator of needs of the community with other agencies. Such organizations are regarded as successful if they are able to attract external funding that directly or indirectly addresses local issues on sustainable manner. Higher rates of participatory outcomes, in this sense, are recognized by the community's access to foreign donor agencies and NGOs. Unlike local agencies, foreign assistance have been assessed to be more result oriented, focused on particular projects, and are gender sensitive (Hamann & Türkmen, 2020). Whereas, local assistance could be unnecessary delayed or found to duplicate projects without variation for differences in dominant social settings particularly when regional averages figures are used as against individual surveys that ascertains local peculiarities.

2.2.1.2.1 Measurement by the Extent of Information Dissemination

Knowledge of CBO projects by other organizations can promote the activities of the CBOs and further attract outside collaborations and assistance. Issues of the awareness of self-help community development organizations and projects by similar community organizations are crucial to the success of urban development projects and the sustainability of the projects too. The awareness of the existence of community organizations can be gauged by the number of external agencies that are either aware of the existence of the CBOs or the activities that they embark upon (Clingingsmith, Khwaja and Kremer, 2009; Croce and Ghignoni, 2012). Groups that explore these outlets are often at the frontlines collaborations and are the first choice when it comes to government's collaborations and seeking assistance from communities. Hence, effectiveness of urban development issues is often linked to self-help groups that are widely known and reckoned with in their immediate and wider communities (Gollagher & Hartz-Karp, 2013; Kawu, 2016; Meredith & MacDonald, 2017; Morgan, 1996).

2.2.1.4.1 CBOs Activity Effectiveness Measured by Extent of Popular Democracy

In many instances, leadership issues have been shown to influence groups' decisions and activities. Community organizations are often assessed based on the display and enthronelement of democratic processes in decision-making and project execution (Mabogunje, 2005, Essler, Lepach, Petermann, & Paulus, 2020; Kawu, 2016). However, it has been discovered that pattern of the democratic dispensation matters a lot. Whereas popular participation in choosing leaders and activities to embark upon can be shown to guarantee success; works have established that successful project execution and management are more aligned to groups whose leaders and executive members are a result of popular selection at meetings rather than those that emerged through processes of electoral democracy (Carothers & Gramont, 2011; Glucker, Driessen, Kolhoff, & Runhaar, 2013; Kawu, 2016; Kuper, 2004; Malešević, 2012). In most communities, the issues of individual character and trust garnered by displayed records of experience always carry the day.

2.2.2 Prospects of Public Participation in African Urbanization

An assessment of the processes and outcomes that gave rise to new and empirical types of partnerships in urban development process can contribute to the understanding of effective urban development and management process that also enlists the efforts and the potentials of beneficiaries as 'one observation about good urban governance is support from local governments for household and community level including enhancing what households and communities already do and can do' (Bartlett, 2010:314). This has necessitated their inclusion in many other emerging urban development and management issues of today. Hence, the emphasis to move beyond mere exploration of these essential groups, that 'there is nothing wrong with studying the activities, characteristics and achievements of CBOs. But there seem to be something odd about the idea that they have no existence beyond these things' (Layder, 2007:174).

By their overwhelming presence and potentials, CBOs in many instances became the only likely avenue for stakeholders, the public and private institutions to collaborate in development projects (Jordan, 2013). Given the present situation about the state of urban environment in developing countries, the end to the proliferation of CBOs is not here yet. Although, at present, issues of CBOs hardly top the agenda of many governments or government institutions and agencies, the growing potentials of the organizations are indications that most urban development activities are likely to be driven by the activities and successes of CBOs. Highlights of the different and promising approaches that directs functional and sustainable partnership between and within players in urban development and management are daily emerging and equally calling for refinement.

Comparative understanding of the prevailing CBOs phenomena in urban centres often present the need to grasp the techniques of measuring activities and analysing successes and the procedures of assessing the challenges that have the potentials to undermine the success of these growing and influential outlets of sustainable urban development in burgeoning cities of the global south. Successes of CBOs in urban environments shows how effective harnessing of little potentials can become a success for the world to reckon with. Through dogged management and all-inclusive participation, it is possible to transform overcrowded poor

neighbourhoods lacking in basic amenities into a paradigm in poverty alleviation and urban infrastructure development, finance and management. For example, 'through the United Neighbourhood Association of Porto Allegre in Brazil the concept of "participatory budgeting" gained currency as a critical strategy for inclusiveness and empowerment in urban governance by ordinary citizens including the poor (Abers, 2001; cited in Mabogunje, (2005:14). A similar endeavour liberated thousands of poor women entrepreneurs in Pakistan through Grameen Bank's initiative (Yunus, 2007 and 2008).

