Electronic Journal of Education, Social Economics and Technology
Vol. 7, No. 1, (2026), e1396
ISSN 2723-6250 (online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.33122/ejeset.v7i1.1396

Research Article

Unauthorized Buildings and Demolition: A Normative Review of Satpol PP Authority and Due Process

Erik Arianto Matondang, Dwi Afni Maileni*, Rizki Tri Anugrah Bhakti, Isfandir Hutasoit

Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Batam, Indonesia, 29425
*Corresponding Author: dwi.afni.maileni@gmail.com | Phone: +6289522594646

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the construction of the authority of the Civil Service Police Unit-Satpol PP in the control and demolition of unauthorized buildings and formulates administrative due process standards as legal limits on local government action. The study is motivated by the fact that demolition practices are frequently contested not only because of the effectiveness of regional regulation enforcement, but also because of unclear legal authority, overlapping institutional roles, and weak traceability of administrative accountability. This research employs a normative juridical method using statutory, conceptual, and limited case approaches. The legal materials examined include legislation, administrative law doctrine, and public administration scholarship relevant to administrative enforcement, discretion, procedural legitimacy, and accountability. The findings show that Satpol PP occupies an important position as an operational administrative enforcement actor; however, the legality of demolition cannot rest solely on its general public order function. The validity of demolition requires a coherent linkage between the verification of violations by the competent technical authority, follow-up determinations by authorized officials, proportionate stages of enforcement, and complete documentation of official action. These findings underscore the importance of structuring both the architecture of authority and the administration of official action in order to ensure lawful, proportionate, and accountable enforcement of Regional Regulations.

Keywords: Satpol PP; Building demolition; Administrative authority; Administrative due process; Regional regulation enforcement.

1. INTRODUCTION

The demolition of unauthorized buildings is among the most sensitive forms of administrative action in the enforcement of regional regulations because it directly implicates property rights, livelihood continuity, personal security, and public trust in local governmental authority. In local government practice, demolition is often framed merely as an issue of public order or spatial-planning compliance. From the perspective of administrative law, however, the core issue extends beyond whether a building violation exists to a more fundamental set of questions: which organ is authorized to act, what legal basis supports the action, which administrative instruments are used, and to what extent the procedure satisfies adequate standards of procedural justice (administrative due process) (Arias et al., 2024; Hutchinson & Duncan, 2012).

In the Indonesian context, the involvement of the Satpol PP in enforcing Regional Regulations frequently places this institution at the forefront of operational action. Yet this frontline position also opens space for normative problems when field action overlaps with the authority of technical local agencies, particularly those responsible for buildings, licensing, and spatial planning. At this point, the legal issue is not limited to the formal legality of the action itself, but extends to the construction of inter-agency authority, the limits of administrative coercive measures, and responsibility for the consequences produced by such action (Bellamy, 2017; Bovens, 2007). The blurred boundary between the technical determination of violations, the issuance of administrative orders, and field execution may produce enforcement that appears administratively effective while remaining vulnerable in terms of legitimacy and accountability (Hupe & Hill, 2007; Schillemans & Busuioc, 2015).

Relatedly, the literature shows that state action at the implementation level is never neutral with respect to discretion, rule interpretation, and situational pressure. The street-level bureaucracy perspective emphasizes that policy implementers operate under conditions of limited resources, demands for rapid results, and conflicting public expectations, such that choices made in the field often involve practical judgments that are not fully explicit in the text of the norm (Heinrich, 2016; Hupe & Hill, 2007). In the context of building control, practice shows that demolition often moves faster than the articulation of its legal basis. Yet because demolition has high-impact consequences for citizens, the discretion of implementers cannot be left without strict legal parameters. Discretion that is not disciplined by legality, due care, and proportionality risks turning into administrative action that is difficult to justify (Heinrich, 2016; Masood & Azfar Nisar, 2021; Schillemans & Busuioc, 2015).

From the perspective of the rule of law, administrative due process functions as a normative instrument to ensure that government action is lawful both in purpose and in method. In the context of demolition, due process requires at least a clear legal basis, adequate notice, traceable warning stages, an opportunity for citizens to provide clarification or comply with administrative obligations, transparent documentation of the action, and access to objection mechanisms or legal remedies (Bovens, 2007; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). Emphasizing procedure does not undermine the effectiveness of Regional Regulation enforcement; on the contrary, a well-structured procedure strengthens the legitimacy of decisions and reduces the risk of disputes, social conflict, and allegations of abuse of power. A broad body of scholarship on the legitimacy of public institutions shows that the quality of procedure influences citizens' acceptance of official decisions, even when those decisions adversely affect individual interests (Belegu & Fejzullahu, 2023; Moynihan et al., 2015).

