

Normative Criticism of the Implementation of Law No. 26 of 2007 Concerning Spatial Planning in Ensuring Legal Certainty of Land Rights

Johamran Pransisto

johamranprasisto@gmail.com

Faculty of Law, Andi Sapada Institute of Social Science
and Business, Indonesia

Article Info

Received: 2024-12-12

Revised: 2025-02-21

Accepted: 2025-06-31

Keywords:

Legal Certainty;

Spatial planning;

Land Rights;

Abstract

This study aims to rigorously analyze the application of Law No. 26 of 2007 on Spatial Planning in ensuring legal certainty for land rights in Indonesia. This study employs normative legal research methodologies, using both a legislative and a conceptual approach, concentrating on the investigation of positive legal norms and the disharmony between the Spatial Planning Law and the Basic Agrarian Law (UUPA). The study's findings indicate that the enactment of Law No. 26 of 2007 continues to exhibit several normative deficiencies, including the lack of alignment between the regional spatial plan (RTRW) and the land administration system, the absence of a compensation mechanism for spatial restrictions, and inadequate sanctions for officials who contravene spatial planning regulations. The lack of connection between geographical data and land data further intensifies legal ambiguity for rightful proprietors. This study's conclusion underscores the need to amend the Spatial Planning Law to enhance legal certainty, safeguard residents' civil rights to land, and ensure equitable, transparent, and responsible spatial planning.

I. Introduction

Law Number 26 of 2007 about Spatial Planning serves as a national legislative framework to achieve an organized, sustainable, and equitable spatial environment. This legislation seeks to govern the use of terrestrial, maritime, and aerial spaces in alignment with ecological functions and national development requirements. (Putri dkk., 2023). Within the realm of agrarian law, this legislation is significant since space is intrinsically linked to land, which serves as a legal entity associated with it. Consequently, the geographical configuration should ideally align with the assurance of legal clarity about persons' civil rights, particularly land rights. (D. A. Bakung dkk., 2022).

The enforcement of the Spatial Planning Law often generates conflicts between spatial planning and individual rights to legally registered property. The misalignment between the regional spatial plan (RTRW) and land data in the national land registration system often results in agricultural conflicts, investment uncertainty, and legal issues that culminate in the annulment of land rights certificates. This indicates that although Law No. 26 of 2007 ostensibly advocates for organized spatial management and serves the public interest, it does not adequately provide legal clarity about land rights, particularly for those possessing official ownership documentation.

Significant issues emerge when the governmental spatial plan is not accompanied by information transparency, public engagement, or precise and timely updates to the land information system. (D. A. H. Bakung dkk., 2022). Numerous instances demonstrate that individuals become aware of their property's inclusion in restricted zones, such as green spaces, protected regions, or riverfronts, only after their application for a permission or rights registration is denied by the land authority. Previously, the land had been owned, sold, or developed in compliance with the relevant licenses at that time. This contradiction signifies inadequate inter-sector cooperation between central and regional governments, along with the failure to execute the notion of integrating spatial planning with the land administration system.

Conversely, Articles 14 and 15 of Law No. 26 of 2007 provide that spatial use must align with the spatial plan, and the government is required to regulate its consumption. In several instances, the government perpetrates breaches of spatial planning by granting development licenses that contradict the established Regional Spatial Plan. This indicates a divergence in the application of standards and principles of effective governance in spatial management. (Sugiarto, 2017). Government violations of spatial planning, at both central and regional levels, establish a detrimental precedent for law enforcement in the land sector and undermine the credibility of state law in providing legal certainty.

Moreover, regarding the safeguarding of land rights, Article 18, paragraph (1) of Law No. 26 of 2007 stipulates that individuals may get compensation if their land rights are restricted as outlined in the spatial plan. In reality, the compensation clause lacks an operational and detailed structure, including compensation formulae, submission processes, and impartial entities designated to evaluate losses. (Languju, 2021). Consequently, landowners impacted by spatial constraints incur financial losses and

forfeit their legal means to protect their rights. The deficiency of derived norms emerges here, obstructing the application of substantive justice in spatial control.

