

Participatory Planning and Implementation of Urban Upgrading Projects in Kenya

Dr. Amolo Elvis Juma Amolo, PhD

Lecturer, University of Kigali, Rwanda

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2024.1108064>

Received: 24 July 2024; Revised: 05 August 2024; Accepted: 10 August 2024; Published: 11 September 2024

ABSTRACT

In Kenya, Urban planning processes is characterized by citizen non-engagement especially in low income communities since the city elites prefer top-down approach and this has led to a series of project failures coupled with forced evictions and violation of economic and social rights of the urban poor. The purpose of the study is to establish the influence of Participatory Planning on Implementation of Urban Upgrading Projects in Kenya. The study is grounded on Stakeholders' theory. The study design involved desk review. The study found that whilst there is no specific policy for urban renewal in Kenya, there has been urban renewal projects carried out in different cities and towns. The situation has been aggravated by inadequate public participation in planning urban renewal projects due to dormancy in participatory planning of urban renewal by responsible authorities, limited resources and lack of political goodwill. Though there is evidence of social groups within the estates, they lack a strong and coherent neighborhood residents' association that would act as key stakeholder during the planning, implementation and maintenance of the estate during urban renewal. Effective participation of residents in rebuilding their community reduces the risk of disintegration of existing networks or homelessness. Critical to the success of projects is the early and continuous integration of the community in the planning, decision-making and implementation process as this would lower costs, better target peoples' needs, incorporate local knowledge, ensure that benefits are equitably distributed and create grassroots capacity to undertake other development projects besides maintaining benefits.

Key words: Participatory planning, Implementation of Urban Upgrading projects, Regulatory Framework

INTRODUCTION

Urban renewal began with attempts to better the living conditions of urban residents through replacement of obsolete structures, containment of urban sprawl, and linking social improvements with economic growth through efficient use of urban land for reduced environmental degradation and improved land and property values, especially after post war reconstruction in Europe and North America (Makagutu, Abonyo and Opiyo, 2020). Urban renewal in the European cities and those of North America has taken three forms including physical improvement from 1950s to 1970s, physical renovation and behavior modification, 1970s to 1990s and prioritization of people's social objectives, heritage conservation and efficient traffic management through better urban design and improved quality of life (Niekerk and Annandale, 2013). Urban renewal, in Britain, began with slum removal following the Torrens (1868) and Cross (1875) Acts and in 1967 diversified into demolition, renovation or selling of public housing and the construction of new high value apartments while in Germany, the policy for urban renewal involved three phases: 'areal redevelopment', carried out between 1963 and 1981 which lacked citizen participation; policy of cautious urban renewal, 1981 and 1989 which accommodated citizen participation; and post-Fordist urban renewal in East Berlin, 1990s. However, urban renewal can also be negative if they result in unsustainable increase in property values, lifestyle costs and gentrification (Horn, Mitlin, Bennett, Chitekwe-Biti, and Makau, 2018).

In the United States of America, urban renewal started between 1949 and 1974 when there was a massive national effort to remove blighted properties and poverty from areas surrounding central business districts guided by the Housing Act of 1949 (Evers et al., 2019). The Act was amended in 1954 to allow sound community planning, land use zoning, subdivision control, building and housing codes. In the 1960s America,

cities cleared slums but failed to produce adequate replacement housing. Further, renewal in Atlanta, in the 1950s and 1960s, was racially biased, reflecting what was happening nationally at the time where white businessmen cleared sites and displaced poor African Americans without providing any permanent replacement housing, arguing that successful urban renewal intended to bring business to the central business district (Koroļova and Trejja, 2019).

In the global south, different approaches for urban renewal have been tried beginning with laissez-faire attitudes in the 1950s-60s, site and service schemes in the 1970s, slum upgrading in the 1980s, enabling strategies and security of tenure in the 1990s and cities without slums action plan of the 2000s. However, Urban renewal is contested by those who argue that it leads to displacement of households and socio-economic disruption, exclusive developments, mono-functionality of land use, and uncontrolled private-led assault on the function and ownership of urban areas (Cullen, Mcgee, Gunton, and Day, 2010). In Turkey, urban renewal projects were part of the comprehensive urban plans that aimed to improve the living standards of the squatter areas and of planned urban environments under different phases: the republican period of 1920s to 1940s covering the rebuilding of the cities destroyed in World War 1 after the defeat of the Ottoman Empire; the period, 1945-1980, addressed housing shortage and deterioration of urban environments occasioned by rural-urban migration; the period, 1980-2000, was a response to the neoliberal policies and; lastly, the period, 2000-to present has seen an increase in collaboration between the private and public sectors to achieve urban regeneration plans (Horn et al., 2018).