2.3 CONCLUSIONS

Full participation of prospective beneficiaries of development projects is sometimes a strong pre-condition for assistance, as it is known to aid decision-making, transparency, and, as a formidable pillar of participatory planning, can ensure that there exists formidable relationship between development project financiers and project beneficiaries. Public participation in urban development in Africa and other developing countries is growing with unprecedented urbanization and Community Based Organizations known to make contributions to the wellbeing of the people, the socio-economic development of the surrounding populations, are needed more than before to assist in the anticipated development and the management of cities. However, existing studies tend to dwell on the strength, weaknesses and challenges of CBOs exclusive of the dearth of legal and policy changes that can enhance free participatory planning and management to create and maintain social and physical structures in the manner most befitting to the communities in the urban century. Also less expressed is the expanding spheres of participatory planning in areas facing varying levels insufficiency in social and physical infrastructure to aid living and livelihood. For cities to be more sustainable, Africa in this age of global urbanization need to identify, document and explore the diverse avenues of partnership in urban development continuously exhibited by the activities of community-based organizations.

REFERENCES

Abbas, T. (2021). Reflections on the contribution of Muhammad Anwar to the study of sociology and racial politics. *Ethnicities*, 21(1), 247-254.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796820975152>

Acemoglu, D. and Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why Nations Fail: The origins of power, prosperity and poverty*. Profile Books Ltd, London.

Adeboyejo, A. T. (2008). Local institutions and urban infrastructure development in Ogbomoso, Nigeria. *Journal of the Nigerian Institute of Town Planners*, 21(1) October: 130-150.

Ali, M. U., & Pirog, M. (2019). Social Accountability and Institutional Change: The Case of Citizen oversight of Police. *Public Administration Review*, 79(3), 411-426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13055>

Alm, J. (2010). *Municipal Finance of Urban Infrastructure: Knowns and Unknowns*. Wolfensohn Center for Development, Washington DC. Working Paper 19 May. Accessed through: www.brookings.edu/global on 30th May, 2011.

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4): 216-224. Retrieved 28 August 2011 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>

Andersson, E., Langemeyer, J., Mcphearson, T., Kronenberg, J., Barton, D. N., Davis, M., & Naumann, S. (2019). Enabling Green and Blue Infrastructure to Improve Contributions to Human Well-Being and Equity in Urban Systems. *BioScience*, 69(7), 566-574. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biz058>

Atkinson, D. (Ed) (1995). *Cities of Pride: Rebuilding Community, Refocusing Government*. Cassell Social Science, Wellington House, London.

Auma, S. L. A. (2012). *Integrating community participation for urban redevelopment planning in Zanzibar town*. Retrieved from http://www.itc.nl/library/papers_2012/msc/upm/auma.pdf

Ayotamuno, A., Gobo, A. E., & Owei, O. B. (2010). The impact of land use conversion on a residential district in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *Environment & Urbanization*, 22(1): 257-265.

Barder, O. (2010). 'What can development policy learn from evolution?' *Farming Matters*, 26(4): 48.

Barnett, J. (2011). A short guide to 60 of the newest urbanisms and there could still be more. *Planning*, 11(4): 19-21.

Baum, S., & Gleeson, B. (2010). Space and Place: Social Exclusion in Australia's Suburban Heartlands. *Urban Policy and Research*, 28(2), 135-159. doi:10.1080/08111141003693133

