Spatial Planning Regulation and Administrative Follow-up: Assessing Implementation Evidence in Bukit Betung, Bangka Regency

Frans Tory Damara Pradipta[1*], Lulu Aperianti[2], Sofa Sofiyanty[3], Erlangga Amirro Hakim[4], Novendra Hidayat[5]

[1-5]Political Science Study Program, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Bangka Belitung, Indonesia

Corresponding Author's e-mail : *franstory24@gmail.com*

ARMADA
JURNAL PENELITIAN MULTIDISIPLIN

e-ISSN: 2964-2981

ARMADA : Jurnal Penelitian Multidisiplin

https://ejournal.45mataram.ac.id/index.php/armada

Vol. 04, No. 10 Oktober, 2026

Page: 6829-6841

DOI:

https://doi.org/10.55681/armada.v4i10.4712

Article History:

Received: Agustus 13, 2026

Revised: September 21, 2026

Accepted: Oktober 19, 2026

Abstract : This study examines the implementation of spatial planning regulation in the case of soil excavation at Lereng Bukit Siam, Bukit Betung, Bangka Regency, Indonesia. It focuses on the relationship between the regulatory framework, reported government responses, and the traceability of administrative follow-up. Using a qualitative case study approach, data were collected through interviews, field observations, media reports, and relevant spatial planning regulations. The findings indicate that residents' objections and the cessation of excavation were reported in local media. A government informant also described responses, including the installation of a prohibition sign and coordination through local administrative channels. However, the available evidence does not sufficiently establish whether site-specific spatial conformity assessments, formal evaluations, or subsequent monitoring were completed. This limitation does not prove that these procedures never occurred but indicates that their implementation could not be independently verified. The study highlights the importance of distinguishing regulatory provisions, reported control actions, and verifiable administrative follow-up when assessing spatial planning implementation.

Keywords : Spatial Planning Regulation, Regulatory Implementation, Administrative Follow-Up, Evidentiary Traceability, Spatial-Use Control.

Abstrak *: Penelitian ini mengkaji implementasi regulasi penataan ruang dalam kasus penggalian tanah di Lereng Bukit Siam, Kelurahan Bukit Betung, Kabupaten Bangka, Indonesia. Kajian berfokus pada hubungan antara kerangka regulasi, respons pemerintah yang dilaporkan, dan keterlacakan tindak lanjut administratif. Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan studi kasus kualitatif dengan data yang diperoleh melalui wawancara, observasi lapangan, pemberitaan media, dan regulasi penataan ruang yang relevan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa keberatan warga dan penghentian penggalian diberitakan oleh media lokal. Informan pemerintah juga menjelaskan sejumlah respons, termasuk pemasangan plang larangan dan koordinasi melalui saluran administrasi pemerintahan setempat. Akan tetapi, bukti yang tersedia belum cukup untuk memastikan apakah penilaian kesesuaian pemanfaatan ruang pada lokasi tersebut, evaluasi formal setelah penghentian, atau pemantauan lanjutan telah dilaksanakan. Keterbatasan ini tidak membuktikan bahwa tahapan tersebut tidak*

pernah dilakukan, tetapi menunjukkan bahwa pelaksanaannya belum dapat diverifikasi secara independen. Penelitian ini menekankan pentingnya membedakan ketentuan regulasi, tindakan pengendalian yang dilaporkan, dan tindak lanjut administratif yang dapat diverifikasi dalam menilai implementasi penataan ruang.

Kata Kunci *: Regulasi Penataan Ruang, Implementasi Regulasi, Tindak Lanjut Administratif, Keterlacakan Bukti, Pengendalian Pemanfaatan Ruang.*

INTRODUCTION

Spatial planning is a legal instrument for directing land use and controlling activities to ensure consistency with designated spatial functions. Its implementation should not be assessed solely through the existence of regulations but also through the control measures undertaken and the administrative evidence supporting them (Abil, 2023). Procedures for assessing the conformity of activities with spatial plans illustrate the importance of administrative examination in implementing spatial planning policies (Suryaningsih et al., 2026). The relationship between spatial plans and land-use decisions has also been examined in studies of regional spatial planning law (Mustamin & Firmanto, 2026).

Spatial planning implementation presents particular challenges in areas affected by mining and land-use change. Research on post-tin-mining land restoration on Bangka Island highlights the need to address environmental degradation following extractive activities (Harahap, 2016). Rehabilitation planning for former tin-mining areas has also been linked to regional development and land recovery (Setiawan et al., 2019). The importance of ecological considerations in tin-mining management has been discussed through the concept of ecocentric governance (Haryadi et al., 2024). The relationship between tin-mining governance, legal policy, and sustainable development has also been examined in the context of the Bangka Belitung Islands (Pradipta, 2026a). Research on post-mining reclamation further highlights the relevance of administrative and criminal law instruments in environmental enforcement (Ratnasari, 2025).

