African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

Page: 309 – 324 https://amjd.kiu.ac.ug

CORRUPTION AS A CATALYST FOR NOISE POLLUTION AND ITS VIOLATION OF THE RIGHT TO A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT: A CASE STUDY OF UGANDA

[1] Daniel M. Walyemera & [2] Gloria M. Walyemera

[1] Postdoctoral Researcher, College of Law, University of South Africa
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4649-9030, +256 (0) 782448598,
Email: dwalyemera@gmail.com / walyedm@unisa.ac.za
[2]Assistant Lecturer, School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Kampala International University
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2341-3719, +256772041080 Email: mahoroglow2@gmail.com

Abstract

Noise pollution has become a notable environmental and public health issue in Uganda, especially in urban areas. Although the constitution and laws guarantee the right to a healthy environment, enforcement is weak, often hindered by corruption. This article explores noise pollution in Uganda from an environmental law perspective, analysing the legal and regulatory framework, court responses, and enforcement obstacles. Drawing on case law, legislative texts, and environmental law theories, it argues that noise pollution infringes on the constitutional right to a healthy environment. The paper offers practical suggestions to improve legal structures, boost enforcement efforts, and encourage public involvement in noise pollution management. Doctrinal research methods are used to examine the data.

Keywords: Noise pollution, Environmental rights, Uganda, Environmental law, public health, Sound level regulations, Corruption

Introduction

Environmental degradation remains one of the principal challenges of the twenty-first century, with pollution manifesting in various forms that jeopardise human health, biodiversity, and ecosystems. Although conventional discourse primarily emphasises air, water, and soil contamination, noise pollution is increasingly acknowledged as a substantial environmental threat with profound public health consequences (King, 2022); (Basner et al., 2014). The World Health Organisation considers noise pollution to be the second most harmful environmental stressor after air pollution, linked to cardiovascular diseases, sleep disturbances, cognitive impairments in children, and mental health disorders (World Health Organisation, 2018).

In Uganda, rapid urbanisation, unregulated industrial growth, increasing vehicular traffic, and the proliferation of entertainment establishments have resulted in significant noise pollution, particularly in urban centres such as Kampala, Entebbe, and Jinja. Noise from religious structures, bars, nightclubs, construction sites, and transportation sources frequently exceeds permissible safety thresholds, affecting the health and well-being of millions of inhabitants (Mohamed, 2021). Despite the constitutional guarantee of the right to a clean and healthy environment enshrined in Article 39 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (1995), as well as specific legislative provisions on noise pollution, enforcement mechanisms remain sporadic and ineffective. This article examines noise pollution in Uganda as a violation of the right to a healthy environment, analysing the legal and institutional framework governing noise control, relevant case law, and the challenges impeding effective enforcement. The study employs a doctrinal legal research approach, analysing primary sources such as the Constitution, statutes, regulations, and case law, as well as secondary sources including academic writings and policy documents.

The paper is organised as follows: the introductory section provides an overview; the research methodology is traversed in Section 2. Section 3 delineates a theoretical framework for understanding environmental law; Section 4 investigates the legal and regulatory framework for noise pollution management in Uganda; Section 5 analyses leading case law; Section 6 discusses enforcement challenges; and Section 7 presents practical recommendations to enhance noise pollution control mechanisms. Section 8 summarises the paper's conclusions.

Research Methods

The research employs a comparative doctrinal analysis approach. (Aryal, 2023) (Ngwoke, 2023) (Taekema, 2020). This establishes a vital foundation for implementing practical interventions within the legal regime on noise pollution. The research employs the "Black Letter Law" method, also referred to as doctrinal research. This methodology encompasses two stages: initially, identifying the fundamental legal principles, which subsequently facilitates a comprehensive analysis of the primary legal texts (Aryal, 2023). This research methodology primarily concentrates on the description, organisation, and analysis of legal sources. It facilitates the identification of recurring themes that can be examined across various sources to substantiate research findings. The fundamental text is scrutinised employing analogical, inductive, and deductive reasoning. Furthermore, the doctrine of precedent is utilised to analyse case law throughout the paper. The study relies on both primary and secondary sources, including statutes, regulations, academic publications, case law, media reports, government documents, and policy papers (Taekema, 2020). Integrating this approach into interdisciplinary research fosters collaboration across diverse fields by bridging the methodological gap between law and qualitative studies. Moreover, it expands the potential applications of this research method within qualitative research (Aryal, 2023). The discourse on theories applicable to the paper follows hereunder.

Theoretical Framework: Environmental Law Perspectives

The Rights-Based Approach to Environmental Protection

The rights-based approach to environmental protection has gained increased prominence within both international and domestic legal frameworks, emphasising that a healthy environment is fundamental to human dignity and well-being (Stamm, 2023); (Hayward, 2005). This approach considers environmental protection not merely as a policy objective but as a fundamental human right, necessitating both negative obligations (to prevent harm to the environment) and positive obligations (to actively safeguard the environment) for the state and private entities (Bryner, 2022); (Boyd, 2012). In 2021, the United Nations Human Rights Council officially recognised the right to a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment as a fundamental human right. However, deliberations regarding its precise scope and enforcement mechanisms continue. This rights-based approach offers several advantages: it elevates environmental protection to a constitutional stature, empowers individuals to contest environmental damage, enables judicial enforcement, and institutes accountability mechanisms for both governmental and non-governmental entities (Bryner, 2022).

