

# **Planning for Rapid Urbanisation Developing Sustainable Settlements in Sierra Leone**

## **Report to Commonwealth Association of Planners December 2017**

---

### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This report has been prepared by Philip Clarke of the charity One World Link (OWL) for the Commonwealth Association of Planners (CAP). OWL has recently helped to deliver a planning workshop in the city of Bo in Sierra Leone. It was facilitating this workshop in support of a pilot project being organised by the Prince's Foundation for Building Community (PFBC). CAP generously provided a grant of £1,000 to OWL to assist with its costs in this and in doing so asked that OWL provide a report of the workshop including setting out how the money was spent.
- 1.2 I am a Vice Chair of One World Link. I am also a chartered town planner working for Warwick District Council in the UK. Along with colleagues from OWL, I provided support to PFBC as it delivered the workshop.
- 1.3 In preparing this report, I would like to record my thanks to Bob May of Turley who led the workshop on behalf of PFBC. The report is my own, but I have used extracts from another report prepared by Bob as part of the background information.

### **2. Background**

#### **(a) Sierra Leone**

- 2.1 Sierra Leone is in West Africa and is bordered by Guinea to the north-east, Liberia to the south-east and the Atlantic Ocean to the south-west. Sierra Leone has a tropical climate, with a diverse environment ranging from savannah to rainforests. The country has a total area of 71,740 km<sup>2</sup> (27,699 sq miles). It gained independence from Great Britain in 1961 and is a member of the Commonwealth.
- 2.2 Based on figures from the 2015 national census, Sierra Leone has a population of 7,092,113. Of this, 59% live in rural areas and 41% in urban areas (of which just over 1 million live in the capital city Freetown).
- 2.3 Sierra Leone is a constitutional republic with a directly elected president and a legislature / parliament. It has national and local elections every four years; the next elections being scheduled for March 2018.
- 2.4 According to the World Bank Sierra Leone is ranked 158 (out of 194) for GDP and within Africa is ranked 41 out of 54 countries. It has a literacy rate of 51.4% and only 16% of it

working population in formal employment (with the remaining 84% classing themselves as self-employed). Delivery of basic infrastructure is a priority for the country. Thirty six percent its population have access to pipe borne drinking water as their main source of water and 73% using pit latrines as their main toilet facility.

- 2.5 Sierra Leone suffered from a major and prolonged Civil War from 1991-2002 however since then has enjoyed a period of stable Government. The Ebola outbreak in 2014-15 was a more recent major crisis for the country. Sierra Leone is a significant beneficiary of overseas aid, including particularly from the UK. This has risen since the Ebola outbreak however is anticipated to return to more “normal” levels soon.

## **(b) Planning in Sierra Leone**

- 2.6 In theory at least the planning system in Sierra Leone is the same as it is in the UK, being based on the same 1947 Act. Other British acts of parliament and EU law have been adopted by the Government of Sierra Leone, so that there is a parallel system of environmental regulation and powers of compulsory acquisition that UK planners recognise.
- 2.7 Although there designated national parks and protected landscapes, controls to prevent development of land that is required for mineral extraction and a system of building permits, operated by the Ministry of Lands (akin to the UK Building Control system), in practice there is only a very limited spatial planning system and little effective regulation of the built environment.
- 2.8 Planning powers and functions have been devolved to District and City Councils, who are (notionally) responsible for preparing a land-use plan for their area and policies to control development in accordance with that plan. To date only Freetown has produced a land use structure plan and no council has yet implemented a system of controlling development. There is no mechanism of submitting a planning application.
- 2.9 Most major development is carried out and controlled by the government, or with government agencies such as the national road authority, the National Power Authority (NPA) or the army. There is a national housing authority, but it has little finance and has only carried out one or two small pilot projects.
- 2.10 Private sector development and developments by other nations, most notably China, are undertaken through individual development agreements, usually in exchange for mineral rights, between the investors and the government.
- 2.11 Planning functions at a local level fall within the remit of the Mayor and the Chief Administrator. Working to them are senior officers, one of whom is the Development Planning Officer (DPO), who is the council’s planner. The day to day job of the DPO is primarily to manage and monitor the Mayor’s 3-year investment programme through the preparation of a Development Plan. These programmes are capital investments programmes that direct spending on water, sanitation, waste and road building. They are often driven by the need to resolve issues around the creation of informal settlements and slum communities. The Development Plan is reviewed annually to provide a 3-year rolling investment strategy for the district or city area.

