

Geographic Spread of Compliance with The Least observed Provision of Building Law - A Quantitative Investigation, evaluation and Judgment of a Planning Law Practitioner in Calabar Metropolis, Nigeria

Victor Eyo Offiong

LL.B, M.Sc, Ph.D Senior Lecturer Cross River University of Technology
Legal Unit Department of Urban and Regional Planning (CRUTECH), Nigeria
Corresponding Author: Victor Eyo Offiong

Abstract: This Research was carried out to investigate and evaluate the geographic spread of compliance with the least observed provision of Building Law by owners of Buildings in the Residential Districts of Calabar Metropolis in Cross River State, Nigeria. The evidence collected by the Researcher-investigator for the Research were data on the physical variables of Buildings under the Cross River State Building Law of 1984 as amended in 1987 and data evaluated from questionnaires issued to owners of the Buildings. The physical variables included the Building line, Ceiling height, Building Plan, Set Back, Building size restrictions, Size of living room, Height of ground floor, Ventilation, Space around building and Corridor dimension, all legal requirements under the extant Law. The measurement was to determine the level of compliance with the ten Building variables that have direct bearing with the safety and health of people living in, and around Buildings so as to observe the spatial compliance with the least observed provision of building Law in Cross River State. The data so obtained was analysed using Statistical Package (SPSS) version 11.0. The study employed one-way multivariate analysis of variance, with residential districts as factor and the ten provisions of the building Laws as dependent variables. This analysis sought to identify the spatial compliance with the least observed provision of the building Law, across the 13 residential districts of the study area. From the study, it was observed that building plan approval provision, which is the least observed provisions, with a mean compliance of (6.16), had a F ratio less than the chosen level of significance, hence giving the researcher the power of negating the null hypothesis and arriving at the conclusion that the spatial level of compliance across the residential districts differs significantly. The researcher recommended that human and material resources needed for planning Law enforcement activities must be improved and equitably distributed according to space or measure of need, towards ensuring compliance with obtaining building plans across residential districts in the study area.

Keywords: Calabar Built-Up Areas, Evaluation,, Investigation,, Planning Law Practitioner, Compliance Classification, Planning Law/Building Law, Quantitative Judgment.

Date of Submission: 03-01-2018

Date of acceptance: 11-01-2018

I. Introduction

Among the greatest challenges facing the world today is development and planning control. To tackle the problem, Developing countries have risen to the global challenge by providing Laws, under their respective Town and Country Planning laws, for the maintenance of a well-planned and liveable environment. Taking a clue from her long history and evolution of the problems of gross violations to preceding urban development control schemes, the urban and regional planning decree of 1992 (Decree No. 88) was passed into law (Sule, 2003). Several Laws have been made in view of development control in Cross River State. One of such Laws is the building Law of 1984, as amended in 1987. The Cross River State Environmental Sanitation Enforcement (Urban Area) Law 2003, and the Land Use and Allocation Act of 1978 are amongst the others.

An important purpose of building laws generally, is to provide for the health, safety and welfare of people in and around buildings. Oloyede (2010) did not mince any words when he described building law as the bedrock of planning in every sane society. This provides the impetus for legislative enactments of regulations by respective governments to ensure sustainable living Environment. The legislative objective of Cross River State planning law under consideration was not far-fetched as it was to ensure a liveable environment by providing standards for approved buildings, location of buildings, types and uses, building lines and setbacks. Others include Laws for spaces around buildings to allow convenient areas for air circulation, services and facilities, built up areas, size of rooms, dimension of ceiling height, ventilation to allow for air circulation, drainage and disposal system, and other building specifications to which all occupiers, users and owners of land are expected

to comply. Compliance here refers to building in line with the requirements of the selected provisions of the Cross River State building Law of 1984 as amended in 1987.essentially, to ensure, under the Law, compliance with building Law, procurement of approved building plan is made a pre-condition. This is principally because to be safe and liveable, building constructions must be done according to plan, without which there can be guarantee of standard compliance as to all other minimum requirements under the Law. It is felt that although all the provisions are important, explanation can be offered why of all, only one or two are mostly violated by developers. The researcher finds that notwithstanding the good intentions of the law and the efforts of the existing Town Planning Department in Calabar, the spatial spread of violations to approval requirement persist is high, even in the face of on-going demolition exercises. This Research, therefore, investigated the geographic spread of compliance with the least observed provision of the building Law by owners of buildings in the various Residential districts that comprise Calabar Metropolis