On the other hand, discussion of the demolition of unauthorized buildings is often trapped in an overly simple dichotomy: strict versus lenient, pro-order versus pro-citizen, or swift versus cumbersome. This dichotomy is problematic because it obscures the more substantive issue of whether the design of authority and the architecture of action have been constructed coherently. Rapid enforcement without a clear legal basis creates legality problems; conversely, lengthy procedures without a firm decision structure also generate legal uncertainty. What is therefore required is not merely an evaluation of enforcement effectiveness, but a normative framework that links the source of authority, the type of administrative action, the procedural stages, and the model of institutional accountability.

To date, studies on Satpol PP have more often focused on the general enforcement of public order, field discretion, or problems of local policy implementation, whereas normative analyses that specifically examine building demolition as a high-intensity form of administrative action remain relatively limited. This gap is significant because the legal regime governing buildings and spatial planning continues to develop, such that the notion of an unauthorized building cannot be understood simplistically without examining its relationship to building-permit instruments and the competent technical authority (Halling & Baekgaard, 2024; Tumuhulawa & Moonti, 2021). Accordingly, research is needed not only to inventory Satpol PP's authority, but also to test its limits in inter-organ relations, the procedural standards that must be satisfied, and the parameters of proportionality before demolition is undertaken as an administrative ultimum remedium (Ishak, 2019; Mungin, 2025).

Against this backdrop, this study aims to examine normatively the authority of Satpol PP in controlling and demolishing unauthorized buildings and, at the same time, to formulate administrative due process standards as the minimum threshold for lawful, proportionate, and accountable action. The study's scholarly contribution lies in the development of an analytical framework that integrates the law of authority, theories of administrative accountability, and principles of procedural justice into an evaluative model for demolition measures. This framework is expected not only to enrich the administrative law debate on the limits of coercive action by local government, but also to provide an argumentative basis for the formulation of SOPs, the design of inter-agency coordination, and more traceable accountability mechanisms in the enforcement of regional regulations.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The control and demolition of unauthorized buildings must be situated within the framework of administrative enforcement rather than the general logic of public order. Regulatory enforcement theory shows that the quality of state action is determined not only by the capacity to act, but also by the ability to design responses appropriate to the type of violation, the level of risk, and the legal position of the object being controlled (Baldwin & Black, 2008; Coglianese & Lazer, 2003). Demolition is a form of administrative intervention that demands stricter legal justification than advisory measures, warnings, or temporary suspension. The perspective of really responsive regulation underscores that regulatory responses must take into account the character of the violation, the behavior of the regulated party, institutional capacity, and the legitimacy effects of the measures taken. The regulatory literature therefore provides a theoretical basis for treating demolition not as a routine instrument, but as a measure that must be placed within a calibrated and accountable sequence of enforcement.

Studies on management-based regulation and regulatory compliance emphasize that effectiveness does not depend solely on the threat of sanctions, but also on institutional design, clarity of authority, and the procedural quality that connects legal norms with field action (Parker & Nielsen, 2009). This insight is highly relevant to research on Satpol PP because the control of unauthorized buildings involves more than one institution and requires field officers to carry out enforcement. When role differentiation is not clearly formulated, control measures risk losing legal coherence.

From the perspective of policy implementation, field officers operate within spaces of interpretation, situational pressure, and the need for rapid decision-making (T. Evans, 2004; Tony Evans, 2020). Discretion therefore has not disappeared from modern bureaucracy; rather, it has been transformed and placed within new frameworks of organizational rules and performance targets (Buffat, 2015). Likewise, modernization, including digitalization and standardization, does not automatically eliminate the need for discretion, but instead changes its locus and form. The academic question, then, is no longer whether discretion can be removed, but how it can be constrained by legality, procedural sequencing, and documentation so that it does not evolve into action that is difficult to test administratively.

The literature on the legitimacy of public authority and procedural justice provides an important normative foundation for demolition measures. Public support for authority is shaped not only by outcomes or enforcement capacity, but also by perceptions of procedural fairness, decision-making neutrality, and the quality of treatment afforded by officials (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). In the same vein, the legitimacy of a decision is strongly influenced by the decision-making process itself, including transparency of reasons and openness of procedure (de Fine Licht, 2011). Within this framework, administrative due process in building demolition should be understood as a device of legitimacy, a restraint on power, and a form of action documentation that ensures the exercise of authority remains rational and accountable.

