ANALYSIS OF CHANGES IN LANDUSE AND LANDCOVER IN THE SUBURBAN AREAS OF IBADAN, NIGERIA

BY

Olayiwola, A.M.* and Fakayode, O.

Department of Geography, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria Corresponding Author's Email: <u>olaadewale1@gmail.com</u>

ABSTRACT

This study analysed the spatial changes in landuse and landcover in the suburban areas of Ibadan, Nigeria between 1986 and 2017. Data were sourced from the National Population Commission (NPC) and Landsat imageries (Landsat 5 MSS/TM, 1986; Landsat 7 ETM+, 2002; and Landsat 8 OLI/TIRS, 2017). Administrative maps of the area were scanned, georeferenced and digitized in ArcGIS environment. Following Anderson's modified version of supervised classification scheme, the imageries were classified into four landuse/landcover classes: built-up, vegetation, exposed surfaces and water bodies. The changes in landuse/landcover for the area were determined by pixel labelling. The period of change analysis was divided into two epochs; 1986-2002 and 2002-2017. Furthermore, a transition probability matrix of landuse change was developed and utilized for assessing the probabilities of other landuses changing to built-up in Markov chain detection method with Cellular Automata. Results of accuracy assessment indicate good image classification (1986, 99.98%; 2002, 99.62%; 2017, 99.21%). Also, results indicate that in the first epoch of study the greatest loss was from vegetation, while very little portions of water bodies and exposed surfaces were converted to other uses. In the second epoch, much of the exposed surface and vegetation were transformed into built-up, while there was no significant transition in the water bodies. Results indicate a future probability of exposed surface and water bodies changing to built-up as higher than that of vegetation. The study concluded that heterogeneous and haphazard land development in the study area was borne out of uncontrolled urban growth. Thus, the study recommends the need for the town planning authorities to be proactive in their duties in order to forestall imminent dangers of shortage of food supply as well as slum and sprawl formation.

Key words: Landuse/cover changes, Markov chain, Physical expansion, Suburban, Transition probability, Trend analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Urban growth combined with urban sprawl, inadequate infrastructure and land use planning are serious challenges in most developing countries. Nonetheless, the importance of human settlements and sustainability of the inhabitants with regards to environmental conditions and orderly use of the urban land cannot be overlooked. The United Nations (2001) corroborated by Herold et al. (2003) revealed that urban areas cover only 3% of the earth's land surface but over half of the world's population now resides in cities. In recent times, it is observed that most of urban development impulses are located at the urban hinterland widely referred to as suburban,

peri-urban, suburbs, urban fringe, city edge or metropolitan shadow (United States Census Bureau, 2010; Aguda and Adegboyega, 2013). Suburban area is where urban and rural uses of the land are mixed to form a transition zone between city and countryside. It is an area of transition between well recognized urban land uses and the rural area. The process of suburban development is complex; it involves many concerns such as change in landownership pattern, land transfer process, types of development, regulatory measures and their enforcement (Adell, 1999; Aguda and Adegboyega, 2013; Adedire, 2018).

Human concentration in the urban centres has encouraged continuing studies on urban dynamisms (Gude et al., 2006; Ahmed and Ahmed, 2012; Lin et al., 2012). However, settlements change spatio-temporally with varying patterns and diverse drivers (Wilson et al., 2003; Sevenant and Antrop, 2007; Aguilera et al., 2011; Olayiwola et al., 2014). The temporal and spatial dilemmas created by urban dynamics are unending concerns, and so the study of urbanisation is a living issue that requires constant updating (Ahsan and Islam, 1999). Therefore, literature abounds on urbanisation and expansion of human settlements. The existing literature explored the extent of development, historical antecedents, spatial distribution and organisation, the causal factors and urbanisation problems (Onokerhoraye and Omuta, 1994; Herold, et al., 2003; Adegboyega and Aguda, 2010).

It has also been noted that certain differences do occur in the factors influencing the growth and development of human settlements (Liu et al., 2010). Furthermore, various scholars have identified different patterns of settlement growth (Mabogunje, 1968; Johnson, 1994; Liu et al., 2010). Also, there are abundant studies on changes in settlements' landscape for alternative human settlement patterns. In this regard, the contributions of digital representation to advancement in spatial representational research have been greatly emphasized (Deng et al., 2009; Dewan and Yamaguchi, 2009; Wang et al., 2011; Yin et al., 2011). Akin to the analysis of settlements' spatial patterns is the location of settlements which is determined by a wide range of factors (Oyeleye, 2001; Abolade, 2007; Luck, 2007; Robinson et al., 2012).

