

**An Assessment of the Urban Conditions and Systemic Issues  
Contributing to Slum Development in Freetown, Sierra Leone**

**Michael A. O. Johnson**

## ACRONYMS

FT	Freetown
FCC	Freetown City Council
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
NGO	Non- Governmental Organisation
FSES	Freetown Slum Exit Strategy,
CIS	Corrugated Iron Sheet
FIRP	Freetown Infrastructure Rehabilitation Project
GVWC	Guma Valley Water Company
SLRA	Sierra Leone Roads Authority
FSP	Freetown Structure Plan
GOAL SL	GOAL Sierra Leone
EC	The European Commission
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
NCRRR	National Commission for Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction
CRS	Catholic Relief Service
NPA	National Power Authority
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
CA	Cities Alliance
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (German Agency for Technical Cooperation)

## TABLES

Table 1.1	Rank Order for Sierra Leone: Urban Localities, Towns and Cities; population and percentage of Population: 2004; 1985; 1974; 1973
Table 1.2	Greater Freetown Census enumeration of 1974 and 1985
Table 1.3	Percentage Distribution of the Total Population by District and Province: Sierra Leone, 1985-2004
Table 3.1	Tenancy and Employment Status of Scoping Survey Respondents in Red Pump
Table 3.2	Tenancy and Employment Status of Scoping Survey Respondents in Old Wharf Wellington
Table 3.3	Tenancy and Employment Status of Scoping Survey Respondents in Susan's Bay
Table 8.1	Monthly Economic Review: Bank of Sierra Leone. Dec. 2008.
Table 8.2	Budgetary allocations to ministries for financial year 2009
Table 8.3	Number of Scoping Survey Respondents Place of Birth, Tribe, Province, Date of settlement in Red Pump
Table 8.4	Number of Scoping Survey Respondents Place of Birth, Tribe, Province, Date of settlement in Old Wharf Wellington.
Table 8.5	Number of Scoping Survey Respondents Place of Birth, Tribe, Province, Date of settlement in Susan's Bay
Table 8.6	Summary of Number of Households with Housing Needs Classified by Housing Need.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

Acronyms .....	ii
Tables .....	iii
Introduction.....	1
Current Situation.....	5
Background and Introduction to the Slum Initiative .....	5
Definitions of Slums .....	5
Types of Slums in Freetown .....	5
Systemic Issues Responsible for Slums.....	7
Review of Previous Studies and Reports .....	15
Local Studies and Reports .....	15
Action on Studies.....	17
Government Policy on Slums .....	18
Experience with Previous Resettlement Interventions .....	20
Appendixes .....	23
References.....	41

# Introduction

## 1.1 Background

Freetown, the capital city of Sierra Leone, was founded in 1787 as a haven identified for the freed African slaves repatriated from Europe and the Americas. Freetown is located in the northern tip of the Western Area peninsular between the Sierra Leone River and the Atlantic Ocean and lies within the administrative boundary of the Western Area of Sierra Leone. Freetown is the country's administrative headquarters and houses the seat of government and the hub of commercial and industrial activities. The country's largest sea port, the Queen Elizabeth 11 Quay, also located in Freetown, handles major import and export.

The topographic characteristics of the city is dominated by a narrow strip of raised beaches along a general east-west alignment, sandwiched by the Western Area peninsular mountains to the south, and the Sierra Leone River and the Atlantic Ocean to the north. These mountains and the raised coastal beaches are dissected by a number of fast flowing, high volume seasonal streams which empty into the Sierra Leone River, the banks of which are dotted with mangrove swamps and mud flats.<sup>1</sup> The topography of Freetown has thus been the principal determinant of the generally east-west direction of growth of the city from the original settlement established in the central lowland areas in the west and central, and around the port in the east. The mountains to the south and the Sierra Leone River and Atlantic Ocean to the north have however not prohibited growth in both directions.

In fact, it is within these mountains to the south and the river and ocean to the north, particularly in the environmentally fragile river valleys, flood plains, mangroves and mud flats from which slums and informal settlements are springing up and expanding.<sup>2</sup> The present 'Greater Freetown' area extends from the settlement of Allen Town in the east to the seaside settlement of Hamilton in the west. The administrative boundary of the Freetown City Council (FCC), which is from Allen Town in the east to the Kaningo River in the west, falls within this 'Greater Freetown' area.<sup>3</sup>

## 1.2 Urban Growth and Expansion of Freetown

There has been a general increase in the population of Sierra Leone from 3,515,812 in 1985 to 4,930,532 in 2004, an increase of 40.2 per cent or a growth rate of 1.8 percent per annum. This growth in the national population is also reflected in the urban population which has increased even faster across the country as indicated in Table (1.1)<sup>4</sup>. Before then, Freetown alone had accounted for about 50% of the 21% Sierra Leoneans that the 1974 census showed to have lived in 'urban' settlements. The 1985 census indicated that the population of Freetown was about 12% of the national population and was growing at a rate in excess of the national urban population growth of 4.5%<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Appendix I Map 1 showing the topographical setting of the Western Area and Freetown.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix I Map3 showing growth direction and intensity of Freetown.

<sup>3</sup> Appendix I Map2 showing Freetown and the surrounding settlements.

<sup>4</sup> Statistics Sierra Leone. Nov.2006; Analytical Report on Population Distribution, Migration and Urbanisation in Sierra Leone: Appendix D-G pages 73-78.

<sup>5</sup> World Bank May 1993. Staff Appraisal Report: Freetown Infrastructure Rehabilitation Project.

**Table 1.1: Rank Order for Sierra Leone: Urban Localities, Towns and Cities; population and percentage of Population: 2004, 1985, 1974 and 1973**

Year	Rank	Locality	Number of Persons	Percentage of Population
2004	1	Freetown	772,837	15.53
	2	Bo	149,957	3.01
	3	Kenema	128,402	2.58
	4	Koidu/New Sembehun	82,899	1.67
	5	Makeni	80,840	1.66
1985	1	Freetown	469,776	13.36
	2	Koidu/New Sembehun	82,474	2.35
	3	Bo	59,768	1.70
	4	Kenema	52,473	1.49
	5	Makeni	49,038	1.39
1974	1	Freetown	276,247	10.10
	2	Koidu/New Sembehun	75,846	2.77
	3	Bo	39,371	1.44
	4	Kenema	31,458	1.15
	5	Makeni	26,781	0.98
1963	1	Freetown	127,197	5.87
	2	Bo	26,613	1.22
	3	Kenema	13,246	0.61
	4	Kissy	13,143	0.60
	5	Makeni	12,304	0.56

*Source: Statistics Sierra Leone (2006) and Population and Housing Census (2004)*

Table (1.1) above shows the rank order of Sierra Leone's major settlements. In table 1 that there is a consistent increase in population in all the regional headquarter towns since the 1963 census. The table also notes that Freetown has consistently maintained the lead in these increases. Apart from the general growth in the Freetown population, different growth rates within the city itself were recorded for the various wards resulting in a total percentage increase of 53.40 percent in the population of Freetown. (Table1.2)<sup>6</sup>

**Table (1.2): Greater Freetown Census Enumeration of 1974 and 1985**

Ward	1974	1985	Percentage Increase
East I	36,337	43,480	19.66
East II	41,482	57,060	37.55
East III	56,435	108,392	92.07
Central I	30,638	34,679	13.19
Central II	18,144	19,266	6.18
West I	24,792	62,555	152.32
West II	34,626	93,175	169.09
West III	33,793	5,169	-84.70
Total	276,247	423,776	53.40

<sup>6</sup> Gibb & Partners/Techsult & Co. 1996 Structure Plan and Investment Programme for Freetown: Inception Report

**Sierra Leone Central Statistics Office, CSO (1986)**

The city wards which experienced significant population increases over the period 1974-1985 also play host to the largest number of slum areas.<sup>7</sup> Large coastal slums such as Kroo Bay, Burmeh/ Congo Town; and Inland/Hillside slums such as Red Pump and Dworzark are located within West I and West II Wards of the city. Susan’s Bay, Moa Wharf, Kanikay and Granville Brook slums are located within the East I and East II Wards of Freetown. Old Wharf and Portee in the Wellington area fall within the East III Ward. The Western Area has also recorded the highest percentage increase of slums in all the regions in the country.

**Table (1.3): Percentage Distribution of the Total Population by District and Province in Sierra Leone, 1985-2004<sup>8</sup>**

Province	Year	Percentage of population	Year	Percentage of Population
Southern Province	1985	21.09	2004	22.0
Eastern Province	1985	27.32	2004	23.9
Northern Province	1985	35.83	2004	35.1
Western Area	1985	15.76	2004	19.0

**Source: Statistics Sierra Leone (2006) and Population and Housing Census (2004)**

**1.3 Pre and Immediate Post-War Situation**

“Analysis of the 1974 census data shows that 21 percent of Sierra Leoneans lived in ‘urban’ settlements with population of 5,000 and above, with Freetown alone accounting for about 50 percent of this population. The most recent census, (1985) indicates that the population of Freetown is about 12 percent of the total population and is growing at a rate in excess of the national urban population growth figure of 4.5 percent”<sup>9</sup>

“Since the late 1970s, government institutions have deteriorated and have limited capacity to deliver even the most basic services. Most infrastructure systems also deteriorated to the point of near collapse. The living conditions for urban residents, particularly in the capital, Freetown, are especially difficult and their quality of life, economic opportunities and environmental conditions extremely poor.”<sup>10</sup> This situation has contributed to the establishment of slums, especially in the city. In 1991, an armed conflict which broke out in Sierra Leone officially ended on the 18th of January 2002. “The eleven years of civil conflict in Sierra Leone destroyed the social and economic infrastructure resulting to negative rates of gross domestic products and displaced about 40.0 percent of the population of five million. Five hundred thousand people became

<sup>7</sup> Appendix I map 4 Showing 1985 census population density.

