

The Fast Track Resettlement and Urban Development Nexus¹: the case for Harare

By

NELSON MARONGWE



Paper Presented at the:

Symposium on Delivering Land and securing Rural Livelihoods: Post Independence Land Reform and Resettlement in Zimbabwe, Mont Clair, Nyanga, 26-28 March 2003

**ZERO – Regional Environment Organisation
No. 158 Fife Avenue
P. O. Box 5338
Harare**

Tel:/Fax: 720405/730230/700030/791333/732858

E-mail: zero@mweb.co.zw

¹ Part of this paper was also presented at the IASCP Conference in Victoria Falls, June 2002.

This chapter was first published in:

Roth, Michael, and Gonese, Francis eds. 2003.

Delivering Land and Securing Rural Livelihoods: Post-Independence Land Reform and Resettlement in Zimbabwe.

Harare and Madison: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe, and Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

This volume was made possible in part through support provided by the US Agency for International Development (USAID), under the terms of USAID/ZIMBABWE CA 690-A-00-99-00270-00. The Land Tenure Center of the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe provide technical assistance, training, capacity building, and research in support of Zimbabwe's Land Reform and Resettlement Program II. Project website:

<http://www.wisc.edu/lc/zimpfl.html>

Introduction and Context of the Study

The year 2000 farm occupations witnessed a massive movement of people from various localities into large-scale commercial farms in search of agricultural land. Whilst most land occupations took place in commercial farming areas in predominantly rural areas close to communal areas, there was also a steady movement into and occupation of various forms of urban and peri-urban areas as the “landless” urban people also took the opportunity and exploited the chaotic situation created by farm occupations countrywide.

On the other hand, Zimbabwe’s land policy had already realized the importance of peri-urban settlement in the country’s land reform process (GOZ 1998). For instance, the Inception Phase Framework Plan proposed, among other things, to develop mechanisms for monitoring urban growth and the demand for and supply of urban land both within and outside existing towns and cities. One of the aims of the policy document is to manage peri-urban areas as zones of transition that maximise the enjoyment of positive elements of both town and country. The rural–urban nexus is therefore an important area for policy analysis and research. It is commonly understood that urban development can only occur at the expense of rural land. The changing land-uses, policy environments, land ownership patterns and land administrative mechanism that occur in such transitional zones are key factors that define the dynamics of development in urban and peri-urban areas.

Studies world-wide have shown that small farms almost always produce far more agricultural output per unit area than large farms. This has been proven to be the case for both industrialised and developing countries. There is wide literature that has confirmed the inverse relationship between farm size and output (Ellis 1993, Berry and Cline W. R. 1979, Feder 1985, Prosterman and Riedinger 1987, Cornia 1985, Netting 1993). For example, various studies have showed that the smallest farms have greater dollar output per acre than larger farms. There are many reasons that explain this situation, with the most obvious ones being that smaller farms tend to specialise in high value crops like vegetables and flowers, that there is more labour and inputs applied per unit area and that there is a tendency towards the use of more diverse farming systems (Strange 1988). Peri-

urban areas provide the greatest opportunity and environment for the implementation of small-farm based resettlement approaches. Intensity of land-use is most practical in the peri-urban areas. The experience of urban allotment gardens in developed countries provides a useful insight on how urban and peri-urban farming can be modelled². This debate largely provides the rationale on why Zimbabwe's land reform processes has carved a niche for urban and peri-urban settlement. This approach in a way accommodates the land requirements of urban agriculture, especially for peri-urban areas.

This paper discusses the nexus between fast track resettlement and urban development. As is mentioned elsewhere in this report, land occupations cum-fast track resettlement in urban and peri-urban areas was driven by two main motives. Firstly, it was the desire by certain sections of the urban populace to access land for residential purposes. Secondly, there was also an inherent desire by settlers to access land for the practice of urban and peri-urban agriculture. Many other scholars have demonstrated the importance of urban agriculture in urban areas and that access to land was the greatest constraint to the activity (Mbiba 1995, Mudimu 1986, Masoka 1997, ENDA-Zimbabwe 1994). Thus some settlers seized the opportunity presented by fast track to access land for the practice of urban agriculture.

Research Methods

This study employed both primary and secondary methods of data collection. In-depth discussions were held with settlers on selected farms within the Harare environs. Direct observation was also used to collect data on some of the sites. Given the highly politicised nature of fast track resettlement, a strategy had to be worked out to facilitate access to data on selected schemes. This entailed co-opting as research assistants some of those who were directly involved in the land allocation process through the various committees that had been put in place. The researcher moved into the selected schemes together with individuals who were already known to the settlers. The study selected

² The historical evolution of the allotment gardens has its roots in the desire to eradicate urban poverty. In Germany for example, the success of the allotment gardens is centred on a number of parameters, chief of which include the facilitatory role of municipalities which availed clusters of plots ranging in size from 200-400m² to the urban poor, organisation of urban farmers into associations or garden clubs which manage the affairs of the farmers, including the management of leasing contracts, the levying of contributions from

Retreat farm and Saturday Retreat farm for more in-depth analysis of the dynamics of fast track resettlement at the local level. Retreat farm was selected because of the diversity of issues that affect this particular scheme. As is elaborated in the case study itself, some of the settlers were relocated from another farm which was close to the Harare International Airport whilst others had been there from the beginning. The settlement is also physically very conspicuous as one drives along the Harare-Chitungwiza road and is close to Waterfalls and Hatfield residential areas. It therefore became more interesting to choose it as one of the case study. Saturday Retreat farm is located a little bit far away from Harare and does not border any residential area. The scheme was also known for its leadership wrangles. These factors added various dimensions on the fast track-urban development conflict which the study sought to understand further.