Normative critique must also address the absence of assurance on the alignment between the Spatial Planning Law and the Basic Agrarian Law of 1960, together with its derivative laws, including Government Regulation No. 24 of 1997 on Land Registration. The Spatial Planning Act lacks a mechanism for harmonization or dispute settlement when a spatial plan contradicts an existing land rights certificate. (M.H & M.H, 2023). In some instances, certified property is classified as unsuitable for designation, hence obstructing the procurement of derivative rights such as building use rights, IMB, or functional conversion. This engenders systemic legal ambiguity that may infringe upon the norms of due process and the safeguarding of people's property rights as enshrined in Article 28H of the 1945 Constitution of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia.

The occurrence of institutional duality between the Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency and local governments in regulating spatial use is a fundamental issue. The lack of a unified digital system that consolidates spatial planning data and land parcel maps results in overlapping jurisdictions and diminished credibility of legal information for the public and investors. (Wahid dkk., 2015). In the age of information technology and governmental openness, this delay cannot be overlooked since it adversely affects public faith in the land system and regional planning overall.

A normative critical assessment of the content, structure, and legal culture in the execution of Law No. 26 of 2007 is required, given these diverse issues. This study aims to detect editorial or technical deficiencies and to analyze the degree to which the provisions of the Spatial Planning Act can effectively provide and safeguard the legal certainty of land rights as a component of basic civil rights under the rule of law. Furthermore, the assurance of legal certainty in land use plays a critical role in promoting sustainable development, protecting human rights, and fostering trust in government institutions. As Indonesia continues to expand its infrastructure and urbanization agenda, the synchronization of spatial planning with land rights is not merely administrative but deeply constitutional.

This research has gained significance owing to the rising incidence of land disputes stemming from the revision of the Regional Spatial Plan, conflicts arising from the implementation of national strategic initiatives, and unincorporated claims of customary territories in spatial plans. This study seeks to perform a comprehensive normative analysis of the discord between the normative goals of Law No. 26 of 2007 and its practical application, while also offering recommendations for legal reform to ensure equitable, proportional, and sustainable legal certainty regarding land rights.

Problem formulation : (1) To what degree does the enforcement of Law No. 26 of 2007 about Spatial Planning provide legal certainty for land rights in Indonesia? and (2) What normative deficiencies exist in Law No. 26 of 2007 that lead to disputes between spatial planning and land ownership rights?

2. Research Method

This study employs the normative legal research technique, which involves a literature-based approach that analyzes legal sources, including pertinent laws and regulations, doctrines, legal principles, and judicial rulings. (Qamar dkk., 2017). This research is prescriptive-analytical, aimed at scrutinizing the positive legal norms within Law Number 26 of 2007 on Spatial Planning, while also assessing its relevance and coherence with other statutes and regulations about land rights, including the Basic Agrarian Law of 1960 and its implementing regulations. The methodologies used include a legislative approach and a conceptual approach to discern the disharmonization of norms and their ramifications for legal certainty. The analysis is conducted qualitatively by elucidating and interpreting legal norms within both theoretical and practical frameworks, aiming to provide comprehensive legal arguments and proposals for constructive normative enhancements to the execution of the Spatial Planning Law.

In addition, a comparative normative approach is employed to analyze legal mechanisms adopted by other jurisdictions, such as Germany and the Netherlands, regarding indirect expropriation and zoning-induced land deprivation, as lessons for Indonesia's spatial planning reform

3. Results and Discussion

Evaluation of the Implementation of Law No.26 of 2007 on the Guarantee of Legal Certainty of Land Rights

Law No. 26 of 2007 on Spatial Planning serves as the principal legislative foundation for the execution of sustainable, coordinated, and equitable national spatial planning. Nonetheless, the practical application of this statute presents a significant threat to the legal certainty of land rights conferred to individuals via authorized processes. Legal certainty in the agricultural environment pertains not only to the acknowledgment of rights but also to the assurance of safeguarding the exercise, use, and transfer of these rights without excessive governmental interference.