<sup>8</sup> Statistics Sierra Leone, Nov.2006; Analytical Report on Population Distribution, Migration and Urbanisation in Sierra Leone:

<sup>9</sup> World Bank May 1993. Staff Appraisal Report; Freetown Infrastructure Rehabilitation Project.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

refugees whilst an estimated 29,000 died as a result of the war”.<sup>11</sup> Thus after the war, Freetown was a capital in near state of collapse due to extreme population pressure on weak infrastructure, services, facilities and a weak urban management structure.

Overall, the country is facing a serious housing crisis after years of destructive war. Poor housing is one of the main manifestations of poverty in both rural and urban areas.<sup>12</sup> Generally, the civil conflict had a devastating effect on the already existing poor infrastructure, making the economic base of the country moribund. The war also characterised with extensive damage and mass destruction of houses and large displacement of population most of which moved to Freetown for the relative safety. This large influx of population into the city over a relatively short period adversely affected the general urban structure. The themes identified through the Prince’s Foundation Scoping workshop in Freetown were numerous, but focused principally on five main issues:

1. Urban sprawl and its consequences, such as deforestation; river contamination, poor infrastructure and services; ecological impacts; and the impact on trans-city movement;
2. Growth impacting on the city centre, through congestion and overcrowding, impeding ability to deliver city centre functions;
3. Administrative control of the city’s growth and functions, from the inability to collect rates to the enforcement of planning regulations;
4. Lack of public housing, resulting in self build solutions and the proliferation of urban sprawl and inner city slums;
5. The lack of basic services such as water, sewage, waste removal and road repairs.”<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Statistics Sierra Leone Nov.2006; Population and Housing Census 2004 Analytical report on Population Distribution, migration and Urbanisation In Sierra Leone

<sup>12</sup> Sierra Leone Government. 2005. Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)

<sup>13</sup> Prince’s Foundation 2007; Report of the Freetown Scoping Workshop. Page 4

## Current Situation

### 2.1 Background and Introduction to the “Slum Initiative”

The growth in the urban population of Freetown and the low capacity of institutions to appropriately respond to the scale and rate of demand for services and facilities sparked off individual ‘self help’ solutions to housing and provision of facilities and services. This ‘self help’ solution ignited the growth and expansion of slums and informal settlements in Freetown. The Freetown City Council in 2006 identified 27 of such slum areas in Freetown and its immediate environs.<sup>14</sup>

In September 2008, the Freetown City Council was awarded a preparatory grant from the Cities Alliance<sup>15</sup> for a ‘Slum Initiative’ programme in line with one of the objectives of the UN Millennium Declaration<sup>11</sup> which is to improve the living conditions of at least 100 million slum dwellers by 2020.

The Freetown Slum Initiative has the following objectives:

1. To commence the process of strategy formulation and engage stakeholders and policy makers in discussion on slum issues;
2. To identify systemic issues as underlying causes of slum development and expansion;
3. To develop a slum and informal settlements strategy outline focusing on measures for slum prevention and slum upgrading of selected areas to improve immediate living conditions; and
4. To make preparation for activities for the next phase (the next phase is expected to produce a full-fledged strategy and a detailed road-map of activities).

### 2.2 Definition of Slums

A range of attributes have been used to define ‘Slum’ areas. On the whole, such attributes describe an area within which residents experience generally poor living conditions. Such generally poor living conditions in the slums is reflected not only in the physical environment, but also reflected in the generally low level of expectations of slum dwellers climbing the social ladder and the general alienation of slum dwellers from relatively well-to-do urban residents in ‘gated’ compounds.

In spite of the apparent dire situation of the slum dwellers, the everyday dynamics in slums is indeed a replica in a miniscule of the operations of the general urban system. There are within some of these slum settlements, basic or primary extractive enterprises or manufacturing, processing, distribution as well as employment centres and recreational infrastructure. These home based enterprises may not be up to ‘standard’ but serve and ‘oil the machinery’ of the slum settlements. These non-state/non-formal bodies are highly utilised and quite responsive to the local context and command a high level of social legitimacy within the various communities.

Perhaps a defining characteristic peculiar to slums could be the concentration in specific locations of the general malaise in the urban structure and the evident contrast between such areas and the relatively ‘better’ parts of the city.

### Characteristics of Slums

---

<sup>14</sup> Appendix I map 6 showing the locations of the different types of slums.

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.citiesalliance.org>

In the light of the varying degrees of deprivation associated with slum areas, UN-Habitat uses an operational definition of slums with key indicators like inadequate access to safe drinking water; inadequate access to sanitation; poor infrastructure and structural condition of housing; overcrowding and insecure residential status.

These characteristics are generally true of areas in Freetown and its immediate environs which are defined as slums. As stated earlier, the Freetown City Council in 2006 identified 27 of such areas in Freetown and its immediate environs.

### **2.3 Types of Slums in Freetown**

The slums in Freetown have been divided into the following five categories which, apart from their distinctive location characteristics, also have differing environmental problems.

**2.3.1 Coastal Slums:** Coastal Slums in Freetown are the oldest and by far the largest in terms of area and population. Among them are Kroo Bay, Susan's Bay, Moa wharf and Kanikay Wharf. Relatively recent coastal slums include Cockerill, Banana Water, Congo River, Granville Brook and Portee Wharf.

Some, like Kroo Bay, are located at the mouths of seasonal streams running down from the mountains on mudflats and flood plains. Others, like Susan's Bay, are located along the tidal waters of the Atlantic Ocean in areas where the mangrove vegetation have been cleared and the land reclaimed. The inhabitants in these coastal slums use garbage from upstream and excavated materials from the land side as embankments to reclaim the land. The majority of the houses in these areas are made up of light-weight recycled materials such as old corrugated iron sheets, tin cans and plastic sheeting for the body/walls of the structures. Sticks and woods are used for the structural/load-bearing components of the structure. There are very few structures with concrete or other solid material foundations. These coastal slums are highly susceptible to flooding from the seasonal streams and to tidal changes in sea level.

**2.3.2 Inland Valley Slums:** Some, like the Alligator River slum, are inland extensions of coastal slums like Kroo Bay. The same applies to Red Pump which is an inland extension of the Congo Town/River slum. Other inland valley slums, Granville Brook and Grey Bush, are precariously located on relative firm land in the inland valleys. The inhabitants use materials excavated from the valley sides to build retaining walls and platforms for their houses. Many of these houses are built with stabilized mud bricks, cement and corrugated iron sheets (CIS). These areas are highly prone to landslides and rock falls.

**2.3.3 Inland Hillside Slums:** These slums such as Dworzark, Sorie Town, Somaila Town, Mount Aureol Terrace and Maiaba are located on the mountainside overlooking the city. The inhabitants use hillside terraced materials to build their houses. Some of the structures are built on 'dry-pack' platforms, (stone packing filled with earth), using stabilized earth bonded with cement as walling materials and some CIS, the material used many instances together with sticks to build most of the houses (Pan Body). These slums are highly prone to landslide which is an annual occurrence during the rainy season at varying levels of severity.

**2.3.4 Rural Slums:** These settlements usually consist of one or two houses adjacent to old buildings to which they had formerly served as ancillary structures, (kitchens/store), and have been changed to residential use. These ‘back houses’ occur in groups in some places at the back of the old buildings. Their locations vary as some could also be found in marginal hill slopes and valleys. In many instances, such slums are indicative of staking claim to unoccupied land. The structures are built usually with CIS on a wood/stick frame.

**2.3.5 Patchwork Slums:** As the name denotes, these are informal settlements scattered across the Western Area mainly in the suburbs. They generally consist of CIS structures scattered within relatively undeveloped areas, recently cleared forest areas, and the immediate periphery of old sub-urban settlements. York, Hamilton and Waterloo are examples of Patchwork Slum. This category of slum epitomizes deforestation, urban sprawl and the unregulated expansion of the suburban settlements.

## **2.4 Systemic Issues Responsible for Growth Expansion of Slums**

### ***2.4.1 Urbanization; Trend to Move to Cities***

The UN Habitat’s State of the World’ Cities Report 2006/2007 states: “The global urban population has quadrupled since 1950 and cities of the developing world account for over 90% of the world’s urban growth”<sup>16</sup> This situation is equally reflected in Sierra Leone. The most recent census of 1985 indicates that the population of Freetown was about 12 percent of the total population of 4,976,871 and is growing at a rate in excess of the national urban population growth figure of 4.5 percent. The rate of urbanisation in Sierra Leone has been on the increase even before the eruption of the rebel war in 1991. An analysis of the 1974 census data shows that 21 percent of Sierra Leoneans lived in ‘urban’ settlements with populations of 5,000 and above with Freetown alone accounting for about 50 percent of this population. The growth in the Freetown urban population has been taking place in face of the poor and inadequate infrastructure. Thus the need for accommodation gave rise to ‘self help’ solutions wherein people are forced to go the extra mile to provide basic facilities in various settlements which end up being slums.<sup>17</sup>

### ***2.4.2 Institutional factors***

“In spite of recent efforts to restructure the administrative machinery of government, most agencies active in the urban sector suffer from problems related to lack of trained staff or otherwise inadequate technical capability”<sup>18</sup> A number of sectoral studies have addressed the issue of the capacity of relevant state institutions to undertake the responsibility allocated to them by law for the provision of urban infrastructure and services. Such studies have included: “Organisation and Financial Review of the Guma Valley Water Company”, 1993; World Bank. “Staff Appraisal Report-Freetown Infrastructure Rehabilitation Project”, May 1993. “Water Supply Master Plan”, 1980; “Sewerage and Drainage Master Plan”, 1997; “Traffic Management Study”, 1996; “Solid Waste Management Study”, 1994; “Organisation and Financial Review of Freetown City Council” 1991; “Freetown Development Plan: Pre-Identification Study” 2008.

---

<sup>16</sup> [http:// www.unhabitat.org](http://www.unhabitat.org)

<sup>17</sup> Appendix I map 5 showing the 1985 census population density.