Previous studies have examined spatial and environmental management through various governance perspectives. Stakeholder involvement in green open space management has been investigated in Semarang (Aliya & Suwitri, 2025). Environmental governance has also been applied to the management of green open spaces in East Kutai Regency (Tiku, 2020). Dynamic governance has been used to examine green open space management in Makassar (Fajri et al., 2020). Government capacity in optimizing green open space management has also been discussed in the same city (Tahir & Nahrudin, 2017). The application of dynamic governance to green open space development has been examined in South Tangerang (Putri & Mawar, 2025). Disaster mitigation-based green open space planning has also been studied in Palu (Pamungkas et al., 2026). Adaptive policymaking has been discussed in the literature on dynamic governance (Muttaqin, 2022). The implications of mining permits have likewise been examined through this perspective in Agam Regency (Anggraini & Helmi, 2025). Dynamic governance has also been applied to development planning in Palembang (Safriansyah & Anggraini, 2026) and to bureaucratic reform in Indonesia (Widowati et al., 2023). Research on civil servants' digital competence further highlights the importance of examining implementation challenges beyond formal policy objectives (Pradipta, 2026b). Unlike these studies, the present research does not focus on a governance model but examines the evidence of regulatory implementation in a specific spatial-use case.

The soil excavation case at Lereng Bukit Siam, Bukit Betung Subdistrict, Sungailiat District, Bangka Regency, provides a context for examining this issue. Media reports published in October 2025 documented residents' objections to excavation activities at the site (Yudi, 2025a). A

subsequent report stated that the Bangka Regency Government had stopped the excavation (Yudi, 2025b). Another report described a request to install a prohibition sign at the location (Nurhayati, 2025). These reports provide an initial account of the incident and the government response reported to the public. However, the reported cessation of excavation does not, by itself, establish the legal basis for the action, the spatial designation of the affected parcel, or the administrative measures undertaken afterward. The reported cessation must therefore be distinguished from evidence that all relevant spatial-control procedures have been completed.

Examining this case requires reference to the applicable spatial planning regulations. Bangka Regency Regulation No. 2 of 2024 concerning the Regional Spatial Plan for 2024–2044 provides the regional planning framework relevant to spatial utilization in the regency (Pemerintah Kabupaten Bangka, 2024). However, the existence of this regulation alone does not establish the precise zoning designation of the research site or prove that the excavation violated a particular provision. Such conclusions require verification against the applicable spatial designation and relevant documentation. Earlier reporting on the designation of a 15-hectare biodiversity park provides historical context for environmental management in Bangka Regency (Kasmono, 2015). Public statements emphasizing shared responsibility for environmental sustainability also reflect the broader local context of environmental protection (Kasmono, 2018). Reporting on student research into community concerns following excavation at Lereng Bukit Siam indicates continued public attention to the case (Redaksi, 2026). These contextual sources cannot replace administrative records establishing the legal and regulatory status of the research site.

Land-use issues have also been examined in research on the development of green agribusiness on post-tin-mining land in Bangka Belitung (Maharani et al., 2026a). Research on sustainable food agricultural land protection has addressed land conversion and its implications for the agribusiness sector (Maharani et al., 2026b). The relationship between ecological crises and social vulnerability has also been examined in the Indonesian context (Pradipta et al., 2026). Although these studies provide relevant environmental and policy context, the present research does not focus on designing alternative land uses or interpreting residents' social experiences.

The central problem addressed in this study concerns the traceability of spatial-use control implementation. This involves establishing the relationship between applicable regulations, reported control measures, available documentation, and administrative follow-up that can be verified. Actions documented in official records must be distinguished from those reported by media outlets or interview participants. Administrative stages that cannot be verified from the research materials must also be distinguished from actions proven not to have occurred. The absence of a document in the materials examined does not necessarily establish that the corresponding administrative action never took place. Instead, it indicates a limitation in the evidence available to reconstruct the implementation process.

Accordingly, this study examines the implementation of spatial planning regulation and administrative follow-up in the soil excavation case at Lereng Bukit Siam, Bukit Betung Subdistrict, Sungailiat District, Bangka Regency. It addresses three research questions: (1) which regulations are relevant to assessing spatial-use control in this case; (2) which control measures are supported by the available evidence; and (3) to what extent can administrative follow-up be verified? The study employs a qualitative case study approach based on relevant regulations, media reports, available documents, and interview evidence. The analysis distinguishes documented facts, reported information, and matters that remain uncertain. Its contribution lies in assessing the relationship between regulatory provisions, control measures, and verifiable administrative follow-up without inferring the overall success or failure of enforcement solely from reports that excavation has stopped.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative case study design to examine the implementation of spatial planning regulation and administrative follow-up in the soil excavation case at Lereng Bukit Siam, Bukit Betung Subdistrict, Sungailiat District, Bangka Regency. The case study approach enables an examination of the relationship between applicable regulatory provisions, reported control measures, and the administrative evidence available for assessing their implementation. Unlike approaches centered on governance capacity, inter-agency coordination, or residents' social interpretations, this study focuses on the traceability of regulatory implementation within a specific case.