The pattern of settlement growth is a unique characteristic of spatial changes that take place in the settlement's built-up areas (Aguilera et al., 2011). Thus, analysis of urban landuse/cover changes; especially the spatiotemporal pattern of urban growth, becomes crucial. Analysing the growth pattern of settlements at different time-scales can be used for effective planning of landuse for maximum utilisation of the land resources (Bhatta, 2010; Liu et al., 2010). In addition, investigating landuse/landcover changes is required in formulating sound viable urban development policies that can lessen the adversative impacts of urbanization and ensure sustainable human settlement development. Also, it enables the understanding of the size and speed of landuse change across various time intervals (Arsanjani et al., 2012; Hettiarachchi et al., 2014). However, inadequate data on spatial growth can limit the process of urban and regional planning and development management (Cheng, 2003; Omwenga, 2010; Estoque and Murayama, 2015; Katyambo et al., 2017).

Several methods and techniques have been developed and applied to quantify and characterize settlement growth processes and patterns, for example visual interpretations of high-resolution aerial photographs. In addition, the advent of land-change science, particularly advances in GIS and remote sensing such as Markov chain analysis, trend analysis and transition probability, have provided platforms to scrutinise landscape transformations across space and time (John and

Xiuping, 2006; Lillesand and Kiefer, 2008; Arsanjani et al., 2013; Estoque and Murayama, 2015). These processes are dynamic simulation-based and statistical-estimation models used to capture the spatio-temporal pattern of urban change through the incorporation of spatial interaction effect in to the analysis of modelling landuse and landcover change (Hu and Lo, 2007). Advancement in and availability of high resolution remote sensing imagery have not only stimulated accurate mapping of urban environments but have also enthused periodic monitoring of urban growth (Mark, 2007; Guindon and Zhang, 2009; Bagan and Yamagata, 2014; Shyamantha et al., 2016).

Ibadan suburb is a contiguous area consisting of many settlements of various sizes which are arranged into six Local Government Areas (LGAs). While some studies have been conducted in the suburban area of Ibadan (Fabiyi, 2006; Agbor et al., 2012; Adebola et al. 2015), less attention is paid to the details of the dynamics of settlements growth to understand their growth pattern. In addition, though there are several studies on each of the LGAs or individual settlements in Ibadan suburb but there is no known published study that incorporates all or, at least, a combination of few of these LGAs or settlements. Furthermore, most of the previous studies relied on just simple change detection techniques which yielded a single estimate of spatial growth between two dates. This does not help much in understanding how and why the growth might have taken place. In addition, this study combined spatio-temporal analysis of landuse/landcover with Markov change detection and Cellular Automata (CA) to examine the variations in the pattern and magnitude of growth in the study area. Therefore, the study analysed the spatial changes in landuse and landcover in the suburban areas of Ibadan between 1986 and 2017 with the view to assessing the growth pattern of the selected section in the suburban areas of Ibadan, Nigeria.

THE STUDY AREA

The study was conducted in selected suburban areas of Ibadan, Nigeria. Ibadan, the capital city of Oyo State, is located in the South-eastern part of Oyo State, Nigeria (Mabogunje, 1968; Fabiyi, 2006). It consists of eleven Local Government Areas (LGAs); five of which constitute the municipal and the remaining six LGAs form the suburb. Based on their proximity of location, three of the six suburban LGAs were selected for this study, these are: Akinyele, Lagelu and Egbeda LGAs (Figure 1). The study area is located between Latitudes 7° 18'N to 7° 42'N; and Longitudes 3° 45'E to 4° 12'E. The National Population Commission of Nigeria (NPC, 2006) revealed that the study area contained 643,587 people spread over a total land area of about 969.08km² (Table 1). The study area consists of Yorubas and other tribes from different parts of the country (Fabiyi, 2006).

The study area falls within the tropical climate characterised by wet season (March to October) and dry season (November to February). While the mean annual rainfall is about 1,260mm, the mean annual temperature is 26.6°C (Oguntoyinbo, 1994; Oyadiran, 2010). Much of the area is covered by pre-Cambrian igneous and sedimentary rocks. The major soil type is the ferruginous tropical soils (Agboola, 1979; Bankole and Bakare, 2011). In effect of these attributes coupled with intense human activities, the natural vegetation is derived forest (Toyobo et al., 2011). Major economic activities in the study area include farming, trading, public service employment and transport. Though, there are very few modern manufacturing industries in the area, but there are many local craft industries using local materials to produce highly sophisticated items such as

farming tools, pottery, woodcarving and blacksmithing. Also, there are sporadic occurrence of calabash carving, textile weaving, dyeing, glass and brass works in the area (Fabiyi, 2006; Bankole and Bakare, 2011; Adelekan et al., 2014).