**(c) Bo**

- 2.12 Bo is currently the third largest city in Sierra Leone by population, with an estimated population of 175,000. (Until the 2015 census it was the second largest city, however Kenema (approximately 40 miles to the east) has now overtaken it.) Bo is the largest city of the southern province and lies approximately 140 miles from Freetown. According to figures from New York University, Bo is anticipated to grow significantly over the next few years, with some estimates putting the population at 583,000 by 2045. This level of expected growth is significant in view of the planning work now being undertaken.
- 2.13 The city is a leading financial, educational and economic centre of Southern Sierra Leone and is home to Njala University, the second largest university in Sierra Leone. It is also home to the Bo Government Secondary School, commonly known as Bo School, which is one of the biggest and most prominent secondary schools in Sierra Leone, and the Bo Stadium, the second largest stadium in Sierra Leone.
- 2.14 There are two local councils in Bo and its surrounding area.
- **Bo City Council (BCC)** controls most of the current urban area of the city. It is headed by a mayor, presently Harold Logie Tucker and has offices within the city. It should be noted that because the city boundary is drawn tightly around this urban area, some recent development is now taking place outside the present city boundary in the area controlled by Bo District Council.
  - **Bo District Council (BDC)** is a large rural district with an area of 5,219 sq km (2,015 sq miles) which abuts Bo City. It is headed by a Chairman, presently Joseph Munda Bindi, and has offices on the edge of Bo.

**(d) One World Link**

- 2.15 One World Link (OWL) is an organisation set up to promote friendships between Bo and Warwick District in the UK. The link that has been running between these two communities since 1981 is inspired by a desire for justice, equality, human understanding and mutual support. Over the years it has helped to strengthen both communities and their awareness of global and development issues.
- 2.16 The link has been maintained through a number of activities including exchange visits, cultural events, links made between schools and other organisations in the two communities. A community centre has been built in Bo by OWL to provide meeting and conference space and accommodation (a six-room guest house) close to the centre of the city. The OWL Centre now provides focus for OWL's activities in Bo and a sustainable income basis for the organisation.
- 2.17 Organisationally, OWL exists with two committees; one in Warwick District in the UK and one in Bo. There are two Chairmen of OWL, one in the UK and one in Bo.

- 2.18 OWL is clear that although it is a registered charity it is not an aid agency. It has, however, as part of its purpose of promoting friendship between the two communities, set up a number of sub-groups to encourage the sharing of skills and ideas between professional in Bo and in Warwick District. A long-running education group links schools in the two communities and there is a regular teacher-exchange programme as part of this.
- 2.19 Another of the sub-groups is the local government group. This was set up in 2007 to support the fledgling local government structures in Bo, and over the following 10 years officers from Warwick District Council and Warwickshire County Council have worked alongside colleagues (officers and councillors) in both BCC and BDC on a number of projects. Previous successes include an exchange programme for environmental health officers (funded by the Commonwealth Scholarship scheme) and a waste management programme. This saw a pilot project trialled in Bo to support waste collection and recycling. The trial was funded by the United Nations Development Programme and led to a wider city-wide waste management scheme funded by the UK's Department for International Development (DFiD, also known as UK Aid). This scheme (also with DFiD funding) has now been delivered in Bo and has been widened to cover the cities of Kenema and Makeni. Although these DFiD-funded schemes have been delivered by a large NGO, OWL has been retained to provide technical expertise.