- Boly, A., Konte, M., & Shimeles, A. (2021). Corruption Perception and Attitude Towards, 30, 140-157. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejab024>
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Pimbert, M., Farvar, M. T., Kothari, A., & Renard, Y. (2004). *Sharing Power: Learning-By-Doing in Co-management of Natural Resources throughout the World*. IIED and IUCN/CEESP/CMWG, Cenesta, Tehran, Iran.
- Brito, L. and Smith, M. S. (2012). State of the Planet Declaration. Proceeding of *PlanetUnder Pressure: New Knowledge Towards Solutions*, International Conference, London, UK, 26-29 March, <http://www.planetunderpressure2012.net/>
- Brondizio, E. S., Andersson, K., de Castro, F., Futemma, C., Salk, C., Tengö, M., ... Siani, S. M. (2021). Making place-based sustainability initiatives visible in the Brazilian Amazon. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 49(March), 66-78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2021.03.007>
- Brower, S. (2011). Neighbours and neighbourhoods: an excerpt from a new APA Planners Press book describes the elements of successful community design. *Planning*; 77(9): 30-33
- Cabannes, Y. (2004). Participatory budgeting: A significant contribution to participatory democracy. *Environment and Urbanization*, 16(1): 27-46.
- CAG, (2009). *Participation: A Theoretical Context*. CAG Consultants. Retrieved 26 August, 2013 from www.cagconsultants.co.uk
- Campanella, T. J. (2011). Jane Jacobs: Planners' best Frenemy. *Planning*. 77(4): 15-16.
- Carothers, T., & Gramont, D. De. (2011). *Aiding Governance in Developing Countries: Progress Amid Uncertainties* (Democracy and Rule of Law). Washington, D. C. Retrieved from www.CarnegieEndowment.org/pubs
- Claridge, T. (2013). *Planning Analysis: The Theory of Citizen Participation*. Retrieved 25th August, 2013 from; uoregon.edu/rgp/PPPM613/class10theory.htm
- Clingingsmith, D., Khwaja, A. I., & Kremer, M. (2009). Estimating the Impact of The Hajj: Religion and Tolerance in Islam's Global Gathering. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124 (3): 1133-1170. Retrieved September, 2013, from .doi:10.1162/qjec.2009.124.3.1133
- Clune, W. H., & Zehnder, A. J. B. (2018). The Three Pillars of Sustainability Framework : Approaches for Laws and Governance. *Journal of Environmental Protection*, 9, 211-240. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jep.2018.93015>

- Collier, P. (2007). *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done About It*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc. Retrieved from www.oup.com
- Cooper, J., Kotval-K, Z., Kotval, Z., & Mullin, J. (2014). University Community Partnerships. *Humanities*, 3(1), 88-101. <https://doi.org/10.3390/h3010088>
- Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking 'Participation': models, meanings and practices. *Community Development Journal*, 43(3): 269-283. Retrieved 2nd September, 2009 from oxfordjournals.org, doi:10.1093/cdj/bsn010
- Croce, G., and Ghignoni, E. (2012). Employer-provided training and knowledge spill overs: evidence from Italian local labour markets. *Regional Studies*, 46(3): 339-353.
- Csefalvay, Z. and Webster, C. (2012). Gates or no gates? A cross-European enquiry into the driving forces behind gated communities. *Regional Studies*, 46(3): 293-308.
- Daniel, M. M. (2014). Local and Community Driven Development approach in the provision of basic facilities in Jos, Nigeria. *Cities*, 39, 99-108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2014.03.003>
- Dasgupta, P., Morton, J. F., Dodman, D., Karapinar, B., Meza, F., Rivera-Ferre, M. G., ... Broecker, H. (2015). Rural areas. *Climate Change 2014 Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability: Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects*, 613-658. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415379.014>
- Davidson, K., & Gleeson, B. (2018). New Socio-ecological Imperatives for Cities: Possibilities and Dilemmas for Australian Metropolitan Governance. *Urban Policy and Research*, 36(2), 230-241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08111146.2017.1354848>
- Ejemeyowwi, D. O. (2015). Crime mapping using time series analysis in asaba, delta state, nigeria: a remote sensing and gis approach. *European Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 2(2), 52-71. Retrieved from www.idpublications.org
- Essler, S., Lepach, A. C., Petermann, F., & Paulus, M. (2020). Equality, equity, or inequality duplication? How preschoolers distribute necessary and luxury resources between rich and poor others. *Social Development*, 29(1), 110-125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12390>
- Few, R., Brown, K., & Tompkins, E. L. (2007). Public participation and climate change adaptation: Avoiding the illusion of inclusion. *Climate Policy*, 7(1), 46-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2007.9685637>
- Fotso, J. C., Ezech, A., Madise, N., Ziraba, A., & Ogollah, R. (2009). What does access to maternal care mean among the urban poor? Factors associated with use of