Data Sources and Collection

The study draws on primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained through in-depth interviews with representatives of the Spatial Planning Division of the Bangka Regency Public Works and Spatial Planning Agency (PUPR) and residents living around Lereng Bukit Siam. The interviews provided information concerning spatial planning authority, the reported response to excavation activities, and the conditions relevant to the implementation of spatial-use control. Field observations were also conducted to examine the physical conditions of the research area and activities relevant to the case. Secondary data comprised applicable spatial planning regulations, available planning documents, media reports concerning the excavation incident, and relevant academic publications. Bangka Regency Regulation No. 2 of 2024 concerning the Regional Spatial Plan for 2024–2044 was considered as part of the regulatory framework. Media reports were used to reconstruct the publicly reported chronology of the incident and the reported government response, rather than being treated as conclusive evidence of legal violations or completed administrative procedures.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed through three connected stages: regulatory identification, examination of control-action evidence, and assessment of administrative follow-up. First, relevant regulatory provisions were identified to establish the legal framework for examining spatial-use control. The analysis did not presume that the excavation violated a specific zoning provision without evidence establishing the spatial designation and the applicability of that provision to the site. Second, reported control actions were examined by comparing information from interviews, field observations, media reports, and available documents. Each item of information was assessed according to its source and evidentiary status. Statements documented in official records were distinguished from media-reported events and information provided by interview participants. Third, the analysis examined the extent to which subsequent administrative actions could be verified from the available materials. The assessment distinguished actions supported by evidence, actions reported but not independently verified, and administrative stages for which sufficient evidence was unavailable. The absence of documentation in the materials examined was not treated as proof that an action had never occurred.

Evidence Verification and Research Limitations

To strengthen the credibility of the analysis, information from different sources was compared to identify consistencies, discrepancies, and unresolved questions. Regulatory provisions were treated as evidence of the applicable legal framework, whereas media reports and interview statements were evaluated according to the claims they could substantiate. Where the available sources did not establish the legal status of the site or confirm a particular administrative action, the analysis retained that uncertainty rather than making an unsupported conclusion. The findings are consequently limited to the case and the evidence available for examination. The study does not claim to establish the complete administrative history of the site where relevant records were unavailable. Instead, it assesses the extent to which the

implementation of spatial-use control can be reconstructed from the regulatory, documentary, observational, and interview evidence examined.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Regulatory Framework for Spatial-Use Control

Spatial-use control is an essential component of spatial planning because the establishment of a spatial plan needs to be accompanied by oversight of activities carried out on the ground. Spatial planning concerns not only the designation of land uses but also the management and control of spatial utilization to ensure that activities remain consistent with the applicable planning framework (Abil, 2023). From an administrative law perspective, the assessment of spatial utilization requires attention to the provisions governing location, the type of activity, and the control instruments available to the government (Mustamin & Firmanto, 2026).

The principal legal instrument relevant to examining the soil excavation case at Lereng Bukit Siam is Bangka Regency Regional Regulation No. 2 of 2024 concerning the Bangka Regency Regional Spatial Plan for 2024–2044. The regulation was enacted on 29 May 2024 and replaced Bangka Regency Regional Regulation No. 1 of 2013 concerning the Regional Spatial Plan for 2010–2030 (Pemerintah Kabupaten Bangka, 2024). The regulation establishes, among other matters, the regional spatial structure plan, spatial pattern plan, spatial utilization directions, provisions for controlling spatial utilization, and arrangements concerning public participation in spatial planning (Pemerintah Kabupaten Bangka, 2024).

The existence of this regulation provides a basis for examining how spatial utilization in Bangka Regency should be assessed under the applicable spatial plan. Research on the mechanism of Spatial Utilization Activity Conformity (Kesesuaian Kegiatan Pemanfaatan Ruang or KKPR) also highlights the importance of relating an activity to the relevant spatial conformity instruments before drawing conclusions about its spatial-use status (Suryaningsih et al., 2026). Accordingly, the soil excavation case at Lereng Bukit Siam needs to be examined by connecting the applicable regulatory provisions, the location of the activity, and the available administrative evidence.

In this study, the existence of the Regional Spatial Plan is not treated as sufficient grounds to conclude that the excavation activity violated spatial planning provisions. A conclusion concerning a violation requires further examination of the precise location, its designated spatial function, the type of activity undertaken, and the specific legal provisions applicable to that activity. This distinction is important because a regency-level spatial plan provides a framework for regional spatial regulation, whereas an assessment of a particular site requires sufficient spatial information to establish whether actual conditions correspond to the applicable provisions (Pemerintah Kabupaten Bangka, 2024).

The need to connect normative provisions with actual conditions is also relevant to spatial-use control in residential areas. Abil (2023), for example, examines the control of residential spatial utilization along the banks of the Alliritengae River in Turikale District, Maros Regency, providing context for understanding the importance of controlling activities in locations with specific spatial characteristics. Although the research object and geographical setting differ, the study is relevant as a point of comparison in emphasizing that spatial-use assessments should consider the characteristics of a location and the applicable regulations rather than relying solely on the presence of physical activity in a particular area.