**(e) One World Link support for planning in Bo**

- 2.20 OWL has also worked alongside BCC and BDC to provide support with town planning over a number of years. Back in 2007, when the local government initiative was launched, Clive Harridge (currently Secretary General of CAP) was one of a small group of professionals who worked alongside BCC to scope out how support for planning may take shape.
- 2.21 This work has been carried forward by the current UK Chair of OWL, John Archer, in the course of a number of visits to Bo since 2010. John is also a chartered town planner and has worked with both BCC and BDC to improve the mapping information for Bo, and also to see how initial steps can be taken to embed the principles of good planning in the work of officers and councillors in Bo.
- 2.22 This work has made some real progress, particularly in the area of the quality and availability of digital mapping information. There is also, OWL believes, at a high level within the councils a general understanding of the value and importance of good planning, particularly in light of the significant projections of population growth for the city. There are, however, a number of genuine reasons - and two reasons in particular - why it has proved difficult to gain any real momentum on planning work. Firstly, and most obviously, without any legislative or regulatory means of controlling where development should (and importantly should not) take place, it is difficult for councils to justify the resources and effort to develop a proper land-use planning framework. There is, furthermore, nobody to hold the councils to account if they do not provide one. Secondly, the needs of local people are such that more immediate concerns (supply of fresh drinking water, basic health, sanitation and education services) outweigh more long-term concerns such as how the city may be impacted on by population growth in 15-25 years.
- 2.23 Immediately prior to the PFBC initiative, it was difficult for OWL to see where and how it could re-energise and dialogue with the two councils about planning matters. The advent of

the PFBC initiative has therefore been a timely one, which has been strongly welcomed by OWL.

**(f) Prince's Foundation for Building Community**

- 2.24 The Prince's Foundation for Building Community (PFBC) evolved from The Institute of Architecture, established by HRH The Prince of Wales. The PFBC's vision is *"to transform lives across the globe through the creation of enduring and harmonious communities that face the future with confidence"*.
- 2.25 The Foundation believes that sustainably planned, built and maintained communities improve the quality of life of everyone who is part of them. They help us live better at a local level, and start dealing with the broader global challenges of urbanisation and climate change.
- 2.26 A particular challenge is that it is estimated that by 2050, the world's urban population will almost double to nearly 6.5 billion people. Rapid urbanisation is of particular relevance to Commonwealth countries where 90% of countries have populations under 1 million and one third of those are expected to (at least) double in size in the next 20 years.
- 2.27 In response to this, PFBC has been preparing a tool kit for rapid urbanisation. In this venture it has been working in partnership with the Commonwealth Association of Planners (CAP), the Commonwealth Local Government Forum (CLGF) and key Commonwealth organisations representing the different professions engaged in the built environment. The initiative was launched by HRH Prince Charles at CAPs biennial conference in Fiji in November 2015.
- 2.28 The proposals are to develop a coordinated toolkit initiative to support implementation of the New Urban Agenda within the Commonwealth. With a primary focus on urban extensions for cities of 1 million inhabitants or less, the proposals envisage the development of a practical toolkit helping to equip a range of stakeholders to prepare and plan for rapid urbanisation. The proposed toolkit seeks to support those cities most vulnerable to the impacts of rapid urbanisation, but also with the least support and funding to implement change at a local level.
- 2.29 PFBC developed the toolkit during 2016 and 2017, and was keen as part of its development to trial it in a limited number of appropriate locations across the Commonwealth. PFBC became aware of OWL's activities in Sierra Leone, and agreed that Bo would be an ideal location for such a trial.
- 2.30 The trial was delivered on behalf of PFBC by Bob May, a chartered town planner from UK consultants Turley. Bob has a wide experience of working in Sierra Leone and has delivered planning workshops in Freetown in the past.
- 2.31 It was agreed with PFBC that Bob would therefore lead on the delivery of the training in Bo with support from OWL.