This argument is further strengthened by the psychological dimension of procedural justice, namely that perceptions of authority are shaped by the fairness of the process even when the outcome disadvantages the affected party. Under conditions of uncertainty, individuals tend to use procedural quality as the basis for judging whether an authority has acted appropriately (van den Bos et al., 1998). Its relevance to the demolition of unauthorized buildings is obvious because such measures have a profound impact and often trigger conflict. Administrative due process is therefore not merely a technical-procedural issue, but a central element in the formation of institutional legitimacy in the enforcement of Regional Regulations.

At the same time, collaborative governance theory emphasizes that enforcement often requires coordination because substantive authority and operational capacity are distributed across several units (Emerson et al., 2012; Provan & Kenis, 2008). Yet governance without an adequate coordination design may create role confusion and reduce accountability (Ansell & Gash, 2008). In the context of controlling unauthorized buildings, this helps explain why demolition frequently becomes problematic not only because of the legality of Satpol PP's actions, but also because of weak integration among technical agencies, decision-making officials, and field implementers.

Based on this review, the literature provides three mutually reinforcing theoretical foundations for the present study: regulatory enforcement theory, which requires gradual and proportionate responses; theories of implementation and discretion; and theories of procedural legitimacy and collaborative governance, which emphasize the importance of due process and clear role allocation. The gap that remains is the lack of integration of these three strands of literature into a normative analysis of Satpol PP's authority in the demolition of unauthorized buildings. This study therefore positions itself to formulate a framework linking the source of authority, the classification of administrative action, due process standards, and inter-agency accountability in the enforcement of regional regulations.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This research was designed as a normative legal study with an analytical-prescriptive orientation to assess the construction of Satpol PP's authority in controlling and demolishing unauthorized buildings and to formulate the minimum standards of administrative due process that government action must satisfy. A normative design was selected because the research problem does not concern the measurement of respondents' perceptions or the statistical effectiveness of a program, but rather the examination of the sources of authority, the forms through which authority is exercised, the relationships among local government organs, and the quality of the administrative procedures accompanying demolition. With this orientation, the study seeks to produce legal arguments capable of distinguishing administratively valid action from measures that risk defects of authority, procedure, or reasoning. The study focuses on four layers of analysis: first, the foundational layer of authority; second, the identification of institutional competence boundaries; third, the layer of administrative procedure; and fourth, administrative responsibility. This delimitation is necessary so that the discussion does not extend into criminal, civil, or land-dispute issues, except insofar as they directly intersect with the legality of administrative action.

The research employs three complementary approaches: statutory, conceptual, and case-based. The statutory approach is used to trace the normative structure from statutes to local regulations governing local administration, government administration, buildings, spatial planning, and the functions of Satpol PP. Through this approach, the study examines both vertical and horizontal consistency among legal norms and tests whether demolition has an explicit normative basis or is merely derived implicitly from the general function of public order. The conceptual approach clarifies the meanings of attributed authority, delegated authority, mandate, administrative discretion, proportionality, administrative due process, and institutional accountability. Meanwhile, the case approach is used selectively to understand how problems of authority and procedure arise in practice, whether through court decisions, oversight documents, or other legal materials reflecting disputes or objections to local government action.

Legal materials were collected through library research and document study. At the initial stage, the researcher developed a list of key legal issues to be examined, namely: the basis of Satpol PP's authority, the types of control measures, the requirements for demolition, procedural stages, the forms of orders or delegation, and accountability mechanisms. This list was used to select the relevant norms and literature. The next stage involved constructing a matrix of normative analysis mapping each administrative measure according to the type of action, legal basis, authorized official, required documents, procedural prerequisites, and potential disputes. This technique helped maintain analytical consistency so that the discussion would move beyond a mere inventory of rules toward an evaluation of the coherence between norms, the structure of authority, and the actions actually taken.

The legal materials were analyzed qualitatively through legal reasoning, interpretation, and normative construction. Interpretation was carried out through a grammatical approach to ascertain the meaning of the text, a systematic approach to place a provision within a broader network of rules, and a teleological approach to assess the regulatory purpose in relation to the protection of the public interest and citizens' rights. In addition, the study applied a harmonization test to detect potential overlap or regulatory gaps between general norms and technical rules at the local level. The results of this interpretive process were then linked to the principles of administrative law, particularly legality, due care, proportionality, the prohibition of abuse of power, and governmental accountability. Through this framework, the study is expected to produce two outputs simultaneously: a normative explanation of the limits of Satpol PP's authority and conceptual recommendations for drafting SOPs and governance arrangements for more legally orderly enforcement measures.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Results