In Africa, urban renewal more often has negative consequences to the local residents which often include overcrowding in the neighboring estates, forced evictions and violation of economic and social rights of the urban poor (Holstein, 2017). The city of Cape Town, South Africa, initiated a Dignified Places Program to improve the urban spaces in Cape Flats, where the city's poorest lived by introducing open spaces to address inequity, environmental degradation and fragmentation, similar to United States' model of 1970s (Cilliers and Timmermans, 2014). In Nigeria, the Lagos Urban Renewal Board, adopted an infrastructure upgrading option with a view to limit physical and social disturbance, however, the project was constrained by inadequate funding, lack of public participation in the implementation stages and poor prioritization by the Federal and local government. In Addis Ababa Ethiopia, urban renewal programs have been successful without displacement of the poor and thus prevents sprawling of urban slums and poverty (Awa, 2017).

In Kenya, different strategies including forced evictions, resettlement, site and services schemes and upgrading have all been attempted without much success, for instance, the upgrading of Pumwani Estate in the 1930s and 1980s, through slum clearance and redevelopment of new housing which adopted a top-down approach resulted in displacement of the residents as they were unable to afford the final product. Equally, attempts in 2000 to upgrade Nairobi's Eastland to provide better-quality housing did not materialize for failure to include community participation in the framework. Upgrading projects in Kenya have had shortcomings at policy levels including lack of affordability, land tenure complications, administrative inefficiency, legal challenges and poor formulation of interventions. Sessional Paper no 5 of 1966 on Housing was the first to address itself to the issue of slums through recognition of slums and stopping harassment for sustainable urban neighborhood development (Odeyo, 2009). Other redevelopment plans in Kenya have included the Redevelopment of the east of CBD bounded by Tom Mboya Street, Haile Selassie Avenue, Race Course and Kirinyaga Roads between 1979 and 1987 that saw the demolition and rebuilding of 23 new buildings through rezoning and change in plot ratios and the transformation of Kilimani Estate, Nairobi in the 1990s from low density through rezoning to high density area allowing for construction of commercial buildings while in 2018 there was forced evictions in Kibera for the slum upgrading.

Further, Urban planning processes is characterized by citizen non-engagement especially in low income communities since the city elites prefer top-down approach and this has led to a series of project failures coupled with forced evictions and violation of economic and social rights of the urban poor (Wanjala and Muiruri, 2016). Even though, in 2012, Kenya's new constitution of 2010 required public participation to be the basis for national and devolved government planning and all government expenditures to be guided by such planning, lack of genuine opportunities to participate leads to further feelings of dependence and frustration, negatively affecting people's sense of belonging in the city and can result into strings of litigations (Tabot, Owuor and Migosi, 2020). The problem is further exacerbated by lack of specific policy for urban renewal,

limited resources, lack of political goodwill, and a lack of conservation culture (Kariuki and Jomo, 2014). Moreover, governments tend to lack commitment to participatory opportunities, allocate limited resources to associated support measures, remain unable to manage elite encroachment, and lack knowledge of how to design citywide plans that build on the assets and resources of low-income groups (Chepngetich and Mokuu, 2017). As evidence, the Kenyan government in 2018 set the Big Four Agenda on provision of affordable housing through upgrading informal settlements without explicitly considering Urban renewal and redevelopment as possible means of providing housing and improving the physical environment (Tabot, Owuor and Migosi, 2020).

The integration of the community in the planning, decision-making and implementation process ensures projects are implemented at lower costs, creates client's satisfaction, incorporate local knowledge, facilitates equitable resource distribution and create sustainability capacity. Effective integrated development is premised on the presence and operationalization of an effective legal framework and that the current legal framework is out of date, uncoordinated and does not provide an appropriate legal foundation for proper urban planning and governance. The study contribute knowledge on Participatory Planning for effective Implementation of Urban Upgrading Projects for practitioners through policy suggestions besides acting as a scholarly reference.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Stakeholders' Theory

The stakeholders' theory advanced by Freeman (1984) has been adopted to explain participatory planning by elaborating how and why government institutions, civil society organizations, donors and community members should be integrated into urban planning process. The theory espouses that the diverse interest and opinions of various stakeholders within the city should be taken into consideration for purposes of capacity building and empowerment, accountability, transparency, ownership and sustainability of Urban Upgrading projects. The engagement of stakeholders in urban upgrading planning minimizes chances of conflicts or litigations during the implementation phase through appropriate resource mobilization, budgeting, communication and risk assessment. Planners should manage the projects for the benefit of its stakeholder's, especially, the beneficiary community in order to ensure their rights and the participation in decision making to ensure the sustainability of the projects and therefore enabling it to improve its performance. This theory is relevant to this study as it will seek to explore how the participation of stakeholders in planning affects quality of implementation of Urban Upgrading projects.

Empirical Literature Review

Implementation of Urban Upgrading Projects

An Urban Upgrading project is considered successful if it's implemented on time, within budget and scope, with quality standards and client's satisfaction (Ochieng' and Sakwa, 2018) puts more emphasis time, cost, quality, client satisfaction, and health and environmental safety. Project implementation process assist in execution of projects as it provides project plans, specifications, and the original project feasibility (Nduthu, Omutoko and Mulwa, 2018). This study defines implementation of Urban Upgrading projects as the success in meeting quality, working within cost and time, reduction in litigation rates, affordable trading units, project operational efficiency, client satisfaction, health and environmental safety.