Numerous other examples are also mentioned through-out the study. For example Aspindale farm and Whitecliffe farm were used as examples mainly because they represent the epitome of the crisis between fast track resettlement and urban development. Settlement was also extensive on these particular schemes. Further, such farms have also received intensive publicity and therefore any researcher would be enticed to learn more about the factual issues on the ground. Consequently, the study sought more information that would contribute to a better understanding of such schemes. Interviews were also held with the city planning authorities.

The researcher also did field visits which allowed a direct observation of some of the processes taking place at some of those schemes. This also enabled the researcher to take photographs that captured different aspects of the emerging settlement patterns, including the types of houses and roads being developed, types of construction materials being used etc.

An intense literature search was also done. The City of Harare and the Ministry of Lands and Agriculture provided the bulk of the secondary information. The key documents reviewed included the operational development plans of the City of Harare, progress reports of the Ministry of Lands and Agriculture and the minutes of various committees

members for the purpose of financing the association's activities and provision of support infrastructure

that have been put in place to take charge of fast track in Harare. A research assistant who was directly involved in fast track resettlement was hired to facilitate easy access to the data. This proved extremely useful in accessing information that would have been otherwise “inaccessible” through the normal channels.

A major limitation of the study was that for reasons of a political and financial nature, it was not possible to develop more case studies. Thus the scope of issues raised by this study could be quite limited. However, despite this limitation, the study managed to generate credible information that has immense value to both researchers and policy makers.

Policy Framework for Urban and Peri-Urban Development in Zimbabwe

This section describes the policy framework for urban and peri-urban development in Zimbabwe. It provides the conceptual framework that defines the plane of interaction between fast track resettlement and urban development. Thus in urban areas, fast track took place on land that was more or less covered by particular development plans which in essence determine the type of land-uses that can developed in defined zones. The section therefore provides the context within which contradictions between fast track resettlement and government policies guiding urban development are placed.

In Zimbabwe, urban development is often guided by development plans prepared by local authorities as provided for by the Urban Councils Act and the Regional, Town and Country Planning Act. The conventional land-uses provided for in such plans are housing, industrial, commerce, open spaces and servitudes (roads, electricity, telephone etc). Urban agriculture is practised within pegged residential stands (on-plot) or outside the pegged residential stands (off-plot). In the low-density areas, stand sizes are bigger and there is often enough space for limited agricultural activities. Some of the bigger low density areas are classified as agro-residential, meaning that occupants are allowed to practice urban agriculture. The Tynwald area in Harare is one such example. The situation is quite different in the high-density areas where stand sizes vary from about 150- 300 square metres. There is hardly any space left for urban agriculture and yet the

activity is mostly needed for the purposes of sustaining the livelihoods of people in these areas³. It is for this reason that some settlers occupied land in the urban and peri-urban areas of Harare. This was evident for example at Retreat farms where settlers had also planted crops on their self-allocated plots.

The current situation in Zimbabwe is that agriculture is not classified as an urban activity and hence by and large, city planners do not plan for urban and peri-urban agriculture. Agriculture is mainly permitted in the peri-urban areas, a zone which is normally dominated by titled properties which are way beyond the reach of the poor. The major challenges in the development of urban and peri-urban agriculture are the issues relating to access to land and the management of the activity. In a survey by Mudimu 2001, it was shown that most households involved in the activity in Harare had accessed land through making a first claim on an open piece of land. This is particularly in relation to access to land by the majority of people in the high-density areas and other low-income people in the low-density residential areas. This process of self allocation of plots was intensified under fast track where settlers went beyond the 'open spaces in urban areas' to include farms in the peri-urban areas of major cities.

The policy framework for the development of urban agriculture is slowly starting to be supportive of the activity. For example, major cities like Harare, Bulawayo and Gweru have developed Master Plans that make provision for urban farming in designated zones. A good example is the Harare Combination Master Plan of 1992 which provided for intensive agricultural smallholdings within the city and the peri-urban areas surrounding it (City of Harare 1992). What still remains outstanding is the practical implementation of such policy proposals in the face of minimal technical capacity and meagre financial resources. Both central and local government are generally acknowledging the role of urban agriculture in their decision-making structures. At the recently held 21st Annual Conferences of the Urban Councils Association of Zimbabwe, a resolution was made that

³ In most cases, it is the residents of high-density areas, out of dire need to survive, who practise urban agriculture in the various kinds of open spaces such as vleis or marsh areas which are not suitable for urban built development, stream banks, service reserves and land for future development. This is land which has been acquired for future urban development but has not yet been developed for a variety of reasons. In the

encouraged all local authorities to recognise the role of urban and peri-urban agriculture in poverty alleviation and enhancement of urban food-security, employment creation and economic development. Such a stance is ideally supposed to provide the framework for the planning and development of urban agriculture.