Within the African context, the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981) explicitly states in Article 24 that "all peoples shall have the right to a generally satisfactory environment conducive to their development." The African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights has interpreted this provision expansively, encompassing protection against various forms of

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

environmental degradation, including pollution (Social and Economic Rights Action Centre v. Nigeria, 2001).

Environmental Justice Theory

Environmental justice theory originated in the recognition that environmental burdens and benefits are unequally distributed across society, with marginalised communities frequently bearing the most severe consequences of pollution and environmental degradation (Figueroa, 2022). This framework emphasises three principal dimensions of justice: distributive justice, which concerns the equitable distribution of environmental benefits and burdens; procedural justice, which ensures active and meaningful participation in environmental decision-making processes; and recognition justice, which upholds the dignity and rights of all communities.

In the domain of noise pollution, concerns pertaining to environmental justice are particularly salient. Residents of low-income urban areas in Uganda habitually live in densely populated areas near bustling roads, factories, and entertainment centres, where noise levels are at their peak (Carson, 2021). These communities frequently lack the political influence and financial resources necessary to relocate or to advocate effectively for noise mitigation measures. Moreover, procedural impediments such as limited access to information, exclusion from decision-making processes, and inadequate legal support exacerbate the injustices experienced by these communities.

The Polluter Pays Principle

The polluter-pays principle, as articulated in Principle 16 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (1992), holds that entities responsible for pollution should bear the costs of managing it to prevent detrimental effects on human health or the environment. This principle facilitates the internalisation of environmental costs and functions as a deterrent to polluting activities (Zhu, 2015). With regard to noise pollution, the polluter-pays principle stipulates that entities responsible for excessive noise such as industrial facilities, entertainment establishments, or construction companies are required to assume responsibility for noise mitigation initiatives and to provide compensation for the damages incurred.

Implementing the polluter-pays principle requires robust monitoring and enforcement mechanisms, clear allocation of responsibilities, and adequate remedies for victims of pollution. Furthermore, it involves transitioning from conventional command-and-control regulations to economic instruments such as noise taxes, trading schemes, or deposit-refund systems, which offer financial incentives for noise reduction (Luppi, 2012); (Zhu, 2015).

The Precautionary Principle

The precautionary principle, articulated in Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration, asserts that when there are threats of serious or irreversible environmental harm, uncertainty in scientific evidence should not hinder the implementation of cost-effective measures to avert damage (Wiersema, 2022). This principle is particularly pertinent to noise pollution, where the long-term health consequences may not be immediately apparent, and the cumulative effects of continuous noise exposure may only become evident after an extended period.

Applying the precautionary principle to noise pollution control requires authorities to adopt protective measures even when scientific evidence of health impacts remains inconclusive. It underscores the importance of prioritising preventative actions over remedial responses and shifts the burden of proof onto those responsible for generating noise, requiring them to demonstrate that their activities are non-harmful (Wiersema, 2022).

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

Legal and Regulatory Framework for Managing Noise Pollution in Uganda

Constitutional Provisions

The 1995 Constitution of Uganda establishes the legal framework for environmental protection, encompassing noise pollution. Article 39 affirms the right of all Ugandans to a clean and healthy environment, while Article 237(2)(b) mandates that land use be governed by principles that promote public health and environmental well-being. These constitutional provisions grant rights that citizens may enforce through judicial proceedings.

The National Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy, particularly Objective XIII, elucidate the state's environmental responsibilities. Objective XIII(i) obligates the state to "promote sustainable development and public awareness of the necessity to manage land, air, and water resources in a balanced and sustainable manner for both current and future generations." Although these National Objectives are not explicitly enforceable under Article 8(2), judicial bodies frequently consider them in interpreting other constitutional provisions and in developing environmental law. Uganda's constitutional framework exemplifies a commitment to a rights-based approach to environmental protection, highlighting that environmental quality is fundamental to human dignity and basic rights. Nevertheless, due to the broad nature of these provisions, they necessitate comprehensive legislative and regulatory measures to address specific environmental concerns, such as noise pollution.

The National Environment Act

The National Environment Act (NEA), enacted in 1995 and subsequently amended, constitutes Uganda's primary legislative framework for environmental protection. It designates the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) as the principal body responsible for coordinating, monitoring, and overseeing environmental management throughout Uganda. As articulated in Section 3, NEMA is mandated to "ensure compliance with environmental quality standards and guidelines."

Section 68 of the National Environmental Act (NEA) addresses noise pollution by prohibiting any noise that causes nuisance or disrupts public peace, comfort, or convenience. It recognises noise as an environmental concern that warrants regulation. Furthermore, Section 69 grants the environment minister the authority to establish regulations for the management of noise pollution, including the determination of permissible noise limits for various areas and times.

The NEA also defines key procedural tools for managing noise pollution. Section 71 authorizes NEMA to issue notices for improvement or prevention to individuals whose actions cause or could cause environmental harm, including noise issues. Section 72 allows for environmental restoration orders, requiring those responsible for damage to restore the environment to its original state. Proper use of these enforcement tools could significantly reduce noise pollution.

The National Environment (Noise Standards and Control) Regulations

Under the authority granted by the NEA, the 2003 National Environment (Noise Standards and Control) Regulations were enacted to set specific standards and control measures for noise pollution. These regulations constitute the most comprehensive legal framework for noise in Uganda and include several essential provisions.