<sup>18</sup> World Bank. May 1993. Staff Appraisal Report-Freetown Infrastructure Rehabilitation Project

Without exception and in various degrees of details, the findings of all these studies point to the general weakness and inability of the state institutions to carry out their legal mandates. Such weakness are identified in low level staffing in terms of numbers and level of training; inefficient administrative/management structures; lack of equipment; old/unrevised legislations and poor funding. The general incapacity of state institutions to execute their statutory obligations is reflected in the evident inability to adequately respond to the increasing demand for services and facilities in the urban areas particularly, thereby contributing to the expansion of existing slums and the growth of new ones.

### **2.4.3 Economic Factors**

The Sierra Leone economy had gone through a protracted period of depression and even stagnation particularly during the rebel war (1991-2002). There are signs that the economy is picking up, but at a pace slower than that required to address the perennial problems of low investment in infrastructure, job creation and rising poverty levels. The latest Monthly Economic Review (Dec.2008) published by the Bank of Sierra Leone indicates various percentage increases in the manufacturing and mining sectors. The report however states: ‘The improvement in total revenue (including grants) relative to the preceding period’s total revenue was due to the receipt of Le 29.95 billion grant from the World Bank for budgetary support’<sup>19</sup>. This is a manifestation that generally speaking, the economy is donor driven and is yet to establish a foundation for indigenous growth.

**Table 8.1 Monthly Economic Review: Bank of Sierra Leone. Dec. 2008.**

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Percentage Increase</b>
<u>Manufacturing:</u>	
Soft Drinks	60.56
Malt	57.44
Cement	9.85
Paint	85.11
<u>Mining:</u>	
Bauxite	4.68
Rutile	0.50
Ilmenite	29.66
Gold	306 ounces -497.61 ounces

### **2.4.4 Low Wages and Unemployment**

The employment figures also do not give comforting expectations to the growth of the economy and its ability to address or finance key infrastructure and social needs. ‘Among the 1.9 million persons employed in the country, about 1.66 million (87.5%) indicated as having some earnings. With an approximate exchange rate with the US dollar (US\$1U=3,000 Leones), about 61.9% of the employed population is earning less than US\$1 a day. About 1.2 million of these employed people are the ‘working poor’, earning up to ninety thousand Leones per month.’

With an employment rate of 38.1% in the urban areas, poverty is thus pervasive. ‘Youths from the Western Region are the most affected by unemployment, with the highest

<sup>19</sup> Bank of Sierra Leone 2009:Monthly economic Review for December 2008

unemployment rate among youths of about 28.9%<sup>20</sup> The report by ILO and Statistics Sierra Leone titled: “Employment and Time Spent on Activities in Sierra Leone (2005)” and the Bank of Sierra Leone “Monthly Economic Review” report together suggest that the possibility of growth related jobs in mining, agriculture and manufacturing is minimal. The informal sector appears to offer the highest opportunity for employment. ‘An estimated total number of 2,003,085 Sierra Leoneans are usually employed in the informal sector in their main occupation. This is about 92% of the total employment in the country’.<sup>21</sup> There is thus the absolute need to incorporate the informal sector into the formal economy in order to boost revenue for the government.

#### 2.4.5 Lack of Investment in Infrastructure

There has been a general low level of investment in infrastructure and services in the Freetown Urban area. This situation is reflected in the World Bank staff appraisal report and the report of the Prince’s Foundation Scoping Workshop. Table 5 showing the 2009 budgetary allocation to key ministries dealing with infrastructure and services paints a rather bleak picture of the ability of government to address the infrastructure needs of Freetown. Such allocation will at best be enough only to finance the routine operations of the ministries and not enough to make any significant investment in the rehabilitation of infrastructure and services in Freetown.

**Table: 8.2 Budgetary Allocations to Ministries for Financial Year 2009.**<sup>22</sup>

Ministry	Total Sum Voted Le.
Health and Sanitation	39,809,500,000
Lands, Country Planning and the Environment	1,454,000,000
Transport and Aviation	2,998,800,000
Gender and Children’s Affairs Division	874,800,000
Energy and Power	45,535,800,000
Works, Housing and Infrastructure	3,867,600,000

(i) Guma Valley Water Company: ‘The Company has been able to provide water supply to areas previously not served including George Brook, Cassel Farm and Congo Market. The company is however facing a number of constraints including inadequate storage facilities, indiscriminate cutting of pipes by the public and the aged distribution network’<sup>23</sup>

(ii) National Power Authority **NPA’s** financial performance remains weak, stemming mainly from technical and commercial loses which makes it impossible for the NPA to recoup its expenditure. As at end 2008, total revenue collected by NPA amounted to 87.6 billion, while total expenditure is estimated at Le 90.7 billion, resulting to a net operating loss of 3.1 billion<sup>24</sup> (Government Budget...2009.)

<sup>20</sup> Statistics Sierra Leone. 2005: Employment and time spent on activities in Sierra Leone.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Government of Sierra Leone. 2009: The Appropriation Act 2009

<sup>23</sup> Guma Valley Water Company. Jan/Feb. 2005; Current Water Situation in Freetown.

<sup>24</sup> Government of Sierra Leone November 2008: Government Budget and statement of Economic and Financial Policies for the financial year 2009

#### **2.4.6 Local/International Civil unrest**

There are no exact figures as to the number of people displaced as a result of the rebel war. The UNHCR has however estimated that in successive waves of flight and return, more than 1.2 million people were displaced within Sierra Leone.<sup>25</sup> A large percentage of such displaced persons sought refuge in Freetown and the other relatively safe urban centers in the country. In Freetown, many of these displaced persons ended up in the slum areas.

#### **2.4.7 Social Factors: Common Origin**

The rebel war was thus a significant factor responsible for the general and sudden redistribution of the country's population. Large scale mass movement and relocation of whole communities took place. Such movement is a major contributing factor to the large scale congregation and even domination of particular tribes in some of the slums in Freetown. A survey of three slum areas, Red Pump, Susan's Bay, Old Wharf), conducted as part of this study shows that these Freetown slums are dominated by particular ethnic groups.<sup>26</sup> Limbas constitute the largest ethnic group in Red Pump, representing about 70.9% of the respondents. Members of the Temne ethnic group form the second largest with 14.6%, while the Fullah and the Mende ethnic groups are the least represented with 2.9% each.

At the Old Wharf slum, 83% of the respondents are Temne, 12% Limba, and 5% Mende. At the Susan's Bay, Temnes form 67% of the respondents and the Fullahs with 11% form the second largest ethnic group, while Vai, Mende and Madingo form the least ethnic groups with 1% each. It is also noted in the scoping survey that in the three slums, the majority of the respondents are from the Northern Province. In Red Pump for instance, 57.3% of respondents are northerners' while 72% and 57% are found in Susan's Bay and Old Wharf respectively. In all three slums, least representation is from the Southern and Eastern Provinces. At Red Pump, 2.9% are from both the Southern and Eastern Provinces. The same least representation from the Southern and Eastern Provinces is also recorded in Old Wharf where there are none and Susan's Bay where only 2% of the respondents are from the Southern Province and only 3% from the Eastern Province.

A significant contributing factor for the dominance of ethnic groups from the north in these slums is that the Northern Province is closest to the Western Area, and Freetown is relatively easily accessible from this region by both land and sea. It is noted<sup>27</sup> that these three slums experienced the highest influx during the period 1991-2009, with the majority of the settlers coming in at the height of the war. Red Pump experienced an influx of 60.2%; Old Wharf 60% and Susan' Bay 79%.

---

<sup>25</sup> National Commission for Resettlement Rehabilitation Reconstruction and UNHCR. September 2001: *Plan of Operation for Voluntary Repatriation and Reintegration of Sierra Leonean Refugees.*

<sup>26</sup> Tables 8.3, 8.4, 8.5

<sup>27</sup> Op. cit.

**Table 8.3 (Number of Scoping Survey Respondents Place of Birth, Tribe, Province, Date of settlement in Red Pump)**

Place of Birth of respondents, Number and % of Total			Tribe of respondents. Number and % of Total			Province of origin of respondents Number and % of Total			Date settled in Red Pump		
Place of Birth	No	% of Total	Tribe	No.	% of Total	Province	No.	% of Total	Date Settled	No.	% of Total
Freetown	38	36.9	Limba	73	70.9	Western Area	38	36.9	1970-80	6	05.8
Kamakwei	13	12.6	Temne	15	14.6	Northern Province	59	57.3	1981-90	35	34
Kambia	23	22.3	Kuranko	5	4.8	Eastern Province	3	2.9	1991-2009	62	60.2
Madina	1	0.9	Fullah	3	2.9	Southern Province	3	2.9			
Koinadugu	4	3.9	Mende	3	2.9						
Port Loko	4	3.9	Loko	4	3.9						
Makeni	3	2.9									
Bafodia	9	8.7									
Kamabai	2	1.9									
Moyamba	1	0.9									
Bo	2	1.9									
Kenema	2	1.9									
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>103</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>103</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>103</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table: 8.4 (Number of Scoping Survey Respondents' Place of Birth, Tribe, Province, Date of settlement in Old Wharf Wellington)**

Place of Birth of respondents, Number and % of Total			Tribe of respondents. Number and % of Total			Province of origin of respondents Number and % of Total			Date settled in Old wharf by respondents, Number and % of Total		
Place of Birth	No.	% of Total	Tribe	No.	% of Total	Province	No.	% of Total	Date Settled	No.	% of Total
Old wharf	29	29	Temne	83	83	Northern Province	88	72	1970-1980	10	10
Koya	11	11	Limba	12	12	Western Area	28	28	1981-1990	30	30
Lunsar	5	5	Mende	5	5	Southern Province	None		1991-2009	60	60
Port Loko	8	8				Eastern Province	None				
Lungi	28	32									
Pepel	15	15									
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table: 8.5 (Number of Scoping Survey Respondents Place of Birth, Tribe, Province, Date of settlement in Susan's Bay)**