- appropriate maternal health services in the slum settlements of Nairobi, Kenya. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 13(1), 130-137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-008-0326-4>
- Franzoni, S., & Allali, A. A. (2018). Principles of Islamic Finance and Principles of Corporate Social Responsibility: What Convergence? *Sustainability*, 10(637), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10030637>
- Gandy, M. (2006). Planning, anti-planning and the infrastructure crisis facing Metropolitan Lagos. *Urban Studies*, 43(2 SPEC. ISS.), 371-396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980500406751>
- George, C. K. (1999). *Basic Principles and Methods of Urban and regional Planning*. Lagos: Libro-Gem Books.
- Ghiring, T. A. (1977). *Symphony, and the Application of the Behavioural Sciences to the Urban Planning process: Exploratory Case Studies of Environmental Perception in Zaria, Nigeria*. PhD (URP) Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.
- Green, D., and Minchin, L. (2012). Commentary: The co-benefits of carbon management on country. *Nature Climate Change*, 2(9): 641-643.
- Glucker, A. N., Driessen, P. P. J., Kolhoff, A., & Runhaar, H. A. C. (2013). Public participation in environmental impact assessment: Why, who and how? *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 43, 104-111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2013.06.003>
- Gollagher, M., & Hartz-Karp, J. (2013). The Role of Deliberative Collaborative Governance in Achieving Sustainable Cities. *Sustainability*, 5(6), 2343-2366. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su5062343>
- Guillaume-Gentil, A. (2014). Gender: Empowering women. *SPORE: The Magazine for Agricultural and Rural Development in ACP Countries*, 173: 13-17.
- Häikiö, L. (2012). From Innovation to Convention: Legitimate Citizen Participation in Local Governance. *Local Government Studies*, 38(4), 415-435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2012.698241>
- Hamann, U., & Türkmen, C. (2020). Communities of struggle: the making of a protest movement around housing, migration and racism beyond identity politics in Berlin. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 8(4), 515-531. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2020.1719191>
- Hassan, A. (2010). Can urban density be made to work for everyone? Exploring options for Karachi's low- and low-middle-class settlements. *Environment & Urbanization*, 22(1): 267-268.

- Hibbard, M., & Lurie, S. (2012). Creating socio-economic measures for community-based natural resource management: a case from watershed stewardship organisations. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 55(4), 525-544. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2011.614093>
- Hope, K. R. (2009). Capacity Development for Good Governance in Developing Countries: Some Lessons from the Field. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 32(8), 728-740. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900690902908562>
- Ibem, E. O. (2009). Community-led infrastructure provision in low-income urban communities in developing countries: A study on Ohafia, Nigeria. *Cities*, 26(3): 125-132. Retrieved May 17, 2011, from www.elsevier.com/locate/cities
- Ibrahim, O. R. (2012). Poverty reduction through territorial rural development in Nigeria. *Regions*, 288(4): 4-8.
- Iwaniec, D. M., Cook, E. M., Davidson, M. J., Berbés-Blázquez, M., & Grimm, N. B. (2020). Integrating existing climate adaptation planning into future visions: A strategic scenario for the central Arizona-Phoenix region. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 200(July 2019), 103820. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2020.103820>
- Jackman, D. (2016). Are 'the destitute' destitute? Understanding micro-inequalities through the concept of defiled surpluses. *Environment and Urbanization*, 29(1), 251-266. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247816672159>
- Jacobs, J. M. (2006). A geography of big things. *Cultural Geographies*, 13(1), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1474474006eu354oa>
- Jinadu, A. M. (2007). *Understanding the Basics of Housing: A Book of Notes for Students in Tertiary Institutions*. Revised Edition. Jos University Press Ltd, Jos, Nigeria.
- Jordan, S. (2013). Sustainability—What Are the Odds? Envisioning the Future of our Environment, Economy and Society. *Humanities*, 2(2), 119-127. doi:10.3390/h2020119
- Kamat, S. (2006). NGOs and the New Democracy: The False Saviors of International Development. *Harvard International Review*. Retrieved May 17, 2011, from <http://hir.harvard.edu/article-authors/sangeeta-kamat>
- Kawu, A. M. (2012). Threats to and opportunities for livelihood innovations in the face of climate change; a case study of the Savanna regions of Nigeria. In *Planet Under Pressure: New Knowledge Towards Solutions* (p. 23). London. Retrieved from www.planetunderpressure2012.net
- Kawu, A. M. (2016). *Assessment of Urban Development Activities of Community*

Based Organizations in Minna, Nigeria. PhD (URP) Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