Spatial control is also connected to the challenges of environmental management in regions experiencing pressure from extractive activities. Research on the restoration of post-tin-mining land on Bangka Island highlights the importance of addressing land conditions after mining activities have taken place (Harahap, 2016). A study of post-tin-mining land rehabilitation directions in South Bangka Regency similarly considers land conditions and rehabilitation needs in regional development planning (Setiawan et al., 2019). These studies provide an ecological context for the present research, but they cannot serve as direct evidence of the legal status or

physical condition of the Lereng Bukit Siam site because their research objects and location-specific data differ.

At a broader level, research on ecocentric governance of tin mining in the Bangka Belitung Islands emphasizes the importance of incorporating ecological considerations into mining governance (Haryadi et al., 2024). This perspective reinforces the relevance of examining spatial-use control not only in terms of the existence of regulations but also in terms of the traceability of related administrative actions. Nevertheless, the assessment of the Lereng Bukit Siam case must remain limited to evidence directly associated with the soil excavation activity under investigation.

On this basis, the focus of this study is neither to repeat an analysis of inter-actor coordination nor to formulate alternative land-use options for the future. Instead, the analysis addresses a more specific question: to what extent can the applicable regulatory framework be connected to reported control actions, and to what extent can subsequent administrative measures be verified through the available evidence? This focus provides the basis for distinguishing between regulatory provisions that apply in principle, actions reported by research sources, and administrative stages that cannot yet be established from the documentation examined.

Evidence of Spatial-Use Control Actions

Soil excavation activities in the Lereng Bukit Siam area attracted public attention following objections from nearby residents in October 2025. A news report published on 13 October 2025 covered residents' protests against the excavation, while a subsequent report published on 14 October 2025 stated that the Bangka Regency Government had halted the activity at the site (Yudi, 2025a; Yudi, 2025b). Another report documented residents' requests for the installation of a prohibition sign as part of the response to the issue (Nurhayati, 2025). These reports provide a basis for reconstructing the publicly reported sequence of events, but they are insufficient to establish the completion of all administrative procedures undertaken by the government.

Information provided by an informant from the Spatial Planning Division of the Bangka Regency Public Works and Spatial Planning Agency (PUPR) offers additional details about the reported control measures. According to the interview data included in the study, the response involved installing a prohibition sign, conveying reports through the local government structure, and discussing the issue through spatial planning coordination mechanisms (PUPR Spatial Planning Division, 2026). The informant also referred to the involvement of environmental authorities, local administrative officials, the subdistrict administration, and the Civil Service Police Unit in addressing the issue (PUPR Spatial Planning Division, 2026).

The interview evidence indicates that government control measures were reported to have taken place. However, an assessment of regulatory implementation must distinguish interview statements from documentary records that can confirm the administrative execution of particular actions. For example, an informant's statement about the installation of a prohibition sign constitutes interview evidence of a reported action. Confirming the installation date, the basis for issuing the instruction, the responsible authority, and the documentation of its implementation would require examination of relevant supporting records. This distinction does not mean that interview evidence is unusable; rather, it clarifies the limits of the conclusions that can be drawn from each type of source.

News reports about the cessation of excavation and the PUPR interview can be considered complementary sources. Media reports provide a publicly documented chronology, whereas the interview offers an account of the measures reported by the relevant government agency (Yudi, 2025b; PUPR Spatial Planning Division, 2026). The consistency between these sources supports a limited conclusion: the cessation of excavation was publicly reported, and the government informant described control measures associated with the case. Nevertheless, these sources do not

independently establish that every stage of spatial-use control was completed in accordance with the applicable legal procedures.

This evidentiary limitation matters because the cessation of an activity is not equivalent to the administrative resolution of a spatial-use issue. The fact that excavation stopped does not automatically establish that spatial conformity, relevant licensing or approval requirements, records of control measures, and post-cessation site assessments were completed. Each of these matters must be examined against the applicable legal provisions, the authority responsible, and the available evidence. Accordingly, this study does not conclude that these stages were neglected; rather, it identifies them as matters that remain unverified when supporting documents are unavailable in the materials examined.

Visual documentation of the excavation activities collected during the research provides contextual information about the physical site. However, photographs and other visual records cannot, on their own, determine the legal status of spatial utilization, the conformity of the activity with the Regional Spatial Plan, or the extent of environmental damage. Assessments of soil stability, drainage conditions, environmental risks, and land suitability require separate technical examination. Field documentation is therefore treated as contextual evidence that complements interviews and written sources, rather than as a substitute for technical assessment or administrative records.

The findings reveal a distinction between reported control actions and the completeness of the evidence documenting their implementation. The available information supports an account of residents' objections, the publicly reported cessation of excavation, and the PUPR informant's description of the response. However, the same evidence is insufficient to reconstruct every administrative stage, from the examination of the applicable legal basis to the evaluation of the site after the activity ceased. This distinction provides the basis for the subsequent assessment of administrative follow-up and evidentiary gaps.