The absence of alignment between the Spatial Planning Law and other statutes, particularly the Basic Agrarian Law and its multiple derivatives, engenders a normative conflict that directly affects the legal status of communal land. In several instances, the classification of a region as a protected area, river boundary, or other restricted zone within a spatial plan leads to the annulment or limitation of property rights previously granted by the National Property Agency. This engenders legal ambiguity, adversely affects landowners, and may contravene the concept of non-retroactivity in state administrative law. (Susman dkk., 2021).

Moreover, Law No. 26 of 2007 has failed to provide an equitable and expeditious dispute settlement procedure for conflicts arising between spatial planning and established land

rights. Citizens often find themselves in a vulnerable situation when confronted with policies of restriction, eviction, or revocation of rights due to modifications in spatial planning, since the existing avenues for complaint or compensation are severely restricted or difficult to navigate. In actuality, the existing legal tools are more advantageous to the state or spatial planning agencies than to the preservation of residents' land rights.

The issue becomes further intricate when spatial plans are dynamic and subject to fluctuations based on development or investment priorities. When the plan is amended without sufficient public engagement, formerly uncontentious land rights may unexpectedly be included inside the limited use zone. This reflects the inadequate principles of involvement, openness, and accountability in the spatial planning process, as mandated by Article 2 and Article 4 of the Spatial Planning Law. (Shaban & Appiah-Opoku, 2024).

Furthermore, a primary issue often encountered in the execution of Law No. 26 of 2007 is the inadequate alignment of spatial planning with the national land administration system overseen by the Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency. In some instances, certified land may be located inside a designated green zone, river boundary, or protected area. This new status constrains and perhaps forbids land usage by its owners, rendering property rights operationally and commercially valueless. In legal philosophy, this circumstance is termed constructive expropriation, which denotes the indirect acquisition of rights by regulatory mechanisms without a compensation mechanism. (Manullang dkk., 2023).

Constructive expropriation, also known as regulatory taking, refers to state action that substantially deprives a landowner of the economic use or value of their property without a formal transfer of title. According to Riffel (2022), such indirect takings may require compensation if the regulatory burden imposed is excessive, even in the absence of physical appropriation.

An illustrative instance is seen in the incident that transpired in Bojonggede Village, Bogor Regency. Several people possessing land title documents discovered that their property falls inside the river border zone as delineated in the new Regency Spatial Plan. Consequently, they are unable to construct dwellings or get Building Permits, even though their title certificates were granted by the National Land Agency well in advance of the establishment of the Regional Spatial Plan. (Martyr, 2011). This disagreement impedes the exercise of rights, resulting in economic losses and less legal clarity.

Instances like those in Bojonggede illustrate the lack of procedural justice in the spatial planning process. The right of residents to express their views on modifications or the creation of spatial plans is often overlooked, resulting in impacted communities lacking the ability to contest or contribute to policies that impact their property rights. In the framework of the rule of law, any limitation on fundamental rights must be founded on open, democratic, and accountable processes.

This situation illustrates the limited efficacy of the property protection concept enshrined in Article 28H paragraph (4) of the 1945 Constitution, which asserts that "Everyone has the right to private property, and such property rights must not be arbitrarily confiscated by anyone." When certified land becomes unusable owing to a new spatial designation, and there exists no effective compensation or complaint procedure, it is a *de facto* loss of rights.

The issue is exacerbated by the lack of a legal framework that specifically governs indirect expropriation (constructive expropriation) under Indonesian land law. Law No. 2 of 2012 on Land Acquisition for the Public Interest solely governs the direct appropriation of rights with compensation, although it does not address instances when limitations on land use imposed by the Regional Spatial Plan lead to a diminution of economic value without compensation. (Ekaristi, 2014). Consequently, citizens have lost their means of legal protection and remain in extended uncertainty. Over time, this disjunction between spatial planning and land administration may diminish public confidence in governmental institutions, particularly for services connected to property rights. If not promptly handled, this circumstance may incite broader agricultural conflicts, particularly in metropolitan regions under significant development pressures. (Pramuji & Putri, 2020).