II. Materials And Methods

2.1 Study area

Calabar is the capital city of Cross River State. The city is located in the southern part of Cross River State. It lies between longitude 08⁰ 26 East of the Greenwich meridian and latitude 04⁰ 58 North of the equator and longitude 08⁰22 East. It has a total surface area of 159.65 square kilometres. It is bounded by the great Qua River and Calabar River. Calabar was the first city in the then Eastern Nigeria. It has remained more than 300 years as an urban centre (Offiong, 2007).Based on the 1996 population projection, the population of Calabar was 379,605. At the 2006 Nigeria population census, the population had grown to 461,796 according to (Geo Names) Geographical Database, making its growth rate more than 3 per cent. The city had a population density of 134/ sqkm in 1991 and in 2006, the population density rose to 293 sqkm in 2006, obscured the rather grave situation in Calabar (National Population Council (NPC), 2006).

At 2016, the number of buildings on separate stand/yard in Calabar Metropolis stood at 15,894, Nigeria’s population and Housing census drawn from the thirteen (13) metropolis residential areas being studied. As rightly observed by (Ebong 1983),housing has become the thorniest problem facing its inhabitants.in an attempt to contend with the housing problems, housing are springing up in disregard to the requirement as to building plan, with attendant consequences on land use planning. One unique characteristics of the study area is that it is contiguous to the completely built areas in the municipal capital whether or not these built up areas complies with government approval is another question. A greater percentage of completed houses are done without prior consideration of access to roads. However, it can be easily observed that more than 50% of districts already designated as residential locations are yet to be fully built up. These include settlements and suburbs such as IkotEkpa, IkotEffiom, Eyamba,ObotOkoho, Bacoco, Awkada,AdebyolkotOmin, Ekaobo, IkotNkebre, IkotEnobong, IkotOmin, IneUdo, NditoOkobo, IneAkpanUfana, IneUdo, all surrounding the completely built up area but hindered by a near absence of access roads.

2.2 Types Of Data And Source

The data utilized in this Research were evidence based data on the spatial level of compliance with the least observed provision of Building Law among owners of building in the study Area. These set of data were needed so as to relate building structures to the level of compliance with building Laws.The observed provisions used for the Research were based on ten provisions as provided by the Cross River State Building Law of 1984 as amended in 1987, displayed in **Table 1**.These set of data were needed so as to relate Building owners level of compliance with least observed provision of the Building Laws.

Table 1Provisions of the Cross River State Building Laws, 1984 as amended in 1987 used for the study.

S/N	Sections	Long Title

GEOGRAPHIC SPREAD OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE LEAST OBSERVED PROVISION OF BUILDING LAW– A...

1.	S.2(A) (4)	Building Plan: Building must be with approved building plan
2.	S.5	Building line: At least 12 meters from road centre.
3.	S.13 (6)	Ceiling height: Minimum dimensions shall be 2.88meters
4.	S.6(3)	Set Back: Minimum permissible distance between a bungalow and other building not less than 4.5 meters.
5.	S.7	Building size restrictions: Not more than 50percent of land size should be built up.
6.	S. 13(b)	Size of living room: Shall be 12.96 square meters with width not less than 3.00 meters
7.	S. 16(3)	Height of ground floor: Shall not be less than 0.15 meters above the level of adjacent ground.
8.	S.19(1) (2)	Ventilation: Buildings shall have adequate cross ventilation with windows size not less than $\frac{1}{8}$ of the flow area of the room.
9.	S. 6 (1)	Space around buildings: A minimum distance of 1.5 meters shall be allowed from the property boundaries not facing any road.
10.	S.13 (d)	Corridor dimension: The minimum width shall be 1 meter.