### 3. First workshop in Bo: 29<sup>th</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> May 2017

- 3.1 The “Planning for Rapid Urbanisation” programme has been developed as a five-step process. This is set out in **appendix 1**.
- 3.2 In November 2016, a two-day workshop was run in Freetown with representatives from all of the Districts within Sierra Leone. The workshop was an exercise in testing the Rapid Planning Toolkit through its stages, from visioning and into identifying growth area options. Representatives from both BDC and BCC attended the workshop.
- 3.3 Following the success of this event, it was agreed that an initial workshop would be held in Bo on 29<sup>th</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> May 2017. The focus of this would be steps 1-3 of the toolkit. The training would be delivered by Bob on behalf of PFBC. OWL agreed to provide all the maps that would be required (using digital maps that had been prepared previously) and to encourage both BCC and BDC to participate. OWL did not have the capacity or resources to attend the event in person.
- 3.4 The workshop took place as planned, hosted by BCC at its offices in Bo. The invited attendees were drawn from the two councils. The event was successful in that it helped to deliver most of steps 1-3 of the toolkit. In particular it enabled a number of maps to be produced which set out:-
- The human and physical constraints on development in and around Bo
  - A mapping of community assets
  - Identification of land suitable for development
  - Identification of the amount of land that would be required to meet development needs, the location of this development and a broad phasing plan (identifying land up to 2030 and land from 2030-2040).
- 3.5 These maps provided an important basis for future work, and were shared with the two councils.
- 3.6 In reflecting on this initial workshop and contemplating whether to undertake a second follow-up workshop, Bob May, PFBC and OWL agreed the following:-
- The level of support from the two councils, whilst adequate to enable the work to be undertaken and produce some meaningful results, was not as great as had been hoped. In total ten participants supported the event (six on day 1 and four on day 2). It would benefit any further sessions if participants could be drawn from a wider cross section of the work of both councils. This is particularly the case as step four envisages a meeting with community stakeholders to test out some of the ideas generated by the participants. This event would require wide support if it is to be meaningful.
  - The venue was not ideal as officers from BCC were occasionally called away on other duties.
  - It was difficult to gauge whether there was any expectation from participants that any payments (travel or otherwise) would be made for their attendance at the workshop. No payments of any kind were made, and no catering provided (participants brought

their own food on both days). It was not clear whether this had any bearing on the level of support from the councils.

- 3.7 It was therefore agreed that in order for any second workshop to be undertaken, these matters needed to be addressed. Bob May was willing to lead a further workshop but, quite reasonably, was keen to ensure that there would be support from within Bo if he was to do so.
- 3.8 It is OWL's experience of working in Sierra Leone over many years that there is no substitute for being present "on the ground" when organising and facilitating such meetings and events. OWL therefore offered to PFBC to support a follow-up workshop in the following ways. We would:-
- Make sure that we were in Bo for a week before the workshop to galvanise support from both Councils and to deal with any practical issues that needed to be addressed before the workshop took place.
  - Be present at the workshop itself to support its delivery.
  - Provide all plans and other material as we had done for the first workshop.
  - Offer the conference facilities at the OWL Centre as a neutral venue for the workshop.
  - Fund any hosting of the workshop including providing catering.
  - Arrange transport. (The workshop required a site visit for which vehicles would be required.)
- 3.9 The date of the workshop was set for 4<sup>th</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> December 2017, and OWL made arrangements to travel a week before this to Bo. It was at this time that OWL formally approached CAP for funding support. The purpose of any funding support was therefore twofold.
- To support the costs of sending the group from One World Link to support the workshop. These costs would otherwise have to be borne either by One World Link from its resources, or by the individuals undertaking the visit.
  - To support the cost of costs of hosting the workshop itself.
- 3.10 A breakdown of the full costs is set out in **appendix 4** below. It should be made clear that whilst the workshop formed the focus of this visit, and certainly dictated its timing, the group undertook a wider range of other activities on behalf of OWL's wider work during the visit.

#### **4. Second workshop in Bo: 4<sup>th</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> December 2017**

- 4.1 In accordance with the framework set out in appendix 1, the workshop was held over two days. The scope and agenda for this are set out in **appendix 2**. A number of the images taken from the workshops are shown in **appendix 3**.
- 4.2 Along with myself, the team from OWL UK that supported Bob May at the event were Cllr Jane Knight, a founder member of OWL and Warwick District councillor and Mair Evans, an OWL member and Arts Officer at Warwick District Council.