Administrative Follow-up and Evidentiary Gaps

The assessment of administrative follow-up in the Lereng Bukit Siam case requires a distinction between the reported cessation of excavation and the extent to which subsequent administrative procedures can be verified from the available evidence. According to the informant from the Spatial Planning Division of the Bangka Regency Public Works and Spatial Planning Agency (PUPR), excavation activities eventually ceased, and the handling process was not reported to have proceeded to subsequent stages (PUPR Spatial Planning Division, 2026). This account provides insight into how the case was understood from the informant's perspective. However, it does not establish the complete administrative status of the site or whether further procedures were undertaken by other relevant authorities.

The available findings can be classified into three evidentiary categories. The first comprises events documented in publicly available reports, including objections raised by residents and the reported cessation of excavation (Yudi, 2025a; Yudi, 2025b). These reports provide a publicly documented chronology of the incident, but they do not independently establish whether all applicable administrative requirements were fulfilled. The second category consists of actions described by the government informant, including the installation of a prohibition sign and the communication of reports through local administrative channels (PUPR Spatial Planning Division, 2026). These statements provide evidence of reported administrative responses, although the completeness of the corresponding documentary records could not be independently established from the materials examined. The third category concerns subsequent administrative stages for which the research materials did not provide sufficient evidence for independent verification.

One issue requiring further verification is whether the spatial status of the excavation site was formally assessed against the applicable regional spatial plan. Bangka Regency Regional Regulation No. 2 of 2024 establishes the regional spatial planning framework for 2024–2044 (Pemerintah Kabupaten Bangka, 2024). The existence of this regulation provides the relevant

regional planning context, but it does not, by itself, establish whether the specific excavation site complied with its provisions. A site-specific determination would require sufficiently precise location information, identification of the applicable spatial designation, and evidence connecting the reported activity to the relevant regulatory requirements. Since these elements have not been sufficiently established in the research materials, this study does not make a definitive determination regarding a spatial planning violation.

A further limitation concerns the available evidence on administrative measures following the cessation of excavation. The research materials examined do not provide sufficient evidence to independently verify whether a formal post-cessation evaluation, a technical assessment of the site, or a documented monitoring procedure was completed. This finding is limited to the scope of the materials available for analysis. The absence of supporting records in these materials does not establish that the relevant activities did not occur; rather, their implementation could not be independently verified within the scope of this study. Further clarification would require examination of relevant administrative records and technical documentation, where available.

The distinction between the cessation of an activity and the completion of regulatory follow-up is also relevant to environmental governance in mining-affected regions. Research on post-mining land rehabilitation in Bangka Belitung highlights the importance of addressing land conditions beyond the period of extractive activity (Harahap, 2016; Setiawan et al., 2019). Research on environmental law enforcement in relation to post-mining reclamation also provides a broader legal context for examining the relationship between environmental obligations and administrative enforcement (Ratnasari, 2025). These studies contextualize the importance of follow-up measures, but they do not establish which specific obligations or procedures applied to the Lereng Bukit Siam excavation case. The applicability of particular requirements must be determined from the relevant legal provisions and case-specific evidence.

The findings therefore indicate a limitation in evidentiary traceability rather than a definitive finding of administrative non-compliance. Publicly available reports document the reported cessation of excavation, while the government informant describes control measures associated with the response. Taken together, these sources support an account of reported responses to the incident, but they are insufficient to reconstruct the complete sequence of administrative actions or independently confirm the completion of subsequent verification and evaluation stages. The central analytical contribution of this study is to assess the traceability of regulatory implementation without treating evidence of an initial response as conclusive proof of complete administrative compliance.

From this perspective, the case illustrates the analytical importance of distinguishing among the existence of a regulatory framework, evidence of an initial control action, and evidence of subsequent administrative follow-up. These dimensions are related but cannot be treated as interchangeable. The existence of a regulatory framework does not, by itself, establish how it was implemented in a particular case, while evidence of an initial control action does not necessarily establish whether subsequent procedures were completed. An assessment of regulatory implementation must therefore remain proportionate to the documentary and empirical evidence available.

Regulatory Implementation Traceability in Spatial-Use Control

Regulatory implementation traceability refers to the extent to which applicable legal provisions can be linked to reported control actions and evidence that allows subsequent administrative follow-up to be independently verified. This approach examines regulatory implementation through the relationship between the legal framework, reported actions, available evidence, and the extent to which implementation can be established. It distinguishes the existence of a regulatory framework from evidence of an initial government response and evidence concerning the completion of subsequent administrative procedures.