The local development plans prepared under Harare's Combination Master Plan however still need to be synchronised in terms of their approach to urban agriculture (see table 1). As an illustration, the local development plan for the Waterfalls/Hatfield area is silent on urban agriculture and even talks of rezoning the agricultural land in the area for urban land-users. The same applies to the Gletwyn local development plan of 2000, which covers an area of approximately 1170 ha. Despite the fact that the farm was mainly being used for commercial farming, the local development plan proposed to use all the land for urban development with no reference to urban agriculture. Under Local Development Plan No 31 of 1999 which covers an area of approximately 15 400 hectares, provision is made only for a residential agricultural zone where the minimum subdivision was pegged at 8000m,² which effectively makes the whole scheme beyond the reach of the poor. On the other hand, the Saturday Retreat Local Development Plan No. 50 of 2001 covering an area of 2727 hectares makes provision for a residential agricultural zone. The minimum subdivision size was fixed at 1.5 hectares and a rural agricultural zone where the minimum subdivision is anchored at 50 hectares was provided for. What is evident is that despite the fact that some of the local development plans also seek to develop high and medium density residential areas, they do not make reference to the urban agriculture land needs of the would be settlers. Thus while local authorities like the Municipality of Harare have acknowledged the importance of urban agriculture, there is no corresponding movement of things on the ground in terms of planning and providing resources for the activity. Under fast track resettlement, the provision of these developments were essentially ignored as people settled in 'areas of their choice'.

Interesting to note is that most of the land that has been planned for urban development was/is predominantly under agriculture and hence there is already massive agricultural investment that has been made on the land, but would be dismantled if all the land is

eyes of the majority (blacks), such land is viewed as under-utilised or idle land and hence they see it as an

converted into strictly "urban land-uses". For example, under Local Development Plan No 31 to the south of Harare, the main agricultural land-uses being practised included tobacco farming, maize farming, dairy farming, cattle and ostrich ranching, poultry farming, wheat farming as well as flower growing (see Box 1). A local plan accommodative of urban and peri-urban farming would not seek total extinction of the land-uses but rather provide for the intensification of selected land-uses which can then be blended with urban-land-uses.

Through a policy directive to local authorities by the Ministry of Local Government, Rural and Urban Development that encouraged the formation of peri-urban agricultural co-operatives, access to land for the practice of urban agriculture was formally provided for in policy. In the city of Harare, a cooperative section was set-up within the department of housing and community services whose main purpose was to identify land that was not immediately needed for urban development and could therefore be leased to agricultural cooperatives (Mudzura E, undated). At the beginning of each rain season, agricultural cooperatives would approach the Department of Housing and Community Services for allocation of land to cultivate. The agricultural cooperatives however did not survive for long as most of the land leased to them was gradually taken for urban development. The city of Bulawayo was even more creative as it went on to provide garden allotments for use for vegetable production by the city's destitute women with extension services and environmental management being provided by the Municipality. Other major cities like Gweru and Mutare used to have similar opportunities that allowed access to land that was not immediately required for urban development. Under fast track resettlement, the idea of forming co-operatives to facilitate access to land was revived as is illustrated in later sections of this paper.

Owing to financial difficulties, most of the municipalities have since stopped the support they gave to agriculture (Chaipa 2001). In Harare, a few agricultural cooperatives are still involved in urban agriculture and have received varied forms of support from the Municipality and private companies while NGOs like Zambuko Trust offer credit to urban farmers. The bulk of the farmers involved in urban agriculture, especially those in

opportunity that needs to be seized in their daily struggles to enhance livelihood strategies.

high-density areas, still practise illegal urban agriculture. A clear policy on urban agriculture supported by an appropriate institutional framework will encourage such farmers to organise their farming activities and thus paving the way for better management of the activity.

What is evident from this section is that although the policy framework is slowly becoming supportive of urban and peri-urban agriculture, little has been achieved on the ground and people still need land for the practice of such activities. The land delivery system for the residential development has also failed to meet the demand for housing development in urban areas. Fast track resettlement therefore provided the ‘space and opportunity’ for settlers to occupy land in urban and peri-urban areas.

Table 1: Main Operational Local development Plans in the City of Harare

Plan	Extent of Planning Area	Minimum Subdivision for residential stands
Ventersburg-Sunway City Local Development Plan No. 33	1595.81 ha	400 m ² for high density areas 600 m ² for medium density areas 1000m ² for low density areas
Borrowdale Brook Local Subject Plan No. 30	1 750 ha	0.4 ha
Waterfalls/Hatfield Local Development Plan No. 26	5 013 ha	700m ² for high density 1000m ² for medium density 2000m ² for low density
Southern Incorporated Areas, Local Development Plan No. 31	15 400ha	150-300m ² for zone 2A 300-900m ² for zone 2B 1000-2000m ² for zone 2C 8000m ² for residential/agricultural zone
Saturday Retreat Local Development Plan No. 50, 2001	2727 ha	200m ² for high density areas 500m ² for medium density area 1.5 ha for residential/agricultural zone 50 ha for rural agriculture zone
Gletwyn Farm Local Development Plan, 2000	1170 ha	8000m ² for residential dispersed zone 2000 m ² for mixed residential/recreation 2000m ² for medium density

Source: decoded from respective planning documents, City of Harare.

Box 1: Existing Agricultural Land Uses for the area under Local Development Plan No 31.