Figure 1: The Study Area: (a) Nigeria (b) Oyo State (c) Study Area Source: Oyo State Ministry of Lands

| S/N | LGA | Headquarters | Land Area* | Population | | |
|-----|----------|--------------|----------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|
| | | | (km ²) | 1991 ** | 2006** | 2017*** |
| 1. | Akinyele | Moniya | 514.05 | 140,118 | 211,811 | 294,622 |
| 2. | Egbeda | Egbeda | 188.33 | 129,461 | 283,643 | 394,538 |
| 3. | Lagelu | Iyana-Offa | 266.70 | 68,901 | 148,133 | 206,048 |
| | _ | Total | 969.08 | 338,480 | 643,587 | 895,208 |

Table 1: Size of the Study Area

Sources: * Town Planning Departments of Akinyele, Egbeda and Lagelu LGAs

** National population Commission of Nigeria (NPC, 1991; 2006)

*** Projection at 3% annual growth rate (NPC, 2017)

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Population data were used to calculate the consumption rate and landuse coefficients of the study area; and Landsat imageries were used to analyse the spatial extent and rate of urban growth. In addition, Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver was used to obtain geographic coordinates of relevant landmarks for ground validations (Table 2).

Data **Spatial** Acquisition Path Row Source Resolution Years Administrative Maps NA 2014 NA NA Oyo State Ministry of Lands Landsat 5 MSS/TM 30m 1986 191 55 http://glcf.umiacs.umd.edu Landsat 7 ETM+ 28.5m 2002 191 55 http://glcf.umiacs.umd.edu **GLOVIS** Landsat 8 OLI/TIRS 28.5m 2017 191 55 **Population Data** NA 1991: 2006 NA NA National Population Commission, Ibadan

Table 2: Types and Sources of Data

Hardcopies of the administrative maps of the selected LGAs were scanned, georeferenced and digitized to make them available for further analysis within GIS software environment. However, all the imageries used were already geo-referenced and geometrically corrected, thus, they were just projected. The portion covered by the study area was extracted using clip tool in ArcGIS 10.5. Also, visual interpretability of the imagery was improved through imagery enhancement, contrast stretching and false colour composites. Furthermore, the imageries were classified into landuse/landcover classes following Anderson (1971) modified version of supervised classification scheme. Moreover, accuracy assessment was conducted to ensure the level of accuracy and quality of the classification exercise (Foody, 2002; Herold et al., 2003; Hai and Yamaguchi, 2008; Lillesand and Kiefer, 2008). Accuracy of the classification was assessed using 100 randomly sampled ground truth points.

The changes in landuse/landcover for the area were determined by pixel labelling of Landsat imageries. Therefore, the Landsat imageries were classified into four feature classes, namely: built-up area, vegetation, exposed surfaces and water bodies using maximum likelihood classification algorithm supervised classification technique (Table 3). The built-up area class which characterizes the settlement areas were carved out from the classified imageries and

mapped to display the nature of changes in 1986, 2002 and 2017 (Herold et al., 2003; Hai & Yamaguchi, 2008).

| S/N | Classes | Land use/cover | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. | Built-up Area | Residential, commercial and services, transportation, communications, utilities, industrial and commercial areas | | | | | |
| 2. | Vegetation | Farmland, plantation, natural vegetation and all other green spaces | | | | | |
| 3. | Exposed surface | Sandy areas, bare/exposed rock, earth surfaced roads, transitional areas and all non-green open spaces. | | | | | |
| 4. | Water Bodies | Rivers, streams, lakes, and reservoirs. | | | | | |
| ~ | | | | | | | |

Table 3: Classification of Landuse/cover in the Suburban Area of Ibadan

Source: Adapted after Anderson (1971)

Due to data availability, the period of change analysis was divided into two epochs; first and second epochs. While the first epoch spanned over sixteen years (1986-2002), the second epoch covered a period of fifteen years (2002-2017). Nonetheless, the difference of one year between the spanning periods of the two epochs is not expected to have significant effect on the results of the study. The resulting landcover maps were compared and areas that were not classified as the same at different times were regarded as changed areas (Veldkamp and Lambin, 2001; Yang and Lo, 2002; Allen and Lu, 2003; Hu and Lo, 2007; Alphan et al., 2009). Furthermore, a transition probability matrix of landuse change was developed and utilized in a Markov chain detection method. However, Agbor et al. (2012) corroborated by Bayes (2013) noted that the transition probability may be accurate on a per category basis, but may be inadequate in analysing spatial distribution of occurrences within each landuse category. Therefore, to overcome this lapse, the present study complemented the analysis with Cellular Automata (CA).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Image Classification and Accuracy Assessment

The overall accuracies of the classification for 1986, 2002 and 2017 are 99.98%, 99.62% and 99.21%, respectively (Table 4). These values indicate that there were high significant agreements between reference points and the extracted classes. Herold et al. (2005) considered accuracy assessment level of, or above 85% as a good result for remote sensing image based analysis. Thus, accuracy assessment values of the imageries used in this study indicate good image classification.