In the Lereng Bukit Siam case, Bangka Regency Regional Regulation No. 2 of 2024 concerning the Regional Spatial Plan for 2024–2044 provides a relevant regulatory framework for examining spatial use (Pemerintah Kabupaten Bangka, 2024). Media reports concerning residents' objections and the reported cessation of excavation, together with information provided by the PUPR informant, offer accounts of the response to the incident (Yudi, 2025a; Yudi, 2025b; PUPR Spatial Planning Division, 2026). These sources serve different evidentiary purposes. The regulation establishes the normative framework, while media reports and interview statements provide information about reported events and administrative actions. Neither category, on its own, establishes the complete sequence of regulatory implementation at the specific site.

To examine these relationships, the study uses a regulatory implementation traceability matrix. The matrix organizes the available evidence according to the aspects examined and identifies the extent to which the corresponding findings can be established. It is an analytical instrument for assessing evidentiary support, rather than a formal legal compliance assessment or a definitive determination of administrative performance.

Table 1. Regulatory Implementation Traceability Matrix for the Lereng Bukit Siam Case

Aspect examined	Available evidence	Analytical status
Spatial planning regulatory framework	Bangka Regency Regional Regulation No. 2 of 2024 concerning the Regional Spatial Plan for 2024–2044	Regulation identified; application to the specific site requires further examination
Community objections	Media reports concerning residents' protests in October 2025	Documented in the media reports examined
Cessation of excavation	Media reports and statements from the PUPR informant	Cessation reported by different sources
Installation of a prohibition sign	Statement from the PUPR informant	Action reported; supporting implementation records were not independently verified
Examination of spatial conformity at the site	Sufficient site-specific evidence and examination documents were not identified in the reviewed research materials	Cannot be independently determined from the available evidence
Evaluation and monitoring after excavation ceased	Sufficient evidence was not identified in the reviewed research materials	Implementation not independently verified

Source: Prepared by the authors based on Bangka Regency Regional Regulation No. 2 of 2024, media reports by Yudi (2025a, 2025b), and an interview with the Spatial Planning Division of the Bangka Regency PUPR Agency (2026).

The matrix shows that regulatory implementation traceability cannot be assessed solely by establishing whether an observable action was reported at the site. The reported cessation of excavation provides evidence of an outcome associated with the response to the activity. It does not, by itself, establish the legal basis and procedural sequence of the response, whether the site's spatial conformity was formally examined, or whether subsequent administrative measures were

completed. The status "cannot be independently determined from the available evidence" therefore refers to the limits of the research materials, rather than establishing that the relevant examination or action never occurred.

The findings can be examined across three analytical dimensions. The first concerns the existence of a regulatory framework, which provides the normative basis for examining spatial use. The second concerns evidence of control actions, including reported measures associated with the government's response to the excavation activity. The third concerns the traceability of administrative follow-up, which addresses whether subsequent procedures can be established through relevant documents or other supporting evidence. Although these dimensions are related, they are analytically distinct. Identifying a regulatory framework does not establish how it was applied in a particular case, while evidence of an initial control action does not necessarily demonstrate that subsequent administrative procedures were completed.

The contribution of this study lies in using evidentiary traceability to define the appropriate scope of conclusions about regulatory implementation. Rather than equating the reported cessation of excavation with the completion of all administrative procedures, the analysis distinguishes between actions documented in available sources, actions reported by an informant, and procedures whose implementation could not be independently verified. The study also refrains from concluding that a spatial planning violation occurred without sufficient site-specific evidence and verification of the applicable regulatory provisions.

The Lereng Bukit Siam case illustrates the importance of establishing a traceable relationship between legal provisions, control actions, and evidence of administrative follow-up when assessing regulatory implementation. Conclusions must remain proportionate to the strength and scope of the evidence examined. This analytical focus distinguishes the present study from research primarily concerned with adaptive governance capacity, alternative land-use planning, or residents' social interpretations of space. Its principal concern is the extent to which the implementation of spatial-use regulation can be examined transparently through available empirical and administrative evidence.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the implementation of spatial planning regulation in the case of soil excavation at Lereng Bukit Siam, Bangka Regency, with particular attention to the relationship between the applicable regulatory framework, reported control actions, and the traceability of administrative follow-up. The findings indicate that the case attracted public attention following residents' objections and that the cessation of excavation was reported by local media and the government informant. These findings establish evidence of a reported response, but they do not independently demonstrate that all relevant administrative procedures were completed. The principal finding concerns the limitations of the available evidence in establishing the full sequence of regulatory implementation. Although Bangka Regency Regional Regulation No. 2 of 2024 provides a spatial planning framework, its existence alone does not establish the conformity or non-conformity of the specific excavation site. Likewise, the reported cessation of excavation and installation of a prohibition sign do not, by themselves, confirm whether subsequent technical assessments, formal evaluations, or monitoring activities were conducted. These matters remain unverified within the scope of the materials examined.