- A couple of farms that included Stoneridge, Eyercourt, Dray Court, Chedgelow and Retreat, and Kutsaga Research Station and Tobacco Training Institute were involved in tobacco growing. An estimated 500 ha was under tobacco in the plan area, of which 350 ha - was being used on a commercial basis.
- A fraction of the plan area was also being used for horticultural production. A survey by the Municipality of Harare in 1994 showed that four properties were engaged in horticultural production on land-sizes ranging from one to eight hectares but were realising a very high turnover.
- Maize production was the dominant land-use in the plan area and was being practised for subsistence on the majority of small plots and for commercial purposes on plot sizes ranging from 20-70 ha.
- Cattle ranching was being practised on some of the properties for both subsistence and commercial purposes while horse breeding was being practised on Stoneridge farms
- Derbyshire Estates under Irvine's Day Old Chicks (Pvt) Ltd was involved in extensive processing and distribution of frozen chicken and eggs. Farms like C of Apsley and remainder of Apley were also involved in poultry production as well as other plots, though on a smaller scale.
- Draycott farm was producing ostriches whilst piggery was being practised on Lot 2 Derbyshire and C of Apsley while goats were also being raised in the area.
- Market gardening was being practised on a large scale on Chedgelow farm and on a subsistence level elsewhere
- Properties along Manyame river were engaged in wheat farming on plot sizes ranging from 20-105 ha whilst groundnuts were also being produced on plot sizes ranging from 10-58 hectares

Source: Municipality of Harare, Local Development Plan No. 31, Southern Incorporated Areas, 1999

Overview of Fast Track Resettlement

The government of Zimbabwe started implementing the fast-track resettlement programme in July 2000. The ultimate objective of the programme was to accelerate both land acquisition and land redistribution. Fast track resettlement programme is officially viewed as a component of the overall National Land Reform Programme. The failure by the Inception Phase Framework Plan to realise fruition resulted in the land reform programme recording its slowest progress ever in the period between October 1998 and June 2000, and in the eyes of Government, this became the justification for the adoption of fast track. The objectives of fast track resettlement are as elaborated in Box 2. As at 14 March 2002, some 114 901 households had been formally settled on 2028 farms with a total area of 4 387 091 hectares (Table 2 refers). An additional 14 286 households were informally settled on some 156 farms with a total area of 416807 hectares. The rapid progress under fast track has raised more questions than answers in relation to the discourse on land rights. Farm occupations and the fast track resettlement that followed created an environment of uncertainty with regards to the land rights of the affected large-scale farmers whilst those of the incoming settlers largely remain unclear and unprocessed. The legitimization of land occupations by the Rural Land Occupiers Act has

made freehold title for rural land in Zimbabwe one of the most insecure forms of land tenure.

Box 2: Objectives of Fast Track Resettlement

- Immediate identification for compulsory of not less than 5 million hectares for Phase II of the resettlement Programme, for the benefit of the landless peasant households
- The planning, demarcation and settler emplacement on all acquired farms
- Provision of limited basic infrastructure (such as boreholes, diptanks and scheme roads) and farmer support services (such as tillage and crop packs)

Source: GoZ 2001

At the start of fast track resettlement in 2000 land occupations were clearly an illegal process according to the legal framework that prevailed at the time. This included the Constitution of Zimbabwe, Land Acquisition Act and the Zimbabwe Government Policy on illegal settlements which all recognised the supremacy of private property rights. For various reasons, the government embarked upon a total revamp of the legal and judiciary framework in an effort meant to “normalise” the situation created by farm occupations and fast track resettlement which had thrown the concept of security into disarray, particularly as it relates to freehold lands. First was the amendment of the Constitution of Zimbabwe in 2000 which placed the responsibility for compensating large scale commercial farmers whose land would have been acquired for resettlement to the UK as the former colonial power. New procedures for paying compensation were also outlined.

Table 2: Fast Track Resettlement as at March 2002

Province	Formal Settlement			Informal settlement			Totals	
	No. of farms	Area (ha)	No. of settlers	No. of farms	Area (ha)	No. of Settler	Settlers	Area (ha)
Manicaland	178	157 363	9874	9	21934.2	1842	11716	179297.2
Mash-East	298	321552.5	17 549	43	28790.0	2038	19587	350342.5
Mash-Central	264	324726	10649	4	4936.30	203	10852	329662.3
Mash-West	406	565569.6	18741	53	67879.9	1805	20546	633449.65
Midlands	217	463819.5	16708	19	37042.7	1382	18090	500862.3
Masvingo	226	1139108.1	25933	9	129395.8	4377	30310	1268503.9
Mat. South	253	890507.5	8080	16	118913.7	2474	10554	1009421.2
Mat North	186	524443.8	7367	3	7915.0	165	7532	532358.8
Totals	2028	4387091.1	114901	156	416807.8	14286	129187	4803897.8

Source: GoZ 2002

The Land Acquisition Act was later amended to reflect changes made to the constitution as well as introducing new procedures for land acquisition. Although no resettlement is

supposed to take place on the land until the Administrative Court confirms the acquisition, regard then shifts to the Rural Land Occupiers Act which protects occupiers who were settled on the land by the first of March 2001. Amendment of Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act to the effect that S 5 (9)(b) states that “ the making of an order in terms of section 8(1) shall constitute notice in writing to the owner or occupier to cease to occupy, hold, or use that land immediately on to the date of service of the order upon the owner” has the ultimate effect of allowing occupation immediately after designation. This essentially erodes the right of the owner to contest acquisition in court as success or failure is almost meaningless as the land would have been occupied. The most recent amendment to the Land Acquisition Act in 2002 gives the acquiring authority, after issuing the land acquisition order in terms of Section 8 of the Land Acquisition Act, the right to start surveying, demarcating and allocating the land.

The main conditions outlined by the Rural Land Occupiers Act for the purposes of protecting occupiers from eviction are that

- one was occupying the land on the first of March 2001 and was still occupying the land at the date of commencement of the Act;
- one occupied land in anticipation of being resettled by an acquiring authority on that or any other land for agricultural purposes in terms of the Land Acquisition Act [*Chapter 20:10*]; and that
- one qualifies for settlement on that or any other land in accordance with the relevant administrative criteria fixed by an acquiring authority for the resettlement of persons for agricultural purposes (GOZ 2001).