The findings show that the core problem in the demolition of unauthorized buildings does not lie in the legitimacy of the enforcement objective itself, but in the architecture of administrative action, which is often insufficiently differentiated between the function of assessing violations, the function of making administrative decisions, and the function of implementing field action. Based on a normative review of the regulatory framework and administrative law doctrine, demolition should be positioned as a high-intensity form of administrative action requiring a stricter legal basis, procedure, and documentation than ordinary control measures. This finding is consistent with the focus of the study, which emphasizes three aspects: the basis of Satpol PP's authority, the limits of its relationship with local agencies, and due process standards before, during, and after demolition.

Analytically, the findings can be formulated into five points. First, there is a need for a clear separation between technical-substantive authority, namely the determination of a building or spatial-planning violation, and administrative enforcement authority. Second, not all measures against unauthorized buildings carry the same legal intensity; accordingly, procedural requirements must be differentiated in stages. Third, administrative due process in demolition must be operationalized as a set of verifiable indicators. Fourth, the most vulnerable point of dispute often arises in the transition from administrative warning to field execution. Fifth, accountability models must be built in a chain so that the source of the order, the implementing actors, and the documentation of the decision can be traced whenever objections or litigation arise.

Table 1. Mapping the Construction of Authority in Handling Unauthorized Buildings

Action	Function	Institutional Actor	Character of Authority	Administrative Output
Verification	Assess the administrative violation relating to the building and spatial planning	Licensing and Spatial Planning Agency	Technical-substantive	Inspection report, verification results, technical recommendation
Follow-up determination	Determine the administrative response	Authorized official under the local government structure	Delegated	Warning letter, stop order, determination of action
Safeguarding implementation	Maintain order and safety during enforcement	Satpol PP	Operational administrative enforcement	Operational plan, personnel assignment
Execution	Implement coercive measures	Joint team	Authority derived from a valid decision	Implementation report, action documentation
Post-action handling	Safeguarding and follow-up of objections	Implementing and technical agencies	Administrative accountability	Inventory, official report, objection channel

The findings in **Table 1** confirm that Satpol PP's position in the demolition of unauthorized buildings should be understood as that of an operational administrative enforcement actor, rather than the sole source of the technical determination of building legality. In other words, Satpol PP's authority is indeed important, but the validity of demolition depends fundamentally on its coherence with administrative products or determinations issued by the authority that is legally competent to assess building or spatial-planning violations. At this point, the study finds a blur in institutional relations that may create the impression that Satpol PP itself decides the demolition, whereas in administrative law the distinction between assessment, order, and execution is precisely what determines whether the action is lawful.

The findings also show that institutional terms such as assignment, order, coordination, or delegation are often used loosely without explaining their legal status. As a result, when an action is challenged, it becomes difficult to determine whether Satpol PP acted on the basis of a valid administrative order, a technical assignment, or merely an internal operational instruction. Because this study explicitly seeks to map authority and formulate operational due process indicators, the clarification of the chain of authority is placed as the first foundation before due process itself is discussed.

Table 2. Classification of Control Measures by Intensity and Legal Consequences

Level	Action	Character	Impact	Administrative Requirements	Enforcement Sequence
I	Appeal and compliance education	Persuasive	Low	Information on the violation	Initial stage
II	Warning	Corrective	Low–moderate	Warning letter and deadline	Before coercive action
III	Temporary suspension	Restriction of activity	Moderate	Administrative order and basis of violation	Escalation following non-compliance
IV	Vacating	Administrative coercion	Moderate–high	Action plan and safeguards	If the violation continues
V	Demolition	High-intensity coercive action	High	Valid decision and complete documentation	Administrative ultimum remedium

Based on **Table 2**, the study finds that demolition cannot be placed at the same level as preliminary control measures. Differences in the intensity of action have direct implications for the required legal basis and the quality of procedure. The greater the impact of a measure on citizens' rights, the higher the standard of administrative justification that must be satisfied. In this context, demolition may properly be classified as an administrative ultimum remedium, namely a last-resort measure used only after lighter instruments have proven ineffective or have not been complied with. This classification is important because, in practice, the narrative of control is often used as a broad term that conceals substantial differences among various measures. The study shows that generic terminology may weaken legal review because actions with profoundly different consequences are treated as though they were equivalent. By ordering measures according to their intensity and consequences, the study provides a basis for assessing whether proportionality has been observed adequately.