- 4.3 In the week before the workshop, OWL undertook the following:-
1. We met with Development Planning Officer (DPO) for BCC, Haja Lukay (see appendix 3: image 5) on two occasions to plan the workshop. Haja has only relatively recently been appointed as DPO. Fortunately, she had attended the previous workshop in May in her previous role as Gender Officer for BCC.
  2. We attended a consultation event for the BCC Development Plan on 27<sup>th</sup> November (see appendix 3: image 2). This was organised by Haja and a number of stakeholders were invited including departmental (“sector”) heads from within BCC, local representatives of government ministries (health, education) and NGOs.
  3. We met with the Mayor of BCC and Chair of BDC to ensure their support, and that of their leading officers, for the event.
  4. We agreed with the two DPOs who should be invited, both to the council workshop on day 1 (4<sup>th</sup> December) and the consultation workshop on day 2.
- 4.4 At these meetings we were greatly encouraged by the enthusiasm of the two DPOs from BCC and BDC. Both were newly in post (since the previous workshop) and quickly saw the opportunities offered by the workshop. Because they were already preparing their own council Development Plans, they had a good understanding of which officers, councillors and key stakeholders should be invited to the workshop events, and were able to mobilise these people quickly. They liaised with us during the week before the workshop and worked together to ensure that people did attend. (For example, they set up a WhatsApp group of key stakeholders to make sure that essential information was passed quickly to key participants.)
- 4.5 The DPOs were also able to make us aware of any cultural and workplace practices that we should be observing, particularly in respect of the stakeholder workshops. For example, it became clear that external participants in the stakeholder workshop (Government ministries, representatives of landowning families and Paramount Chiefs) would expect their reasonable travel and (where appropriate) accommodation expenses to be met. We were therefore able to give assurances that these costs would be met. There was no prior budget for this, and so these costs were met by OWL.
- 4.6 There is no doubt that this work by the DPOs contributed significantly to the ultimate success of the event itself. Day one of the workshop was attended by 14 people from the two councils and beyond including councillors and senior officers from across all major departments.

#### Attendees on Day One of the workshop

##### **Bo City Council**

Development Planning Officer  
2 x Assistant Development Planning Officer  
Environmental Health Officer  
Environmental Services Officer  
Gender Officer  
Waste Management Manager  
Councillor

##### **Bo District Council**

Deputy Chief Administrator  
Development Planning Officer  
Monitoring & Evaluation Officer  
Environmental Services Officer  
Councillor (Planning Chairman)  
  
Former Development Planning Officer (now working for another council)

4.7 The stakeholder workshop on day 2 was attended by 26 representatives.

#### Attendees on Day Two of the workshop

##### **Bo City Council**

- Development Planning Officer
- 2 x Assistant Development Planning Officer
- Environmental Services Officer

##### **Bo District Council**

- Deputy Chief Administrator
- Development Planning Officer
- Monitoring & Evaluation Officer
- Environmental Services Officer
- Civil works engineer
- Councillor (Planning Chairman)
- Former Development Planning Officer (now working for another council)

##### **Other participants**

- Representative of Paramount Chief (Gbo region)
- Representative of Paramount Chief (Bo)
- Representative of Paramount Chief (Samamie region)
- Representative of Paramount Chief (Komboya region)
- Representative of Paramount Chief (Kakua region) x 2
- Landowning family - Kakua
- Ministry of Agriculture, Farming and Fisheries
- MIE/IT officer
- Christian Aid
- Programme Officer RADA – (civil society advocacy programme) x 2
- One World Link (Chair of Bo Committee)
- Red Cross

4.8 The workshop was able to deliver all of the key outcomes. These included:-

1. A re-cap of the work undertaken at the previous (May 2017) workshop.
2. A presentation by the BCC DPO of a vision for Bo City. (see appendix 3: image 5)
3. An assessment by workshop participants of the priority areas for growth and a critical analysis of the development potential within these areas.
4. A site visit which helped to further develop this thinking. (see appendix 3: images 7-8)
5. A lively stakeholder workshop in which the emerging ideas were presented and there was an open discussion of the key challenges affecting the ability of the Council to deliver an effective and deliverable plan.
6. Some early more detailed masterplanning of how individual neighbourhoods can be planned. (see appendix 3: image 4)