Source: Cross River State Building Laws 1984 as amended in 1987.

2.3 Procedures for Investigation / Data Collection

The collection of data was established using seven hundred and ninety four questionnaires (794) issued to seven hundred and ninety four (794) respondents/owners of the five per cent of buildings on separate stand, measured with the help of skilled field assistants. After measurement of each variables, the researcher and his field assistants recorded the data on the counterpart part of the questionnaire provided for that purpose. The data so obtained in the field were used for the analysis. The population of study is made up of Calabar Metropolis Residential buildings/houses on separate stand and their owners in the thirteen residential areas of Calabar Metropolis. There are about 15,894 completed buildings on separate stands in the 13 residential districts of the study area.

Table 2: Residential districts and number of buildings measured in the Study Area

S/N	Residential Districts	No. of Buildings	No. of buildings measured/ questionnaire administered.	Questionnaires Retrieved.	Percentage retrieved (%)
1.	Akim Qua Town	2020	101	99	98
2.	Ediba Qua Town	1837	92	82	90
3.	Big Qua Town	2361	118	117	99
4.	Essien Town	1942	97	97	100
5.	Ishie Town	2627	131	112	85
6.	IkotAnsa	1722	86	73	84
7.	University Town	750	38	38	100
8.	IkotEfa	414	21	18	85
9.	Esuk Utan	204	10	10	100
10.	Ekorinim	441	22	22	100
11.	Esuk Atu	240	12	12	100
12.	Nyangasang	720	36	36	100

13	EdimOtop	616	30	25	83
	Total	15, 894	794	742	93

Source:2006 Population and Housing Population Data Bank, Nigerian’s National Population Commission
Sample size: Researcher’s Field Work 2016.

The measurement of the buildings was done considering the 5 per cent of buildings on separate stand selected using systematic random sampling technique in each of the 13 metropolis residential districts that made up the study area. Copies of the questionnaire were distributed to owners of the buildings measured. From the study, out of 794 questionnaires administered, 742 copies of the questionnaires representing 93 per cent were successfully retrieved. This number was representative enough for the study. Table 2 shows the residential districts and number of buildings measured in the Study Area.

The study utilized a multi-stage sampling technique. In stage 1, purposive sampling of residential districts was done, to satisfy the researchers’ desire to study only buildings within the metropolis residential districts which are adjacent to the completely built up area in the Calabar Municipality. The districts so captured include Akim Qua Town, Ediba Qua Town, Essien Town, Ishie Town, IkotAnsa, University Satelite Town, IkotEfa, Esuk Utan, Ekorinin, Nyangasang and EdimOtop; secondly, to capture only buildings on separate stand/yard. Further types of housing units were sampled, these include; informal improvised dwelling (0.6percent), semi-detached (7.3percent), flat in block of flats (10.4percent), Traditional Hut structure (9.5percent), others (0.4percent). At Stage 2, systematic sampling was done. A sample frame was defined for each street at the interval of 20 buildings according to the number of buildings on separate stand/yard with a target of not less than 5percent in mind. Stage 3 involved repeated systematic sampling in districts where the minimum 5percent was not met at first time due to repeated absence or outright refusal to allow measurement or supply needed information by owners of buildings within the frame.

2.4 Data Analysis

The ten provisions considered for the study are as provided by the Cross River building Law 1984 as amended in 1987. These include: Building line, Ceiling height, Building Plan, Set Back, Building size restrictions, Size of living room, Height of ground floor, Ventilation, Space around building and Corridor dimension. The compliance classification is shown in the Table 3.

Table 3 Compliance classification

Compliance		
Mean grouping	Ranking	Classification
1 – 59.4	1	Poorest
59.5 – 79.4	2	Poorer
79.5 – 95.4	3	Poor
95.5 – 100	4	Good (Full compliance)

Source: Researcher’s Field Work 2016

A one-way multivariate analysis of variance was done, with residential districts as factor and the ten provisions of the building Laws as dependent variables. This analysis sought to identify the spatial compliance with the least observed provisions of the building Law, across the 13 residential districts of the study area. It involved the computation of various descriptive statistics, variance components and tests for significance utilizing the Pilla’s trace, Wilks Lambda, Hotelling’s Trace, Roys largest root, the F-ratio and LSD test statistics in the general linear model from data obtained from the field.