Table 3. Indicators of Administrative Due Process Before, During, and After Demolition

Stage	Minimum Indicator	Legal Function	Ideal Evidence
Before	Clarity of legal basis and status of violation	Ensure legality of action	Technical verification results, normative references
Before	Adequate notice to affected parties	Ensure awareness and preparedness	Notice letter and proof of receipt
Before	Opportunity for clarification, objection, and compliance	Ensure procedural fairness	Minutes, clarification report
Before	Proportionate stages of written warning	Ensure gradual escalation	Warning letters I/II/III
During	Clarity of command and team roles	Prevent action beyond assigned duties	Assignment letter, operational plan
During	Documentation of implementation and limits of action	Ensure accountability	Implementation report
During	Protection of vulnerable persons and third parties	Ensure proportionality	Safeguarding record
After	Safeguarding and recording of affected property	Prevent secondary disputes	Inventory
After	Information on follow-up and objection channels	Ensure administrative and legal access	Information letter and explanation of decision
After	Complete archive of the action	Ensure traceability of responsibility	Compiled action dossier

Table 3 shows that administrative due process in demolition is not a concept limited to rights in the abstract, but a series of procedural controls binding action before, during, and after implementation. An important finding of this study is that due process must be understood as a mechanism for controlling authority rather than as a mere administrative formality. The absence of a single element—such as proof of notice or documentation of warning stages—may undermine

the intelligibility of the action's overall rationality, especially when the authority seeks to demonstrate that demolition was genuinely adopted as a last resort. In addition, the study finds that post-demolition stages receive insufficient attention in the design of enforcement. When safeguarding, recording the impact, and informing affected parties about objection mechanisms are poorly managed, the dispute may shift from the issue of the building violation itself to the issue of maladministration.

Table 4. Points of Vulnerability to Administrative Defects in the Demolition of Unauthorized Buildings

Vulnerability Point	Form of Problem	Legal Impact	Implication
Blurred basis of authority	It is unclear which organ issued the order	Competence dispute	The action is vulnerable to being considered ultra vires or defective in authority
Undocumented status of violation	No technical verification	Dispute over administrative facts	The basis of action is viewed as weak
Warning stages skipped	No gradual escalation	Allegation of disproportionality	The action is considered premature
Citizen clarification not facilitated	No opportunity to be heard	Allegation of unfair procedure	Procedural legitimacy declines
Minimal implementation documentation	Evidence of action is incomplete	Difficult to evaluate accountability	Risk of dispute increases
Overlapping inter-agency roles	Operational instructions are not synchronized	Confusion over responsibility	Accountability becomes fragmented
Vulnerable-party handling ignored	No social mitigation	Social and reputational impact	Proportionality is called into question

The findings presented in **Table 4** indicate that administrative defects most often do not stem from a single violation, but from an accumulation of procedural weaknesses. A blurred basis of authority, for example, may still be mitigated by very complete documentation and strong technical verification; however, if it is coupled with unclear warning stages and the absence of an opportunity for clarification, the legal position of the action becomes far more fragile. In other words, the validity of demolition is cumulative: it is built through a sequence of mutually reinforcing stages. This finding helps explain why demolition disputes often evolve into broader debates about justice, rather than remaining confined to narrow questions of legality. When citizens cannot trace who made the decision, what legal basis was used, and whether they were ever given an opportunity to respond, an action that is ostensibly intended to enforce Regional Regulations may instead be perceived as coercive and opaque. From a governance perspective, that vulnerability entails not only a risk of litigation, but also a risk of institutional delegitimation for the bodies responsible for Regional Regulation enforcement.

Table 5. Model of Administrative Decision Sequence and Accountability in Demolition

Process Stage	Key Output	Primary Responsible Actor	Supporting Responsible Actor	Accountability Function
Identification of violation	Verification results	Technical agency	Satpol PP	Establish the factual basis
Follow-up determination	Administrative warning letter	Authorized official	Technical legal unit	Establish the legal basis
Implementation preparation	Assignment letter and operational plan	Satpol PP	Technical agency, related apparatus	Establish the chain of command
Demolition execution	Implementation report	Implementation team under a valid mandate	Satpol PP and technical agencies	Ensure traceability of action
Post-action stage	Inventory, archives, objection information	Initiating agency	Satpol PP and technical agencies	Ensure control and evaluation