The study contributes an evidentiary traceability perspective to the assessment of spatial-use control. By distinguishing regulatory provisions, reported actions, and verifiable administrative follow-up, it demonstrates the importance of aligning conclusions with the strength and limitations of the available evidence. This approach avoids treating the cessation of an activity as conclusive proof of full regulatory compliance or interpreting incomplete documentation as definitive proof that administrative action did not occur. The study is limited by the scope of the case and the availability of documentary evidence concerning site-specific spatial conformity and subsequent administrative procedures. Further research could strengthen the assessment through

examination of relevant administrative records, verification of the site's spatial designation, and additional technical documentation concerning the excavation area. Such evidence would enable a more comprehensive evaluation of how spatial planning regulations are implemented and followed up in practice.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research team would like to express its sincere gratitude to Dr. Novendra Hidayat, M.Si., as the supervisor, for his guidance, direction, and valuable input throughout the research and preparation of this article. The team also extends its appreciation to the Institute for Research and Community Service of Universitas Bangka Belitung for the support and facilities provided during the research process. Special thanks are also extended to the Bangka Regency Public Works and Spatial Planning Agency (PUPR), residents around the Lereng Bukit Siam area, and all informants who generously provided their time and valuable information for this study. The team also appreciates all team members and other parties who provided support throughout the research process until the completion of this article.

REFERENCES

Abil, A. (2023). Pengendalian pemanfaatan ruang permukiman di sempadan Sungai Alliritengae Kecamatan Turikale Kabupaten Maros. *Urban and Regional Studies Journal,* 6(1), 138–142. https://doi.org/10.35965/ursj.v6i1.3798

Aliya, F. N., & Suwitri, S. (2025). Peran stakeholders dalam penataan ruang terbuka hijau (RTH) Kecamatan Tugu Kota Semarang. *Journal of Management and Public Policy,* 15(1), 120–135. https://doi.org/10.14710/jppmr.v15i1.54910

Anggraini, V., & Helmi, R. F. (2025). The dynamic governance in the implications of mining permit: A case study in Bawan Village, Agam Regency. *TOFEDU: The Future of Education Journal,* 4(7), 2662–2669. https://doi.org/10.61445/tofedu.v4i7.911

Fajri, F. Y. K., Khaerah, N., & Razak, F. S. H. (2020). Dynamic governance dalam pengelolaan ruang terbuka hijau di Kota Makassar. *Journal of Government and Politics* (JGOP), 2(2), 104–112. https://doi.org/10.31764/jgop.v2i2.2300

Harahap, F. R. (2016). Restorasi lahan pasca tambang timah di Pulau Bangka. *Society,* 4(1), 61–69. https://doi.org/10.33019/society.v4i1.36

Haryadi, D., Ibrahim, & Darwance. (2024). Membangun tata kelola pertambangan timah yang ekosentris di Kepulauan Bangka Belitung. *Bina Hukum Lingkungan,* 8(3), 235–257. https://doi.org/10.24970/bhl.v8i3.276

Kasmono. (2015, June 12). Pemkab tetapkan Taman Kehati seluas 15 hektare. *ANTARA News* Bangka Belitung. https://babel.antaranews.com/berita/23611/pemkab-tetapkan-taman-kehati-seluas-15-hektare

Kasmono. (2018, April 24). Plt Bupati Bangka: Kelangsungan bumi tanggung jawab bersama. *ANTARA News Bangka Belitung.* https://babel.antaranews.com/berita/75445/plt-bupati-bangka-kelangsungan-bumi-tanggung-jawab-bersama

Maharani, E., Lalang, M., Pradipta, F. T. D., & Fadly, Z. A. S. (2026). Tata kelola dan kerangka hukum pengembangan green agribusiness pada lahan pascatambang timah di Bangka Belitung. *Journal of Contemporary Business Law,* 1(2), 9–16. https://ojs2.adzkia.ac.id/index.php/jcbl/article/view/68

Maharani, E., Pradipta, F. T. D., Fadly, Z. A. S., & Lalang, M. (2026). Juridical analysis of sustainable food agricultural land protection policy in controlling land conversion and its impact on the agribusiness sector. *Punggawa Law Review,* 1(3), 18–23. https://punggawajournal.com/plr/article/view/35

Mustamin, M., & Firmanto, T. (2026). Legal politics of spatial utilization for residential areas in the Regional Spatial Plan Regulation of Bima City (2021–2024). *Jurnal Hukum Prasada,* 13(1), 17–27. https://doi.org/10.22225/jhp.13.1.2026.17-27

Muttaqin, M. A. (2022). Membangun kebijakan adaptif menuju dynamic governance. *Jurnal Wacana Kinerja,* 25(1). https://doi.org/10.31845/jwk.v25i1.773

Nurhayati, E. B. M. (2025, October 14). Warga protes pengerukan tanah di lereng Bukit Siam, Yusrizal minta Pemkab Bangka pasang plang larangan. *Erabaru Media.* https://www.erabarumedia.id/berita/216701928/warga-protes-pengerukan-tanah-di-lereng-bukit-siam-yusrizal-minta-pemkab-bangka-pasang-plang-larangan

Pamungkas, Y., Darwis, & Sisrilnardi. (2026). Penataan ruang terbuka hijau (RTH) berbasis mitigasi bencana dalam perspektif dynamic governance: Studi kasus RTH publik Kota Palu. *Jurnal Studi Inovasi Pemerintahan*, 2(2).