Moreover, the enforcement of provisions in this Law, including Article 14 and Article 15, which mandate adherence to the Regional Spatial Plan, is often executed unilaterally, without socialization and community engagement. In other instances, people discovered that their property was situated in a restricted zone only after their permission applications were denied or when they faced impediments in the transaction process. This indicates that the current spatial system is non-participatory, characterized by a top-down and administrative approach.

Conversely, the efficacy of municipal governments in regulating spatial use remains suboptimal. Numerous regional leaders give building licenses or property conversions that contradict the Regional Spatial Plan they have established. This discrepancy renders the Regional Spatial Plan politically adaptable, while legally oppressive to ordinary residents without access to authority. In the philosophy of the rule of law, this undermines the premise of equality before the law. (Ghaziani & Ghaziani, 2021).

The occurrence of unilateral and uneven execution reveals a contradiction in the implementation of spatial planning in Indonesia. Law No. 26 of 2007 underscores the need to adhere to the Regional Spatial Plan as a mechanism for regulating growth and preserving the environment. Nevertheless, in reality, the enforcement of these standards does not provide equitable access to information, impartiality in licensing, or uniform legal treatment between the public and the authorities.

The deficiency of a robust socialization mechanism and the absence of community involvement in the formulation and amendment of the Regional Spatial Plan signify a breach of the principles of transparency and public participation, as explicitly stipulated in Article 2, letters c and d of the Spatial Planning Law. This leads to the Regional Spatial Plan being seen as an elite technical creation, rather than as a product of a societal

consensus that reflects the needs and interests of the broader community. Consequently, inhabitants sometimes remain unaware of changes in the status of the area until they encounter administrative denials, such as the rejection of petitions for building permits, business licenses, or transactions facilitated by notaries and the National Land Agency (BPN) (Ulenaung, 2019).

Moreover, when the local government contradicts the established Regional Spatial Plan, such as by granting construction licenses in protected areas or green zones for the advantage of investors, it undermines the legitimacy of spatial planning regulations. (A'isyah & Manaf, 2018). This scenario indicates that the Regional Spatial Plan functions as a flexible political device for the powerful and affluent, while serving as a strict legal framework for the general populace. This imbalance fundamentally contradicts the idea of equality before the law, a cornerstone of the rule of law (*rechtstaat*), whereby every citizen ought to be treated justly and equitably under the law, without exception.

Critique of the execution of Law No. 26 of 2007 should also focus on the inadequate dissemination of geographical data and the limited public access to spatial information. The community lacks an established mechanism for promptly and readily verifying the status of land assignment. Despite the debut of the GISTARU application by the Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency, full integration remains incomplete in most areas. This affects the community's limited legal knowledge of their land's status inside the relevant spatial planning system. Consequently, the enactment of Law No. 26 of 2007 has not sufficiently ensured legal clarity regarding land rights. The lack of institutional synchronization, insufficient openness, and the absence of mechanisms to safeguard landowners' rights regarding alterations in spatial planning demonstrate the inadequate protection of these legal principles. Under the pressures of national strategic project growth and expansion, people's land is at risk of being compromised without sufficient legal safeguards.

Identification of Normative Weaknesses in Spatial Planning Laws That Trigger Land Conflicts

Law Number 26 of 2007 about Spatial development is a national legislative framework designed to govern the development, usage, and regulation of space in a holistic and sustainable way. This legislation integrates the use of space with ecological, social, economic, and national security considerations. Nonetheless, its execution reveals many agricultural concerns that indicate fundamental normative deficiencies in the legislation, particularly about the actual dynamics of land ownership and community management. These vulnerabilities have precipitated many land disputes that are not only administrative but have evolved into intricate, systematic, and recurrent judicial challenges.