Place of Birth of respondents: Number and % of total			Tribe of respondents: Number & % of total			Province of origin of respondents: Number and % of total			Date Settled at Susan's Bay: Number and % of total		
Place of Birth	No.	% of Total	Tribe	No.	% of Total	Province	No.	% of Total	Date Settled	No.	% of Total
Freetown	32	32	Temne	67	67	Western Area	32	32	1960-1990	21	21
Port Loko	16	16	Fullah	11	11	Northern Province	57	57	1991-2009	79	79
Kambia	14	14	Limba	8	8	Eastern Province	3	3			
Kabala	4	4	Krio	1	1	Southern Province	2	2			
Makeni	10	10	Susu	7	7						
Guinea	5	5	Loko	3	3	Guinea	5	5			
Pujehun	2	2	Mende	1	1	Liberia	1	1			
Lunsar	2	2	Madingo	1	1						
Kono	1	1	Vai	1	1						
Tonkolili	6	6									
Kenema	2	2									
Magburaka	1	1									
Mile 91	3	3									
Liberia	1	1									
Yele	1	1									
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### 2.4.8 Lack of Provision of Low Income Housing

The present housing problem in Sierra Leone is enormous. It is such that a considerable number of housing units are unsatisfactory due to improper location; poor construction and quality of materials; lack of sanitary facilities and poor state of repairs. This situation is indeed a reflection of a number of unsuccessful interventions in the housing sector by both the central government and the local authorities. By and large, such interventions had not been successful due mainly to the general slow in growth and even down-turn of the economy since independence in 1961. The situation was not helped by periods of political instability and the recent civil conflict. Such unsuccessful interventions by government have included the 1929 Freetown Municipality Housing Scheme; the 1952 Civil Servants' Housing Loan Scheme; the 1961 Kissy Low Cost Housing Scheme.

It is noted that these schemes were not 'social' housing schemes focussing at the generality of the population and particularly the low income earners and the poor. The schemes were targeted at regular income earners within the formal economy. Slum residents were not provided for in such schemes as most of them are in the lowest income bracket and operate in the informal sector of the economy. The accumulation of such factors as unemployment; low income; lack of provision of low income housing and absence of urban infrastructure and services, is reflected in table 6.<sup>28</sup>

**Table 8.6: Summary of Number of Households with Housing needs classified by Housing Need**

Type of Need	Sierra Leone	Western Area
To relieve overcrowding (more than 2 persons per room)	388,653	65,565
To replace thatch and other non-durable materials	271,762	9,816
To replace unsatisfactory wall materials (Zinc/timber/poles and reeds/mud and wattle/tarpaulin)	345,378	37,529
To replace inadequate sources of water (unprotected wells, rivers and streams)	475,207	16,033
To replace unsanitary toilet facilities (Bush/river/bucket)	266,631	9,531
To improve current state of repair of dwelling unit (Due for rehabilitation/reconstruction)	258,657	27,884
To meet future population increase and formation of new household by 2016.	267,130	41,405

#### 2.4.9 Indeterminate Land Tenure Rights

Land tenure in Sierra Leone is characterised by a dual structure: Land in the Provinces operates under a 'Communal Ownership' system. Land in the Western Area, within which the study area falls, operates under a 'Freehold Interest' system. There are a range of sub-categories under these two classifications.

The bulk of the land in the Western Area is 'Crown/State' land, owned by the government. The government generally bequeaths such land under various tenancy agreements. All coastal land and land in river valleys and the banks of streams is government property. Land on steep hillsides falling within the forest reserves is also government property. It is pertinent to note the location of the Freetown slum settlements

<sup>28</sup> Thomas. Armand c: May 2006: Sierra Leone Housing Programme 2006 to 2016. Page 13.

in this context as many of the slums are sited within these locations. The National Lands Policy 2005 reports state that land management in the country is characterised by ‘rampant encroachment on and illegal acquisition of large tracts of government land which had not been surveyed, registered and otherwise protected, or have not been utilised’.<sup>29</sup>

Formal access to state land is rather cumbersome as it involves an extensive administrative process. Access to private land is restricted by high prices. Many of the slum residents are neither in the position to go through the administrative process nor are they able to pay high prices for land. The residents use the established social order in the slums to occupy a portion of land for which authentic documents may not be required.

‘To make up for this absence of a document or title, a claimant would make a declaration under oath setting out the root of his/her possessory title accompanied by a similar declaration by two corroborating witnesses. A survey plan on which is delineated, the land in question is invariably attached to the document. To give it authenticity, as it were, the document is submitted for registration under the provisions of the Registration of Instruments Act. Cap. 256 of the Laws of Sierra Leone, 1960’.<sup>30</sup>

Slum residents are thus in a situation in which their tenancy or right of occupation is questionable and are as such, faced with the prospect of eviction.

---

<sup>29</sup> Ministry of Lands, Country Planning and the Environment. February 2005: National Lands Policy. Page iii

<sup>30</sup> Renner-Thomas A, Sierra Leone law Review, vol.1 No.1

## Review of Studies and Reports

### 3.1 Overview

Global bibliography on slums is quite exhaustive. The international community and donor organisations have produced a plethora of such reports. There are around 1200 references in ‘The Challenge of Slums’ UN Global Report on Human Settlements, for example.

Such studies have identified and examined various elements of slums and slum dwellers relative to poor housing and social conditions in slums, high incidence of drug taking, teenage pregnancy and early marriage, high infant mortality rates, lack of potable water and health facilities and the absence of infrastructure. Slum dwellers, according to many studies, are living below the poverty line with an accompanying low life expectancy. The reports and studies have generally identified different potentials to improve on living conditions of slum dwellers. A range of micro-finance schemes have been devised to tap the latent financial resources of slum dwellers. Many types of approaches have also been suggested to address tenure security for slum dwellers.

The bulk of such studies have however been subject specific, identifying and addressing key systemic issues responsible for the development of slums. But the reports did not examine slums within the total picture of the urban context that they exist. This has resulted in identifying slum-area specific solutions which have generally been short term including durable structures, low cost housing, micro-finance and improved access to safe water, among many examples. As cities grow however, so do their slum populations; particularly in sub-Saharan Africa cities where the slum population accounts for over 70% of the urban population.

Slum studies and reports should thus be approached from the perspective that the existing structures are unable to cope with the high rate of urbanization and rising poverty levels. Solutions or mitigating measures adopted within such a context would then be addressing slum issues in a comprehensive manner rather than in the current area-specific incremental manner.

### 3.2 Local Studies and Reports

For Sierra Leone also, there have been quite a few such studies and reports which have been commissioned or undertaken by the government, donor organisations, INGOs, NGOs and CBOs. The bulk of these reports and studies have been undertaken within the context of examining particular slum issues or preparing specific projects like housing, water and sanitation, maternal and child health among others.

(i) **The World Bank, May 1993, Staff Appraisal Report:** ‘Freetown Infrastructure Rehabilitation Project (FIRP).’ The objective of this report is to finance a project to improve the quality of life and environmental conditions for the most disadvantaged groups in Freetown. “The proposed project will meet this objective by providing essential infrastructure including roads and drainage, solid waste collection, water supply and sanitation in six areas identified as the most deprived in the city and to carry out badly

needed structural repairs and environmental improvement on six of the main city markets. The project was also directed at improving the capacity and efficiency of the Guma Valley Water Company (GVWC) and building up the institutional capacity of the Freetown City Council (FCC) as well as strengthening the capacity of the Sierra Leone Roads Authority (SLRA). The project envisaged cooperation with NGOs in sensitization for improved environmental sanitation and to undertake short term emergency physical improvements in the depressed areas. A considerable portion of this 'Freetown Infrastructure Rehabilitation Project' (FIRP) was carried especially with regards to improvement on the road networks in depressed areas such as Brookfields and Ginger Hall. This was also followed by the rehabilitation of markets and the construction of ablution facilities and toilets in those depressed areas. The full execution of the project was aborted when the rebel war intensified.

**(ii) Sierra Leone Roads Authority, Sir Alexander Gidd & Partners, UK Ltd in association with Techsult and Company Ltd; Sierra Leone, January 1997:** 'Report on the Final Structure Plan'. The objective of the Freetown Structure Plan (FSP) is to develop a strategic planning framework to determine the medium and long term growth characteristics of the city and provide for the preparation of appropriate development plans for the future. The FSP examined all the various components of the urban structure including housing, infrastructure, transport, employment, recreation, education, health and recommended a 'Nodal development' strategy which envisages the strategic distribution of urban services and facilities to the suburban peripheral areas, thereby maintaining the identity and planned growth of satellite settlements. The FSP also examined two alternative strategies for the sustainable development of Freetown.

**Minimum Intervention:** This strategy entails allowing individuals and the private sector to continue the current pattern of development with minimal intervention from government.

**Compact Development:** Is a strategy which envisages the intensification "densification" of the use of land with higher building densities and concentration of services and facilities.

**(iii) Thomas. Armand C. 2006; 'Sierra Leone National Housing Programme 2006-20016' is a UN-Habitat/UNDP funded study as part of the 'Sierra Leone Revised National Housing Policy 2006':** This report assesses the housing need and projects the housing requirements for various economic levels, making references to housing the 'Urban and Rural poor'.

**(iv) Cole. Ms. Henrietta 2006; 'The Improvement of Slums and Informal Settlements in Freetown' is a UN-Habitat/UNDP funded study and resource material for the 2006 Sierra Leone 'Revised Housing Policy' 2006:** This study examines the housing conditions of the 'Urban Poor' in Freetown and focuses on the slum residents.

**(v) GOAL Sierra Leone 2008; ‘Findings of a Community-Based Survey on Child Protection, Health and Nutrition, Water Sanitation and Hygiene and HIV/AIDS’:** The report contains findings of a community-based survey conducted in November 2007 in the nine operational ‘Slum’ communities in urban Freetown. The report identifies the prevalence of social and health issues indicative of slums; “The average household contains 8 people. The largest average household is in Mabela (Median=14 persons).” “Children under five have 5.2 episodes of diarrhea per year on average.”