Such provisions have far-reaching effects if the settlers are on farmland which is within the urban and peri-urban areas where the provision of social services (water and sewerage) is of paramount importance. Indeed, informal settlements have mushroomed in many parts of Harare.

Settlers were allocated land under the modified A1⁴ and A2⁵ resettlement models. For settlers allocated land under the self contained units system of the Model A1 variant and

⁴ Under model A1, settlers are allocated land in two ways. One is through the villagised settlement pattern whilst the other is the self contained units. The model targets the decongestion of rural areas.

those under the A2 schemes, their land tenure rights were 99-year leases with option to purchase. Such leases were issued under the Agricultural Land Settlement Act. For the settlers under the villagised resettlement scheme, settlers were supposed to be given leases with option to purchase within ten years or 99-year leases for arable land as outlined in the 1998 National Land Policy Framework. The huge volumes of settlers under fast track have placed immense pressure on any efforts towards the processing of leases and it is most likely that most settlers are already on the land whilst their land rights (leases) largely remain unprocessed, particularly for those settled under villagised variant of Model A1. In fact, evidence from the field has shown that fast track settlers under model A1 are being given a resettlement certificate which specifies the holder's right to erect a residential structure as well as engaging in farming activities on the said plot. It also mentions that the settler's activities must be done in conformity with the respective Rural District Council's Land-Use and Conservation by-laws as well as abiding within the framework of the main environmental legislation that include the Natural Resources Act, Forest Act and the Rural District Councils Act. As has been always the case, the permit is not transferable

Fast Track and Peri-Urban Settlement

Under the Fast Track resettlement programme which was adopted in the year 2000, the government introduced a Model A2 variant for the redistribution of land in the peri-urban areas. Under the peri-urban model, farm sizes are expected to range between 2 to 50 hectares. Peri-urban farmers are expected to intensify production with a bias towards horticulture, market gardening or crop farming.

The demand for land under the Model A2 peri-urban variant was quite significant as illustrated by the fact of the 88 389 applications that had been received by August 2001 for Model A2 farms, 9473 (10.7%) of these were under the peri-urban model. Further, as at March 2002, a total of 6424 plots had been allocated under the peri-urban resettlement model, of which 5044 of these were in the three Mashonaland provinces.

⁵ Model A2 has taken the place of the Commercial Farmer Settlement Scheme and it seeks to indigenise large-scale commercial farming. Land is allocated in four variants namely small, medium and large scale commercial farming.

Within the Harare environs, more than 100 farms ranging in size from less than 10 ha to close to 7000 hectares were at some stage occupied. The ownership of the farms and the land-uses practiced on those farms were quite varied. Indigenous farmers, municipalities (Harare and Chitungwiza), individual white farmers and private agro-industrialists and the Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing represent the broad cross-section of stakeholders who owned the occupied properties. Several other farms were also covered by country-to-country agreements. For these reasons, a large number of the farms were delisted although in reality it did not mean automatic removal of settlers on the land. To this end, some of the farms are still occupied to date, (see also Table 3)

Table 3: De-listing of Farms in the Harare Environs

No. of Farms	Hectarage	Main Reason for Delisting
6	4 479.3	Chitungwiza Urban Development;
2	1 630.4	Zimbabwe Investment Centre Permit
7	8 223.1	Agro-Industry
1	84.8	Ruwa Urban Development
1	8.9	Part of Prince Edward Dam
3	2 156.7	City of Harare Sewerage Treatment
5	5 888.0	Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing
2	1 266.0	Country to Country Agreement
16	21 917.1	Indigenous Owned
2	1 939.2	Single Farm Ownership
Totals: 50	47 592.9	

Land occupations, and the subsequent fast track resettlement, affected various forms of land-uses in the urban and peri-urban context. For example, settlement on farms used for sewerage treatment works had the potential of affecting the City of Harare's Health delivery services while at the same time it also exposed the health of the settlers to a high risk. Settlement on land that forms part of Prince Edward Dam which is one of the dams that supplies water had the potential effect of silting the dam as well as polluting its water. The road infrastructure in these settlements remain undeveloped (see photos) and thus exposing the soil to a high risk of erosion. Unregulated extraction of construction materials (bricks, river-sand and pit-sand) also resulted in fast track contributing directly to the deterioration of the environment.

Box 3 illustrates some interesting details on fast track resettlement. For example, among other things, it gives some general description on the type of beneficiaries that got land .

However, the social characteristics of beneficiaries seemed to vary from one scheme to the other. At Retreat farm, it is evident from the type of developments being put up by settlers that they are generally in the low-income group. However the situation changes drastically if one examines the situation at Aspindale and Whitecliffe farms. The type of houses that have been put up by some settlers are a clear indication that some of the settlers were not low income earners (see also photos). Others were however poor as evidenced by the type of shacks they had put up.

Box 3: Settlement of Retreat Farm

Retreat Farm lies between the Cities of Harare and Chitungwiza. Before the occupation of the farm by war veterans and landless people (at the instigation and invitation of war veterans) in the year 2000, the farm was used for both crop and livestock production. Tobacco was the main cash crop on the farm while cattle's ranching was the dominant activity in the livestock section of the farm. The farm was also known for poultry production (eggs and chickens) and citrus (oranges) production. Essentially, these constituted the core business of the farm. However, in addition to these, the farm also practiced aquaculture whilst racehorses were also kept at the farm.