| Class Name | 1986 | 2002 | 2017 | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|--|
| | Pa; <i>Ua</i> | Pa; Ua | Pa; Ua | |
| Built-up | 100.00; 100.00 | 100.00; 95.36 | 99.80; 99.49 | |
| Vegetation | 100.00; 100.00 | 99.71; 99.96 | 98.93; 100.00 | |
| Exposed Surfaces | 99.30; 98.87 | 97.35; 94.99 | 100.00; 48.96 | |
| Water bodies | 96.58; 97.50 | 94.01; 100.00 | 100.00; 100.00 | |
| Kappa Statistics (\mathcal{K}) | 0.9972 | 0.9748 | 0.9829 | |
| Overall Accuracy | 99.98% | 99.62% | 99.21% | |
| | | | | |

 Table 4: Image Classification Accuracy Assessment

Sources: Landsat TM, 1986; ETM+, 2002 and OLI/TIRS, 2017 (Path 191 Row 55)

Physical Changes in the Suburban Areas of Ibadan

Table 5 shows the distribution pattern of landuse/landcover of the study area. Throughout the study period, vegetation occupied the highest portion of the area (78.89% in 1986; 74.84% in 2002; and 49.63% in 2017). Exposed surfaces recorded a dwindling coverage at 12.16% in 1986, 12.28% in 2002 and 24.87% in 2017. Also, the built-up area occupied 8.82% of the area in 1986, 12.71% in 2002 and 25.30% in 2017. The total built-up area in 1986, 2002 and 2017 were 85.484km², 123.173km² and 245.099km², respectively (Table 5). Water bodies covered the least area of 0.13% in 1986, 0.17% in 2002 and 0.20% in 2017.

| LULC | 1986 | | 2002 | | 2017 | | |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|--|
| | Area (km ²) | % | Area (km ²) | % | Area (km ²) | % | |
| Built up | 85.484 | 8.82 | 123.173 | 12.71 | 245.099 | 25.30 | |
| Vegetation | 764.485 | 78.89 | 725.210 | 74.84 | 480.910 | 49.63 | |
| Exposed Surfaces | 117.815 | 12.16 | 119.092 | 12.28 | 241.101 | 24.87 | |
| Water bodies | 1.299 | 0.13 | 1.608 | 0.17 | 1.973 | 0.20 | |
| Total | 969.083 | 100 | 969.083 | 100 | 969.083 | 100 | |

Table 5: Summary of Landuse/Landcover Statistics for 1986, 2002 and 2017

Sources: Landsat TM, 1986; ETM+, 2002 and OLI/TIRS, 2017 (Path 191 Row 55)

These results confirmed certain assertions in the literature that suburban areas of large metropolis exhibit significant levels of land use change (Arsanjani et al., 2013; Adedire, 2018). A comparison of the results obtained from the computed output for the 31 years indicates an overall increase in the built-up areas (1986, 2002 and 2017 were 85.484km², 123.173km² and 245.099km²). However, it should be noted that urbanisation of the low density areas and along the urban-rural interface entails simultaneous processes of land conversion from natural landscape to human development, and increased population (Bhatta, 2010; Bankole and Bakare, 2011; Aguda and Adegboyega, 2013; Katyambo and Ngigi, 2017). Therefore, persistent increase

in the built-up areas might be due to the increase in population within this period thereby leading to competition for space and huge encroachment into available lands for accommodation and economic activities. Over the years, the expansion increased outwardly from the metropolis to the hinterland taking over vegetation area and part of the exposed surfaces. On the whole, the expansion trends specify that the area is losing vegetation to development activities. These expansion trends could adversely affect the eco-environment of Ibadan suburban if not controlled.



Figure 2: Landuse/landcover of the Study Area: (a) 1986 (b) 2002 (c) 2017 Sources: Landsat Imageries (Path 191 Row 55): TM 1986; ETM+ 2002; OLI/TRI 2017

In most of the previous studies relating to landuse and landcover changes, the general pattern has been that the conversion of natural landcover to other uses will continuously lead to losses in the extent of natural landscapes (Fabiyi, 2006; Abolade, 2007; Adegboyega and Aguda, 2010; Ahmed and Ahmed, 2012; Olayiwola et al., 2014; Estoque and Murayama, 2015). The present study indicated that intense human activities could alter the rate and magnitude of land uses. This study showed declines in vegetated area and dwindling changes in water bodies due to channelization of water ways and rehabilitation of dams within the study area. Also, there were

small gains in exposed surfaces (12.16% in 1986, 12.28% in 2002 and 24.87% in 2017). This may not be unconnected with clearing of the natural vegetal covers to give room for farming.

Figure 2 shows that the expansion increased outwardly from the metropolis to the hinterland taking over vegetation area and part of the exposed surfaces. There is significant loss in the portions of vegetation to built-up areas and exposed surfaces (Figure 2).