**(vi) Corsten, Ms. Nina 2008; ‘Waste-Land. ‘The Urban Slums of Freetown, Sierra Leone’ is part of the EC funded 2008 ‘Freetown Development Plan Study’:** This study gives a typology of the Freetown slums based on location and identifies peculiarities in the various housing, social and economic conditions of the slums and slum dwellers

**(vii) Prince’s Foundation 2007; ‘Report on the Scoping Workshop, Freetown, Sierra Leone 2007’:** This is a report on the general condition of urban Freetown. It identifies key systemic slum issues such as poor services delivery which is also characteristic of the Freetown metropolis.

**(viii) The European Commission (EC) 2008; ‘Freetown Development Plan: Pre-Identification Study’ and EC 2008; ‘Freetown Development: Preliminary Assessment Draft Final Report’:** Both reports give a detailed account of the various components of the Freetown urban structure including housing, infrastructure, transport, urban management and trace the inadequate living conditions in the slums to the general urban structure of Freetown. The 2008 European Commission (EC), Freetown Development Plan; Pre-Identification study identifies similar decay in the urban structure as did the 1993 World Bank Staff Appraisal Report. The EC report on the whole makes recommendations as to how to address the decay of general infrastructure of Freetown and the slums in particular. It must be noted that the findings of the EC reports are rather endemic as they recur in all similar reports on the status of the urban infrastructure in Freetown.

### **3.3 Action on Studies**

It should be noted that the 2008 EC Freetown Development Plan; Pre-identification Study reports that nothing has yet been done towards the implementation of many of the recommendations of the studies that form the basis for devising the 1993 FIRP. After partial implementation in the ‘six depressed areas’ and the cessation of the FIRP in 1997, the number of ‘disadvantaged communities’ has now alarmingly increased from 6 to 27. Such growth and expansion of the ‘depressed areas’ within Freetown suggests the need for development of alternative approaches to addressing slum growth, expansion and the general decay in infrastructure and services.

### 3.4 Government Policy on Slums

Sierra Leone has yet to develop a national policy approach to the issue of slum and informal settlements. Government interventions in these depressed areas have been recurrent demolitions, provision of disaster relief assistance during flooding and landslides, relocation and provision of emergency medical assistance in the event of an outbreak of diseases such as malaria, typhoid and cholera

Key government institutions within whose purview the fundamental systemic causative/contributing factors for the existence and expansion of slums fall have all developed sector specific policies. Such policies address particular elements of the urban structure and generally in a broad sweep, address issues relating to the 'poor'. Such policies relate to water and sanitation, land, housing and secondary roads for example.

**(i) Sierra Leone, Water and Sanitation Policy (Draft) 2007:** The Water and Sanitation Policy addresses the issue of "Water for Low Income Groups and Community User Groups." With the "objective to improve water and sewage services in low income areas. People living in underprivileged areas rarely benefit from adequate water and sanitation services...recognizing the existence of low income groups in the urban areas, water supply entities shall be required to provide them with adequate services."<sup>31</sup>

**(ii) Sierra Leone National Lands Policy 2005:** The indeterminate nature of ownership/occupation in the slums reflects the rather chaotic nature of land management in the country. Thus land and land related matters have tended to clog the court system which government intends to clear by initiating the National Lands Policy. 'Fair access to land and security of tenure' forms one of the cardinal principles of this lands policy. "...This National Lands Policy therefore provides the foundation for the review of existing laws and the enactment of new ones to create the enabling environment to accommodate the rapid socio-economic development programmes of government in general and specifically, to regulate and streamline access to, and the use of land in order to ensure the development of a sustainable environment." There have not yet been any positive or concrete move to address the generality of the issues encapsulated in this policy nor has there been any legislative reform to address tenancy/occupation rights to streamline access to land.

**(iii) Sierra Leone. Revised National Housing Policy 2006:** The Revised National Housing Policy recognizes the already poor housing situation which has been exacerbated by the rebel war and the resulting "approximately to 350,000 dwellings (that) were destroyed."<sup>32</sup> It however does not make any specific references or recommendations relative to the approach for housing in the slums. "The central goal of the National Housing Policy is to achieve a maximum addition to the housing stock of the nation and to make it possible for every Sierra Leonean to have access to safe, sanitary and decent housing, together with the necessary ancillary facilities either on home ownership or rental basis..."<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Guma Valley Water Company. June 2007: Draft Water and Sanitation Policy.

<sup>32</sup> Ministry of works, Housing and Technical Maintenance. 2006; Revised National Housing policy

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

The above three policies; **Water and Sanitation**, **Lands** and **Housing** are typical of current policy responses to key systemic issues relating to slums. The policies are generally statements of intent and are issue specific: **Water**, **Land** and **Housing**. The policies do not focus on slums and informal settlements or make any particular reference to them. Thus concerns of slums areas are subsumed in the general policy of addressing infrastructure and services and concerns nationwide. Due to the current state of the national economy as outlined earlier, it is unlikely that any one of these policy statements will be realized in the short term.

## Experience of Previous Resettlement Interventions

### 4.1 Resettlement after the War: Hastings Refugee Camp

The Government of Sierra Leone with the assistance of the international community developed a resettlement strategy in 2001. The aim of the resettlement strategy was: “To support the resettlement and reintegration of the internally displaced, refugees and ex-combatants together with their dependants back into their communities and to strengthen their livelihood, security and to promote reconciliation.”<sup>34</sup> This aim appears to have been directed at internally displaced persons (IDP’s) from the rural areas. The strategy further states “registered IDP’s whose home of origin is in the Western Area and large urban settlements, additional shelter support may be provided where feasible until low cost housing opportunities are available.”<sup>35</sup> Many of these IDP’s for whom ‘low cost housing opportunities’ was anticipated ended up in the slums of Freetown. Many of the IDP’s who were repatriated returned to Freetown to reoccupy structures that were not demolished in camps. Such ‘returned’ IDP’s form the majority of residents at both the Hastings and Waterloo camps which bear all the characteristics of slums as was earlier defined. The NCRRR resettlement and rehabilitation programme was planned and implemented with the assistance of the country’s development partners. There were lots of details considered in the programme. This included prior sensitisation of the host/receiving communities; the provision of non food items; starter kits for each returnee and basic core housing and transport fare to places of origin for the returnees. However, the programme was beset with some problems which marred its success. The pace and rate of transporting the returnees was slow and far between and the booths were not demolished immediately the occupants were removed. This slow pace reduced the nostalgia and initial willingness of the IDP’s to return home. Eventually, the undemolished booths provided ready accommodation for those who returned to the camps.

### 4.2 Relocation of Moa Wharf residents to Jui by Government

Moa Wharf is one of the teeming coastal slums. It is located at the bottom of a cliff which had been continuously undercut to provide land space and building materials for the residents. During the raining season in 2001, an extensive landslide killed a number of residents. Government then decided on a snap relocation of the residents to the Jui peninsular in the east of the city which is in a similar coastal location offering facilities for fishing which is the main occupation of the residents in their former location. This relocation was not successful mainly because the real intent of the relocation was not clearly spelt out to the residents at the initial stage and their full cooperation was not sought. The real intent of government was to conclusively close the Moa Wharf settlement. Initially however, the residents were told the relocation exercise was a temporary measure to remove them from the immediate danger of another landslide. Since the remaining structures were not demolished and government had no immediate plans for an alternative use of the land when once the people were removed, the residents progressively returned to Moa Wharf.

---

<sup>34</sup> National Commission for Resettlement Rehabilitation Reconstruction and UNHCR. September 2001: *Plan of Operation for Voluntary Repatriation and Reintegration of Sierra Leonean Refugees*.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

### **4.3 Relocation from King Tom (Burmeh) to Grafton by the NGO, FORUT**

Burmeh is the first and largest land fill site in Freetown. It is located at King Tom in the west of the city. Government and FORUT, an NGO, jointly undertook a programme to relocate the residents of the slum settlements at Congo Town adjacent to the landfill site. The intention was to develop a bio-gas plant at the Burmeh site. Government provided land at Grafton in the east of Freetown and FORUT built mini settlement consisting of one and two-room bungalows, titles which were handed over to the former Burmeh residents. The houses were subsequently rented by the new owners who then returned to the Burmeh slum settlement. The relocation failed for a variety of reasons. Key among the reasons advanced was that the bio-gas programme did not materialise and there were no immediate employment opportunities at Grafton. Furthermore, the selection criteria for relocation did not reflect ‘family’ units.

### **4.4 Relocation Programme to Grafton**

The January 1999 rebel invasion of Freetown was characterised by the burning down of large number of houses. Many other dwelling units were made uninhabitable by the removal of roofs, windows and doors among other fittings. A new category of internally displaced persons including landlords and tenants emerged in the Western Area as a result. Government then provided lands in various parts of Freetown and its outskirts and NCRRR facilitated building campsites and temporary shelter. NCRRR also provided technical supervision to some of the displaced to build their own homes. The outcome of this programme was mixed. Some landlords now have more than one property and as a result some sold their property in the new settlement. Also, some of the houses remained incomplete and above all, the intended new settlement in Grafton has limited employment opportunities with only a water bottling plant as the main source of employment.

### **4.5 Lessons Learnt**

1. The 2001 National Commission for Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction, (NCRRR) programme; the FORUT-Grafton relocation programme; the CRS-Grafton relocation programme and the Government of Sierra Leone-Jui relocation programme met with varying degrees of success.
2. Some new housing units were constructed and others rehabilitated. The resettlement/relocation programmes gave rise to the emergence of new landlords and house owners. These programmes did not however make any significant impact in reducing the growth of new slums and limiting the expansion of existing ones in Freetown.
3. A key factor which limited the success of these programmes was the low level and (in the case of the Jui programme), absence of the participation of the slum residents in the design stage of the programmes.
4. Since relocation/resettlement was identified at the second slum workshop as an option in the Freetown Slum Exit Strategy, it is of vital importance that slum residents become active participants at the initial design stage of any such programmes. A

successful relocation/ resettlement programme does entail the building of new housing units or the allocation of land in a new area alone. A resettlement/relocation programme should entail a situation in which the socio-economic set up of the slum settlement is 'transported' with minimum disruption.