In Colombia, Holstein (2017) found that participatory planning encourages the inclusion of marginalized neighborhoods within the physical and social fabric of the city, thus, resulting in effective implementation within time, cost, quality and to the user's satisfaction while observing the health and environmental safety. However, lack of genuine opportunities to participate leads to further feelings of dependence and frustration, negatively affecting people's sense of belonging in the city and can result into strings of litigations. In Malaysia, Rosli, Omar and Ali (2017) observed that participatory planning approach can open opportunity for people excluded from development not only to participate in decision making but also to assess levels of local government transparency and accountability which ensures that projects

meet quality standards with maximum efficiency. True public participation process ensures communities are fully involved in planning process and incorporating their input into the development plan to avoid project sabotage.

In Kenya, Barasa and Jelagat (2013) assessed the importance of participatory planning on implementation of projects and found that participatory development has the propensity of achieving project sustainability, ownership, promotes equity, legitimizes decision-making processes, strengthens self-determination and predisposes a people toward a more democratic behavior. This, results into projects implementation within time, cost, quality and meeting user satisfaction while observing environmental and health safety. Therefore, literature reviewed converge on implementation indicators as productivity numbers, timelines of activities done and project implementers' satisfaction.

Despite previous studies convergence on implementation indicators measurement in terms of quality treatment, project implementation within cost and time, increased detection rate, affordable treatment, project operational efficiency, client satisfaction, health and environmental safety (Ochieng' and Sakwa, 2018; Holstein, 2017; Rosli, Omar and Ali, 2017; Barasa and Jelagat, 2013), none focused on how the Implementation of Urban Upgrading Projects can be influenced by Participatory Planning, a gap which the current study intends to fill.

Participatory Planning

Globally, Participatory planning addresses the Sustainable Development Goals' (SDGs) commitments to "leave no one behind" and SDG 11 (inclusive, safe and resilient cities) and the New Urban Agenda (Rosli, Omar and Ali, 2017). From the 1980s, a range of methodologies have evolved that propose participatory approaches including Participatory Action Research (PAR), Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA), Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), or even Participatory Hygiene and Sanitation Transformation (PHAST) (Al-Nammari, 2013). Since 1985, the European Charter of Local Self-Government (Preamble) which states that 'the right of citizens to participate in the conduct of public affairs is one of the democratic principles that are shared by all member States of the Council of Europe' and that 'it is at local level that this right can be most directly exercised' (Holstein, 2017). In Malaysia, publicity approach has been used in planning process of giving people the opportunity to make an appeal on matters that fall within the proposal as stipulated in Town and Country Planning Act 1976 (Act 172) under section 9(1) (Rosli, Omar and Ali, 2017). However, the current planning process no longer considers public participation as relevant.

From the 1990s after decentralization reforms and establishment of institutional channels for citizen engagement at the local level, local governments have been facilitators of good urban governance, citizen empowerment and redistributive planning, for example, in the Philippines, 1990 Local Government Code created Local Government Councils; India, 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendment created Panchayats; and Bolivia, 1994 Law of Popular Participation created Neighborhood Councils and Civic Oversight Committees (Horn et al., 2018). These legislative reforms promoting good urban governance and participation were certainly successful in some urban settings, contributing to citizen empowerment and more inclusive and redistributive planning. However, progress was slower than anticipated in some contexts due to the weak local government institutions, lack of capacity among local authorities to undertake institutional reforms and lack of political goodwill. All major development organizations including multi-lateral agencies like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund have arrived at a near consensus that development cannot be sustainable unless people's participation is made central to the development process (Barasa and Jelagat, 2013).

In Brazil, participation has been incorporated into the end stage of the master planning process under the Brazil's City Statute requiring every municipality to subject their master plans to public ratification and consultation for good urban governance and citizen empowerment (Holstein, 2017). Participation also represents a key element of City Development Strategies (CDS's) which, with support from Cities Alliance and the World Bank, have been introduced by more than 200 cities across the Global South since 2009 (Koroļova and Treija, 2019). In sub-Saharan Africa, urban planning processes is characterized by citizen non-engagement especially in low income communities since the city elites prefer top-down approach which has led to a series of project failures (Kariuki and Jomo, 2014). However, South African local government appears to be well placed to support citywide participatory engagement though not in a very active manner (Wanjala

and Muiruri, 2016).

In Kenya, the District focus for rural development (DFRD) strategy launched in 1980 aimed at addressing community participation in rural development while the Development plan 1985-1990 emphasized participatory process through harambee contribution in form of cash, labor, materials and lately professional services (Barasa and Jelagat, 2013). Kenya's Policy Approaches to Community Participation in Planning include Sessional Paper No. 1 of 1986 whose theme was 'Economic Management for renewed Growth' to increase the extent of participants' support especially for services provided by local authorities (Wanjala and Muiruri, 2016). In 2012, Kenya's new constitution required public participation to be the basis for national and devolved government planning and all government expenditures to be guided by such planning (Tabot, Owuor and Migosi, 2020). This realization has led to the adoption of the 'bottom-up' approach to development.