Changes in Landuse/Landcover in the Study Area

Table 6 shows that the probabilities of changes in the landuse/landcover indicate that between 1986 and 2002, the probability of vegetation changing to built-up was 0.0748 (7.48%). Also, the probability of exposed surface changing to built-up between 1986 and 2002 was 0.2638 (26.38%). Table 6 shows further that between 2002 and 2017, the probabilities of other landuses changing to built-up area were: vegetation (0.1089; 10.89%); water (0.1250; 12.5%); and exposed surfaces (0.4425; 44.25%). At both epochs of analysis, exposed surfaces had the highest probability of changing to built-up.

| Table 0. Transition Trobability, 1960 to 2017 | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--------|------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|
| Class Name | Built-up | | Vegetation | | Water | | Exposed | |
| | | | | | | | Sur | face |
| | 1986 | 2002 | 1986 | 2002 | 1986 | 2002 | 1986 | 2002 |
| | to | to | to | to | to | to | to | to |
| | 2002 | 2017 | 2002 | 2017 | 2002 | 2017 | 2002 | 2017 |
| Built-up | 0.7149 | 0.9133 | 0.0718 | 0.0096 | 0.0006 | 0.0000 | 0.2127 | 0.0770 |
| Vegetation | 0.0748 | 0.1089 | 0.8423 | 0.6482 | 0.0003 | 0.0003 | 0.0827 | 0.2427 |
| Water | 0.1355 | 0.1250 | 0.0961 | 0.0000 | 0.6504 | 0.8750 | 0.1180 | 0.0000 |
| Exposed Surface | 0.2638 | 0.4425 | 0.3790 | 0.0505 | 0.0061 | 0.0017 | 0.3511 | 0.5052 |
| Sources: Lands | Sources: Landsat TM, 1986; ETM+, 2002 and OLI/TIRS, 2017 (Path 191 Row 55) | | | | | | | |

Table 6: Transition Probability, 1986 to 2017

Table 7 shows that whereas much of the exposed surface was later transformed into built-up in the second epoch of the study; there was no significant transition in the water bodies. Also, vegetation transitioned to built-up area by 30.65km² between 1986 and 2002 and 77.39km² between 2002 and 2017. On the whole, the spatial changes within the study area show significant landscape transitions during the study period.

| Fable 7: | Landuse / | / Landcover | Transition | for Built-u | p Class (in km ²) | |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | |

| S/N | 1986-2002 | 2002-2017 | Legend |
|-----|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| 1. | 30.65 | 77.39 | Vegetation to built-up |
| 2. | 22.35 | 52.30 | Exposed surface to built-up |
| 3. | 0.10 | 0.16 | Water bodies to built-up |

Sources: Landsat TM, 1986; ETM+, 2002 and OLI/TIRS, 2017 (Path 191 Row 55)

Table 8 shows the percentage gains of the built-up class and losses for other landuses in the study area between 1986 and 2017. In the first epoch, the built-up area gained 38.33% in addition to the existing area covered before 1986; other landuses and landcover lost 11.11% within the period. This may not be unconnected with one of the major human occupation in the study area whereby the natural vegetal covers were cleared to give room for farming. Also, the gain was as a result of clearing the water ways and rehabilitation of dams within the study area. However, 50.57% of the total land area remained persistent in use (Figure 3). In the second epoch, the percentage gain of the built-up area was 51.33% as against 38.33% gained in the previous epoch. While the other landuse classes lost only 3.2% in this period, there was retrogression in the persistent land uses. Therefore, the incremental percentage change in the built-up area was gained from the losses of the persistent land uses.

| Table 6. Tercentage Gams and Losses of Landuses/Landcovers | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|------|--------------------------|------|------|--|--|
| Changes | 1986 to 2002 2002 | | 1986 to 2002 2002 to 201 | | 2017 | | |
| | km ² | % | km ² | % | | | |
| Gains (by the built-up class) | 53.1027 | 38.3 | 129.8664 | 51.3 | | | |
| Losses (of other landuses) | 15.3882 | 11.1 | 8.0487 | 3.2 | | | |
| Persistence | 70.0623 | 50.6 | 115.1109 | 45.5 | | | |

Table 8: Percentage Cains and Lesses of Landusos/Landcovers

Sources: Landsat TM, 1986; ETM+, 2002 and OLI/TIRS, 2017 (Path 191 Row 55)



Figure 3: Gain and losses of LULC between: (a) 1986 and 2002 (b) 2002 and 2017 Sources: Landsat TM, 1986; ETM+, 2002 and OLI/TIRS, 2017 (Path 191 Row 55)