Regulation 4 sets the maximum permissible noise levels in various categorised areas. For residential zones, the thresholds are 50 dB during the day and 35 dB at night. Commercial zones permit 60 dB during the day and 35 dB at night. Industrial zones have higher allowable limits: 75 dB during the day and 65 dB at night. These standards align with World Health Organisation guidelines, which

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

recommend that background noise should not exceed 55 dB during the day and 45 dB at night in residential areas to mitigate health risks.

Regulation 5 prohibits the use of loudspeakers or public address systems between 9:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., unless authorised by local authorities. Regulation 6 mandates that premises operators implement measures to mitigate noise disturbance. Regulation 7 stipulates that individuals generating potentially loud noise must obtain approval from NEMA or the relevant local authorities.

The regulations also encompass enforcement provisions. Regulation 11 authorises environmental inspectors to access premises to evaluate noise levels and respond to complaints. Regulation 12 delineates penalties, stating that individuals convicted of violations may be fined, imprisoned, or both. However, the comparatively modest fines generally not exceeding 1 million Ugandan shillings (approximately $270) raise concerns about their deterrent efficacy, particularly for commercial enterprises that derive substantial benefits from noise-generating activities.

The Public Health Act

The Public Health Act (Cap. 281) supplements environmental legislation by recognising noise as a public health concern. Section 10 grants local authorities the power to establish bylaws to prevent or mitigate health risks, including excessive noise. Section 105 explicitly designates noise as a statutory nuisance that must be addressed by authorities.

Numerous local authorities in Uganda have enacted bylaws under the Public Health Act to address noise pollution. For example, the 2015 Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA) Public Health (Noise Pollution) Bylaws establish specific regulations for noise control in Kampala, including limitations on amplified music, construction noise, and vehicular sound levels. These bylaws encompass provisions for inspections, notifications, and sanctions for violations.

The Public Health Act framework implements a decentralised approach to addressing noise pollution, delegating authority to local agencies in close proximity to affected communities to manage noise concerns. However, this approach encounters challenges, including limited capacity, resource shortages, corruption and inconsistent enforcement across different local government jurisdictions.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act

The Occupational Safety and Health Act (2006) addresses workplace noise pollution. Section 13 mandates that employers ensure the safety, health, and well-being of all employees, including measures to protect against excessive noise levels in the workplace. The Act authorises the Commissioner for Occupational Safety and Health to establish standards for maximum noise exposure and to require employers to implement noise assessments and control measures.

Although this occupational health framework primarily focuses on safeguarding workers, it also provides indirect benefits to neighbouring communities by requiring noise-reduction measures that reduce emissions beyond the workplace. Nonetheless, enforcement has been constrained due to inadequate inspection resources and lenient sanctions for violations.

Judicial Responses: Leading Case Law on Noise Pollution in Uganda

In contrast to countries such as Kenya, South Africa and India, where judicial authorities have imposed stringent penalties for noise pollution, Ugandan courts have not enacted robust deterrent sanctions, thereby exacerbating the issue. This is particularly noteworthy considering the severe sanctions prescribed within the legislative statutes. Furthermore, certain cases have been dismissed on procedural grounds, consequently leaving victims of noise pollution without

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

adequate redress. In (Mansur & 4 Ors Vs Casablanca Pub, Night Club & Restaurant Ltd & 6 Ors, 2019), the High Court determined that when a statute confers initial jurisdiction upon a lower court, the High Court is obliged to comply with that statute and may only exercise appellate jurisdiction when appropriate. Consequently, the argument presented by the counsel supporting the jurisdiction of the Applicants was deemed unfounded. Justice Honrietta Walayo observed that, because of the breach of statutory duty by KCCA and NEMA, jurisdiction appropriately resides with the magistrates' court as the court of first instance, particularly given that only declaratory orders are being sought.

On a positive note, certain courts have resisted the offenders' attempts to obscure justice for victims through legal technicalities. In the case of (Safina Kigambo and Another v Uganda, 2025), The High Court of Uganda dismissed the Respondent's application to revise the criminal charges on the grounds of purported irregularities in the charge sheet, particularly noting that the noise pollution legislation (NEMA Act) had undergone amendments. Justice I. Muwata affirmed the validity of the charges, finding no substantive errors needing correction. Concerning the second issue, the petition to stay the criminal proceedings pending the resolution of civil suit number 90 of 2022 was denied, as the objectives of the respective proceedings are distinct and no exceptional prejudice was demonstrated. Finally, the motion to declare the criminal proceedings null and void was also rejected, as no irregularities were identified that would warrant such a declaration.

Victims of noise pollution have, in other cases, accessed justice when Ugandan courts have ruled in their favour, albeit with insignificant penalties. In (Bashaija K. Andrew v Green Lounge Investments Limited and 2 Others, 2023), a High Court Judge, who is a resident of Muyenga, an elite suburb, sued a bar and restaurant. The High Court declared that the acts of the defendants constituted a private nuisance to the plaintiff. The court also issued a permanent injunction restraining the defendants from carrying on the business of a bar and restaurant in a designated residential area.