Participatory planning in urban development increases efficiency by lowering cost of urban projects and better response to citizens' interests during budgeting, ensures empowerment and building of citizen capacity among low-income, and that the benefits of development are equitably shared and owned by the community (Holstein, 2017). However, lack of genuine opportunities to participate leads to further feelings of dependence and frustration, negatively affecting people's sense of belonging in community projects. Further, governments tend to lack commitment to participatory opportunities, allocate limited resources to associated support measures, remain unable to manage elite encroachment, and lack knowledge of how to design citywide plans that build on the assets and resources of low-income groups. This study defines participatory planning as engagement of the community and other stakeholders in the process of budgeting, communication, risk assessment and resource mobilization as explained in the subsequent sub-themes:

Participatory Resource Mobilization and Implementation of Urban Upgrading Projects

It is important for stakeholders to share resource mobilization plans developed during project planning, considering the type of resources, quantities required, who should provide and the cost since untimely availing of resources for implementing projects results into poor performance (Nduthu, Omutoko and Mulwa, 2018). On the other hand, Ochieng' and Sakwa, (2018) posit that resource mobilization involves acquiring financial resources, mapping human resources, acquisition of physical resources, and community participation for accountability and transparency. Discovering the skills of the community members reduces the costs of outsourcing and can help the community to invest in their own future through localize fundraisings. According to this study resource mobilization is the act of beneficiaries willingly accepting to contribute money, labor, or materials to the development and operation of projects, so as to feel ownership of the project.

In Africa, Horn et al., (2018) investigated participatory planning in Zimbabwe, South Africa and Kenya and found that savings groups should catalyze into neighborhood associations to deepen local democratic practice and build leadership accountability and financial capability. However, Participatory development initiatives may fail due to uneven power relations between low-income residents and political authorities, and selective citizen involvement. Governments tend to lack commitment to participatory opportunities, allocate limited resources to associated support measures, remain unable to manage elite encroachment, and lack knowledge of how to design citywide plans that build on the assets and resources of low-income groups. If properly implemented participatory planning at neighborhood scale might lead to important improvements at the household level or to small-scale community interventions. However, such processes rarely lead to larger-scale improvements within low-income neighborhoods which require pooling of financial resources, technical, political and administrative support.

Similarly, MacPherson (2018) assessed Participatory approaches to Slum Upgrading and poverty reduction in Kitale, Kenya and found that participatory urban planning fosters rational resource distribution and utilization of local human capital in the decision-making process for meaningful input and empowerment of the residents.

Participatory Communication and Implementation of Urban Upgrading Projects

Participatory communication during planning is helpful in building trust and socio-political capital between stakeholders for knowledge exchange and project sustainability. Participatory communication is the exchange

of information through dialogue between project parties for mutual understanding and consensus in decision-making process for their empowerment, sense of ownership and a reflection of socio-cultural dynamics to enhance sustainability in projects (Maina, Biwott and Ombaka, 2020). As a result, participatory communication is viewed as a platform for the voice of the vulnerable and marginalized. However, most development programs in third world countries fail to overcome poverty reduction due to low participation and communication mismatches in terms of inappropriate channel, technology and language style in the empowerment process (Aminah, 2016). The approach to development projects which is carried out in a centralized manner, top-down, and by applying a linear communication without the interaction and involvement of stakeholders in decision-making creates helpless communities (Chepngetich and Mokuu, 2017). Communication if ignored in development can be a recipe for failure when people do not understand a project and its benefits then their buy is not guaranteed.

A study by Hassan, Hefnawi and Refaie (2011) assessed the efficiency of participation in city planning and observed that communicative turn in spatial planning reflects the changes of local economies and society towards open, globally reaching relationships, and increasing concerns for local environments. Participatory planning enhances the legitimacy of policy and decision making by creating a sense of local ownership and ensuring consideration of citizens' and property owners' rights. Different workshops, focus group discussions and community-based dialogues should be designed in ways which enhance the learning capacity of the participants in the process, increase their abilities to develop with consultant's adequate community-based indicators and to build development scenarios based on the combination of proposed measures and perceived consequences. Further, allocating enough time and resources to sustain communication channels, between different stakeholders' groups, which have been opened through planning phases ensure sufficient communication in implementation and monitoring phases.

In Kenya, Kimeto and Somba (2017) assessed the principles of participatory communication in the design and implementation of the Kenya Slum Upgrading Program in Kibera through descriptive survey design and data collected using questionnaires, Focus Group Discussion and interviews from 88 respondents while analysis involved descriptive statistics. Findings showed that the principles of participatory communication like dialogue, engagement and consultation were integrated into the design and implementation of the project. However, due to lack of empowerment component of communication strategy, the implementation of the project faced several misunderstandings as community members felt communication with government officials was just a formality with no attention being paid to their priority needs which points to a top-down communication approach in the slum upgrade. Further, bureaucratic interests favor informational over participatory communication because participation is viewed as time consuming, unpredictable and can interfere with the normal functioning of procedures.