The model presented in **Table 5** is the most operational finding of this study. It shows that administrative accountability for demolition must be constructed as both a chain of documents and a chain of roles, rather than being reduced to the personal responsibility of field implementers alone. This approach is important to avoid two equally problematic extremes: first, the legal risk is imposed entirely on Satpol PP as the most visible actor in the field; second, responsibility is dispersed so broadly that no actor can meaningfully be called to account administratively. Through this model, the study emphasizes that enforcement quality should not be measured merely by whether a building is successfully demolished, but by the relationship between the factual basis, the legal basis, the implementation of action, and the documentation of accountability. In this way, the study produces both a mapping of Satpol PP's authority and an evaluative due process framework that can be used to assess whether demolition satisfies the standards of legality, proportionality, and accountability. This is consistent with the targeted outputs of the research, namely an authority map, operational due process indicators, and normative recommendations aimed at strengthening legal certainty. Overall, the findings indicate that the demolition of unauthorized buildings should be understood as a matter of institutional design and the administrative ordering of official action, rather than merely as a question of enforcement strictness. The normative findings show that validity depends on the linkage among verification of the violation, decision-making, procedure, implementation, and post-action documentation. In the discussion section, these findings are considered in relation to theories of administrative enforcement, implementer discretion, and procedural legitimacy in order to evaluate whether the proposed model can reconcile the tension between effective control and the protection of citizens' rights.

4.2 Discussion

The findings of this study show that the problem of demolishing unauthorized buildings at the local government level is best understood as an issue of the design of administrative authority rather than merely as a matter of field execution. The theoretical implication is significant: debates that have often centered on the strictness of the apparatus in fact obscure a more fundamental issue, namely whether the decisions and actions taken rest on a structure of authorization that can be justified. Within the framework of administrative law, government action does not gain legitimacy solely because it is directed toward the public interest; legitimacy is also determined by the quality of the relationship among the norm, the authorized official, and the procedure used to execute the decision. This is consistent with the literature on public accountability, which emphasizes that the assessment of state action must include the dimensions of justification and the clarity of accountability forums, rather than merely the achievement of outcomes (Baldwin & Black, 2008; Blume et al., 2010; Coglianese & Lazer, 2003).

Based on the perspective of policy implementation, the separation between the function of technically assessing violations and the function of operational enforcement demonstrated by the findings reinforces the thesis that field officials work within a multi-actor system in which role boundaries are vulnerable to becoming blurred (Buffat, 2015; Tony Evans, 2020). Street-level bureaucracy theory explains that field implementers are positioned as the most visible face of the state, so the public tends to associate the entire decision with the officials present at the site. In the context of building demolition, this causes Satpol PP to bear a substantial symbolic and administrative burden, even though the substantive decision on the status of a building violation should rest on technical verification and competent technical authority. The findings therefore broaden our understanding of the discretion that must be controlled and of the coordination design that determines who assesses, who decides, and who implements.

The classification of control measures according to intensity and legal consequences also opens a sharper discussion of the principle of proportionality. In regulatory enforcement theory, good governmental response is not always the harshest response, but the response that is appropriately sequenced, proportionate to the level of violation, and capable of explaining the reasons for escalation (de Fine Licht, 2011; van den Bos et al., 1997). The findings show that problems arise when the term control is used generically, making the differences among warnings, activity restrictions, and demolition itself increasingly obscure. From the standpoint of regulatory theory, this ambiguity is not merely terminological; it erodes the basis for testing whether government action has passed through reasonable corrective stages. One of the major contributions of this finding, therefore, is that it provides an analytical basis for assessing the escalation of measures more objectively, including when coercive action may be considered justified and when it instead appears premature.

A particularly prominent aspect is the operationalization of administrative due process into indicators that can be verified at every stage of action. Academically, this is important because debates on due process often remain at the level of principle without explaining how those principles operate in concrete local government decisions. The literature on legitimacy and procedural justice shows that process quality influences the willingness of affected parties to accept official decisions, including when the final outcome is disadvantageous to them (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012; Ulibarri et al., 2020). In the context of building demolition, due process serves a dual function: it limits the potential for excessive action while simultaneously strengthening the government's legal position when the decision is challenged. Interestingly, the findings also indicate that the most vulnerable point is not always the stage of physical execution, but rather the transition between administrative decision and field implementation. Theoretically, this finding aligns with critiques of bureaucratic approaches that place too much emphasis on initial procedure while paying insufficient attention to the implementation handoff, namely the transfer of responsibility from decision-maker to implementer. At this stage, the unclear form of orders, the lack of supporting documents, or overlapping instructions among agencies may reduce the legality of the action as a whole. In other words, procedures that appear complete on paper do not automatically guarantee lawful action if they are not translated into a consistent chain of command and administrative proof. This finding is relevant for correcting institutional perspectives that often separate the administration of decision-making from the administration of implementation as though the two were unrelated.