The case of (Mukwasi General Contractors Ltd v Living Words Assembly Limited & 2 Ors , 2018), serves as a significant reference point on noise pollution in Uganda. The High Court ascertained that a church emitting noise at 64.8 decibels within a mixed residential and commercial zone contravened existing regulations. Justice M. Ssekaana clarified that the permissible noise levels are 55 decibels during daytime and 45 decibels at night in such areas. The court noted that, although the defendant possesses the right to utilise their property freely, excessive noise interfered with the lawful use of the plaintiff's property. Consequently, a permanent injunction was issued to prohibit the defendant from generating such noise and disturbing the plaintiff's peaceful enjoyment. The court emphasised that: "A person who disturbs another's enjoyment of property cannot justify this disturbance by asserting that it is a natural consequence of exercising their rights if such rights are exercised performatively or excessively". Refer to Halsbury's Laws of England (4th edition), volume 34, paragraph 323. Referring to Halsbury's Laws of England (4th edition), volume 34, paragraph 324, the court additionally observed that an act is considered an inconvenience if it significantly impairs an individual's fundamental physical comfort, regardless of sophisticated or delicate lifestyles, but in accordance with simple, clear, and universally accepted standards. See We will address the enforcement challenges in the subsequent section.

Challenges in Enforcement and Gaps in Implementation

Despite Uganda's comparatively robust legal framework and evolving case law, enforcement of noise pollution regulations faces significant challenges that impede effective protection of the right to a healthy environment.

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

Institutional Limitations

NEMA and local authorities responsible for noise pollution control encounter significant capacity challenges (Sundaram, 2024). NEMA possesses limited staff and resources relative to its expansive mandate across Uganda's environmental concerns. With only a small number of environmental inspectors nationwide, maintaining consistent noise-level monitoring proves challenging. Local authorities, particularly in rural and smaller urban areas, frequently lack the technical equipment, trained personnel, and legal expertise needed for effective enforcement. Financial constraints further exacerbate these issues, as limited budgets limit investments in monitoring tools, public awareness campaigns, and enforcement initiatives. This scarcity of resources engenders a vicious cycle: inadequate enforcement diminishes regulatory credibility, thereby leading to increased non-compliance and persistent noise pollution (Sundaram, 2024).

Coordination and Institutional Fragmentation

The management of noise pollution involves various entities, including NEMA, local authorities, the Ministry of Health, the Directorate of Occupational Safety and Health, and law enforcement agencies (Kasimbazi, 2023). This multi-agency responsibility often gives rise to coordination challenges and jurisdictional ambiguities. Communities affected by noise pollution often struggle to identify the appropriate authorities to address their complaints. Rivalries among institutions and unclear delineation of responsibilities can lead to overlapping efforts in certain areas and oversight deficiencies in others.

The lack of effective coordination mechanisms leads to sporadic collection and dissemination of information on noise pollution among relevant institutions. Such fragmentation hampers the development of comprehensive strategies to address noise pollution and complicates monitoring of enforcement outcomes and evaluation of intervention effectiveness (Hemmat, 2023).

Political and Economic Pressures

Enforcing noise regulations is frequently impeded by political and economic considerations (Bragdon, 2016). Religious institutions, which represent significant sources of noise pollution, possess considerable political influence and often oppose noise restrictions. Political leaders are often hesitant to enforce these regulations against religious organisations to avoid alienating their supporters (Walyemera, 2025). Similarly, establishments such as bars, nightclubs, and entertainment venues contribute substantially to local taxation and employment, which may incentivise authorities to overlook noise violations in these instances (Hemmat, 2023).

Corruption and Regulatory Capture

Corruption constitutes a significant obstacle to the effective enforcement of noise pollution regulations in Uganda (Walyemera, 2025). It manifests at various levels within the regulatory framework and assumes multiple forms, persistently thwarting initiatives aimed at environmental protection.

1) **Bribery and extortion.** Establishments that produce noise frequently attempt to influence environmental inspectors, law enforcement officials, and local authorities through bribery to avoid enforcement actions. Inspectors may accept bribes in exchange for favourable assessments or to overlook violations. The comparatively low compensation for enforcement personnel increases the propensity for corruption. For example, in Uganda, environmental inspectors often receive salaries below the rate of inflation. When a nightclub owner offers several months' wages as a bribe to an inspector with a modest salary, the likelihood of the bribe being accepted increases significantly (Walyemera, 2025).

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

2) **Political interference.** Politicians at both national and local levels sometimes intervene in enforcement activities to protect establishments linked to themselves, their relatives, or political allies (Walyemera, 2025). Environmental inspectors and local officials responsible for enforcing noise rules at venues with political ties may encounter threats, be reassigned to less desirable locations, or face dismissal. This situation results in a chilling effect, making enforcement officials reluctant to act against violations by powerful individuals.
3) **Regulatory capture.** At times, regulatory authorities may be influenced by the industries they supervise. Representatives from sectors such as entertainment, religious groups, or commerce can influence policymaking and enforcement practices, leading to relaxed regulations and lenient enforcement. This concern is exacerbated by the revolving-door phenomenon between regulatory agencies and private enterprises, as well as by local governments' dependence on revenue from noise-polluting businesses.
4) **Licensing and permits obtained fraudulently**. Corruption within the licensing process enables establishments to obtain operational permits without meeting noise-control standards (Nwazi, 2025). Bribery may be used to expedite approval processes, secure deviations from noise regulations, or obtain permits for locations where they should not be granted. In some cases, entirely counterfeit permits are issued without appropriate regulatory review.
5) **Manipulation of surveillance systems.** Corruption may entail manipulating noise-monitoring data, such as having inspectors falsify readings to falsely indicate compliance despite existing violations. It may also involve conducting measurements at misleading times or locations that do not accurately represent the noise impact on communities. Furthermore, deliberate tampering with equipment calibration could be employed to produce inaccurate readings that favour violators.