5. Different relocation/resettlement options should also be made available to the slum residents. Such options might include that of going to settle in an area other than the relocation site.
6. Employment opportunities in the new location and the potential for slum residents to be engaged in their traditional economic activities should also be critically considered in any relocation programme. Critically important also is the setting up of an efficient management structure to address teething problems and ensure the sustainability of the programme.

## **Appendix I**

MAP 1: Topography of the Western Area and Freetown.

MAP 2: Freetown and the Surrounding Settlements.

MAP 3: Direction and Intensity of Growth of Freetown.

MAP 4: 1985 Census Population Density of the Western Area.

MAP 5: 2004 Census Population Density of the Western Area.

MAP 6: Locations of Different Types of Slums.

## **Appendix II**

### **Report on the first ‘Freetown Slum Initiative’ Workshop**

The first slum initiative workshop was held on January 23<sup>rd</sup> 2009 at the Freetown City Council, (FCC) conference hall. There were 35 delegates representing 16 organisations which included the central government, FCC, local and international NGOs, donor organizations, community groups, youth groups and slum residents. The opening statement was delivered by the Chief Administrator of the FCC. He explained the background to the Freetown Slum Initiative and the support of the Cities Alliance (CA). He stressed the significance of the Freetown Slum Initiative and the high level of commitment given to it by both the central government and the FCC. The local CA Consultant gave a presentation on the existing conditions of the Freetown slums and made an overview of the Freetown Slum Initiative. The issues presented by the local consultant were lively debated upon and meaningful contributions made by the participants. The NGO representatives highlighted experiences gained during their intervention in the slum areas. The slum residents identified their concerns and explained the nature and manner of their interactions with government officials and NGOs. The proposed timetable and sequence of activities to be followed in the process of developing an exit strategy for the Freetown slums were extensively discussed and approved. The date and the agenda for the second slum initiative workshop were also approved.

## Appendix II

### **Representation at the Inaugural Workshop on The Freetown Slum Initiative Held at the Conference Room of the Freetown City Council on Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2009.**

No.	Representative	Organisation
1	The Director of Development and Economic Planning	The Ministry of Development and Economic Planning
2	Director of Country Planning.	Ministry of Lands, Country Planning and the Environment
3	The Director of Surveys and Lands.	Ministry of Lands, counter Planning and the Environment
4	The Director of the Environment.	Ministry of Lands, counter Planning and the Environment
5	The Professional Head.	Ministry of Works, Housing and Technical Maintenance
6	The Director of Local government	Ministry of Local Government
7	The Chief Administrator (Chairman)	Freetown City Council
8	Chairman Development and Planning Committee.	Freetown City Council
9	The Development Officer	Freetown City Council.
10	The World Bank	Donor Organisations/Funding Partners
11	The European Union	Donor Organisations/Funding Partners
12	DFID	Donor Organisations/Funding Partners
13	UNDP	Donor Organisations/Funding Partners
14	UN-Habitat	Donor Organisations/Funding Partners
15	National Commission for Social Action	Donor Organisations/Funding Partners
16	. SLANGO	Non- Governmental Organisation
17	Compad-Africa.	Non- Governmental Organisation
18	GOAL	International Non- Governmental Organisation
19	Concern World Wide.	International Non- Governmental Organisation
20	Sierra Leone Youth and Adolescent Network	Youth Organisation
21	Kroo Bay Development Association	Community Based Organisation
22	Susan's Bay Youth Development Association	Community Based Organisation
23	Michael A. O. Johnson	Consultant

## Appendix II

### **Agenda for the Inaugural Meeting of the Freetown City Council Steering Committee on Slum Initiative**

09:00-09:30 Registration of Participants	
09:30-09:35 Opening	Individual silent prayers.
09:35-09:50 Opening Statement	: The Chief Administrator (Chairman)
09:50-10:45 Presentation by the Local Consultant: (Slide Presentation)	
09:50-10:00. Introduction,	Background to the slum Initiative;
10:00 -10:20 Slide show;	Existing Slum conditions
10:20-10:45	Process, Timetable and activities to be followed
10:45-10:55. Coffee/Tea break.	
10:55-11:45	Plenary discussions
11:45-12:10 Resolutions:	
11:45-11:55	Confirmation of Process, timetable and activities to be followed
11:55-12:00	Date for the second Workshop ( Tuesday 10 <sup>th</sup> & Wednesday 11 <sup>th</sup> February2009)
12:00-12:10	Agenda for the second workshop.
12:10-12:15. Closing statements	
12:20 Lunch/Refreshments	

## Appendix II

### Timetable: Six Months Duration

ACTIVITY	<u>M 1</u>	<u>M 2</u>	<u>M 3</u>	<u>M 4</u>	<u>M 5</u>	<u>M 6</u>
<b><u>Activity 1</u></b> commence the process and engage stakeholders	<u>XXXX</u>					
<b><u>Activity 2</u></b> Identify systemic issues (after selecting a technical expert to assist the city throughout the process)	<u>XXXX</u>	<u>XXXX</u>				
<b><u>Activity 3</u></b> Develop a slum and informal settlements strategy outline			<u>XXXX</u>	<u>XXXX</u>		
<b><u>Activity 4</u></b> Carry out preparation activities for the next phase				<u>XXXX</u>	<u>XXXX</u>	
<b><u>Activity 4</u></b> Perform Audit.						<u>XXXX</u>

## Appendix II

### Activities to be followed

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Methodology</b>
Activity (1): Commence the process and engage stakeholders	(1) Kick-off workshop with stakeholders (City Council, sub-national authorities, line Ministries, youth-based organizations, CBOs, NGOs and donors), followed by multiple sessions, interviews and discussions to mobilize the public.
Activity (2): Identify systemic issues	(2) Identify the range of contributing factors, which could include land ownership, property rights, tenure, issues of legal and regulatory nature, socio-economic conditions, state of the physical infrastructure and service deliver, etc., and how they impact the development of and conditions on slum areas. Available literature will be reviewed. NGOs/partner organizations will be interviewed. Mobility patterns and poverty levels will be taken into consideration
Activity (3): Develop a slum and informal settlements strategy outline	The outline should be a reflection of the strategic issues causing slum development and obstacles to sustain livelihoods in areas of informal settlements. The outline should cover a variety of areas and be as holistic (in terms of coverage) as possible.
Activity (4): Carry out preparation activities for the new phase	These will include: (a) After reviewing available literature and information, identify studies/other technical information that needs to be collected prior to commencing the process of full-fledged strategy formulation (for instance, land availability, plans for spatial development, access to sources of livelihood, accessibility and connection to public services, projections for population increase, etc); (b) draft the application for CA funding after exploring with partners and donors funding and co-funding possibilities; (c) in consultations with communities, define an indicative cost (USD) per hectare for slum upgrade of physical infrastructure (for example, the cost of individual investments in Lagos' slums was capped at \$20,000 per hectare to allow equitable distribution among communities and captured costs of local construction.

Activity	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	Comment
1. Preparatory Activities							Local Consultant explains process and mobilizes stakeholders
2. First meeting of Steering Committee							On-going activities by Local Consultant
3. Consultations with government and non-government stakeholders							Draft Report prepared by Local Consultant. Need to be reviewed and cleared by International Consultant and World Bank
4. Prepare Assessment of Urban Conditions and Systemic Issues Contributing to Slum Development							Bank Task Team Leader needs to be in Freetown for Second Meeting of Steering Committee – in 1 <sup>st</sup> Week of February
5. Present Report to the Second Meeting of the Steering Committee for validation							
6. Development of Strategy Outline/Inputs by Local Consultant to International Consultant. Local Consultants carry consultation with stakeholders to ensure buy-in for the Strategy Outline							Both Corado and Kremena need to be in Freetown for the third meeting of Steering Committee – in April
7. Strategy Outline Presented for validation at the third workshop of Steering Committee							
8. Printing and Dissemination of Strategy Outline							

## **Appendix III**

### **Report on the Second Workshop on the Freetown Slum Initiative**

The second of three workshops under the Freetown Slum Initiative was held at the Atlantic Hall of the National Stadium in Freetown on Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> and Wednesday 11 February 2009.

These workshops form an integral part of the Freetown Slum Initiative and are an important element in the interactive process for the development of a slum strategy for Freetown. The workshops were aimed at soliciting the views of a cross sections of the Freetown community, (particularly slum dwellers, local government officials, central government, community based organisations, local NGOs and INGOs), in order to ensure effective buy-in of the outcomes and to lay the foundation for sustainable intervention on slum issues.

The two-day workshop saw an attendance rate of at least seventy-six persons (See Appendix), representing slum residents; elected city councillors within whose constituencies the slum settlements fall; CBOs; NGOs and INGOs.

Three Ministers of key government ministries, (Works and Housing, Lands and Country Planning, Social Welfare, Gender and Children's Affairs), dealing with some of the systemic issues responsible for slums were in attendance and made statements committing government to the Freetown Slum Initiative.

Senior elected officials of the FCC, which is the direct beneficiary of the Freetown Slum Initiative, were also in attendance. They also made pertinent contributions to the discussions. The elected city officials included the Deputy Mayor and the Chairman of the Development Committee among others.

The workshop concluded with the identification of the systemic issues responsible for the growth and expansion of slums and proposed a range of interventions to reduce slums. (Appendix II), and developed a 'Freetown Slum Charter', (Appendix III), on the basis of which all interventions in the slum areas should take place.

