DOI: https://doi.org/10.66884/kesj.2020.iy7fntya

Kaduna State University Environmental Science Journal (KESJ) vol. 1 Issue 2

Evaluation of Infrastructure Development in Resettlement Schemes of the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja

UNAH Mathew Okopi

Department of Architecture, Faculty of Earth and Environmental Sciences. Bayero University, kano Nigeria.

* E-mail of the corresponding author: unahkay@yahoo.com ,umokopi.arc@buk.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

Infrastructures development in resettlement scheme has been a major challenge to successive governments in provision of a befitting settlement for her indigenous aborigine of the federal Capital territory. The resettlement schemes over the years have lack the provision of basic necessities of life and have suffered set-back from housing rejection due to inadequacy in infrastructural development. The study evaluates the development and condition of infrastructures facilities in resettlement schemes in the Federal Capital Territory (FCT) Nigeria. The study uses field observation were a quantitative method was adopted anda total of 120 structure close-ended questionnaires were administered to forty (40) respondents in each of the selected resettlement schemes, However, only 112 (93.33%) valid responses was retrieved and used for data analysis. Questionnaire designed to collect data information's from the residents are provided in three categories; (1) housing services infrastructure, (2) neighborhood facilities and location facilities and (3) socio-economic environment. Likert scale was used to rate residents' perception on a three-point scale: provided=3, fairly provided=2 and not provided=1. Each response was coded as follow: very bad = 1, fair = 2, and very good = 3, are scale used to determine the level of satisfaction of respondents. Data were presented using the relevant descriptive and inferential statistical techniques where the Sum of Weight Mean (SWM), Standard Deviation (Std.D) and Relatively Important Index (R.I.I) was used to rank the level of importance the residents attached to the infrastructure. The findings indicated that portable pipe borne water supply, access road, electricity, drainage system, waste management system, recreational facilities, health, educational and security facilities are found to be major problems in this resettlement schemes. The study recommends that every successive government should adhered to implement in full capacity infrastructural facilities / development in order to promote a sustainable living environment and improvements the socio –cultural adaptability of the indigenous people.

Keywords: Abuja-FCT, Post- Occupancy Evaluation, resettlement schemes, sustainable infrastructure, Housing development.

INTRODUCTION

Resettlements in the federal Capital Territory (FCT) have suffered serious neglect. The displacement and relocation of the indigenous inhabitants has been urban areas to hinterland of peripheral settlement. The inadequacy of infrastructure development and availability of fundamental social facilities has impacted negatively on the Affected People (APs). It is the duty of the Federal Capital Development Authority (FCDA) to relocate these people on new site and provide for basic infrastructure facilities so that the livelihood is not disturbed. Rather resettlement schemes are dissatisfaction in terms of improved living conditions & quality of life of rural poor Dhammika and Wijayasinghe (2010). Sulyman (2014) opined that the rural settlement of the display people remained under development as a result of their location. The development of this resettlement schemes has led to several experiments with various levels of successes or failures which have resulted to rejection as a result of livelihood and dissatisfaction with compensation Ayuba (2014). Olotuah&

Taiwo (2013), Adeponle (2013),Unah (2019a), Senecal (2002) and Knight (2001) opined for organized physical planning place for the wellbeing consideration of the resettles, protection of healthy living environment, safety, efficiency, satisfaction with one's home, presence of government and there are also issues of perception that take into account people's experiences where they lived before, the routes they travel, and the sensory quality of their environment. All this encompasses the provision of resettlement infrastructure of the indigenous inhabitant of Abuja is not negotiable. The provision of basic infrastructure facilities to enable sustainable environment and improved the quality of the suburban resettlement environment throughout the world are issues of concern for researchers as well as the resettles. Resettlement which is the transferred or evacuation of the people from one place to another with the intension of creating an enable and sustainable human planned settlements and with the set goal of raising their standard of living, Lethukuthula (2016) has the attribute of socio-economic and cultural of the individual on a new settlement where they are to be equipped with all necessary infrastructure to better and improved their ways of life. Resettlement scheme occurred virtually in most part of FCT as this resettled people abandoned their schemes and relocate to a substandard make shift- houses in slum environment that is degrading of sustainable infrastructure facilities. This is the most problems facing the indigenous inhabitants of FCT city, which is unending issues that has lingered on since 1980. The UNCHS (2006) posit the inadequacy provisions of these infrastructures facilities to be alarming in the host communities. It is widely believed that all is not well with infrastructure facilities in most of the resettlement schemes in the FCT Abuja Nigeria. Ayuba (2014) and Ebehikhalu et al. (2016). However, studies have shown that these basic social amenities are least provided as required for a befitting place of harbor for her indigenous aborigine Unah (2019b).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Infrastructure development is provided in response to the basic needs of communities and to enhance the quality of life, equity, stability and social well-being. It also acts as the building block to the enhancement of human and social capital. This basic infrastructure facility enables a sustainable environment and improved the quality of the agrarian community's environment throughout the FCT Act of 1976 which placed the entire land mass of the FCT under the auspices of the Federal Government. It also charged the Federal Capital Development Authority (FCDA) with the responsibility of spatial planning and development of the FCT (COHRE and SERAC, 2008). The most profound impact of infrastructure development on human needs is basically on housing, health, welfare, and productivity of individuals (IPA 1979). Furthermore, the residents of this resettlement housing scheme will judge the City not only on how the organization of the City fits everyday needs, but how the demand for housing and infrastructure development is provided in the eyes of itsresidents. Adeponle (2013), Unah (2019b) opt that most settlements development are located at the suburban fringing peripheral of most surrounding towns and settlements popularly referred to as 'satellite towns',] as there is still little or no provision for basic infrastructure amenities. This is due to certain factors which are not taken in consideration during relocation process. Most of the resettle returned to their original places or settled nearby work place and created new slums.