Most of the settlers on the farm used to reside in the high-density residential areas of Sunningdale and Epworth and the low-density areas of Hatfield and Waterfalls. Generally, most of these were low-income earners lodging in these areas whilst others were unemployed or self-employed residents of these suburbs. Whilst some settlers express the need for farmland for crop and livestock production, the majority cite the need for accommodation as the key motivation factor for participating in the land occupations and fast track resettlement.

Initially, there were about 120 families at the farm but these have more than doubled to 250 when settlers from Arlington Farm were relocated to that farm. As already mentioned, most settlers at the farm are more interested in affordable accommodation than in farmland for agricultural production. As such, developments at the farm reflect more activity on residential development. Originally, settlers were each allocated 900m². War veterans are in charge of the allocation process and they expect that each aspiring resident must be a cardholder of the ruling party. Further, each individual is expected to make an initial contribution of \$9000 to cover for land survey, water reticulation and road infrastructure costs. Meanwhile, the settlers depend on social services within Hatfield, Waterfalls and Sunningdale areas.

The settlers have also organized themselves into groups to further their interests and there are two main Housing Cooperatives namely Hatidzokere Shure and Chenjerai Hunzvi Housing Cooperatives. Membership contributions were pegged at \$7 500.00.

Plate 1: Residential Development and Urban Agriculture at Whitecliffe Farm



A ZESA employee had formally acquired a stand on Whitecliffe Farm. A section of this farm was later occupied.

Plate 2: Occupation of Whitecliffe Farm



Settlements are being developed haphazardly at the occupied portion of Whitecliffe Farm.

Photographs By: K Chatiza: 13-05-2003

Plate 3: An internal Road on Whitecliffe farm



There is no proper infrastructure planning on occupied farms.

Plate 4: Brick-making at Whitecliffe Farm



These kilns have been made on site, contributing to the defacing of environment.

Photographs By: K Chatiza: 13-05-2003

Plate 5: Settlement at Aspindale Farm

It was certainly not the Urban Poor who developed this house

Plate 6: Another huge House under construction at Aspindale



Again, it cannot be the urban poor who put up some huge houses at Aspindale farm

Photographs by: N Marongwe 13-05-2003

Fast Track resettlement programme resulted in the acquisition and distribution of rural and peri-urban land alike. As already mentioned, land occupations in the peri-urban areas (which preceded fast track) were driven by the desire by urban residents to access land for residential purposes. From the policy point of view, rural land in the peri-urban areas was supposed to be considered mainly for peri-urban agriculture. However, evidence available show that the demand for residential land became the main driver for land occupations in most of Zimbabwe's major cities including Harare, Bulawayo, Gweru, Chinhoyi etc.. As a matter of policy, land in the peri-urban areas was supposed to be settled under the Model A2 only and none under the villagised settlement.

A special committee was put in place to guide identification and allocation of land for peri-urban agriculture purposes in the City of Harare. The committee was composed of the Ministry of Local Government and National Housing, Ministry of Lands and Agriculture, ZANU P-F Harare Province, War Veterans, representatives from the three Mashonaland Provinces and the Municipalities of Harare and Chitungwiza. In an effort to assist the City of Harare in dealing with settlers who had occupied land within city boundaries in anticipation for accessing land for housing development, a sub committee was also formed. The composition of the sub-committee was made up of the Ministry of Local Government and National Housing (Housing section), Department of Physical Planning, War Veterans, ZANU P-F, City of Harare and Chitungwiza, Ruwa and Norton Town Boards and Epworth Local Board.

The urban 'land-less' took advantage of the opportunity created by fast track to present their own land demands. A common characteristic was that they formed housing cooperatives as a strategy of spearheading their land demands. This saw the establishment of more than 18 housing cooperatives in Harare which were operating from the occupied land spread right round the city. This form of organization by the settlers/occupiers became the link between the settlers and authorities that included the City of Harare and the two committees that had been put into place.

Some of the farms that were settled under fast track resettlement in most districts surrounding Harare fell within the City of Harare's Combination Master Plan boundary

and such land was effectively occupied for residential purposes. However, some of the farms were outside the Combination Master Plan boundary and it was resolved that these be used for peri-urban settlement and in terms of administering of the land allocation process, be handled by the Ministry of Lands and Agriculture.

Table 5: Examples of Farms settled under Fast Track in Harare

Farm Name	Area
Remainder of Odear Farm	605.8
Saturday Retreat	46.2
Lot 2 of Saturday Retreat	22.1
Remaining Extent of Retreat Estate	1057.4
Stand 48 Aspindale Park Township	100.3
Remaining Gletywin of Gletywin	6913.9
Stand 1, Gletwyn Township	255.9
Remainder of Garlyn Barton	71.8
Pangoula of Sternblick	299.9
Remaining Extent of Garlick Creagh Section 4	

Source: Harare City Council Documents

The haphazard manner in which farms were occupied or settled under fast track led to a serious deviation from the planning procedures and also created a huge demand for the servicing of the ‘demarcated’ stands by the City of Harare. In a number of cases, such land occupations contradicted with the planned use for the area. For example, Arlington Farm, is classified as a security sensitive zone next to the Harare International Airport and other Defensive Structures. This resulted in the relocation of some 500 people who had parceled out stands amongst themselves and most of these were off-loaded to Retreat farm, along the Harare-Chitungwiza Road. Another example was White Cliff farm, which was actually owned by a black Zimbabwean who had already started a housing development project. Hopley farm owned by the Harare Municipality was also settled. A portion of this farm had actually been donated to the Child Survival Foundation for street kids but the Child Survival Foundation had not developed the land.