Most landuse change models do not create spatially explicit predictions of urban growth. However, such dynamic models as Markov change detection and Cellular Automata (CA) provide abilities to simulate possible urban growth under various planning and management situations. Therefore, whereas many of the previous studies used simple change detection method to estimate spatial growth between two dates, this study explored the usefulness of Markov change detection and Cellular Automata (CA) to examine the variations in the pattern and magnitude of growth in the study area. This produced probabilities of the transition patterns of land uses in the suburban area of Ibadan. Results indicate that probability of exposed surface changing to built-up is higher than probability of vegetation changing to built-up. Also, the probability of water body changing to built-up depicts that with time part of the water body might be converted to built-up class. In a similar case study in Ibadan Northwest Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria, Adebola et al. (2015) found that maximum change

occurred from wetland to bare surfaces and minimum change from thick vegetation to water body. Also, they observed that the built up area is the most consistent land cover type because it has the highest probability value. This contradiction could be as a result of differences in the study locations; the study of Adebola et al. (2015) was conducted in the core area of Ibadan with thicker population and more buildings than the present study area.

CONCLUSION

This study presented a remote sensing approach that allowed a separation of landuse categories and descriptions of its temporal changes. The spatiotemporal analyses of the growth pattern in the suburban area of Ibadan showed that the area is rapidly urbanising which could be as a result of ever increasing population. In effect, large proportions of vegetation and other landuses have been transformed to built-up areas at both epochs of the study. However, urban growth was rather uncontrolled resulting in heterogeneous and haphazard land development. This may pose serious threats to the inhabitants especially creating water shortages and development of squatters which may lead to the formation of slums and sprawls. In addition, the productive agricultural lands are being threatened, particularly around the fringes of the built-up areas.

From the foregoing, it is recommended that government should be sensitized to utilize the capabilities of Remote Sensing and Geographic Information Systems in policy and decision making relating to landuse and landcover changes. By so doing, the planning authority will be able to carry out regular urban audit on landuse changes which can be used to determine the trend and direction of development. In addition, the study recommends the need for the town planning authorities to be proactive in their duties in order to forestall imminent dangers of shortage of food supply as well as slum and sprawl formation. Also, the town planning authorities should be proactive and stop approving building plans without proper assessment of the areas intended to be developed. This will help in mitigating haphazard growth of the study area. Also, it will serve as a check to the complex implications of with urban growth problems like urban food crisis, poor accessibility, sprawl development at the fringe and other environmental problems that may be imminent.

REFERENCES

- Abolade, O. (2007). The Pattern, Direction and Factors Responsible for Urban Growth in a Developing African City. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 22(3), 221-226.
- Adebola, A.O., Adegboyega, S.A.A., Olajuyigbe, A.E. and Oladejo, S.O. (2015). Modelling of land use and land cover change in Ibadan North-West local government area (LGA), Nigeria using satellite imageries and GIS techniques. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 17(7), 138-166.
- Adedire, F.M. (2018). Peri-urban Expansion in Ikorodu, Lagos: Extent, Causes, Effects, and Policy Response. *Urban Forum*, 29(3), 259-275.
- Adegboyega, S.A. and Aguda, A.S. (2010). Spatio-temporal analysis of urban sprawl in a fringe area around Ibadan, Southern Nigeria. *IRPG*, 19(1), 132-154.

- Adelekan, I., Olajide-Taiwo, L., Ayorinde, A.M., Ajayi, D. and Babajide, S. (2014). *Building Urban Resilience: Assessing Urban and Peri-urban Agriculture in Ibadan, Nigeria.* United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya.
- Adell, G. (1999). *Theories and models of the peri-urban interface: a changing conceptual landscape*. Development Planning Unit, University College London, UK.
- Agboola, M.O.K. (1979). Field spray of Fungicides for the control of phytophthora pod Rot. *Annual Report*, Ibadan, Nigeria: Cocoa Research institute of Nigeria, 74-77.
- Agbor, C. F., Aigbokhan, O. J., Osudiala, C. S. and Malizu, L. (2012). Land use land cover change prediction of Ibadan metropolis. *J. of Forestry and Environment*, 9, 1-13
- Aguda, A.S. and Adegboyega, S.A. (2013). Evaluation of Spatio-Temporal Dynamics of Urban Sprawl in Osogbo, Nigeria using Satellite Imagery and GIS Techniques. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Research*, 60-73.
- Aguilera, F., Valenzuela, L.M. and Botequilha-Leitao, A. (2011). Landscape metrics in the analysis of urban land use patterns: A case study in a Spanish metropolitan area. *Urban Planning*, 99, 226–238.
- Ahmed, B. and Ahmed, R. (2012). Modelling urban land cover growth dynamics using multitemporal satellite images: A case study of Dhaka, Bangladesh. ISPRS *Int. J. Geo-Inf.*, 1, 3–31.
- Ahsan, M.R. and Islam, N. (Ed.) (1999). Urban Bangladesh: Geographical Studies, Urban Studies Programme Series No 06, 1-6, Dept. of Geography, University of Dhaka.
- Allen, J., and Lu, K. (2003). Modeling and Prediction of Future Urban Growth in the Charleston Region of South Carolina: a GIS-based Integrated Approach. Conservation Ecology, 8(2), 2.
- Alphan, H., Doygun, H., and Unlukaplan, Y. (2009). Post-classification comparison of land covers using multitemporal Landsat and ASTER imagery: the case of Kahramanmaraş, Turkey. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 151(1-4), 327-336.
- Altman, D. G. (1998). Categorizing continuous variables. In: Armitage, P. and Colton, T. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Biostatistics*, 1. Wiley, Chichester.
- Anderson, J.R. (1971). Land use classification schemes used in selected recent geographic applications of remote sensing. *Photogramm. Eng.*, 37(4), 379-387.
- Arsanjani, J.J., Helbich, M. and de Noronha, V.E. (2013) Spatiotemporal simulation of urban growth patterns using agent-based modeling: The case of Tehran. *Cities*, 32, 33-42