   The pervasive corruption in noise pollution enforcement cultivates a culture of impunity, in which violators perceive bribery as a more economical alternative to complying with noise regulations (Walyemera, 2025). This phenomenon undermines public confidence in regulatory agencies, thereby rendering the constitutional entitlement to a healthy environment ineffective for individuals who lack the resources or connections necessary to pursue justice. The problem is exacerbated by inadequate accountability measures, insufficient oversight of enforcement officials, and a widespread culture of corruption permeating multiple sectors of Ugandan governance.

Public Awareness and Cultural Factors

Limited public awareness concerning noise pollution and its health consequences hampers enforcement efforts. Many Ugandans do not consider noise a significant environmental or health issue, viewing it as an inevitable aspect of urban living. This viewpoint is further reinforced by cultural norms that often regard loud music and public address systems as symbols of celebration and vitality.

Numerous business owners and operators are unaware of noise regulations or regard them as unnecessary interference with their activities. Furthermore, the lack of heightened public awareness of the health and environmental impacts of noise pollution makes it difficult to secure political support for enforcement measures (Hemmat, 2023) (Bragdon, 2016).

Insufficiency of Penalties

Penalties for violations of noise pollution laws are often insufficient in deterring offenders, especially commercial entities that derive significant revenue from noisy operations. Fines are comparatively modest for many businesses and can be easily offset by income from amplified music

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

and entertainment. Furthermore, the infrequent enforcement of these regulations means that such penalties are rarely imposed.

Criminal prosecution for noise pollution is infrequent, and when it does occur, cases often drag on for years due to judicial delays (Bragdon, 2016). The sluggish judicial process and the low probability of conviction diminish the deterrent effect of criminal penalties. Although civil remedies through tort nuisance claims are theoretically available, they are typically too costly and time-consuming for most affected individuals.

Limited Access to Justice

Access to justice for victims of noise pollution remains constrained. Although Uganda's legal regime confirms the individuals' entitlement to contest noise pollution, considerable obstacles to legal recourse remain. Legal costs are substantial, making it difficult for many Ugandans to pursue constitutional litigation. While environmental organisations participate in public interest litigation, their limited resources hinder their ability to address all aspects of noise pollution.

The absence of class action provisions in Ugandan law impedes affected communities from pooling resources for collective legal initiatives. Consequently, individual complainants bear the entire burden and risk of legal proceedings, which frequently discourages them from pursuing legal action despite apparent violations.

Practical Recommendations

Addressing noise pollution effectively requires a comprehensive strategy that strengthens the legal framework, enhances institutional capacity, intensifies enforcement efforts, and promotes public participation.

Legislative and Regulatory Reforms

1) Enhance sanctions for violations of noise regulations. The government is advised to amend the Noise Standards and Control Regulations to substantially increase penalties for violations, aligning them with the economic gains obtained from non-compliance. It is recommended that commercial enterprises implement fines based on a percentage of revenue to ensure penalties act as an effective deterrent. Furthermore, repeated infractions should incur progressively harsher sanctions, such as suspension or revocation of business licenses.
2) Establish strict liability standards for noise pollution. The legislation should be amended to impose strict liability for noise pollution, thereby eliminating the need to prove negligence or intent. This adjustment would necessitate noise sources to prove adherence to established standards and would streamline enforcement by minimising evidence requirements.
3) Broaden the extent of noise control measures. Regulations should be amended to address emerging noise sources, including mobile loudspeakers, outdoor events, and recreational activities. Additionally, they should establish explicit guidelines for construction noise, including specified time restrictions, impact assessments, and mitigation measures for projects located in or near residential areas.
4) Establish noise zoning regulations. Local authorities should be required to establish noise zones with different acceptable noise levels that correspond to land-use patterns. Zoning laws should restrict noise-generating activities in residential areas and establish buffer zones to separate residential areas from commercial or industrial areas.
5) Require noise impact assessments as a mandate. The legislation should require noise impact assessments for all development projects likely to generate significant noise, such as construction, industrial facilities, entertainment venues, and transportation infrastructure.

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

These assessments ought to be integrated into the environmental impact evaluation process and should include community consultation and mitigation strategies.

Institutional Capacity Building

1) Increase enforcement resources. The government should allocate adequate financial resources to NEMA and local authorities to manage noise pollution. This funding should support noise-monitoring devices, inspection vehicles, and enforcement staff to monitor and enforce noise pollution.
2) Create dedicated noise pollution units. NEMA and key urban local authorities should establish dedicated teams to monitor and enforce noise pollution regulations. These teams should be composed of trained environmental health officers and equipped with calibrated sound level meters and relevant tools.
3) Improve technical skills and capabilities. Training programs ought to be meticulously crafted to enhance the technical expertise of environmental inspectors, local government officials, and law enforcement personnel in areas such as noise measurement, assessment, and enforcement. Engaging with international organisations and academic institutions can facilitate the development of comprehensive training curricula and certification programs for professionals specialising in noise pollution.
4) Establish a network for noise monitoring. Urban areas should set up permanent noise-monitoring stations at strategic locations to continuously monitor ambient noise levels. This data will support enforcement efforts, identify noise hotspots, and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions. The monitoring system must be linked to a central database accessible by authorised authorities.