Based on the perspective of collaborative governance, the chained accountability model formulated in the findings offers a strong conceptual contribution. The literature on inter-organizational collaboration emphasizes that coordination cannot be built merely through meetings or informal communication; effectiveness and accountability instead depend on clarity of roles, rules of interaction, and the distribution of authority at each stage of the process (Provan & Kenis, 2008). In building demolition cases, the need for coordination between decision-making officials and Satpol PP can no longer be understood merely as a matter of synergy, but must be positioned as part of the legal structure of the action itself. Good collaboration therefore means not simply working together in the field, but integrating documents, legal bases, and responsible actors. This is where the study offers a corrective to practices that rely excessively on situational instructions without adequate administrative recordkeeping.

When extended to the policy realm, this discussion suggests that strengthening Regional Regulation enforcement should not be measured only by the increased frequency of operations or the speed with which violating objects are removed. A more relevant measure is whether the control system is capable of producing legally stable decisions, minimizing disputes, and explaining action transparently to affected parties. Such an approach is more consistent with the principle of good administration because it balances the public interest with the protection of citizens. The normative recommendations generated by this study therefore do not weaken Satpol PP's function; rather, they reorganize the legal and procedural foundations so that Satpol PP's role as an enforcement implementer is both better protected and more legitimate. Overall, the findings enrich the debate on the relationship between enforcement effectiveness and the legality of action in local government. The study shows that these two values need not be placed in opposition. On the contrary, clarity of authority, structured procedural stages, and traceable accountability are precisely the conditions that allow enforcement to operate consistently and withstand legal challenge.

5. CONCLUSION

The analysis demonstrates that the principal problem does not lie in the need for enforcement itself, but in how the authority to act is structured, limited, and exercised within the relationships among local government organs. Accordingly, evaluation of demolition measures cannot stop at the question of whether the building violated the applicable rules, but must be extended to questions concerning the validity of the authority's legal basis, the quality of the procedures followed, and the clarity of administrative accountability at every stage of action. Substantively, the study shows that Satpol PP's role in controlling unauthorized buildings falls within the sphere of highly important operational administrative enforcement, but it cannot be detached from the broader structure of administrative decision-making. Satpol PP is not the only actor that determines the legality of demolition, because such action requires linkage with technical verification, follow-up determinations by authorized officials, and administrative instruments that can be tested in law. This conclusion underscores that enforcement effectiveness must not be built on institutional simplification that places the entire burden of responsibility on field officials. Strong enforcement instead requires a clear division of functions among violation assessment, decision-making, and implementation.

The study also confirms that administrative due process in demolition must not be treated as a procedural formality that may be pushed aside in the name of speed. In the context of high-intensity measures, due process is a substantive mechanism for preserving proportionality, preventing arbitrariness, and ensuring that government action can still be explained rationally to citizens. Clear notice, staged warnings, opportunities to respond, documentation of implementation, and post-action management must therefore be viewed as an integrated sequence that forms the legitimacy of the action, rather than as isolated administrative elements. This position is important because many demolition disputes arise not solely from the status of the building violation, but from the perception that state action was taken without a fair and traceable process. Based on the perspective of knowledge development, the study contributes by formulating an evaluative framework that links the source of authority, the classification of control measures, due process standards, and models of inter-agency accountability within a single analytical flow. This framework offers a middle path between administrative law approaches that focus on the legality of norms and public administration approaches that highlight the dynamics of field implementation. Through this integration, the study shows that discussion of the demolition of unauthorized buildings can move beyond the dichotomies of strict versus slow or orderly versus procedural toward a more precise evaluation of the quality of local government action.

At the practical level, the principal implication of this study is the need to redesign enforcement based on clarity of authority and the administration of action. Local governments must ensure that every stage in handling unauthorized buildings has a clear map of roles, an adequate documentary basis, and coordination standards that can be tested. Strengthening Satpol PP, therefore, cannot be pursued solely through personnel and operational measures, but must be accompanied by improvements in decision architecture and administrative accountability. Through these steps, Regional Regulation enforcement through control and demolition can be carried out more consistently, with stronger legal protection, and with greater legitimacy in the eyes of the public.