- Arsanjani, J.J., Helbich, M., Kainz, W. and Boloorani, A.D. (2012). Integration of logistic regression, Markov chain and cellular automata models to simulate urban expansion. *Int. J. Appl. Earth Obs. Geoinf.* 21, 265–275
- Bagan, H., and Yamagata, Y. (2014). Land-cover change analysis in 50 global cities by using a combination of Landsat data and analysis of grid cells. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 9, 1–13
- Bankole, M.O. and Bakare, H.O. (2011). Dynamics of urban land use changes with remote sensing: Case of Ibadan, Nigeria. *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*, 4(11), 632-643.
- Bayes, A., Kamruzzaman, M.D., Xuan, Z., Shahinoor R. and Keechoo, C. (2013). Simulating Land Cover Changes and Their Impacts on Land Surface Temperature in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *Remote Sens.*, 5, 5969-5998.
- Bhatta, B. (2010). Analysis of Urban Growth and Sprawl from Remote Sensing Data. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- Cheng, J. (2003). *Modelling Spatial and Temporal Urban Growth*. Febodruk BV, The Netherlands.
- Deng, J. S., Wang, K., Hong, Y., and Qi, J. G. (2009). Spatio-temporal dynamics and evolution of land use change and landscape pattern in response to rapid urbanization. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 92(3–4), 187-198.
- Dewan, A. M. and Yamaguchi, Y. (2009). Land use and land cover change in Greater Dhaka, Bangladesh: Using remote sensing to promote sustainable urbanization. *Applied Geography*, 29, 390–401.
- Estoque, R.C. and Murayama, Y. (2015) Intensity and spatial pattern of urban land changes in the megacities of Southeast Asia. *Land Use Policy*, 48, 213–222.
- Fabiyi, O. (2006). Urban Land Use Change Analysis of a Traditional City from Remote Sensing Data: The Case of Ibadan Metropolitan Area, Nigeria. *Humanity & Social Sciences Journal*, 1(1), 42-64.
- Foody, G.M. (2002). Status of land cover classification accuracy assessment. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 80(1), 185-201.
- Gude, P.H., Hansen, A.J., Rasker, R. and Maxwell, B. (2006). Rates and drivers of rural residential development in the Greater Yellowstone. *Landscape Urban Planning*, 77, 131–151.
- Guindon, B. and Zhang, Y. (2009). Automated Urban Delineation from Landsat Imagery based on Spatial Information Processing. *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing*, 75(7), 845-858.