- Kawu, A. M., & Shuaibu, S. (2007). Physical Planning and Sustainable Urbanization in Nigeria. *Humanities and Education Research Journal (NASHER Journal)*, 5(1), 78-86.
- Kindersley, D. (2007). *DK Illustrated Oxford Dictionary*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Komendantova, N., Vocciante, M., & Battaglini, A. (2015). Can the BESTGRID process improve stakeholder involvement in electricity transmission projects? *Energies*, 8(9), 9407-9433. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en8099407>
- Kuper, A. (2004). *Democracy Beyond Borders: Justice and Representation in Global Institutions*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0199274908.001.0001>
- Lawanson, T., Soyinka, O., & Omole, F. (2013). Achieving Safety and Security in Nigerian Cities: Matters Arising. In S. Fadare, I. Nwokoro, T. Lawanson, & V. Onifade (Eds.), *Emerging Issues in Urban Planning and Development* (pp. 132-147). Lagos: Dept. of URP, University of Lagos,
- Layder, D. (2007). *Understanding Social Theory*. London: Sage Publications Limited.
- Löw, C. (2020, April 1). Gender and indigenous concepts of climate protection: a critical revision of REDD+ projects. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*. Elsevier B.V. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2020.03.002>
- Mabogunje, A. L. (1999). Cities for All: The challenges for Nigeria. *World Habitat Day*, Public Lecture, The Federal Ministry of Works and Housing, Urban and Regional Planning Development Division, Abuja: Ladi Kwali Centre, 4th October.
- Mabogunje, A. L., & Kates, R. W. (2004). *Sustainable Development in Ijebu-Ode, Nigeria: The Role of Social Capital, Participation, and Science and Technology* (Sustainable Development Program No. 102). Cambridge, MA. Retrieved from <http://www.cid.harvard.edu/cidwp/102.htm>
- Mabogunje, A. L. (2005). Global urban poverty research agenda: The African case. In *Global Urban Poverty: Setting the Research Agenda*. Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars, Washington DC: USA. December 15. Accessed 23 February, 2006 from www.WilsonCenter.org
- Maithani, B. P. (n.d.). Training module on participatory planning and management. Retrieved 11 May 2022, from <https://www.fao.org/3/ad346e/ad346e06.htm>

- Malešević, S. (2012). Wars that Make States and Wars that Make Nations: Organised Violence, Nationalism and State Formation in the Balkans. *European Journal of Sociology*, 53(01), 31-63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003975612000021>
- Mallam, S. (1997). *The Role of Non-Governmental and Community-Based Organization in Urban Environmental Management: A Case Study of Bida*. Unpublished B (URP) Dissertation, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.
- Mcdonald, R., Blei, A. M., Civco, D. L., & Parent, J. (2020). The Urban Century, (40), 2012-2013.
- Mcdonald, R. I., Beatley, T., & Elmqvist, T. (2018). The green soul of the concrete jungle: the urban century, the urban psychological penalty, and the role of nature, 1-13.
- Meredith, T., & MacDonald, M. (2017). Community-supported slum-upgrading: Innovations from Kibera, Nairobi, Kenya. *Habitat International*, 60, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2016.12.003>
- Mitlin, D., and Satterthwaite, D. (2013). *Urban Poverty in the Global South: Scale and nature*. Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon, UK.
- Mohamed, S. E. E. (2009). *The Participation of Informal Settlement Communities In City-Level Policy-Making Processes in Johannesburg*. A Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. Retrieved August 5, 2013 from <http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/45>
- Momoh, J., Opaluwah, A., & Albeera, H. (2018). Challenges Facing Nigeria's Urban Environment: The Abuja Case. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 20(2), 34-49.
- Montgomery, M. R. (2009). Urban Poverty and Health in Developing Countries. *Population Reference Bureau*, June, 64(2). Retrieved from www.prb.org
- Morgan, D. L. (1996). A New Era of Focus Groups View project Basic and Advanced Focus Groups, from Sage View project. *Focus Groups Article in Annual Review of Sociology*, 22(March), 129-152. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.22.1.129>
- Msuya, J. & Salm, M. (2010). Multi-stakeholder processes. *Farming Matters*, 26(4): 33.
- Ndayako, F. M., & Kawu, A. M. (2011). Beneficiaries' Assessment of Public Private Partnership in Housing Delivery in Minna, Nigeria. *Centre for Human Settlements and Urban Development Journal*, 2, 41-54. Retrieved from