A primary shortcoming is the lack of synchronization between the Spatial Planning Law and the Agrarian Basic Law, which serve as the foundation of the national land system. The Basic Agrarian Law offers constitutional assurances for land rights, including property rights, rights for company utilization, rights for construction utilization, and use

rights, all of which are tangible, inheritable, and legally safeguarded. Conversely, the Spatial Planning Law establishes zoning categories that may often restrict or entirely nullify property use by legitimate proprietors. Conflict arises when certified land rights are located inside the green zone, river boundary, or protected area as defined by the regional spatial plan (Indrajit et al., 2021). The lack of a definitive legal framework to resolve these conflicts has resulted in legal ambiguity within the Spatial Planning Law, jeopardizing the stability of residents' civil rights concerning land.

The notion of space usage, as outlined in Articles 14 and 15 of Law No. 26 of 2007, mandates adherence to the Regional Spatial Plan, fundamentally aimed at environmental preservation and the control of planned development. This provision lacks an accompanying clause for the preservation of pre-existing civil rights. In legal philosophy, this scenario is classified as constructive expropriation, referring to the indirect appropriation of rights via regulatory mechanisms without formal procedures or compensation. (Riffel, 2022). This circumstance contravenes the norm of non-retroactivity in administrative law and the constitutional principle of property rights protection. When a community is denied the opportunity to use, transfer, or employ its property owing to a new designation in the Regional Spatial Plan without compensation, the state effectively denies the community the economic advantages of the land, notwithstanding the official recognition of ownership rights.

A further problem is the lack of an effective protest procedure for citizens against spatial zoning restrictions that adversely affect them. Despite Article 65 of the Spatial Planning Law recognizing the community's right to submit complaints, there is, in fact, an absence of a standardized mechanism and institutional venue that ensures the objective and transparent consideration of such concerns. (Jazuli, 2017). Consequently, inhabitants become aware of changes in the status of the property only after encountering a permit denial, such as when asking for a Building Permit (IMB) or supplementary certification, or when facing impediments in the land transaction process. This indicates that the legal rules have not been supported by an institutional framework capable of implementing the norms of due process. Modifications to Regional Spatial Plans are often not broadly communicated, and community engagement is restricted to superficial public consultation procedures.

The provisions in the Spatial Planning Law do not specifically delineate the hierarchical connection among national spatial plans, provinces, districts/cities, and national strategic regions. The contradiction across the tiers of the Regional Spatial Plan results in overlapping policies, leading to a duality of power in zoning. When a region in the province's Spatial Plan is classified as industrial, however, in the district Spatial Plan it is designated as agricultural, policy ambiguity becomes unavoidable. This gap is often used by stakeholders, including both commercial and governmental authorities, to alter the status of the place in alignment with economic and investment objectives. In this situation, the law ceases to serve as a mechanism for egalitarian social engineering and instead transforms into a means of legitimizing elite interests. Consequently, those without access to authority become victims of undemocratic zoning alterations.

Normative deficiencies are evident in the inadequate regulation of compensation for losses incurred due to spatial limitations. When an area is designated as a protected zone or a river border that is off-limits for use, there is no need for the state to provide compensation for the rights to the impacted property. This contradicts the idea of proportionality in constitutional law, which mandates that any limitation on people's rights must be accompanied by a mechanism for protection, rehabilitation, or equitable substitution. In some contemporary legal systems, like Germany and the Netherlands, indirect expropriation of land rights necessitates compensation as a safeguard for private property. Indonesia, by failing to regulate this under the Spatial Planning Law, effectively permits structural abuses of property rights. (Siburian dkk., 2024).