A more conspicuous example is Aspindale farm, which is located between Kambuzuma and Mufakose suburbs. An absentee landlord owns the land and at one time the Zimbabwe Republic police demolished the structures that had been put-up only to be re-erected. The farm itself is zoned for residential uses by the City Council. High and medium density stands were planned and allocated to about 4000 people and 200

structures were at different stages of construction (field visit December 2002, Harare City Council Records).

Fast track resettlement presented serious implementation problems to planning authorities. Firstly, the planning and demarcation of stands was not done following any planning standards, making service delivery (water, sewerage, roads, electricity etc.) very difficult to provide. Secondly, the cost of service delivery could not be met both by the Central Government and the Harare Municipality. Thirdly, the structures that were developed do not conform to the Building Bye-Laws. This was so because the occupiers cannot at law submit any planning applications for approval by the Municipality, as they were not the titleholders of the land. As a result of this, it becomes illegal for the City Planners to advise the new settlers on what they should do to ensure that their structures meet the planning standards.

Whilst most settlers have organized into Housing Cooperatives there are leadership wrangles as different factions wrestled each other to take control of the process. A typical example has been the development of New Cerney Township where different factions are claiming to be leaders. As a result, land allocation was even more problematic as a result of multiple leadership structures which at times culminated in physical fights (see also Box 4)

Box 4: Settlement of Saturday Retreat Farm (New Cerney Township)

Saturday Retreat Farm is located 16 km from the City Centre along the Harare-Masvingo Road. Part of the farm, now known as New Cerney Township, was developed in the 1970s as a medium density suburb. About 800 stands were demarcated and surveyed, and it was also partially serviced (roads and water). The development was not finished as a result of the intensity of the liberation war and neither was it completed in the post-independence period. The area was then occupied in November 2000 and an additional 2500 stands were parceled out. A four-member committee chaired by a war veteran (base-commander) has been put in place to run the scheme.

The scheme is home to Ushewokunze Housing Cooperative. The cooperative has also managed to get hold of the Harare City Council Plan for the area, Saturday Retreat Local Plan No. 50 and have made an attempt to implement the plan provisions. The joining fee for members was initially \$5000.00 but has since been raised to \$100 000.00. The fees collected are being used in financing the servicing of the area.

However, the settlement pattern that has been established does not fully comply with council plans. For example, areas that have been planned for industrial areas and school sites had been settled. Some of the settlers have access to piped water while others have dug deep wells. Generally, the scheme is badly organized and they do not have one recognized leadership structure. As such, there is a leadership crisis as some leaders are not recognized while physical fights often erupt among youths representing different factions.

ZERO Field Survey 2002.

This study supports the argument by Marongwe (2002) that farm occupations and fast track resettlement in the peri-urban and urban environs have placed urban localities in a

dilemma. It has already been pointed out that settlement patterns created under fast track are in direct contradiction with land-use plans that guide development in respective urban areas. In some situations, permanent physical structures have already been put into place and yet do not meet the planning standards as defined by various statutes. Any attempt to regularise such developments is directly opposed to the practicalities of urban planning, urban development and urban management. Thus fast track has created conflict between settlers and urban managers and at the same time providing the ideal environment for an uncontrolled sprawling of urban agriculture. However an interesting case was observed in the City of Gweru where the Municipality argued that fast track resettlement eased the demand for land for the practice of urban agriculture as most people opted for fast track plots which were generally out of the city (Interviews with mayor of Gweru, 15-10-2002).

Concluding Remarks

Urban development is primarily a planning activity which is executed through the development and implementation of various forms of development plans. On the other hand, fast track resettlement is/was about putting people on the land first while planning was to be done at a later stage. This effectively defines the interface between fast track resettlement and urban development. It has been illustrated that the overriding motivation for land occupations and fast track in urban and peri-urban areas was the desire to access land for residential development. However the planning and development of residential areas in an urban context is legally required to respect the planning and development control functions of local authorities. Firstly, development is expected to take place in an area /zone that has been planned for such purposes. This was however almost impossible given the “urgency” and political nature of fast track resettlement. Secondly, those planning to develop in an urban area have got to establish their *loci standi*. In this respect, any development plans submitted to urban councils for approval will have to be accompanied by legal documents that show that the applicant owns the property where development is expected to take place. A major flaw of fast track resettlement is the unclear nature of land rights accorded to new settlers. More importantly, most farms have still not been confirmed as legally acquired and hence new

settlers in urban areas cannot submit any development plans for approval by local authorities. What is imminent from this study is that there is collision between municipal development plans and settler plans. This collision process needs to be properly managed and one can only brainstorm on any options on the way forward. Some of these options on the way forward include the following:

- The government must recognise the importance of municipal development plans and in cases where settlements are contradicting such plans, settlers need to be relocated to areas which are zoned for such land-uses. In situations where settlement patterns do not contradict land use planning zones, then the state should mobilize resources that enable regularization of such developments
- The legal status of farms that were not de-listed need to be sorted out as quickly as possible. The state needs to move with speed to complete acquisition of such farms and pay compensation and thereby setting the pace for the transfer of title to government and ultimately to settlers.
- Where it would have been confirmed that the settlement is permanent, there is an urgent need to allow the proper and formal demarcation of stands to be done. This will set the pace for the municipality to start providing utilities and other infrastructure on the land.
- Given the high cost of servicing land in an urban area, the government should consider establishing a fund that will enable beneficiaries to obtain grants for housing development with injections of private capital.