REFERENCES

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18(4), 543–571. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032

Arias, J., Moreno-Rebato, M., Rodriguez-García, J. A., & Ossowski, S. (2024). Automated legal reasoning with discretion to act using s(LAW). Artificial Intelligence and Law, 32(4), 1141–1164. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-023-09376-5

Baldwin, R., & Black, J. (2008). Really Responsive Regulation. The Modern Law Review, 71(1), 59–94. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2230.2008.00681.x

Belegu, B., & Fejzullahu, A. (2023). The procedural rights in tax administrative legislation system: Evidence of the emerging economy. Corporate Law and Governance Review, 5(2), 19–26. https://doi.org/10.22495/clgrv5i2p2

Bellamy, R. (2017). The Rule of Law and the Separation of Powers (R. Bellamy (ed.)). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315085302

Blume, B. D., Ford, J. K., Baldwin, T. T., & Huang, J. L. (2010). Transfer of Training: A Meta-Analytic Review. Journal of Management, 36(4), 1065–1105. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352880

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework. European Law Journal, 13(4), 447–468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x

Buffat, A. (2015). Street-Level Bureaucracy and E-Government. Public Management Review, 17(1), 149–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2013.771699

Coglianese, C., & Lazer, D. (2003). Management-Based Regulation: Prescribing Private Management to Achieve Public Goals. Law & Society Review, 37(4), 691–730. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0023-9216.2003.03703001.x

de Fine Licht, J. (2011). Do We Really Want to Know? The Potentially Negative Effect of Transparency in Decision Making on Perceived Legitimacy. Scandinavian Political Studies, 34(3), 183–201. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9477.2011.00268.x

Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 22(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011

Evans, T. (2004). Street-Level Bureaucracy, Social Work and the (Exaggerated) Death of Discretion. British Journal of Social Work, 34(6), 871–895. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bch106

Evans, Tony. (2020). Street-Level Bureaucrats: Discretion and Compliance in Policy Implementation. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.1422

Halling, A., & Baekgaard, M. (2024). Administrative Burden in Citizen–State Interactions: A Systematic Literature Review. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 34(2), 180–195. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muad023

Heinrich, C. J. (2016). The Bite of Administrative Burden: A Theoretical and Empirical Investigation. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 26(3), 403–420. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muv034

Hupe, P., & Hill, M. (2007). Street-Level Bureaucracy and Public Accountability. Public Administration, 85(2), 279–299. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2007.00650.x

Hutchinson, T. ., & Duncan, N. (2012). Defining and describing what we do: Doctrinal legal research. Deakin Law Review, 17, 83–119.

Ishak, N. (2019). Implementation and Supervision of Official Discretion in Loacal Government of Republic of Indonesia. Al Daulah : Jurnal Hukum Pidana Dan Ketatanegaraan, 8(2), 197. https://doi.org/10.24252/ad.v8i2.11293

Masood, A., & Azfar Nisar, M. (2021). Administrative Capital and Citizens' Responses to Administrative Burden. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 31(1), 56–72. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muaa031

Moynihan, D., Herd, P., & Harvey, H. (2015). Administrative Burden: Learning, Psychological, and Compliance Costs in Citizen-State Interactions. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 25(1), 43–69. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muu009

Mungin, M. (2025). Menjembatani Aturan dan Kebutuhan: Kajian Kebijakan atas Pendirian Rumah Ibadah Tanpa Izin di Papua Barat. Jurnal Ilmiah Gema Perencana, 4(2), 1347–1368. https://doi.org/10.61860/jigp.v4i2.268

Parker, C., & Nielsen, V. (2009). The Challenge of Empirical Research on Business Compliance in Regulatory Capitalism. Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 5(1), 45–70. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.093008.131555

Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2008). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18(2), 229–252. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum015

Schillemans, T., & Busuioc, M. (2015). Predicting Public Sector Accountability: From Agency Drift to Forum Drift. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 25(1), 191–215. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muu024

Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The Role of Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Shaping Public Support for Policing. Law & Society Review, 37(3), 513–547. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5893.3703002

Tumuhulawa, A., & Moonti, R. M. (2021). The Authority of Government Officials in Delegating and Mandating. Unnes Law Journal, 7(1). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15294/ulj.v7i1.38778

Ulibarri, N., Emerson, K., Imperial, M. T., Jager, N. W., Newig, J., & Weber, E. (2020). How does collaborative governance evolve? Insights from a medium-n case comparison. Policy and Society, 39(4), 617–637. https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2020.1769288

van den Bos, K., Lind, E. A., Vermunt, R., & Wilke, H. A. M. (1997). How do I judge my outcome when I do not know the outcome of others? The psychology of the fair process effect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72(5), 1034–1046. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.5.1034

van den Bos, K., Wilke, H. A. M., & Lind, E. A. (1998). When do we need procedural fairness? The role of trust in authority. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75(6), 1449–1458. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.6.1449