The Spatial Planning Law is insufficient to impose severe punishments on public officials or local governments who provide licenses for land use that contravene the Regional Spatial Plan. The penal measures in Article 69 and Article 70 only target corporate entities or communities that contravene zoning regulations, failing to address state officials who intentionally issue permits inconsistent with spatial planning. Regional authorities often provide licenses for the development of residential, commercial, or industrial projects on property designated as green or conservation areas; however, there are insufficient legal repercussions for these activities. This disparity in law enforcement undermines the notion of equality before the law, highlighting that spatial planning legislation is more oppressive to the populace while more accommodating to authority. (Yustia & Fatimah, 2019).

A significant normative issue is the lack of digital and administrative integration between spatial data and land data. The geographic information system (GIS) used by local governments within the framework of the Regional Spatial Plan is not systematically integrated with the land information system overseen by the Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency. Consequently, the verification of the geographical and legal status of the land cannot be conducted automatically and with precision. (Ginting dkk., 2025). This enhances the likelihood of issuing land rights certificates in locations unsuitable for zoning, or conversely, imposes zoning limitations on property with established legal title. The fragmentation of this system is the primary cause of several horizontal and vertical disputes about spatial usage. (Insan et al., 2024).

The normative deficiencies in the Spatial Planning Law significantly affect public faith in legal institutions and the state within the framework of national development. When the law fails to provide clarity, fairness, and the safeguarding of rights, individuals will seek informal avenues to assert or exploit their land. This elucidates the pervasive unresolved property disputes, the rise of land mafias, and the imposition of unlawful fees in the land licensing and legalization process. Inadequate and biased legislation facilitates the misuse of authority, concurrently undermining the state's credibility in governing the living conditions of its population.

Given these recurrent conflicts, Indonesia lacks a statutory mechanism for harmonizing disputes between spatial planning policies and existing land rights. An independent spatial-land dispute resolution board, or judicial review mechanism within the

administrative court, could be institutionalized to mediate and settle these normative clashes proactively.

In light of these normative deficiencies, the government and lawmakers must amend the Spatial Planning Law, focusing on enhancing legal clarity and safeguarding land rights. (Akmal dkk., 2023). The revision must incorporate clear stipulations concerning the interplay between the Regional Spatial Plan and registered land rights, provisions for compensation related to limitations on detrimental land use, mechanisms for objections and equitable dispute resolution, as well as enhanced penalties for officials who misuse spatial planning authority. Furthermore, it is essential to connect national land and geographic information systems to ensure that all policies are coherent, precise, and transparent.

Consequently, the normative deficiencies in the Spatial Planning Law should not be seen only as a technical issue, but rather as a structural flaw within the national legal framework that directly affects the constitutional rights of persons. Reforming spatial planning standards and institutions is essential for the state to achieve equitable, participative, and sustainable development. In the absence of this, the law would persist as a sole instrument of spatial control, rather than serving as a mechanism for safeguarding persons' rights to conduct their economic and social activities with dignity.

4. Conclusion

Law No. 26 of 2007 on Spatial Planning, although ostensibly designed to provide equitable and sustainable spatial management, has considerable normative deficiencies in guaranteeing legal certainty of property rights. The disjunction between spatial planning and land administration systems, inadequate compensation and grievance mechanisms, ambiguous connections between Regional Spatial Planning and current land rights, along with the lack of penalties for infractions by state officials, have engendered extensive agrarian conflicts and legal ambiguity. Consequently, integrative and inclusive normative revision and institutional reform are essential to guarantee that spatial planning rules do not serve as vehicles of unilateral limitations, but rather as mechanisms for safeguarding individuals' constitutional rights to land.

Ultimately, spatial planning must not be reduced to a technocratic instrument of land control, but must be governed by the values of the rule of law, procedural fairness, and substantive justice. A reformed legal framework should reflect the balance between public interest and private rights, thereby restoring public confidence in land governance and legal institutions.