## **5. Conclusions and learning points**

5.1 The purpose in undertaking the workshop was twofold; for PFBC it was to trial their emerging “Rapid Urbanisation” toolkit in a real-life situation, whilst for OWL it was to see how it could provide meaningful planning support to local councils in Bo.

5.2 PFBC has developed the toolkit with a view to it being rolled out over a much longer period, and being a primarily on-line resource to be used and adapted by local practitioners. As such, it recognises that a two-day workshop setting is not the normal way that it would expect the toolkit to be used. It will be for PFBC to assess how the toolkit may need to be further refined following the experience from this workshop (and those in other trial

locations). OWL has offered to contribute to this discussion. As initial feedback, I would comment as follows:-

1. The toolkit provides a useful framework for making sense of universal principles of good planning and design. It has a logical flow which should, in theory, be able to be used by local practitioners.
2. That said, when it is being used in a situation where there are few professionals with a formal planning training (as is the case in Sierra Leone), a greater level of support would be required to complete many of the tasks. For example, the participants in Bo would likely have struggled to complete masterplanning work (see step 4 in appendix 1) without external assistance.
3. A workshop setting is a good way to introduce the various themes and ideas in a structured and supported way. It does not, however, always allow sufficient time for these issues to be fully explored. For example, a useful exercise would be to look in much more detail at the constituent elements of what makes up a neighbourhood (eg: roads, homes, schools, waste storage areas, etc) and consider which uses are compatible, and incompatible, with each other. This would then help frame a fuller discussion of detailed masterplanning. The toolkit could be expanded to give a framework for this type of exercise.
4. The toolkit should – implicitly or explicitly – recognise that in some locations in the world (such as Sierra Leone) it will need to operate in an environment with no proper regulatory planning framework. It should therefore take every opportunity to encourage a bottom-up approach to developing a planning framework which embodies the principles of good community planning. In a situation such as Sierra Leone, such a toolkit can only be effective if all major stakeholders can see the benefits of such a collaborative approach. The toolkit should encourage a process which could - hopefully – lead to a planning framework that has a strong degree of consensus.
5. The resource issues inherent in delivering the toolkit should not be underestimated. Whilst in many countries delivering a planning framework will be seen as a legitimate function of local government in some form, and therefore to be resourced by local government, this will not always be the case. In Sierra Leone, the desire to provide a framework to guide future planning must sit alongside other – more immediate – needs. It is likely that without additional capacity and funding support, many councils would struggle to deliver the toolkit or to gain any real benefit from it.

5.3 From OWLs perspective, and our desire as an organisation to support our colleagues in Bo to develop a planning framework for the city, the opportunity to engage with PFBC and for Bo to be a trial city in developing the toolkit, has been an extremely positive experience. In these terms, the following concluding comments can be made.

1. The workshop must be viewed as extremely successful. It has enabled OWL to engage afresh with colleagues in BCC and BDC and to help them to think in a positive and structured way about the challenges that the future growth of the city will bring. It has

raised the profile of these issues, and of planning more generally, including with a wide range of local stakeholders.