### Appendix III

**List of participants at the second workshop on the Freetown Slum Initiative 10th and 11th February 2009**

No	Names of participants	Organisation
1	Alfred S. Thoronka	Dwarzark
2.	Mohamed	Portee Community
3.	Maraka Kargbo	Susan's Bay
4	Aminata A. Gbassa	Freetown City Council
5	Cllr. Sembia Johnson	Freetown City Council
6	Cllr. Saidu Mansaray	Freetown City Council
7.	Emmanuel Sella	GOAL Sierra Leone
8.	Alusine Nfa Turay	Independent Observer
9.	Vigender Sign	Save The Children
10.	Nicolas Geirda	Life Herald
11.	Yaklie Kamara	MOLLSS Organisation
12.	Unisa S. Conteh	WARD COMMITTEE OKARAY MURRAY TOWN
13.	Fraida Raffell	YMCA
14	Aminata Sillah	CAMPAD Africa
15.	Solif F. Kamara	CBO
16.	Fuetzi Agbewanu	Freetown City Council
17.	John S. Turay	Grey Bush
18.	Jerimiah Oju Moses	Tengbeh Town Community
19.	Unisa Kanu	
20.	Unisa S. Conteh	Congo Town Community
21	Gibril Sesay	Culture Radio
22.	Rajeer K. Vishtassma	Concern World Wide
23.	Samuel Kamara	Banana Water
24.	Tenneh Kamara	Ward Committee member
25.	Cllr.. Alusine Alu-Conteh	Freetown City Council
26.	Jeffery Cole	YAPAD
27.	Festus Margae	Africa Champion Newspaper
28.	Hassan Kamara	Susan's Bay Community
29.	Sulaiman T.B. Bangura	Moa Wharf
30.	Ibrahim Ahmed Banagura	Moa Wharf
31.	Mohamed B. Kamara	Moa Wharf
32.	Yimah D. Conteh	George Brook
33.	Hassan Sesay	Mabella
34.	Abdul R. Kamara	Mabella
35.	Augustine Kai Banya	MLCP
36.	Samuel Cox Koroma	Comm. Steering Committee
37.	Gibril K. Bangura	Kainekay Ward 367
38.	Cllr. Maseray Sesay	Freetown City Council

39.	Mr. Durosime Williams	
40.	John Sembu Sesay	Crab Town
41.	Jalloh	Guma Valley
42.	Cllr. Collins T. Pearce	Freetown City Council
43.	Cllr. Samuel Bonghor Sesay	Freetown City Council
44.	Banya Davies	(MOLCPE) Ministry of Lands
45.	Saidu Sesay	MOLCPE
46.	Cllr. Kemoh Kargbo	Ward 367
47.	Cllr.. Kemoh Mansaray	Ward 367
48.	Jattu Kamara	Ward 365
49.	Actoma Kamara	Ward 365
50.	Mayalie Bundu	Ward 355
51.	Solomon Stenleg	Ward 390
52.	Cllr. Christiana Conteh	Freetown City Council
53.	Samir Baber Toure	Ward 380 Committee Member
54.	Marharet Gborie	Women Organisation
55.	Ibrahim A. Conteh	Ward 368 Fourah Bay Community
56.	Isha A. Kamara	Ward 368 Fourah Bay Community
57.	Momodu Mansaray	Government Wharf
58.	Ekoh Nelson	Ward 381
59.	John Coker	Min. Lands Country Planning
60.	Alhaji U.A. Sesay	National Assets Government
61.	Cllr. Mansaray Kebe	Freetown City Council
62.	Abu A. Kanu	Freetown City Council
63.	Abu H. Sesay	Campaign for Good Governance (CGG)
64.	Donald King	National Assets Commission
65.	Sergio Oliete Josa	European Commission
66.	Nancy Sesay	Ward 377 Susan's Bay
67.	Sara Bech Padrosa	Student UPC-GRECDH
68.	Alusine Bangura	United Youth Organisation
69.	Mohamed M. Kamara	AYFAD
70.	Abu Barrie	
71.	Kamanda Bangura	Freetown City Council
72.	Alimamy Fofanah	Ward 366

## Appendix III

### A Charter for the Freetown Slum Area Exit Strategy

In the second half of the first day workshop, a participatory section was held. The participants (mainly slum residents) were divided into three groups each of them guided respectively by the CA International Consultant (Mr. Corrado Minervini), the Director of Compad Africa, a local NGO, (Miss Aminata Sillah), and Mr. Aiah Brima, the Development Officer of the Freetown City Council and Michael Johnson, the CA Local Consultant. The three groups identified the major problems affecting the slum areas (see tables below) and consequently the areas to focus attention and resources of the interested stakeholders for the Freetown Slum Exit Strategy. The main slum issues identified by the participants were: (i) Land, (ii) Employment, (iii) Planning, and (iv) Management.

These four main topics summarize the notes pointed out by the participants once revised, grouped and rephrased by the CA team who had also proposed to develop a charter for basing the Freetown Slum Area Exit Strategy.

#### Group 1

Participant's proposals		Main issue
1.	A committee to oversee the management of slum (management committee)	Management
2.	Demographic survey of slum	Area Planning
3.	Provision of Low cost housing	Area Planning
4.	Options for relocations	Land tenure / Relocation
5.	Improvement in sanitation	Area Planning
6.	Accessibility improvement	Area Planning
7.	Provision of schools	Area Planning
8.	Employment	Employment
9.	Improve environmental management	Management
10.	Improve drainage and storm water facilities	Area Planning
11.	Water supply	Area Planning
12.	Flooding mitigation measures, and disaster management	Management
13.	Specific attention to be paid to women, children and disables	Management
14.	Continuing sensitization to public and people's location / settlements	Management
15.	Establish management system within the FCC to coordinate intervention in the slums	Management
16.	Independent Planning and management authority for FT	Planning Management

**Group 2**

<b>Participant's proposals</b>		<b>Main issue</b>
1.	Regulatory Framework to be established and enforcement after planning and work implementations	Area Planning
2.	Sensitization of slum and non slum dwellers on the slum issues	Management
3.	slum dwellers cannot be displaced without their consent	Land tenure / Relocation
4.	Planning Authority to deliberate on slum issues	Planning
5.	Thorough Survey of the slum areas	Area Planning
6.	FDP and slum area planning need to result from a consultative process	Planning
7.	Regularize the ownership of land	Land tenure / Relocation
8.	Recognize the land reclaimed to the sea or river	Land tenure / Relocation

**Group 3**

<b>Participant's proposals</b>		<b>Main issue</b>
1.	Pollution. Effective waste management, involving youth	Employment
2.	Shelter. Modern housing facilities	Area Planning
3.	Toilet facilities	Area Planning
4.	Roads. Proper development plan.	Area Planning
5.	Health. Affordable health care facilities	Area Planning
6.	Embankment against flooding	Area Planning
7.	Land tenure system in SLUMs	Land tenure / Relocation
8.	Electricity	Area Planning
9.	Police post	Area Planning
10.	Proper drainage system	Area Planning
11.	Social security	
12.	Attitudinal change	Management
13.	Effective community development plan and community monitoring system	Management

## Land Issue

It is the most delicate and controversial issue for the majority of slum dwellers. Since the residents have occupied abusively the state land in principle, they could be evicted and persecuted. But also, since they have developed an economy providing themselves with the basic services, facilities and housing, and hence contributing somehow to the development of the overall urban economy, again in principle, they have the full title of urban residents.

Land issue is also the starting point of any Slum Exit Strategy. Once the slum residents have negotiated their roles, functions and most of all rights, the development process can start.

There are several kinds of land tenure the slum residents might get:

- i. Full tenure
- ii. Moratorium on relocation or eviction
- iii. Temporary occupation license (an opportunity given to the occupiers to occupy a piece of land for a limited period of time and for a specific use and purpose)
- iv. Communal or individual lease (a contract granting use or occupation of property during a specified time for a specified payment<sup>36</sup>),
- v. Community land trust (a property trust which aims to benefit the surrounding community by ensuring the long-term availability of affordable housing<sup>37</sup>),
- vi. Communal ownership
- vii. Customary tenure (the holding of land in accordance with customary law)

The key objectives should be to provide adequate security and maintain or increase access by the urban poor to locations where they can increase their incomes. It is also important to reduce the attraction to higher-income groups of buying out low-income residents. (Payne, G. 2005)

All these types of land tenures might be considered options within the negotiation process between the slum dwellers (the occupants) and the state representatives (the actual legal land owner). Such negotiation needs to be guided by an independent body like an International NGO who takes into account the peculiar conditions of the slum dwellers, the area's potential development, the economic and social costs and benefits which might be derived and the adoption of the most appropriate tenure solution.

---

<sup>36</sup> Leasehold or rental: Under both common law and civil law, land may be leased or rented by its owner to another party; a wide range of arrangements are possible, ranging from very short terms to the 99-year leases common in the United Kingdom, and allowing various degrees of freedom in the use of the property. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Land\\_ownership\\_and\\_tenure](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Land_ownership_and_tenure)

<sup>37</sup> The CLT acquires multiple parcels of land throughout a targeted geographic area with the intention of retaining ownership of these parcels forever. Any building already located on the land or later constructed on the land is sold off to an individual homeowner, a cooperative housing corporation, a nonprofit developer of rental housing, or some other nonprofit, governmental, or for-profit entity. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Community\\_land\\_trust](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Community_land_trust)

Considering the deplorable economic condition of the slum dwellers and the tight relationship between the location occupied and the slum activities, relocation effort might be harmful and in many cases even fatal.

Sometimes, however, relocation is necessary due to the extreme precarious living conditions of the inhabitants. Therefore, it is advisable that in the event that relocation is unavoidable, basic human rights should be provided with highest priority and together with the rights and services as proposed by international organizations.

## **Employment**

Employment and Employment Scheme development is a cross sectoral issue. It advocates for the local community involvement within the planning (as far as auxiliary activities are concerned) and the development and management activity (i.e. home-based enterprises, cooperatives, etc.).

It is also an indication of the desire of the local community to be part of the overall urban development plan and efforts to get out of miserable ghettos and eventually out of the informal economy too. Through skill training initiatives, the dwellers, particularly the youth, might enter the official labour market.

The solid waste management, for instance, being the first and most important issue in most of the slum areas, might easily be an employment sector the slum dwellers would like to be involved into first.

## **Management**

Management in slum is basic while the Slum Exit Strategy needs to get through the improvement of the management effectiveness and capacity.