III. Results, Evaluation and Discussion

To determine the spatial compliance with the least observed provisions out of the ten provisions used for the study, descriptive statistics were computed for the ten provisions of the building Laws in each of the thirteen distribution of the study area. Results are presented in Table 4-5. Table 4 gives the summary of the results, mean, standard error of estimate and confidence interval (95percent).Based on the result from the Table 4 below, the researcher finds that building plan approval provision was the building Law provision with the lowest mean compliance (6.16), meaning that the Law prescribing that building plan must be approved before commencement of any building was the least observed provision (5.999 < x < 6.331). The most observed provision of the law however, was Law 3(b) size of living room prescription with a mean compliance of 9.423 estimates (0.059). The descriptive statistics for the ten provisions of the law for the 13 districts are presented in Tables 4 and 4.1.

GEOGRAPHIC SPREAD OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE LEAST OBSERVED PROVISION OF BUILDING LAW– A...

Table 4 Mean and Standard Error of the ten provisions of the Building Law

Building Laws	Mean	Std. Error	95percent Confidence Interval		
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Building plan approval S.2 (A)(4)	6.165	.085	5.999		6.331
Building line S.5	8.145	.103	7.943		8.347
Ceiling height S.13 (6)	8.999	.073	8.855		9.143
Built up area S.7	7.928	.117	7.699		8.158
Size of living room S.13 (B)	9.316	.059	9.200		9.432
Height of ground floor S.16 (3)	8.065	.093	7.882		8.249
Set back S.6 (3)	8.233	.097	8.043		8.423
Ventilation S.19 (1)(2)	7.859	.088	7.686		8.032
Space around buildings S.6 (1)	8.940	.073	8.797		9.083
Corridor dimension S.13 (d)	8.757	.123	8.515		8.999

Dependent variable: Level of compliance with building Laws

Source: Researcher's field work, 2016

The Table 4.1 below contains the result for the preliminary multivariate test

Table 4.1 Preliminary multivariate Test

Effect	Test	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig
Intercept	Pilla's Trace	.986	5127.142a	10.000	720.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.014	5127.142a	10.000	720.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	71.210	5127.142a	10.000	720.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	71.210	5127.142a	10.000	720.000	.000
District	Pilla's Trace	1.355	9.523	120.000	7290.00	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.201	10.733	120.000	0	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	1.940	11.612	120.000	5602.70	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	.701	42.570	12.000	5	.000
					7182.00	
					0	
					729.000	

a. Extract statistic

b. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

c. Design: Intercept+district.

Source: Researcher's fieldwork, 2016

In order to test for the level of significance for the spatial compliance with the least observed provisions of the building Law, a one way multivariate analysis of variance was then conducted by the researcher. The Table 5 below gives the ANOVA summary of the spatial compliance with the ten building Law provisions.

Table 5: Anova Summary For The Spatial Compliance With Ten Building Law Provisions.

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Corrected Model	Building plan approval	931.728a	12	77.644	28.323	.000
	Building line	989.916b	12	57.243	14.148	.000
	Ceiling height	218.423c	12	18.202	8.847	.000
	Built up area					

GEOGRAPHIC SPREAD OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE LEAST OBSERVED PROVISION OF BUILDING LAW– A...