<http://repository.futminna.edu.ng:8080/jspui/handle/123456789/13798>

- Ndebele-Murisa, M. R. (2011). *An analysis of primary and secondary production in Lake Kariba in a changing climate*. Doctor of Philosophiae Thesis in the Department of Biodiversity and Conservation Biology, University of the Western Cape, South Africa.
- Newman, D. M. (2008). *Sociology: exploring the architecture of everyday life*. California: Pine Forge Press.
- Newton, J., & Parfitt, A. (2011). Striving for mutuality in research relationships: the value of participatory action research principles. In Franklin, A., & Blyton, P. (Eds): *Researching Sustainability: A Guide to Social Science Methods, Practice and Engagement*, London: Earthscan, 71-88.
- Norius, D. (2011). Measuring Community Development Outcomes: In Search of an Analytical Framework. *Economic Development Quarterly* 25(2). Accessed June 16 from <http://edq.sagepub.com/content/current>
- Nwankwo, A. (1998). *African Dictators: Logic of Tyranny and Lessons from History*. Fourth Dimension Publishers, Enugu, Nigeria.
- Nour, A. M. (2011). Challenges and Advantages of Community Participation as an Approach for Sustainable Urban Development in Egypt. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 4(1), 284-298. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v4n1p79>
- Obasanjo, O., and Mabogunje, A. (1991). *Elements of development*. African Leadership Forum, Ota, Nigeria.
- Olorunfemi, S. O. (1990). *Evolving Affordable Housing for the Urban Poor: A case study of Kaduna Metropolis*. Unpublished PhD (URP) Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- Olurin, T. O. (2006). Community-based organizations (CBOs) and environmental consciousness: the challenges for contemporary communities in the twenty-first century. In: Agbola, T. (Ed) *Environmental Planning and Management: concepts and application to Nigeria* (pp. 83-99). Ibadan, Constellation Books.
- Page, M. & Mennel, T. (Eds). (2011). *Reconsidering Jane Jacobs*. American Planning Association, Planners Press, Chicago, USA.
- Perenboom, R. J. M. & Chorus, A. M. J. (2003). Measuring participation according to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 25(11-12): 577-587. doi: 10.1080/0963828031000137081

- Reid, H., Chambwera, M. and Murray, L. (2013). *Tried and tested: Learning from farmers on adaptation to climate change*. Gatekeeper Series 153, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), www.iied.org/pubs/
- Reid, J. M. (2000). *Community participation: How People Power Brings Sustainable Benefits to Communities*. USDA Rural Development Office of Community Development. Accessed December 29, 2011 from <http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/rbs/ezec/Pubs/commparticrept.pdf>
- Reid, H. (2005). Africa: a crucible for climate change and poverty. In: Bigg, T., and Satterthwaite, D. (Eds), pp. 157-174.
- Rifkin, S. B., & Kangere, M. (2002). What is Participation? In Hartley S. *CBR: A participatory strategy in Africa*. University College London, London, UK. Assessed through: <http://www.asksource.info/cbr-book/cbr03.pdf> on 3RD April, 2010. Pp. 37-49.
- Rizzi, P., & Porebska, A. (2020). Towards a Revised Framework for Participatory Planning in the Context of Risk. *Sustainability*, 12(5539), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12145539>
- Robinson, J. (1949). The theory of planning. *Soviet Studies*, 1(1): 60-64. Retrieved August 6, 2013 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09668134908409731>
- Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Panaf Publishing, Inc., Abuja, Nigeria.
- Sangregorio, I. (2000). *Collaborative Housing in Sweden*. The Swedish Council for Building Research, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Satterthwaite, D. (2004). The underestimation of urban poverty in low- and middle-income nations. *Poverty Reduction in Urban Areas Series*, Working Paper 14, IIED, London.
- Satterthwaite, D. (2005). *The scale of urban change worldwide: 1950-2000 and its Underpinnings*. Human Settlement Discussion Paper Series, Theme: Urban Change, IIED, London.
- Satterthwaite, D. (2008). Editorial: The social and political basis for citizen action on urban poverty reduction. *Environment and Urbanization*, 20(2), 307-318. doi:10.1177/0956247808096114
- Satterthwaite, D. (2011). Editorial: Why is urban health so poor even in many successful cities? *Environment & Urbanization*, 23(1): 2 - 11. <http://eau.sagepub.com>
- Satterthwaite, D., & Mitlin, D. (2013). *A future that low-income urban dwellers want, and can help secure*. London: International Institute for Environment and