Enhanced Coordination Frameworks

1) Establish interagency coordination structures. A National Noise Pollution Control Committee should be established, comprising members from NEMA, local authorities, the Ministry of Health, law enforcement agencies, and civil society organisations. This committee will oversee enforcement initiatives, coordinate policy development, facilitate information exchange, and formulate national strategies to mitigate noise pollution.
2) Clarify the mandates of institutions. The roles and responsibilities of various institutions in noise pollution control should be clearly delineated through memoranda of understanding or legal amendments. This approach would prevent jurisdictional confusion and ensure that all aspects of noise pollution management are comprehensively addressed.
3) Establish a centralised complaints system. A centralised complaints system should be established, accessible via telephone hotlines, mobile applications, and online platforms, enabling citizens to report noise pollution with ease. It should automatically direct complaints to the appropriate authority and incorporate tracking features, allowing users to monitor the progress of their reports.

Economic and Market-Based Instruments

1) Implement noise charges. Consider instituting noise levies for establishments that generate excessive noise. These charges help internalise the environmental costs of noise pollution and provide economic incentives to mitigate noise levels. The revenue generated could be allocated to noise abatement initiatives and support for affected communities.
2) Implement noise trading schemes. In industrial zones, small-scale noise trading schemes could be tested, enabling facilities that keep noise below set limits to sell noise credits to others.

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

This market-oriented approach would encourage noise reduction through economic incentives, ensuring overall noise remains within acceptable limits.

3) Provide incentives for noise abatement. Businesses investing in soundproofing, noise barriers, and other abatement technologies should be eligible for tax incentives, subsidies, or expedited licensing. Such measures would promote voluntary compliance and demonstrate that noise control can be harmonised with economic development.

Public Awareness and Education

1) Initiate wide-ranging awareness campaigns. NEMA and local authorities should initiate public awareness campaigns to inform citizens about the health effects of noise pollution, applicable legal standards, and procedures for lodging complaints. These campaigns ought to utilise radio, television, social media, community gatherings, and school activities to engage a broad audience.
2) Incorporate education about noise pollution into school curricula. Environmental education programs within educational institutions should integrate modules on noise pollution, its health implications, and individual responsibility for reducing noise. Such an approach would foster enduring awareness and stimulate cultural transformations pertaining to noise.
3) Engage religious and community leaders. Religious institutions and community leaders ought to be engaged as collaborative partners in addressing noise pollution. Inviting religious authorities to harmonise worship practices with community health objectives may foster voluntary adherence and mitigate potential conflicts. Furthermore, community leaders are instrumental in mediating disputes and advocating for behaviours that respect noise regulations.
4) Create educational materials to raise awareness about noise pollution. Develop and widely distribute accessible educational materials that elucidate noise standards, associated health impacts, and the rights and responsibilities of users. These resources should be provided in local languages and be inclusive of individuals with disabilities.

Technology and Innovation

1) Advocacy for the adoption of soundproofing technology. The government should encourage the availability of affordable soundproofing materials and technologies. This may include establishing soundproofing standards, certifying qualified contractors, and providing technical guidance to establishments on effective noise mitigation methods.
2) Employ noise mapping technology. Urban local authorities should utilise geographic information systems (GIS) to develop noise maps that pinpoint areas of high noise pollution and facilitate ongoing monitoring of noise levels. These maps can support land-use planning, assist in prioritising enforcement efforts, and inform evidence-based policymaking.
3) Utilise mobile technology for monitoring purposes. Develop and promote smartphone applications that enable citizens to assess and report noise levels. Although these applications will not replace official monitoring efforts, citizen science initiatives can serve as valuable supplements to regulatory measures and help increase public awareness.
4) Artificial Intelligence and Noise Pollution Enforcement

Community Participation and Access to Justice

1) Strengthen community participation. Legal provisions should be established to ensure meaningful community involvement in decisions related to noise-producing activities. This includes mandates for public notification of license or permit applications for establishments

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

that may generate noise, public hearings prior to approving such applications, and community representation on local noise management committees.

2) Promote easier access to justice. Legal aid should be accessible to communities affected by noise pollution so that they can seek legal remedies. Public interest litigation should be promoted by implementing protective costs orders that mitigate financial risks for individuals pursuing environmental protection cases. Furthermore, establishing environmental courts or tribunals with streamlined procedures and reduced costs should be considered to improve access to justice.
3) Strengthen communities by promoting decentralisation. Local communities should have the capacity to develop and enforce noise control measures tailored to their specific circumstances. Community-led monitoring and enforcement, supported by local authorities, can complement official regulations and help ensure that noise management meets local requirements.

Regional and International Collaboration

1) Implement global best practices. Uganda should explore and adopt effective noise pollution control strategies from other nations. Engaging in exchange programs, study tours, and technical cooperation with countries that have successfully managed noise pollution could offer valuable insights and proven models.
2) Get involved in local environmental projects. Uganda should actively participate in regional environmental cooperation frameworks, such as those of the East African Community, to align noise standards, exchange experiences, and address transboundary noise pollution.
3) Seek international technical and financial support. The government ought to secure technical and financial aid from international organisations, development partners, and environmental funds to facilitate capacity building, technology transfer, and the execution of noise pollution mitigation initiatives.

Anti-Corruption Strategies in Environmental Enforcement

Addressing corruption in noise pollution enforcement requires comprehensive reforms that target both supply- and demand-side corruption, strengthen accountability measures, and fundamentally change institutional culture.