Participatory Risk Assessment and Implementation of Urban Upgrading Projects

Since 2000, the participatory assessment of risks has enjoyed growing interest globally with the aim of having a transformative effect of identifying, assessing, and monitoring risks at community level (Niekerk and Annandale, 2013). Through a community-based participatory approach, community members would learn how to analyze vulnerable conditions, find ways to solve problems, develop strategies for risk reduction, and establish an organization to implement disaster risk management tasks by applying local knowledge and experience (UN-Habitat, 2020). Risk-sensitive development is required to reduce risk that has accumulated in the city and to better consider risk when planning new developments including more appropriate building design, construction and land-use planning, enhanced infrastructure access and maintenance, risk awareness and planning for emergency response (Evers et al., 2019). However, risk management remains limited and constrained by weak co-ordination between all sectors, as well as complex policy landscapes where implementation and enforcement are widely lacking. Capacity building, and closing data gaps to improve understanding of the nature and scale of urban risks, are both challenging.

In Cambodia, Flower, Fortnam, Kol, Sasin, and Wood (2017) assessed effectiveness of participatory methods in analyzing urban risks in informal settlements through descriptive survey design and data collected using interview guide from 41 participants. Findings showed that participatory approach reveals household and community-level processes through which risks are experienced, negotiated and addressed besides providing

valuable insights into the ways vulnerable urban populations can be best supported. Participatory risk capacities assessment collects data on the ability of the community and individuals to minimize, cope with, recover from and adapt in response to the impacts of shocks through participatory mapping exercises, hazard assessments, the development of historical timelines and seasonal calendars, stakeholder analysis and transect walks. The National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction emphasizes the growing threat of disasters in urban contexts and in response, established National Committee for Disaster Management which work across ministries and mobilize funds to build the disaster resilience of urban areas at various scales.

In sub-Saharan Africa, Leck et al., (2018) investigated the risk sensitivity and transformative urban development in Malawi, Nigeria, Niger and Kenya and observed that risk-sensitive urban development is required to reduce accumulated risk and to better consider risk when planning new urban developments. Citizens' partnerships with non-state actors increase the quality of state action in a way that enhances accountability and legitimacy. However, there is also some concern that risk accumulation could be exacerbated by the involvement of external actors and donor funding, particularly where priorities are not aligned. Care is required from governments and potential funders in supporting alternative forms of risk reduction led by citizen movements as this very support can co-opt and destroy the alternative ethos, governance form and pro-poor adaptation movement that is important for transformative development.

Further, UN-Habitat (2020) assessed mechanisms of breaking cycles of risk accumulation in African Cities and observed that combining action on overarching urban planning risk culture and the details of decision-making for sectoral policy and local practice can be a powerful and long-lasting way to approach the integration of risk management into urban development. Success at a project and policy level reinforces the importance of risk culture across the city which, in turn, leads to the prioritization of inclusive risk-reducing practice and policy. For risk reduction in urban Africa, the emergence of multilevel governance arrangements comprising strongly networked civil society organizations acting in concert with local and city authorities to address root causes, to record event losses and to better understand and support household resilience provides a specific opportunity for equitable and sustainable risk reduction for meeting the SDG targets.

Participatory Budgeting and Implementation of Urban Upgrading Projects

Participatory budgeting is a democratic process by which the citizens are involved in the decision-making process regarding the way budgetary resources are allocated including debating, analyzing, prioritizing, mobilizing resources, monitoring and evaluating the expenditure of public funds and investments (Emil, 2019). Projects resulting from participatory budgeting are considered to be cheaper and better maintained due to community control and oversight and transformation into a more open, deliberative and collaborative process in which direct and deliberative democracy can flourish (Tsurkana et al., 2018). To achieve the Millennium Development Goals, local governments should be involved, for stronger promotion of public participation in democratic and development processes, and responsive participatory planning and budgeting. Participatory budgeting increases democratic representation of previously excluded categories, increases the level of trust between authorities and citizens, expands public service delivery and increases the quality of public services. However, the danger of manipulating the entire process cannot be ruled out mainly by authorities, local elected representatives and civil society leaders who want to impose their agenda.

In Latvia, Koroļova and Treija (2019) evaluated Participatory Budgeting in Urban Regeneration and observed that along with community involvement in planning processes, participatory budgeting gives a chance for inhabitants to participate in the budgetary decision-making process as the model includes also public voting, which must be taken into consideration. Participatory urban regeneration can foster sense of community and strengthen neighborhood identity. Participatory budgeting has become one of the tools for engaging the wider population in urban development issues. Participatory budgeting can be defined as a mechanism through which citizens decide or contribute to decisions made at local level about the use of all or the part of the public resources available. Participatory planning and co-creation can increase the efficiency of regeneration proposals and help to create spaces, which will be used by local inhabitants. As sustainable development is the main goal of many cities, then ensuring public participation in urban regeneration is crucial while searching for effective long-term solutions.