References

- A'isyah, S., & Manaf, A. (2018). PENGENDALIAN PEMBANGUNAN PERUMAHAN SKALA KECIL TAK BERIZIN DI KAWASAN LINDUNG PAMURBAYA. *Jurnal Pengembangan Kota*, 6(1), 26–34. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jpk.6.1.26-34>
- Akmal, D. U., Fitriansyah, H., & Ramadhan, F. A. (2023). Reformasi Hukum Pertanahan: Perlindungan Hukum Hak Atas Tanah Terhadap Pengalihan Hak Secara Melawan Hukum. *Negara Hukum: Membangun Hukum Untuk Keadilan Dan Kesejahteraan*, 14, 193–214. https://berkas.dpr.go.id/pusaka/files/jurnal_kepakaran/Negara%20Hukum-14-2-November-2023.pdf#page=67
- Bakung, D. A., Abdussamad, Z., & Muhtar, M. H. (2022). The Principle of Freedom of Contract in Agricultural Product Sharing based on Islamic Law. *Jambura Law Review*, 4(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.33756/jlr.v4i2.11645>
- Bakung, D. A. H., Abdussamad, Z., & Muhtar, M. H. (2022). Contra Perceptions Of The Freedom Of Contract Principle In Law No. 2 Of 1960 Concerning Agricultural Products Sharing With The Community Ijon System In The Bonebeach Environment. *Protection: Journal Of Land And Environmental Law*, 1(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.38142/pjlel.v1i1.280>
- Ekaristi, P. P. D. (2014). Justification for Indirect Expropriation Within a Government Measure. *Juris Gentium Law Review*, 2(1), Article 1. <https://journal.ugm.ac.id/jurisgentiumlaw/article/view/56648>
- Ghaziani, M. A., & Ghaziani, M. A. (2021). The Role of Expropriation Clauses in Protection and Promotion of Foreign Investments in Renewable Energy: An Essential but Overlooked Legal Consideration. *Indonesia Law Review*, 11, 191. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/indolawrev11&id=191&div=&collection=>
- Ginting, A. S., Lubis, R. P., & Hidayat, W. (2025). INTEGRASI SISTEM INFORMASI GEOGRAFIS (SIG) PARTICIPATORY DAN EVALUASI LOKASI TEKNIS UNTUK PERENCANAAN TATA RUANG WILAYAH DAN PERUMAHAN. *GOVERNANCE: Jurnal Ilmiah Kajian Politik Lokal Dan Pembangunan*, 11(3), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.56015/gjikplp.v11i3.367>
- Indrajit, A., van Loenen, B., Suprajaka, Jaya, V. E., Ploeger, H., Lemmen, C., & van Oosterom, P. (2021). Implementation of the spatial plan information package for improving the ease of doing business in Indonesian cities. *Land Use Policy*, 105, 105338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105338>
- Insan, I. H., Chryzalmantia, V., Khodijah, S., Ningrum, S. P., & Brahmana, R. (2024). Kajian Hukum Tata Ruang Sengketa Tanah Warga Terhadap Kepentingan Masyarakat Luas (Studi Kasus: Pengembangan Jalan Tol Trans Sumatera Lampung). *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 10(10), Article 10. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11435356>
- Jazuli, A. (2017). PENEGAKAN HUKUM PENATAAN RUANG DALAM RANGKA MEWUJUDKAN PEMBANGUNAN BERKELANJUTAN. *Jurnal Rechts Vinding: Media Pembinaan Hukum Nasional*, 6(2), 263–282. <https://doi.org/10.33331/rechtsvinding.v6i2.156>
- Languju, F. (2021). PENEGAKKAN HUKUM TERHADAP BANGUNAN YANG TIDAK MEMILIKI IZIN MENURUT UNDANG-UNDANG NOMOR 28 TAHUN 2002 TENTANG BANGUNAN GEDUNG. *LEX ET SOCIETATIS*, 9(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.35796/les.v9i1.32056>
- Manullang, S. O., Putri, V. S., Kusumadewi, Y., & Ningrum, E. (2023). Legal Construction for Settlement of Spatial Planning Disputes After the Law No. 11 of 2020 About Job Creation Applied. *Legal Standing: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 7(1), 159–172.
- M.H., I. H. J. R., M. Si, & M.H., A.S., S.H. (2023). *Hukum Tata Ruang: Dalam Konsep Kebijakan Otonomi Daerah*. Nuansa Cendekia.
- Pramuji, S. E., & Putri, V. S. (2020). Meninjau Efektivitas Penegakan Hukum Penataan Ruang dalam Rangka Mewujudkan Tertib Tata Ruang. *Jurnal Pertanahan*, 10(1). <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/5941/68d10369f8ed6bad7fbd9022d6088e1984d5.pdf>