1) Improve law enforcement agents' salaries and conditions. The government should significantly increase remuneration for environmental inspectors, law enforcement officers, and local officials responsible for enforcing noise pollution regulations (Sundaram, 2024). Offering competitive salaries diminishes the probability of bribery and attracts competent professionals. Furthermore, improving working conditions—such as supplying suitable equipment, vehicles, and operational resources—further mitigates corruption risks by enabling personnel to execute their responsibilities efficiently.
2) Implement oversight and accountability mechanisms. An autonomous entity dedicated to environmental enforcement should be instituted, endowed with the authority to investigate allegations of corruption, conduct random audits of enforcement activities, and review licensing determinations. It should possess the capacity to recommend disciplinary actions, prosecute corrupt officials, or remove them from office. Regular audits of enforcement records, inspection reports, and licensing decisions are essential to identify corruption patterns and deter misconduct.
3) Implement transparent and digitalised systems. Digitising licensing, permitting, inspection, and complaint systems can help reduce corruption risks by minimising the need for face-to-

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

face interactions between regulators and regulated parties. Utilising online platforms for license applications, automated processing, digital payments, and electronic enforcement tracking enhances transparency and establishes audit trails, thereby facilitating the detection of corrupt activities. Furthermore, publishing noise monitoring data and inspection reports online in real time enables public oversight.

4) Enhance protections for whistle-blowers. Implementing comprehensive whistle-blower protection legislation is vital to safeguard environmental inspectors, government officials, and community members who expose corruption in noise pollution enforcement (Uganda Government, 2010). Establishing secure disclosure channels, confidentiality assurances, anti-retaliation measures, and compensation for individuals facing repercussions would encourage the reporting of misconduct. Additionally, highlighting successful whistle-blower cases can demonstrate the system's effectiveness.
5) Implement integrity testing and conduct lifestyle audits. Routine integrity assessments of enforcement personnel, conducted through controlled scenarios, help identify corrupt officials. In accordance with section 31 of the Anti-Corruption Act, Lifestyle audits, in which environmental inspectors and licensing officials are required to declare their assets and expenses and verify them against legitimate income sources, can uncover unexplained wealth indicative of corruption. Personnel who fail these integrity evaluations or possess unexplained wealth should be investigated and subject to appropriate sanctions.
6) Enhance penalties for corruption in environmental enforcement. Specific criminal offences should be created for corruption in environmental enforcement, with severe penalties including mandatory imprisonment, substantial fines, permanent disqualification from public service, and asset forfeiture. Prosecution of corrupt environmental officials should be prioritised, with dedicated prosecutors assigned to environmental corruption cases. Public prosecution of high-profile cases would demonstrate political commitment to fighting corruption (Walyemera, 2025).
7) Encourage multi-stakeholder oversight. Civil society organisations, community groups, and media should be empowered to oversee enforcement actions and report instances of corruption. Community monitoring committees could collaborate with inspectors during noise inspections, observe licensing decisions, and review enforcement records. Media investigations into environmental enforcement corruption should be supported by access-to-information laws and protections for investigative journalists.
8) Implement the segregation and rotation of functions. Enforcement personnel should be regularly rotated across different geographic regions and sectors to prevent the development of corrupt relationships with regulated entities. Licensing functions should be kept separate from inspection duties, and both should be independent from prosecution decisions to ensure no single official has control over the entire enforcement process. Conducting team inspections with multiple officials can promote mutual oversight and reduce the risk of individual corruption.
9) Establish ethics training and codes of conduct. Mandatory ethics training for all personnel involved in noise pollution enforcement should focus on fostering professional integrity, understanding the public health impacts of non-enforcement, and recognising the legal and career risks associated with corruption. Well-defined codes of conduct, delineating prohibited behaviours, conflicts of interest, and ethical duties, should be established and strictly enforced. Moreover, officials ought to sign integrity pledges and transparently disclose any potential conflicts of interest.

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

10) Establish incentives to motivate good performance. Performance-based incentives should acknowledge enforcement personnel for quantifiable advancements in noise pollution management, such as decreases in noise complaints, increased compliance rates, or successful prosecutions. Recognising and rewarding exemplary service can bolster pride in professional integrity. Promotions should be based on demonstrated integrity and effectiveness, rather than political connections.
11) Engage political leaders in anti-corruption initiatives. Strong political commitment is essential in combating corruption within environmental enforcement (Walyemera, 2025). The President, Ministers, and parliamentary committees must openly condemn corruption and endorse anti-corruption initiatives. Leaders should refrain from interference in enforcement activities and ensure accountability for those who obstruct legitimate enforcement actions.
12) Enhance the integrity of the judicial system. Corruption can infiltrate the judiciary, leading judges to accept bribes to dismiss noise pollution cases or render favourable judgments. The implementation of judicial anti-corruption measures such as asset declaration requirements for judges, judicial conduct commissions, and transparent appointment procedure is imperative to guarantee the equitable adjudication of noise pollution cases.

    To effectively change institutional culture and ensure credible enforcement of noise pollution controls, these anti-corruption measures must be implemented thoroughly and sustained over the long term. Although it is challenging, lessons from other countries show that sustained anti-corruption efforts can significantly strengthen environmental enforcement and rebuild public confidence in regulatory agencies (Walyemera D. , 2025).

Conclusion

Noise pollution in Uganda significantly infringes upon the constitutional right to a healthy environment, thereby affecting public health, quality of life, and environmental justice. Although Uganda has developed a relatively comprehensive legal and regulatory framework for managing noise pollution, enforcement is constrained by limited institutional capacity, coordination issues, political and economic obstacles, limited public awareness, and inadequate enforcement of sanctions.

Theoretical frameworks of environmental law, such as the rights-based approach, environmental justice theory, the polluter pays principle, and the precautionary principle, offer vital insights into understanding and tackling noise pollution. These perspectives highlight that noise pollution is more than just a nuisance; it is a serious violation of human rights that necessitates stringent regulation and proactive measures.