Pemerintah Kabupaten Bangka. (2024). *Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Bangka Nomor 2 Tahun 2024 tentang Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah Kabupaten Bangka Tahun 2024–2044.* https://jdih.bangka.go.id/content/peraturan-daerah-kabupaten-bangka-nomoir-2-tahun-2024-tentang-rencana-tata-ruang-wilayah

Pradipta, F. T. D. (2026a). Politik hukum tata kelola pertambangan timah dalam perspektif pembangunan berkelanjutan di Provinsi Kepulauan Bangka Belitung. *Jurnal Sutasoma,* 4(2), 31–42. https://ejournal.universitastabanan.ac.id/index.php/jurnalsutasoma/article/view/455

Pradipta, F. T. D. (2026b). Smart governance, weak implementation? Evaluating digital civil servants competence in the age of e-government. *Jurnal MSDA (Manajemen Sumber Daya Aparatur),* 14(1), 103–123. https://doi.org/10.33701/jmsda.v14i1.6148

Pradipta, F. T. D., Irawan, H. A., & Rahmadani, S. (2026). Krisis ekologis dan kerentanan sosial dalam tata kelola kabut asap di Indonesia tahun 2026. *Journal of University Students in Multidisciplinary Subject,* 2(1), 55–77. https://doi.org/10.69673/junistuject.v2i1.272

Putri, D. Y., & Mawar. (2025). Penerapan dynamic governance dalam pengembangan ruang terbuka hijau (RTH) di Kota Tangerang Selatan. *Sosial Simbiosis: Jurnal Integrasi Ilmu Sosial dan Politik,* 2(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.62383/sosial.v2i2.1395

Ratnasari, C. (2025). Penegakan hukum lingkungan hidup melalui instrumen hukum administrasi dan hukum pidana terhadap korporasi yang tidak melakukan reklamasi pasca tambang (Studi kasus reklamasi tambang timah di daerah Bangka Provinsi Bangka Belitung). *LITRA,* 3(2). https://doi.org/10.24198/litra.v3i2.947

Redaksi. (2026, August 6). Mahasiswa Program Studi Ilmu Politik UBB kaji keluh kesah masyarakat pasca penggalian tanah di kawasan lereng Bukit Siam. *Garuda Merdeka.* https://garudamerdeka.id/2026/08/06/mahasiswa-program-studi-ilmu-politik-ubb-kaji-keluh-kesah-masyarakat-pasca-penggalian-tanah-di-kawasan-lereng-bukit-siam/

Safriansyah, T., & Anggraini, D. (2026). Pendekatan dynamic governance dalam perencanaan pembangunan di Kota Palembang. *Jurnal STIA Bengkulu,* 12(2), 185–194. https://doi.org/10.56135/jsb.v12i2.349

Setiawan, F., Murtilaksono, K., & Widiatmaka. (2019). Arahan rehabilitasi lahan pasca tambang timah untuk pengembangan wilayah di Kabupaten Bangka Selatan. *Tataloka,* 21(4), 660–668. https://doi.org/10.14710/tataloka.21.4.660-668

Suryaningsih, E., Diartika, F., Astanto, T. Y., Wahyuningtiyas, L., & Rambe, S. S. U. (2026). Kajian mekanisme kesesuaian kegiatan pemanfaatan ruang (KKPR) kegiatan berusaha. *SOSMANIORA,* 5(2), 1253–1259. https://doi.org/10.55123/sosmaniora.v5i2.8276

Tahir, M. M., & Nahrudin, Z. (2017). Kapabilitas dynamic governance dalam optimalisasi pengelolaan lahan terbuka hijau di Kota Makassar. *CosmoGov,* 3(1). https://doi.org/10.24198/cosmogov.v3i1.12404

Tiku, D. (2020). Environmental governance dalam penataan ruang terbuka hijau di kawasan pusat pemerintahan Bukit Pelangi Kabupaten Kutai Timur. *JAP: Jurnal Administrasi Publik,* 4(1), 447–459.

Widowati, L., Setyowati, K., & Suharto, D. G. (2023). Dynamic governance as perspective in Indonesian bureaucracy reform. *Jurnal Bina Praja,* 15(2), 403–415. https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.15.2023.403-415

Yudi. (2025, October 13). Penggalian lereng Bukit Siam Sungailiat diprotes warga. *Babel Pos.* https://babelpos.disway.id/bangka/read/679769/penggalian-lereng-bukit-siam-sungaliat-diprotes-warga

Yudi. (2025, October 14). Pemkab Bangka hentikan penggalian tanah di lereng Bukit Siam Sungailiat. *Babel Pos.* https://babelpos.disway.id/berita-utama/read/679799/pemkab-bangka-hentikan-penggalian-tanah-di-lereng-bukit-siam-sungaliat