	Size of living room measured					
	Ventilation					
	Distance from building to fence					
Corrected Model	Building plan approval	1113.787d	12	92.816	17.754	.000
	Building line	297.280e	12	24.773	18.561	.000
	Ceiling height	657.044f	12	54.754	16.410	.000
	Built up area	528.140g	12	44.012	12.261	.000
	Size of living room measured	231.368h	12	19.281	6.477	.000
	Ventilation	257.655i	12	21.471	10.655	.000
	Distance from building to fence	607.141j	12	50.595	8.683	.000
Intercept	Building plan approval	14529.581	1	14529.581	5301.791	.000
	Building line	25361.163	1	25361.163	6268.128	.000
	Ceiling height	30956.748	1	30956.748	15046.882	.000
	Built up area	24029.502	1	24029.502	4596.380	.000
	Size of living room measured	33181.892	1	33181.892	24861.540	.000
	Ventilation	24866.673	1	24866.673	7452.553	.000
	Height of ground floor	25912.188	1	25912.188	7218.488	.000
	Setback Ventilation	23611.769	1	23611.769	7931.809	.000
	Distance from building to fence	30554.178	1	30554.178	15162.122	.000
	Corridor dimension	29315.530	1	29315.530	5031.281	.000
District	Building plan approval	931.728	12	77.644	28.332	.000
	Building line	686.916	12	57.243	14.148	.000
	Ceiling height	218.423	12	18.202	8.847	.000
	Built up area	1113.787	12	92.816	17.754	.000
	Size of living room measured	297.280	12	24.773	18.561	.000
	Ventilation	657.044	12	54.754	16.410	.000
	Height of ground floor	528.140	12	44.012	12.261	.000
	Setback Ventilation	231.368	12	19.281	6.477	.000
	Distance from building to fence	257.655	12	21.471	10.655	.000
	Corridor dimension	607.141	12	50.595	8.683	.000
Error	Building plan approval	1997.828	729	2.741		
	Building line	2949.571	729	4.046		
	Ceiling height	1499.810	729	2.057		

GEOGRAPHIC SPREAD OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE LEAST OBSERVED PROVISION OF BUILDING LAW– A...

	Built up area	3811.153	729	5.228		
	Size of living room measured	972.973	729	1.335		
	Ventilation	2432.429	729	3.337		
	Height of ground floor	2616.889	729	3.590		
	Setback Ventilation	2170.120	729	2.977		
	Distance from building to fence	1469.055	729	2.015		
	Corridor dimension	4247.630	729	5.827		
Total	Building plan approval	35061.802	742			
	Building line	53142.931	742			
	Ceiling height	62412.806	742			
	Built up area	50069.468	742			
	Size of living room measured	66897.121	742			
	Ventilation	56444.107	742			
	Height of ground floor	56405.410	742			
	Setback Ventilation	47615.776	742			
	Distance from building to fence	62182.985	742			
	Corridor dimension	63116.361	742			

Corrected Total	Building plan approval	2929.556	741
	Building line	3636.487	741
	Ceiling height	1718.233	741
	Built up area	4924.940	741
	Size of living room measured	1270.253	741
	Ventilation	3089.473	741
	Height of ground floor	3145.029	741
	Setback Ventilation	2401.488	741
	Distance from building to fence	1726.710	741
	Corridor dimension	4854.772	741

a. R squared = .318 (Adjusted R squared = .307)

- b. R squared = .189 (Adjusted R squared =.176)
- c. R squared = .127 (Adjusted R squared = .113)
- d. R squared = .226 (Adjusted R squared = 213)
- e. R squared = 234 (Adjusted R squared = 221)
- f. R squared = 213 (Adjusted R squared = .200)
- g. R squared = .168 (Adjusted R squared = .154)
- h. R squared = .096 (Adjusted R squared = .081)
- i. R squared = .149 (Adjusted R squared = .135)
- j. R squared = .125 (Adjusted R squared = .111)

Source: Result of Data Analysis, 2016

From the results of Table 5, it was observed that in the case of building plan approval provision already identified as the least observed provision of the law, the p-value (0.000) associated with the computed F-value was less than the chosen level of significance. The null hypothesis was thus rejected. This means that the spatial level of compliance with the least observed building Law provision, especially the building plan approval, varied significantly across residential districts in the study area.

To identify which pair of means (by residential district) was responsible for the observed significant result, a pair wise multiple comparison Tests were further carried out. Since the researcher’s interest was on spatial compliance to the least observed provision, the results were extracted for this variable (building approval status).