In Brazil, Cabannes (2015) assessed the contribution of participatory budgeting in municipalities through descriptive survey design and data collected using interview guide from 20 key informants while analysis involved descriptive statistics and meta-data analysis. Findings showed that participatory budgeting has significantly improved governance and delivery of services, making the projects to be sustainable due to community control and oversight. However, it does not often fundamentally change existing power relations between local governments and citizens. Public Budgeting's 'original' resources have a strong catalytic effect for channeling both monetary and non-monetary resources, people's oversight allows for lower building costs and maintenance costs, is conducive to the modernization of local administrations and the empowerment of citizens and communities. Even if Public Budgeting processes contribute positively to the delivery of basic services, they are still limited in their capacity to meet the scale of the needs and the depth of citizens' aspirations.

In Kenya, Awire and Nyakwara (2019) analyzed public participation on budget implementation in Kisii county government through descriptive survey design and data collected using questionnaire from a sample size of 105 respondents while analysis involved descriptive and inferential statistics of correlation. Findings showed that public participation positively and significantly influence budget implementation. County governments should create rules to support Economic and Social Rights Center, 2013 which demands the general population inclusion to incorporate their views in the County Integrated Development. However, Governments use participatory rhetoric and limited gestures toward increased budget transparency and community budget consultations to assuage donors and reduce tensions with civil society, but they may not meaningfully engage with the process.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted desk review of previous studies with a focus on participatory planning and implementation of urban upgrading projects. The searches involved global reviews from Europe, North America, Asia, and Africa and locally in Kenya.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Urban renewal has existed over time since 1950s in Europe and North America through replacement of obsolete structures, containment of urban sprawl, and linking social improvements with economic growth through efficient use of urban land for reduced environmental degradation and improved land and property values, especially after post war reconstruction. Urban renewal in the Europe and North America took three forms including physical improvement from 1950s to 1970s, physical renovation and behavior modification, 1970s to 1990s and prioritization of people's social objectives, heritage conservation and efficient traffic management through better urban design and improved quality of life. In the United States of America, urban renewal started between 1949 and 1974 when there was a massive national effort to remove blighted properties and poverty from areas surrounding central business districts guided by the Housing Act of 1949. The Act was amended in 1954 to allow sound community planning, land use zoning, subdivision control, building and housing codes but failed to produce adequate replacement housing racial biases in allocations.

In the global south, different approaches for urban renewal have been tried beginning with laissez-faire attitudes in the 1950s-60s, site and service schemes in the 1970s, slum upgrading in the 1980s, enabling strategies and security of tenure in the 1990s and cities without slums action plan of the 2000s. However, Urban renewal is contested by those who argue that it leads to displacement of households and socio-economic disruption, exclusive developments, mono-functionality of land use, and uncontrolled private-led assault on the function and ownership of urban areas.

In Africa, urban renewal more often has negative consequences to the local residents which often include overcrowding in the neighboring estates, forced evictions and violation of economic and social rights of the urban poor. The city of Cape Town, South Africa, initiated a Dignified Places Program to improve the urban spaces in Cape Flats, where the city's poorest lived by introducing open spaces to address inequity, environmental degradation and fragmentation, similar to United States' model of 1970s. In Nigeria, the Lagos Urban Renewal Board, adopted an infrastructure upgrading option with a view to limit physical and social

disturbance, however, the project was constrained by inadequate funding, lack of public participation in the implementation stages and poor prioritization by the Federal and local government. In Addis Ababa Ethiopia, urban renewal programs have been successful without displacement of the poor and thus prevent sprawling of urban slums and poverty.

In Kenya, different strategies including forced evictions, resettlement, site and services schemes and upgrading have all been attempted without much success, for instance, the upgrading of Pumwani Estate in the 1930s and 1980s, through slum clearance and redevelopment of new housing which adopted a top-down approach resulted in displacement of the residents as they were unable to afford the final product. Equally, attempts in 2000 to upgrade Nairobi's Eastland to provide better-quality housing did not materialize for failure to include community participation in the framework. Upgrading projects in Kenya have had shortcomings at policy levels including lack of affordability, land tenure complications, administrative inefficiency, legal challenges and poor formulation of interventions. Sessional Paper no 5 of 1966 on Housing was the first to address itself to the issue of slums through recognition of slums and stopping harassment for sustainable urban neighborhood development. Other redevelopment plans in Kenya have included the Redevelopment of the east of CBD bounded by Tom Mboya Street, Haile Selassie Avenue, Race Course and Kirinyaga Roads between 1979 and 1987 that saw the demolition and rebuilding of 23 new buildings through rezoning and change in plot ratios and the transformation of Kilimani Estate, Nairobi in the 1990s from low density through rezoning to high density area allowing for construction of commercial buildings while in 2018 there was forced evictions in Kibera for the slum upgrading.