2. There is early evidence that the ideas emerging from the workshops will be taken up by officers at the two councils. The BCC DPO is currently in the process of the annual review of the Development Plan, and she is proposing to include a section in the document on a spatial framework for the city. This will set out the key learning points from the workshop (the rate and scale of growth projected for Bo and where this growth will be directed). It is to be hoped that this will provide, at very least, a reference point for investment decisions and applications for external bodies (eg: government) for support. For example, it could influence where resources should be directed to support road improvements and future water supply. It would also provide a reference point for discussions with the various ministries about issues such as health and education provision.
  3. A key challenge will be to maintain momentum on this work. A possible line of enquiry is in the opportunities for a community-planning approach to masterplanning the development of growth areas. The toolkit provides a set of tools for this, but without local facilitation, capacity and funding this is unlikely to be taken forward. Sierra Leone in general, and Bo in particular, is fortunate, however, in that a significant civil advocacy programme has been undertaken to engage local stakeholders with local decision making, including within local government. This is a DFID funded programme being delivered by the UK charity Christian Aid. Christian Aid, and its local delivery partner RADA, has an office in Bo and attended the workshop. There may be the potential for Christian Aid and RADA to have an ongoing role in working with the City Council to deliver a community-led plan for growth areas in Bo.
  4. Resourcing all the above will remain a significant challenge. Involving Christian Aid/RADA as outlined above may be a way of delivering both the capacity and expertise to take this work forward. OWL may be able to continue to have a role in supporting this work.
- 5.4 I would like to close by taking this opportunity to reiterate the gratitude of One World Link to the Commonwealth Association of Planners for its generous support for the workshop. The costs of hosting the workshop itself provided greater than originally anticipated owing in large part to the high number of people attending, and the grant from CAP was extremely helpful in this regard. This helped provide a funding basis for a very successful workshop which we hope will have some lasting value within Bo.

Philip Clarke  
Vice Chair, One World Link  
December 2017  
Email: [philip.clarke@warwickdc.gov.uk](mailto:philip.clarke@warwickdc.gov.uk)

## **Appendix 1: Outline of the PFBC “Planning for Rapid Urbanisation” toolkit**

---

**Please note that this is the draft framework while the toolkit is being developed and trialed.**

### **Step 1: Visioning**

Goal: to engage stakeholders to define and document a shared vision for the city and the context in which it needs to be planned:

- Explain the process to be undertaken and the value of urban planning to the city
- Present projected population growth scenarios
- Document stakeholders’ aspirations and vision for the future of their city
- Assess the national and local legal planning framework

### **Step 2: Mapping**

Goal: to conduct city-wide analysis to map the context and create 7 key plans that:

- Identify administrative boundaries and legal restrictions (eg city boundaries, national parks)
- Identify hazards and landscape constraints (eg flood plains, water, beaches, forest)
- Identify existing transport routes and access points (eg roads, railways, walking routes, airports)
- Identify land uses (eg residential, CBD, industrial, agricultural)
- Identify public spaces and services (eg green or open spaces, health, schools, places of worship)
- Identify access to services and utilities (eg power lines, water, sewage system)
- Identify land ownership (eg public, private, major holdings)

### **Step 3: Identifying extension / infill/ expansion options**

Goal: to assess and prioritise land available for planned city extensions

- Use plans from Step 2 to identify options available for extension or infill
- Use growth projections to calculate land required, using 3 graded densities
- Use growth projections and densities to calculate public services required (eg schools, parks)
- Prioritise options based on key criteria and vision document
- Overlay legal / policy restrictions

### **Step 4: Structure growth areas**

Goal: to create plans for the options identified that deliver walkable neighbourhoods through a series of coordinated design workshops, technical briefings and site visits for each growth area option

- Undertake site visits to potential growth areas
- Identify green/blue corridors defining linkages, boundaries & open space
- Structure walkable neighbourhoods along primary road network and blue/greenways
- Create intersecting secondary routes to define neighbourhood centres
- Determine block size with finer grain towards centre
- Develop density, phasing, transport and key fixes plans

### **Step 5: Implementing urban plans**

Goal: to develop a realistic, implementable urban plan

- Refine phasing of growth areas, define formal vs informal

- Identify public and private investment opportunities >> financial plan
- Propose mechanisms for regulating land for private development
- Propose design codes and opportunities for demonstration project
- Agree strategy to protect key fixes (infrastructure corridors, critical centres/public services)
- Define strategy for building the necessary regulatory framework enabling delivery of the plan

## Appendix 2: Workshop Outline

---

The purpose of the workshop is to undertake Step 4 – structuring growth areas of the rapid urbanisation toolkit.