Management needs to be applied to;

1. Solid waste collection and disposal,
2. Basic service planning, delivery and maintenance,
3. Planning, and
4. Development.

In principle, the local government is to be responsible of an effective management aiming at the area development. In practice, the International NGO might have a pivotal role leading (temporary) a slum management committee to oversee, manage and coordinate the intervention in the slum areas, and to put in place an effective community development plan and community monitoring system for improved attitudes of residents and environmental conditions.

Management should also pay particular attention to the disadvantaged people (women, children and disables), the disaster risk management and the flood mitigation measures.

## **Planning**

Most of the participants of the three working groups pointed out issues which could be grouped into one activity only: **Planning** and **Area Planning** specifically.

As a matter of fact, low cost housing schemes, water supply and sanitation, educational and health facilities, drainage and flooding protection measures, electrical and road network and security are definitively part of a comprehensive planning or area planning component activities as well as the preliminary activities which include demographic, social and economic survey, and the Regulatory Framework including enforcement which deliberate (soon after planning) on work implementations and the development management framework.

All the above mentioned activities are integrated (inclusive) in a comprehensive and sustainable planning of the slum areas where the method applied needs to be participatory to create ownership and responsiveness (which will enhance the development management).

The area planning moreover needs to link and open (physically, socially and economically) the slum areas to the rest of the city. Hence the area planning for the slum areas are to be conceived in the frame of the overall FDP. In the meanwhile, an Independent Planning and Management Authority for Freetown and Freetown Slums is desirable, under the auspices of the FCC and the central government. Such authority will deliberate on urgent matters (such as basic urban services) which cannot wait the time requirements for FDP drafting, and will be necessarily in line with the FDP features in that aspect.

## **Appendix III**

### **Slum Strategic Management Agreement: Basis of an Exit Strategy from Slums**

Based on the results of the participatory session of the CA “Slum Initiatives” workshop on Slum Exit Strategies (held on February 9 and 10, 2009) and the consultative process, the Cities Alliance team has initiated with the major stakeholders of the Freetown Urban Development, the following proposal to be endorsed by the representatives of the central and local government and official slum areas CBOs.

#### **Purpose**

This Strategic Management Agreement is a basic document which aims at guiding the process leading to improved living conditions in slum areas and to make slum dwellers and Freetown citizens aware of the major slum issues, from basic service needs to participatory and inclusive urban development. It is addressed to all the stakeholders involved in this process: citizens, NGOs, government agencies, institutions, political leaders, and particularly all those responsible for managing the Slum Exit Strategy, namely the governmental institutions and the local CBOs. The following guiding principles are to be assumed as a commonplace for the urban development and Good Governance practices.

#### **Overarching Principle**

Slum residents as citizens of Sierra Leone are to be given full rights as provided for under the Constitution, taking particular note of the provisions of Section 6(2); “Accordingly, the State shall promote national integration and unity and discourage discrimination on the grounds of place of origin, circumstances of birth, sex, religion, status, ethnic or linguistic association or ties” and Section; 6 (3) (a) “Secure full rights of residence for every citizen in all parts of the state”.

#### **Guiding Principles**

- i. The Freetown slum areas are at extreme health risks with high potential for epidemics and perennial outbreaks of contagious diseases. The provision of basic services in the slum areas is of crucial importance. The involvement of the local residents in the urban service delivery will maximize the potential for inclusion of their citizenry in the process of urban governance and could make the service itself more efficient and cost-effective.
- ii. The participatory approach for slum living standard improvement has to be suitable and sustainable particularly for those issues which are considered priorities such as land tenure, employment, planning and development management.
- iii. The inclusion of slum residents in the development and financial mechanism and monitoring systems is not only a local resident right but also a guarantee of a successful urban development.

- iv. The slum areas are an integral part of the overall Freetown urban area. The approach to their development/improvement should as such be taken from a comprehensive perspective as envisaged in the Freetown Development Plan Preliminary Study. If so, any area planning exercise drafted and implemented in the meanwhile should be incorporated in the Freetown Development Plan.
- v. Natural and cultural resources have become part of the slum areas and their inhabitants. Their preservation (the preservation of their overall urban identity) might enhance the local economic potentials and develop the social commitment and interests.
- vi. Freetown slums are fragile human settlements. Their inhabitants have developed a weak social and economic system as a result of the physical location. If relocation is inevitable, every effort will tend to provide slum residents with adequately improved living standard which might reflect the previous social and economic conditions.

### **Envisaged Activities**

A well organized Slum Strategic Management is a sound starting point for the urban development of the slum areas in Freetown and is an integral part of good local governance. Hence it shall be conducted in a transparent and accountable manner with adequate expert assistance as far as the technical and technological topics are concerned in urban planning. In this regard, the local and central governments are committed in the short run to:

- i. Ensure that the minimum level of acceptable services are provided to all slum dwellers;
- ii. Be responsive to the service levels and basic health conditions claimed by the residents;
- iii. Provide the basic services in a transparent and accountable manner and involve the local residents in any service provision activity;
- iv. Ensure appropriate in-house capacity to manage and oversight service provisions;
- v. Establish an ad hoc independent committee to guide, coordinate and direct the immediate short term urgent matters (e.g. water supply and sanitation, and other urgent basic infrastructure works in the slum areas) with the intent to mitigate the poor living conditions of the slum environments;
- vi. Alert and inform the donor community and the NGOs (local and international) on the above mentioned priority issues and commit them to take action in partnership with the local and central governments;
- vii. Propose area planning activities in slum areas to be sustainable, inclusive and participatory with tight links with the remaining urban area and the natural environment.

In the long run, local and central governments commit to:

- i. Ensure appropriate in-house capacity to plan, manage and oversee the development of slum urban areas;
- ii. Ensure that the slum residents are involved in the decision-making process leading to the development of their neighbourhoods which in effect means that those decisions are to be taken in the interest of the slum and overall Freetown community, the urbanities and the city as a whole.

## References

1. Bank of Sierra Leone. February 2009: Monthly Economic Review, December 2008.
2. Government of Sierra Leone Gazette Extraordinary Vol. CXXXIX No. 54. 7<sup>th</sup> November 2008: The Appropriation Act, 2009.
3. Government of Sierra Leone. August 2003: Sierra Leone Vision 2025, Strategies for National Transformation.
4. Government of Sierra Leone. 2005: Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper; A National Programme for Food Security, Job Creation and Good Governance 2005-2007.
5. Ministry of Finance and Economic Development. November 2008: Government Budget and Statement of Economic and Financial Policy 2009.
6. Statistics Sierra Leone. November 2006: 2004 Population and Housing Census; Executive summary.
7. Statistics Sierra Leone. November 2006: 2004 Population and Housing Census; Analytical Report on Population Distribution, Migration and Urbanisation in Sierra Leone.
8. Guma Valley Water Company. January/February 2005: Current Water Situation in Freetown.
9. Guma Valley water Company. June 2007: Draft Water and Sanitation Policy.
10. The Laws of Sierra Leone, 1960: Chapter 66, Freetown Improvement Act.
11. The Laws of Sierra Leone, 1969: Chapter 81, The Town and Country Planning (Amendment) Act, (1969).
12. UNDP. 2007: Sierra Leone Human Development Report 2007.
13. UNDP. Support for Policy and Programme Development Project. October 2-3 2001: Access to Land; Baseline Paper for a Workshop on Strategies for Human Settlements Development and Shelter Delivery.
14. Un-Habitat, 2006: Liberia; Settlement and Shelter programme 2006-2010.
15. UNDP. 2007: Human Development Report 2007/2008.
16. The World Bank. Staff Appraisal Report. May 11 1993: Freetown Infrastructure Rehabilitation Project.
17. European Commission Delegation in Sierra Leone. 2008: Freetown Development Plan: Pre Identification Study. Quick Wins Identification. Draft Final Report.
18. European Commission Delegation in Sierra Leone. 2008: Freetown Development Plan: Pre Identification Study. Preliminary Assessment. Draft Final Report.
19. European Commission Delegation in Sierra Leone. 2008: Freetown Development Plan: Pre Identification Study. Contents and Indicative Structure of the Document of the FDP.
20. Ministry of Education, Science and Technology 2007: Sierra Leone Education Sector Plan 2007-2015.

21. Statistics Sierra Leone. December 2005: Employment and Time Spent on Activities in Sierra Leone.
22. Ministry of Lands, Country Planning and the Environment. 2004: Draft Lands Commission Act.
23. International Unit, Her Majesty's Land Registry, United Kingdom. John Llewellyn and Andrew Smith. March 2008: Sierra Leone. An Investigation into Land Issues.
24. Ministry of Lands, Country Planning and the Environment. 8<sup>th</sup> February 2005: Draft National Lands Policy.
25. Ministry of Works, Housing and Technical Maintenance. May 2006: Sierra Leone Revised National Housing Policy.
26. Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries Sector Review and Project Identification. June 2003: Land Tenure in Sierra Leone.
27. The Prince's Foundation for The Built Environment. July 2007: Freetown, Sierra Leone. Scoping Workshop Report.
28. Cole. Henrietta May 2006: The Improvement of Slums and Informal Settlements in Freetown.
29. Thomas. Armand C. May 2006: Sierra Leone National Housing Programme 2006-20016.
30. GOAL Sierra Leone. January 2008: Findings of a Community-Based Survey on Child Protection, Health and Nutrition, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene, and HIV/Aids.
31. Sierra Leone Roads Authority. Sir Alexander Gibb & Partner Ltd. UK. In association with Techsult and Co. Ltd. Sierra Leone. January 1997: Report on the Final Structure Plan for Freetown.
32. Sierra Leone Roads Authority. Sir Alexander Gibb & Partner Ltd. UK. In association with Techsult and Co. Ltd. Sierra Leone. April 1997: Draft Immediate Development Programme and Report of the Second Workshop on the Freetown Structure Plan

### **Websites**

[http:// www.unhabitat.org](http://www.unhabitat.org)

<http://www.citiesalliance.org>