The District focus for rural development (DFRD) strategy launched in 1980 aimed at addressing community participation in rural development while the Development plan 1985-1990 emphasized participatory process through harambee contribution in form of cash, labor, materials and lately professional services. Kenya's Policy Approaches to Community Participation in Planning include Sessional Paper No. 1 of 1986 whose theme was 'Economic Management for renewed Growth' to increase the extent of participants' support especially for services provided by local authorities. In 2012, Kenya's new constitution required public participation to be the basis for national and devolved government planning and all government expenditures to be guided by such planning. This realization has led to the adoption of the 'bottom-up' approach to development.

Though the Kenyan government in 2018 had set the Big Four Agenda on provision of affordable housing through upgrading informal settlements, Urban renewal and redevelopment have not been explicitly identified by as possible means of providing housing and improving the physical environment in the big 4 agenda. However, lack of public participation and planning inadequacies have hindered urban renewal efforts. Critical to the success of projects is the early and continuous integration of the community in the planning, decision-making and implementation process as this would lower costs, better target peoples' needs, incorporate local knowledge, ensure that benefits are equitably distributed and create grassroots capacity to undertake other development projects besides maintaining benefits. Kenya's 2010 Constitution and succeeding enactment, for example, the County Governments Act and the Public Finance Management Act, 2012 require open involvement on issues of open fund, however, participation has been consumed as a formality. Participatory planning if properly undertaken has the propensity of achieving project sustainability, ownership, promotes equity, legitimizes decision-making processes, strengthens self-determination and predisposes a people toward a more democratic behavior. Effective integrated development is premised on the presence and operationalization of an effective legal framework and that the current legal framework is out of date, uncoordinated and does not provide an appropriate legal foundation for proper urban planning and governance.

Participatory planning in urban development increases efficiency by lowering cost of urban projects and better response to citizens' interests during budgeting ensures empowerment and building of citizen capacity among low-income, and that the benefits of development are equitably shared and owned by the community. However, lack of genuine opportunities to participate has increased the feelings of dependence and frustration, negatively affecting people's sense of belonging in community projects. Further, governments tend to lack commitment to participatory opportunities, allocate limited resources to associated support measures, remain unable to manage elite encroachment, and lack knowledge of how to design citywide plans that build on the assets and resources of low-income groups.

CONCLUSIONS

Whilst there is no specific policy for urban renewal in Kenya, there has been urban renewal projects carried out in different cities and towns. The situation has been aggravated by inadequate public participation in planning urban renewal projects due to dormancy in participatory planning of urban renewal by responsible authorities, limited resources and lack of political goodwill. Though there is evidence of social groups within the estates, they lack a strong and coherent neighborhood residents' association that would act as key stakeholder during the planning, implementation and maintenance of the estate during urban renewal. Effective participation of residents in rebuilding their community reduces the risk of disintegration of existing networks or homelessness. Critical to the success of projects is the early and continuous integration of the community in the planning, decision-making and implementation process as this would lower costs, better target peoples' needs, incorporate local knowledge, ensure that benefits are equitably distributed and create grassroots capacity to undertake other development projects besides maintaining benefits.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Nammari, F. (2013). Participatory urban upgrading and power: Lessons learnt from a pilot project in Jordan. *Habitat International* 39 (2013) 224-231
2. Aminah, S. (2016). The Application of Participatory Communication in the Implementation of Small Farmers Empowerment Program. *Jurnal Bina Praja* 8 (1) (2016): 135-148
3. Awa, A. (2017). Participatory Approach in Project Management and Development in Developing Countries. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, Vol. 2, Issue 7
4. Barasa, F. and Jelagat, T. (2013). Community Participation in Project Planning, Management and Implementation: Building the Foundation for Sustainable Development. *International Journal of Current Research* Vol. 5, Issue, 02, pp.398-401
5. Cabannes, Y. (2015). Contribution of Participatory Budgeting to provision and management of basic services: Municipal practices and evidence from the field. *International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)*, Vol. 27(1): 257–284.
6. Chepngetich, M. and Mokua, E. (2017). The Influence of Participatory Communication in Promoting Accountability and Transparency of Constituency Development Fund in Emurua Dikirr Constituency, Kenya. Unpublished MA Communication Studies, University of Nairobi, Kenya
7. Cilliers, E. and Timmermans, W. (2014). The importance of creative participatory planning in the public place-making process *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 2014, volume 41, pages 413 – 429.
8. Cullen, D., Mcgee, G., Gunton, T., and Day, J.C. (2010). Collaborative Planning in Complex Stakeholder Environments: An Evaluation of a Two-Tiered Collaborative Planning Model. *Society and Natural Resources*, 23, 332-350.
9. Evers, J., Douven, W., Van der Stroom, J., Hasan, S., Seijger, C. and Phi, H. (2019). A framework to assess the performance of participatory planning tools for strategic delta planning. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* Vol. 62, No. 9, Pp1636-1653
10. Flower, B., Fortnam, M., Kol, L., Sasin, P. and Wood, R. (2017). Using participatory methods to uncover interacting urban risks: a case study of three informal settlements in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. *Environment & Urbanization*, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). Vol. 30(1): 301–316
11. Hassan, G., Hefnawi, A. and Refaie, M. (2011). Efficiency of participation in planning. *Alexandria Engineering Journal* (2011) 50, 203–212
12. Holstein, E. (2017). Experiences of Participatory Planning in Contexts of Inequality: A Qualitative Study of Urban Renewal Projects in Colombia. DOI: 10.1080/14649357.2017.1406981
13. Horn, P., Mitlin, D., Bennett, J., Chitekwe-Biti, B. and Makau, J. (2018). Towards citywide participatory planning: emerging community-led practices in three African cities. GDI Working Paper 2017-034. Manchester: The University of Manchester.
14. Kariuki, K. and Jomo, M. (2014). Factors Influencing Community Participation in Project Planning in Kenya. A Case Study of Mbucana Water Dam Project, Kiambu County, Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business and Change Management*, Vol. 2 (29), pp. 560-582