From the analysis carried out by the researcher on the pair wise comparison, shown in Table 6, it was observed that in terms of building approval status, district Akim Qua Town was significantly different from Big Qua Town, Ishie Town, IkotEfa, Esuk Atu, Nyanasang and EdimOtop. Ediba Qua Town was significantly different from Big Qua Town, IkotAnsa, IkotEfa, Esuk Atu, Nyanasang. EdimOtop was significantly different from all others except Esuk Atu residential district; similarly, Nyanasang district was significantly different from all others except Esuk Atu district. There is no significant difference between district Esuk Atu and IkotEfa, Nyanasang and EdimOtop. The next outstanding district is IkotEfa district which is significantly different from all others except Esuk Atu and EdimEtop. All other differences are as indicated.

Table 6 Pairwise comparison of compliance with building plan approvalStatus, by Residential Districts

District	Akim Qua Town	Ediba Qua Town	Big Qua Town	Essien Town	Ishie Town	Ikot Ansa	Univer sity Satellit e Town	IKotE fa	Esuk Utan	Eko rini m	Esu k Atu	Nyan sang	Edim Otop
Akim Qua Town	-	0.09	1.24	0.31	0.10	0.75	0.18	3.03	0.31	0.14	3.02	3.99	2.18
Ediba Qua Town	0.09	-	1.34	0.22	0.19	0.84	0.09	3.12	0.22	0.05	3.11	4.08	2.27
Big Qua Town	1.24	1.34	-	1.56	1.15	0.49	1.43	1.79	1.56	1.39	1.78	2.75	0.94
Essien Town	0.31	0.22	1.56	-	0.41	1.07	0.13	3.34	0.00	0.17	3.33	4.31	2.50
Ishie Town	0.10	0.19	1.15	0.41	-	0.66	0.28	2.93	0.41	0.24	2.92	3.89	2.09
IkotAnsa	0.75	0.84	1.49	1.07	0.66	-	0.94	2.28	1.07	0.89	2.27	3.24	1.43
University Satellite Town	0.13	0.09	1.43	0.13	0.28	0.94	-	3.21	0.13	0.04	3.20	4.17	2.35
IkotEfa	3.03	3.12	1.79	3.34	2.93	2.23	3.21	-	3.34	3.17	0.01	0.96	0.85
Esuk Utan	0.31	0.22	1.56	0.00	0.41	1.07	0.13	3.34	-	0.17	3.33	4.31	2.50
Ekorinim	0.14	0.05	1.39	0.17	0.24	0.89	0.04	3.17	0.17	-	3.16	4.13	2.32
Esuk Atu	3.02	3.11	1.78	3.33	2.92	2.27	3.20	0.01	3.33	3.16	-	0.97	0.84
Nyanasang	3.99	4.08	2.75	4.31	3.89	3.24	4.17	0.96	4.31	4.13	0.97	-	1.81
EdimOtop	2.18	2.27	0.94	2.50	2.09	1.43	2.35	0.35	2.50	2.32	0.84	1.81	-

Significant at 0.05 levels. P < 0.05

Source: Result of data Analysis, 2016

IV. Conclusion / Judgment and Recommendation

From findings, the Geographic spread in compliance with the minimum requirement as to building plan, was significantly different across the study area, which also, as in the case of all the regulations put together requires different levels of approaches in dealing with the problems as no two resident districts performed the same.

Evaluation of Data based on the target objective represents the spatial level of compliance to the least observed provision of the building Law among owners of building across the residential district of Calabar Metropolis. This certainly would not admit of straight-jacketed-good for all solutions as Solutions which will generally mitigate the difference in the spatial compliance with building law provisions especially the provision on building approval plan will be vital. This will be imperative in order to enhance the spatial level of compliance with building regulations in Calabar, occasioned by the present level of compliance of building owners with approved plan requirements. Based on the finding, both plan approval and site inspection have a significant effect on compliance with the law in the study area, It is also recommended that before any construction work is commenced, the owner should apply in writing to the authority for official inspection first to ensure there is an approved plan and secondly to ensure building is in line with the approved plan. Failure to do so should also be inserted into the law as an offence punishable by a suspension order of not less than one year. Failure on the part of the authority should also be considered under the law as a breach of duty. For effective implementation of these recommendations, the state government should recruit more staff into the enforcement unit of the Town Planning Department to help brace up with the envisaged challenge of shortage of staff in this area.. As a result, it is recommended that a certificate of site inspection and a clean bill of compliance at the foundation, DPC, windows and roof levels should be part of building documents to be issued by the authority.