- Putri, V. S., Muhtar, M. H., Winarsasi, P. A., & Manullang, S. O. (2023). *Kewenangan Izin Pemanfaatan Ruang Pasca Undang-undang Cipta Kerja*. Eureka Media Aksara. <https://repository.penerbiteureka.com/publications/563020/>
- Qamar, N., Syarif, M., Busthami, D. S., Hidjaz, M. K., Aswari, A., Djanggih, H., & Rezah, F. S. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Hukum (Legal Research Methods)*. CV. Social Politic Genius (SIGN).
- Riffel, C. (2022). INDIRECT EXPROPRIATION AND THE PROTECTION OF PUBLIC INTERESTS. *International & Comparative Law Quarterly*, 71(4), 945–974. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020589322000343>
- Siburian, H. K., Baren Sipayung, Andjarwati, A., Manullang, S. O., & Harahap, M. A. K. (2024). *The Existence of Civil Sanctions in Spatial Law Enforcement in Indonesia*. 23(2). https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Baren-Sipayung/publication/381522011_The_Existence_of_Civil_Sanctions_in_Spatial_Law_Enforcement_in_Indonesia/links/6672b51e481b18050adf2757/The-Existence-of-Civil-Sanctions-in-Spatial-Law-Enforcement-in-Indonesia.pdf
- Sugiarto, A. (2017). Implementasi Pengendalian Pemanfaatan Ruang dan Sanksi Administratif Dalam Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah Kabupaten Sidoarjo: JKMP (*Jurnal Kebijakan Dan Manajemen Publik*), 5(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jkmp.v5i1.812>
- Susman, R., Gütte, A. M., & Weith, T. (2021). Drivers of Land Use Conflicts in Infrastructural Mega Projects in Coastal Areas: A Case Study of Patimban Seaport, Indonesia. *Land*, 10(6), Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land10060615>
- Syaban, A. S. N., & Appiah-Opoku, S. (2024). Unveiling the Complexities of Land Use Transition in Indonesia’s New Capital City, IKN Nusantara: A Multidimensional Conflict Analysis. *Land*, 13(5), Article 5. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land13050606>
- Syahid, H. L. (2011). *Land Administration and disaster risk management: Case of earthquake in Indonesia* [Info:eu-repo/semantics/masterThesis]. University of Twente. <https://essay.utwente.nl/92903/>
- Ulenaung, V. Y. (2019). IMPLEMENTASI PENATAAN RUANG DALAM PERATURAN DAERAH RENCANA TATA RUANG WILAYAH (RTRW) MENURUT UNDANG-UNDANG NOMOR 26 TAHUN 2007. *LEX ADMINISTRATUM*, 7(2), Article 2. <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/administratum/article/view/26978>
- Wahid, F., Sæbø, Ø., & Furuholt, B. (2015). The use of information systems in Indonesia’s land management. *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Social Implications of Computers in Developing Countries*, 20–23. https://www.academia.edu/download/47268314/The_Use_of_Information_Systems_in_Indone20160715-8011-ixpe4m.pdf
- Yustia, R. D. A., & Fatimah, U. D. (2019). STRATEGI PENGGABUNGAN SANKSI BAGI PELANGGARAN HUKUM TATA RUANG DALAM RANGKA PEMULIHAN PEMANFAATAN RUANG. *LITIGASI*, 20(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.23969/litigasi.v20i1.2020>