15. Kimeto, L. and Somba, A. (2017). Application of the Principles of Participatory Communication in the Design and Implementation of the Kenya Slum Upgrading Program (KENSUP). *Mara International Journal of Social Sciences Research Publications* Vol. 1, No. 1, Pp 7 - 20
16. Koroļova, A. and Treija, S. (2019). Participatory Budgeting in Urban Regeneration in Latvia: Defining the Gap Between Formal and Informal Citizen Activism. *Journal of Architecture and Urban Planning*, 10.2478/aup-2019-0018/2019 /15
17. Leck, H., Pelling, M., Adelekan, I., Dodman, D., Issaka, H., Johnson, C., Manda, M., Mberu, B., Nwokocha, E., Osuteye, E., and Boubacar, S. (2018). Towards Risk-Sensitive and Transformative Urban Development in Sub Saharan Africa. *Sustainability* 2018, 10, 2645; doi:10.3390/su10082645
18. MacPherson, L. (2018). Participatory Approaches to Slum Upgrading and Poverty Reduction in African Cities. *Hydra - Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 1, Issue 1, pp. 85-95.
19. Maina, B., Biwott, C. and Ombaka, B. (2020). Participatory Communication Strategies Used in the Implementation of Public Water Projects in Murang'a County, Case Study of Northern Collector Tunnel, Kenya. *Journal of Arts & Humanities*, Vol. 09, Issue 05, 2020: 01-12
20. Makagutu, O., Abonyo, E. and Opiyo, R. (2020). Urban Renewal Potential in Kaloleni Estate in Kisumu City, Kenya. Masters project in Urban Management. University of Nairobi, Kenya
21. Nduthu, P., Omutoko, L. and Mulwa, A. (2018). Project Implementation Process, Legal Framework and Performance of Projects: The Case of Indigenous Chicken Projects Sponsored by Agricultural Sector Development Support Programme In Machakos County, Kenya. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Nairobi, Kenya
22. Niekerk, D. and Annandale, E. (2013). Utilizing Participatory Research Techniques for Community-Based Disaster Risk Assessment. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters* August 2013, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 160–177
23. Ochieng', F. O. and Sakwa, M. (2018). Impact of Participatory Resource Mobilization in the Implementation of Community Water Projects on the well-being of Beneficiaries' Households in Kisumu County, Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, Vol. 5, Iss. 4, pp 1709 - 1720
24. Odenyo C. and James, R. (2018). Influence of Resource Mobilization on Sustainability of Women Group Projects in Vihiga County, Kenya. Unpublished MBA Project, Kenyatta University, Kenya
25. Rosli, N., Omar, D. and Ali, N. (2017). Participatory Planning Process for Community Resettlements Program. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences* Vol. 7, No. 12; ISSN: 2222-6990
26. Tabot, A., Owuor, O. and Migosi, J. (2020). Influence of Participatory Project Initiation on Sustainable Forest Management in Saboti, Trans-Nzoia County, Kenya. *International Journal of Forestry Research* Volume 2020, Article ID 2648391, 7 pages
27. Tsurkana, M., Sotskovab, S., Aksininab, O., Lyubarskayac, M. and Tkachevad, O. (2016). Influence of the Participatory Budgeting on the Infrastructural Development of the Territories in the Russian Federation. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, VOL. 11, NO. 15, 7684-7702
28. UN-Habitat (2020). *Breaking Cycles of Risk Accumulation in African Cities*. United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat). ISBN Number: 978-92-1-132851-6
29. Wanjala, E. and Muiruri, Z. (2016). Participatory Planning and Quality Service Delivery in Local Authorities in Kenya. *Science Journal of Business and Management*. Vol. 4, No. 5, 2016, pp. 156-164.