Judicial decisions, established important precedents that acknowledge noise pollution as an environmental harm that breaches constitutional rights and impose positive obligations on regulators to enforce noise standards. However, translating these rulings into effective protections requires addressing systemic obstacles that impede enforcement.

This article's recommendations—encompassing legislative reform, capacity development, enhanced coordination, economic incentives, public awareness initiatives, technological progress, community participation, and international collaboration—outline a comprehensive strategy to improve noise pollution management in Uganda. Effective implementation depends on robust political commitment, sustained resource allocation, and cooperation among government agencies, civil society, the private sector, and local communities.

Ultimately, effectively managing noise pollution in Uganda necessitates acknowledging that environmental protection and sustainable development can coexist with economic growth,

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

cultural expression, and religious freedom. These elements are vital to a society that upholds human dignity, safeguards public health, and ensures that all individuals—regardless of socioeconomic status or geographic location—have the right to a clean and healthy environment.

References

1) Aryal, A. &. (2023). Black-Letter Methodology in Qualitative Research: Theoretical Perspectives and Applications. . *A Bi-annual South Asian Journal of Research & Innovation, 10*(2), 1-8.
2) Ngwoke, R. A. (2023). A critical appraisal of doctrinal and non-doctrinal legal research methodologies in contemporary times. *International Journal of Civil Law and Legal Research, 3*(1), 08-17.
3) Taekema, S. A. (2020). Legal Philosophy as an Enrichment of Doctrinal Research Part 1: Introducing Three Philosophical Methods, 2020. *Law and Method.*
4) King, E. A. (2022). Here, there, and everywhere: How the SDGs must include noise pollution in their development challenges. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development, , 64*(3), 17-32.
5) Mohamed, M. A. (2021). A study of noise pollution and impact on human health. . *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Research, 9*(6), 610-614.
6) Stamm, I. (2023). Human rights–based social work and the natural environment: Time for new perspectives. *Journal of Human Rights and Social Work, 8*(1), 42-50.
7) Bryner, N. (2022). A constitutional human right to a healthy environment. . In *Research Handbook on Fundamental Concepts of Environmental Law* (pp. 141-159). Edward Elgar Publishing.
8) Figueroa, R. M. (2022). Environmental justice. . In *The Routledge companion to environmental ethics* (pp. (pp. 767-782).). Routledge.
9) Carson, B. B. (2021). How can citizen science advance environmental justice? Exploring the noise paradox through sense of place. *Cities & Health, 5*(1-2), 33-45.
10) Zhu, L. &. (2015). Polluter-Pays Principle-Policy Implementation. *Envtl. Pol'y & L., 45*, 34.
11) Luppi, B. P. (2012). The rise and fall of the polluter-pays principle in developing countries. *International Review of Law and Economics,, 32*(1), 135-144.
12) Wiersema, A. (2022). (The precautionary principle in environmental governance. In *In Research Handbook on fundamental concepts of environmental law* (pp. 361-380). Edward Elgar Publishing.
13) Sundaram, A. (2024). The Enforcement Of Environmental Laws In Developing Countries: Challenges And Opportunities. *Library of Progress-Library Science, Information Technology & Computer,, 44*(3).
14) Kasimbazi, E. B. (2023). *Environmental law in Uganda.*
15) Hemmat, W. H. (2023). Exploring noise pollution, causes, effects, and mitigation strategies: a review paper. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences, 1*(5), 995-1005.
16) Bragdon, C. R. (2016). *Noise pollution: The unquiet crisis.* University of Pennsylvania Press.
17) Walyemera, D. M. (2025). (2025). Unraveling the Intricacies of Formality and Informality: An Examination of Uganda's Institutional Fight against Corruption. *Journal of Anti-Corruption Law, 9*(2), 143-170.
18) Nwazi, J. &. (2025). Legal and Practical Challenges of Combating Noise Pollution in Nigeria. *Pellucid International Journal of Social Sciences, Management and Humanities*, 148-168.
19) Uganda Government. (2010). Whistleblowers Protection Act. Uganda Government.
20) Walyemera, D. (2025). Strengthening the right to institute a private prosecution as an Anti-Corruption Tool in Uganda: Lessons from Other Commonwealth Jurisdictions. *Speculum Juris, 39* (1), pages 196 – 212.
21) Mansur & 4 Ors Vs Casablanca Pub ,Night Club & Restuarant Ltd & 6 Ors, (MISC. APPLN. 406 OF 2018) [2019] UGHCCD 8 (26 February 2019) (High Court of Uganda February 26, 2019).
22) Safina Kigambo and Another v Uganda, (Miscellaneous Application 29 of 2024) [2025] UGHCCRD 41 (18 September 2025) (High Court of Uganda September 18, 2025).
23) Bashaija K. Andrew v Green Lounge Investments Limited and 2 Others, (Civil Suit No. 0026 of 2020) [2023] UGHCCD 428 (22 February 2023) (High Court of Uganda February 22, 2023).

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)

24) Mukwasi General Contractors Ltd v Living Words Assembly Limited & 2 Ors , (CIVIL SUIT NO. 230 OF 2013) [2018] UGHCCD 101 (12 December 2018) (High Court of Uganda December 12, 2018).

ISSN: 2518-2951 https://doi.org/10.59568/AMJD-2026-14-2-24 African Multidisciplinary Journal of Development (AMJD)