- Hai, M.P. and Yamaguchi, Y. (2011). Urban growth and change analysis using remote sensing and spatial metrics from 1975 to 2003 for Hanoi, Vietnam. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 32(7), 1901-1915.
- Herold, M., Couclelis, H., and Clarke, K. (2005). The role of spatial metrics in the analysis and modeling of urban land use change. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 29(4), 369–399.
- Herold, M., Goldstein, N.C., and Clarke, K.C. (2003). The spatiotemporal form of urban growth: measurement, analysis and modeling. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 86(3), 286-302.
- Hettiarachchi, M., Morrison, T.H., Wickramsinghe, D., Mapa, R., de Alwis, A. and McAlpine, C.A. (2014). The eco-social transformation of urban wetlands: A case study of Colombo, Sri Lanka. *Landscape Urban Plan*, 132, 55–68.
- Hu, Z., and Lo, C.P. (2007). Modeling urban growth in Atlanta using logistic regression. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 31(6), 667-688.
- John, A.R. and Xiuping, J. (2006). *Remote Sensing Digital Image Analysis*. Springer Nature, Switzerland.
- Johnson, K. (1994). Segment Based Land Use Classification from Spot Satellite Data. *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing*, 60(1), 47-53.
- Katyambo, M.M. and Ngigi, M.M. (2017). Monitoring of urban growth using GIS and remote sensing: A case study of Nairobi metropolitan area, Kenya. *American Journal of Geographic Information System*, 6(2), 64-82.
- Lillesand, T.M. and Kiefer, R. (2008). *Remote Sensing Image Interpretation*. John Wiley, New York.
- Lin, Y.P., Hong, N.M., Chiang, L.C., Liu, Y.L. and Chu, H.J. (2012). Adaptation of land-use demands to the impact of climate change on the hydrological processes of an urbanized watershed. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 9, 4083–4102.
- Liu, J., Zhang, Z., Xu, X., Kuangwenhui, Z.W., Zhang, S., Li, R., Yan, C., Yu, D., Wu, S., and Jiang, N. (2010). Spatial patterns and driving forces of land use change in China during the early 21st century. China: National Basic Research Program of China.
- Liu, X., Li, X., Chen, Y., Tan, Z., Li, S. and Ai, B. (2010). A new landscape index for quantifying urban expansion using multitemporal remotely sensed data. *Landscape Eco.*, 25(5), 671-682.
- Luck, G.W. (2007). The relationships between net primary productivity, human population density and species conservation. *J. of Biogeography*, 34, 201–212.

Mabogunje, A.L. (1968). Urbanization in Nigeria. University of London Press, London.

- Mark, A. (2007). Mapping as a tool for planning and coordination in humanitarian operations. *Humanitarian Practice Network*, 36, 29-35.
- Oguntoyinbo, J.S. (1994). *Climatic Characteristic of Ibadan in Ibadan Region*. First Edition. Department of Geography, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Olayiwola, A.M., Ajala, O.A. and Sangodipe, J.A. (2014) Physical Growth Pattern of Settlements in a Traditional Region, Southwest Nigeria. *International Journal of Geosciences*, 5, 1345-1360.
- Omwenga, M. (2010). Nairobi Emerging Metropolitan Region: Development Planning and Management Opportunities and Challenges. Nairobi Metropolitan Region, 46th ISOCARP Congress, 2010.
- Onokerhoraye, A.G. and Omuta, G.E.D. (1994). Urban Systems and Planning, for Africa. Benin City, Nigeria: Editorial Committee, Geography and Planning Series, University of Benin.
- Oyadiran, O. (2010). Landuse Landcover Change in Traditional Urban Settlement: A case Study of Ibadan Metropolis, Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Birkbeck, University of London
- Oyeleye, D.A. (2001). Settlement Geography. University of Lagos Press, Nigeria.
- Robinson, D., Murray-Rust, D., Rieser, V., Milicic, V. and Rounsevell, M. (2012). Modelling the impacts of land system dynamics on human well-being: Using an agent-based approach to cope with data limitations in Koper, Slovenia.Comput. *Environ. Urban. Syst.* 36, 164–176.
- Sevenant, M. and Antrop, M. (2007). Settlement Models, Land Use and Visibility in Rural Landscapes: Two case studies in Greece. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 80(4), 362–374.
- Shyamantha, S., Ronald, C.E. and Yuji, M. (2016). Spatiotemporal Analysis of Urban Growth Using GIS and Remote Sensing: A Case Study of the Colombo Metropolitan Area, Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Geo-Information*, 5(11), 1-19.
- Toyobo A.E., Muili A.B. and Adetunji M.A. (2011). The Relevance of Infrastructural Facilities to Rural Housing Development in Lagelu Local Government, Oyo State, Nigeria. *International NGO Journal*, 9(3), 29-34.
- United Nations (2001). *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2000 Revision*. New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs/Population Division.

- Veldkamp, A. and Lambin, E.F (2001). Editorial: Predicting land-use change. Agriculture, *Ecosystems and Environment*, 85(1-3), 1-6.
- Wang, L.X., Jiang, F. and Liu, Z (2011). Spatiotemporal Difference Analysis in Land Use Change Using RS and Landscape Indices. *Energy Procedia*, 13, 3898-3904.
- Wilson, E.H., Hurd, J.D., Civco, D.L., Prisloe, S. and Arnold, C. (2003). Development of a geospatial model to quantify, describe and map urban growth. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 86(3), 275–285.
- Yang, X. and Lo, C.P. (2002). Using a time series of satellite imagery to detect land use and land cover changes in the Atlanta, Georgia metropolitan area. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 23(9), 1775-1798.
- Yin, J., Yin, Z., Zhong, H., Xu, S., Hu, X., Wang, J., Wu, J., (2011). Monitoring urban expansion and land use/land cover changes of Shanghai metropolitan area during the transitional economy (1979-2009) in China. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 177(1-4), 609-621.