A very important measure to use in ensuring compliance with approved plan is to ensure that professionals handle building projects in the study area. In collaboration with the Nigerian Council Calabar Chapter, the Town planning Authority can rise to the occasion by ensuring that buildings have approved plan and that only trained builders should supervise approved buildings. This can be achieved by insisting that approved plan should be accompanied with not less than three registered trained builders, one of whom shall eventually be selected by the developer-owner to supervise the building construction. Owners of buildings who fail to comply with the directive can be penalised by imposing a punitive fine to serve as a deterrent to other developers. The builder council should be made to realize that apart from the fact that it is loss of revenue to their accredited members, it is also loss of credibility to the profession if it lacks the will to enforce best practice in the field. The enforcement unit of the planning department should be saddled with the responsibility of ensuring that the supervision is actually done by one of the named registered builders. This can be achieved by the task force paying a surprise visit to the sites.

The Registered builders are also abscribed their own share of blame. As experts, they owe a duty of care and liability here is normally strict in law. Therefore, On the parts of the registered builders, responsibility for compliance should be placed more strictly on them. So that apart from demolition of buildings, when there is a gross violation, the building supervisor can be penalized also. Depending on the level of violation, the penalty can range from fine, suspension of practice for a certain period to outright withdrawal of license. By these stringent measures the supervisor will not be able to transfer the blame to the owners of the building for not making available, enough funds, or for not supplying standard materials. By this measure also, the supervisor would have been co-opted into quasi-enforcement by being expected to report erring owners of building to the Town Planning Authority. Since the findings also revealed that construction sites that were visited and inspected by the Town Planning Inspectors tended to comply more than those that were not inspected, it is recommended, therefore, that more regular visits to construction sites should be encouraged as it is done with the judiciary officers to enhance effective and speedy dispensation of justice, a system of returns in which cases successfully determined by Judges are recorded or reported as a basis for promotion, should be adopted for enforcement officials of the town planning department. Visits to construction sites at least thrice before completion of buildings should be an additional condition for promotion for officers of the enforcement units. This judgment will apparently serve as an incentive to government site inspectors who should naturally work hard for their promotion.

Very importantly, the job of regular inspection to construction sites should be left in the hands of specialised professionals, to be officially referred to as “site inspectors”. These sites inspectors should be professionals who should be given special oath of office to ensure effective and uncompromising discharge of their duties. And to complement the present work force, more graduates professionals should be employed as site inspectors. If the work of enforcement is to be accorded its deserved importance, Government should vote more funds to enforcement activities. This, the Authority should begin with by ensuring plan approval,

embarking on regular site visits and inspection. By adherence to these prescriptions, it is submitted that compliance with Building plan requirement can be improved across the residential restricts of the study area

References

- [1]. Cross River State Building Law of 1984 as Amended in 1987.
- [2]. Ebong M. O. (1983) The Perrenition Of Residential Quality: A Case Study Calabar, Nigeria. *Third World Planning Review* 5(3).
- [3]. Victor Eyo Offiong. "Geographic Spread of Compliance with The Least observed Provision of Building Law - A Quantitative Investigation, evaluation and Judgment of a Planning Law Practitioner in Calabar Metropolis, Nigeria" *IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology (IOSR-JESTFT)* , vol. 12, no. 1, 2018, pp. 01-09.
- [4].
- [5].

Victor Eyo Offiong "Geographic Spread of Compliance with The Least observed Provision of Building Law - A Quantitative Investigation, evaluation and Judgment of a Planning Law Practitioner in Calabar Metropolis, Nigeria." *IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology (IOSR-JESTFT)* 11.7 (2017): 01-05.