The workshop will run over two days and consider ideas on the planning of small to medium sized urban settlements along the following lines, with the goal of structuring urban plans for future growth areas of Bo:

Goal: to create plans for sustainable walkable neighbourhoods:-

- Identify green/blue corridors defining linkages, boundaries & open space
- Identify land for civic and community needs
- Identify land for employment and commerce
- Identify safeguarding requirements for waste, recycling and drainage
- Structure walkable neighbourhoods along primary road network and greenways
- Create intersecting secondary routes to define neighbourhood centres for commerce and employment
- Determine block sizes with finer grain towards centres
- Develop principles for density, phasing, transport and key fixes

The two days are proposed to be structured as follows:

### Day 1 – 9.00am to 5.00pm

- (i) Presentation – Review session – recap of the Rapid Urbanisation Toolkit approach and work done to date
- (ii) Seminar – Introduction to principles of urban design and sustainable neighbourhoods
- (iii) Workshop – Identification of missing information and inputs; and a strategy to secure it
- (iv) Site visit/s – walking the sites identified for the new neighbourhoods
- (v) Review – review of the day and preparation for the morning session

### Day 2 – 9.00am to 5.00pm

- (vi) Meeting – community meeting with stakeholders to discuss principles, opportunities and issues
- (vii) Plan making – preparation of a Key Fixes Plan
- (viii) Report back – meeting with Bo leadership

## Appendix 3: Images of the workshop

---

### 1. The One World Link Centre, Bo - the venue for the workshop



2. Development Plan workshop, Bo City Council, 27<sup>th</sup> November 2017. This was led by the BCC Development Planning Officer and included many of the participants who also attended the PFBC workshop (see para 4.3 above).



**3. Bob May (left) with Maada Fobay (Chair of One World Link – Bo) at the stakeholder consultation, 5<sup>th</sup> December**



**4. At the workshop, 5<sup>th</sup> December**



**5. Haja Lukay, Development Planning Officer, Bo City Council**



**6. Elfrida Bokarie, Development Planning Officer, Bo District Council**



**7. Site visit, 4<sup>th</sup> December**



**8. Site visit, Bo airstrip, 4<sup>th</sup> December**



## Appendix 4: Breakdown of costs for the visit and hosting the workshop

There were three members of One World Link who supported the workshop. The approximate costs for each person in undertaking a 10-day visit such as this are as follows:-

Item	Approximate cost (£)	Notes
Flights	500	
Accommodation in Bo	130	Accommodation in OWL Centre is approximately £13 per night (half board)
Travel within Sierra Leone	100	This includes vehicle and driver hire and petrol costs between Freetown and Bo
Accommodation costs within Freetown (2 nights)	150	
Visas	110	
Other incidental costs	150	This includes transfer costs to the airport, taxi fares within Bo, other meals & drinks, malaria tablets, etc.
<b>Total (per person)</b>	<b>1,140</b>	

The costs for the workshop itself were as follows:-

Item	Cost (£)	Notes
Hire of venue (2 days)	80	OWL Centre
Catering	315	A breakfast (£105) and cooked lunch (£210) was provided in accordance with local traditions and practice. This was based on 70 participants over the two days.
Travel expenses	140	It is usual for these to be paid when participants are travelling for some distance and may have overnight accommodation to find. The costs ranged depending on the nature of travel expenses incurred from £4 to £20 per person. In total, 15 lots of travel expenses were paid.
Plans and other material	100	This included a number of plans at A1 and A0 scale as well as other material to support the workshop (pens, tracing paper, clip boards, etc).
<b>Total</b>	<b>635</b>	

As noted in the main report, it should be made clear that whilst the workshop formed the focus of this visit, the group undertook a wider range of other activities on behalf of OWL's wider work during the visit. This included visits to schools, hospitals and clinics, meeting with the Bo OWL Committee, planning a visit by teachers from Bo to the UK (scheduled for summer 2018), scoping an emerging cultural link between Bo and Warwick District and undertaking meetings in Freetown with the British High Commissioner, DFID and the British Council.