- Development (IIED), London.
<https://doi.org/http://pubs.iied.org/10626IIED.html>
- Savini, F. (2011). The Endowment of Community Participation: Institutional Settings in Two Urban Regeneration Projects. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 35(5), 949-968. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2010.00997.x>
- Schwarte, C. (2008). *Public Participation and Oil Exploitation in Uganda*. Gatekeepers: keyhighlights in sustainable agriculture and natural resource management, International Institute for Development and Environment (IIED), London.
- Seers, D. (1969). *The Meaning of Development* (Communication Series No. 44). Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK. Retrieved from www.ids.ac.uk/files/dmfile/themeaningofdevelopment.pdf
- Sharma, M. (2007). Community participation in community-based rehabilitation programmes. *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal*, 18(2): 146-157.
- Spore, (2012). A collective adventure: A business match. *Spore: The Magazine for Agriculture and Rural Development in ACP Countries*. Special Issue, July 11-15. Available at <http://spore.cta>
- Solis, P., & Richardson, D. (2010). Bowling together: participatory geography at the AAG. *AAG Newsletter*, 15(3): 2-4.
- Sunley, P., & Pike, A. (2020). In search of the skilled city : Skills and the occupational evolution of British cities, 57(1), 109-133. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098019834249>
- Todaro, M. P. & Smith, S. C. (2009). *Economic Development*. Tenth Edition. Pearson Education Limited, Harlow, England.
- Ukoje, J. E. (2011). *Analysis of the Determinants of Participation of Stakeholders in Solid Waste Management in Zaria, Nigeria*. PhD (URP) Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria
- Usman, Y. B. (2004). *The President, Are You Serious About NEEDS? Open Letter to President Olusegun Obasanjo on the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS)*. Kaduna, Vanguard Printers and Publishers Ltd.
- Wang, X. and van Hofe, R. (2010). *Research Methods in Urban and Regional Planning*. Tsinghua University Press, Beijing and Springer-Verlag GmbH Berlin Heidelberg www.springer.com

- Warlick, J. L. (1973). *Participation as a measure of program success*. Retrieved 20 May, 2009 from www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc51d.pdf
- World Bank, (2005). *Guidance on Waste Management*. Environment Department Dissemination Note, Number 66. The World Bank, Washington DC., USA: January.
- Yahaya, M. K. (2002). Development and Challenges of Bakolori Irrigation Project in Sokoto State, Nigeria. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 11(3), 411-430.
- Yomo, M., Villamor, G. B., Aziadekey, M., Olorunfemi, F., & Mourad, K. A. (2020). Climate change adaptation in Semi-Arid Ecosystems: A case study from Ghana. *Climate Risk Management*, 27(November 2019), 100206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2019.100206>
- Yunus, M. (2007). Creating a world without poverty: social business and the future of capitalism. *Public Affairs*, New York, USA. Retrieved December 25, 2011 from http://www.amazon.com/dp/B001W6RRTI/ref=rdr_ext_tmb
- Yunus, M. (2008). Creating a world without poverty: social business and the future of capitalism. *Global Urban Development Magazine*, 4(2). Retrieved September 10, 2011, from www.globalurban.org/GUDMag08Vol4Iss2/Yunus.pdf
- Yunusa, M. B. (1979). *Urban Associational Relationships: A Study of Socio-Economic Characteristics and Participation in Voluntary Associations*. BSc. Sociology Dissertation, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.
- Yunusa, M. B. (1991). *Socio-spatial Effects of Ajaokuta Steel Complex*. PhD (Geography) Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.
- Yunusa, M. B. (2013). *Understanding the Almajiri: Muslim Child and Youth Education in Nigeria*. Tamaza Publishing Company Limited, Wusasa-Zaria, Nigeria.
- Yunusa, M. B. (2015). Planning for the Socially Disadvantaged. In *Making Cities in Nigeria Functional*, The 46th Annual Conference/AGM of the Nigerian Institute of Town Planners, Ilorin, Nigeria 21st-30th October, pp. 74-79.
- Yunusa, M. B., & Ahmed, A. (2012). Youth perception of the city its challenges and opportunities: a case study from Zaria, Nigeria. *Journal of Contemporary Urbanology*, 1(1): 1-15.