The current situation where nothing seems to be taking place in relation to the developments associated with fast track is a recipe for the development of shanty settlements in the model of Epworth and Hatcliffe Extension settlements in Harare. This indeed has to be avoided at all costs as it defeats the whole purpose of development planning which is supposed to improve and not threaten the livelihoods of people. The history of illegal settlements is characterized by extremely poor conditions, and hence it is necessary for political leaders and policy-makers to respect their own policies, in this case those that regulate urban and peri-urban development.

References:

- Berry R A and Cline W.R.(1979): **Agrarian Structure and Productivity in Developing Countries**, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Chaipa I(2001): **The Status of Urban Agriculture and Identification of Information , Training and Communication Needs in Zimbabwe**, a Study Commissioned by the municipal development Programme for Eastern and Southern Africa., Harare.
- City of Harare 1992: **Harare Combination Master Plan: Study Report and Written Statement**, Unpublished Report, Department of Works, Harare
- City of Harare 1999: **Local Development Plan No 31, Southern Incorporated Areas**, Unpublished Report, Department of Works, Harare.
- City of Harare 2000: **Gletwyn Farm Local Development Plan: Draft Report of Study and Written Statements**, Unpublished Report
- City of Harare 2002: **Saturday Retreat Local Development Plan NO. 50; Report of Study and Written Statement**, Unpublished Report, Department of Works, Harare
- Cornia, G. A (1985): 'Farm Size, Land Yields and Agricultural Production Function: an analysis of fifteen developing countries', *World Development* 13 (4): 513-534.
- Drescher A.W (2001): **The German Allotment Gardens - a model for Poverty Alleviation and Food Security in Southern African Cities?**, article published in the Proceedings of the sub-Regional Expert Meeting on Urban Horticulture, Stellenbosch, South Africa, 15-19 January 2001, FAO/University of Stellenbosch.
- Ellis F. (1993): **Peasant Economics: Farm Households and Agrarian Development**, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- ENDA-Zimbabwe (1994): **Urban Agriculture in Harare: report on an IDRC-supported project**, ENDA-Zimbabwe, Harare.
- Feder G (1985): **"The relationship between Farm size and Farm Productivity"**, *Journal of Development Economics* 18: 297-313.
- Government of Zimbabwe (1998): **Inception Phase Framework Plan 1999-2000: an implementation plan of the Land Reform and Resettlement Programme Phase 2**, Ministry of Lands and Agriculture, Harare.
- Marongwe N (2002): **Conflicts over Land and other Natural Resources in Zimbabwe**, ZERO Publications, Harare.
- Mbiba B (1995): **Urban Agriculture in Zimbabwe, implications for Urban Poverty and Management**, Aldershot, Avebury.
- Masoka M (1997): **The Potential Role of Cultivators in open space cultivation reform in Harare**, Unpublished MA Dissertation, Department Of Geography, University of Zimbabwe.

- Mudimu, G (1986): **Urban Agriculture Activities and Women Strategies in Sustaining Family Livelihoods in Harare**, Zimbabwe, Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography 17(2): 179-194.
- Mudimu G.D 2001: Political Economy of Land for Urban and Peri-Urban Agriculture in Zimbabwe: Research Perspectives and Current Issues on Dynamics of Land Markets, Strategies for Access and Patterns of Land-use, paper in MDP 2001: **The Political Economy of Urban and Peri-Urban Agriculture in eastern and Southern Africa, Proceedings of the MDP/IDRC workshop**, 28 February to 2 arch 2001, Bronte Hotel, Harare.
- Mudzure E (undated): **The Problems of illegal Urban Agriculture and its impact on the Environment: the Case of Harare**, Institute for Housing Studies and Municipal development Programme.
- Netting, R. McC (1993): **Smallholders, Householders: Farm families and the Ecology of Intensive, Sustainable Agriculture**, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Prosterman, R and J. M. Riedinger (1987): **Land Reform and Democratic Development**, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Strange, M (1988): **Family Farming: A new Economic Vision**, University of Nebraska Press and Food First Books, Lincoln.
- Zimbabwe, Government of (1978): **Agricultural Land Settlement Act**, Chapter 20:01, Government Printers, Harare.
- Zimbabwe, Government of (1979): **Constitution of Zimbabwe**, Zimbabwe, Government Printers, Harare.
- Zimbabwe, Government (1941): **Natural Resources Act** No 9 of 1941, Government Printers, Harare.
- Zimbabwe, Government of (1988): **Rural District Councils Act**, No 8 Zimbabwe, Government Printers, Harare.
- Zimbabwe, Government of (1992): **Land Acquisition Act**, Government Printers, Harare.
- Zimbabwe, Government of (1996): **Urban Councils Act** Chapter 29:15, Revised Edition, Government Printers, Harare.
- Zimbabwe, Government of (1996): **Regional, Town and Country Planning Act**, Chapter 29:12, Revised Edition, Government Printers, Harare.
- Zimbabwe, Government of (1996): **Forestry Act, revised edition, Govt. Printers, Harare**
- Zimbabwe, Government of (2001): **People First: Zimbabwe's Land Reform Programme**, Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement, Harare.
- Zimbabwe, Government of (2001): Rural Land Occupiers (Protection From Eviction) **No. 13/2001, Cap.20:26** Government Printers, Harare.