Ozdemir (2002) as cited in Adebayo (2006) opined that housing policies should focus not only on production of new housing units but

also on improving the standards of the existing stock (infrastructure) to meet the current and challenging standards. This sustainable infrastructure as posit by Omole (2001) and Ebehikhalu et al. (2016) includes services and facilities necessary for its economy to function, such provision are: Portable water supply, electricity, access road, drainages, sanitary, health care and educational facilities. Chima and Ahmadu (2019) posit that resettlement whether in the form of voluntary or involuntary always has its repercussion for the displaced persons and the organization or government initiating the idea of resettlement. The group of people being compelled to pave way for "development" will unavoidably encounter a decrease in their standard of living, as their social fabric are always being torn apart. Therefore, it paramount that these individuals or group of communities to be adequately needed to resettle in a more sustainable environment infrastructural without any delayed.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Resettlement schemes across the FCT are identify amongst most common fringing settlement that are situated far away from the city bowl of the FCT. They lack functional infrastructural facilities, such as water supply, elliptic electricity supply, inaccessible untarred motor able roads, Buildings are poorly constructed. The dwellers are face with inadequate access to health and educational facilities, inadequate agrarian land, eroded drainage and inadequate provision of refuse evacuation. This lack of basic social infrastructural amenities has huge challenges on the resettlement schemes in the FCT which has led to the growing insecurity and rising rates of criminal activities. This paper asserts the need to improve social and sustainable infrastructural in these resettlement schemes across the FCT, so that the residents make a living and contribute meaningfully to the development and economics growth of Federal Capital City (FCC).

MATERIAL AND METHOD

STUDY AREA

Abuja is Nigeria's Federal Capital Territory (FCT) located in the middle of the country with a land area of about 8,000 km2 of which the actual city (i.e. Federal Capital City) occupies 250sq km. Abuja is bounded on the north by Kaduna state, on the west by Niger state on the east and southeast by plateau state, and on the south-west by Kogi state. It lies within latitude 90 25'N and 90 20'N of the equator and longitude 50 45'E and 70 39'E.FCT is made up of six local area councils: Abuja Municipal, Gwagwalada, Kuje, Bwari, Kwali and Abaji area councils, which boast several resettlement schemes as: Usman Resttlement Scheme, Kubwa Resttlement, Kuje Resttlement,Karu, Ushafa, Giri, Dei-dei, Lugbe, Gosa, Garimpa, Kurudu, Apo, Wasa and Shere-galuyi Resettlement Scheme. The later three were selected for this research, simply because they are recently developed resettlement scheme in the FCT.

A total of 120 structure questionnaires were administered to forty (40) respondents in each of the three resettlement schemes (table1) .and 112 (93.33%) responses was retrieved and used for the study and supplemented by field observation. Questionnaire designed to collect data from the residents as provided in three categories; (1) housing services infrastructure, (1) neighborhood facilities and location facilities and socio-economic environment. Likert scale was used to rate residents' perception on a three-point scale, provided=3, fairly provided=2 and not provided=1. Each response was coded as follow: very bad = 1, fair = 2, and very good = 3, are scale used to

determine the level of satisfaction of respondents with infrastructural facilities. Data were presented using the relevant descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. The sum of Weight Mean, Standard Deviation and Relatively Important Index (R.I.I) were analysis and ranked accordingly. Thus: Relative Importance Index (R. I. I.) = (3n3+2n2+1n1)/3N.

Where: N3=strongly agree; n2= fair and n1=strongly disagree; and N= total number of the respondents. Each coded response was multiplied by number of respondents, which gave the Weighted Value (WV). The Summation of the Weighted Values (ΣWV) was divided by number of respondents (n) to arrive at each component Mean Weighted Value (MWV). The Mean of Mean Weighted Value (MWV) was then obtained by dividing Summation of Mean Weighted Value (ΣMWV) by total number of infrastructure or building elements (y) surveyed in the study. This gave the overall conditions. Thus, MWV = ΣWV/n, where n = population of respondents. Overall condition = Mean of MWV = ΣMWV/y, y = total number of variables.

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Table 1:

Respondents resettlement scheme	Questionnaires Administered	Questionnaires Retrieved	Response Rate (%)
Apo resettlement	40	39	34.82
Shere-galuwyi	40	36	32.14
Wasa resettlement	40	37	33.04
Total	120	112	100.00

Source: Fieldwork survey, 2019.

Table 2: Guide to degree of significant impact

Degree of Significant Impact	Rating using Summation of Mean Weighted Value (Σ MWV)	Interpretation
Most significant	2.00-3.00	present
significant	1.40-1.90	insufficient
Less significant	0.10-1.39	not present

Source: Fieldwork survey, 2019.

Table 3: R. I. I. of the Highly Essential Infrastructure in the Study Area

INFRASTRUCTURE	ΣMWV	ΣMWV	R.I.I	Ranking
Access roads	640	5.71	0.634	1st
Power supply (electricity)	578	5.51	0.572	2nd
Portable water	572	5.15	0.567	3rd
Mean transportation	569	5.07	0.563	4th
Health facilities	562	5.00	0.556	5th
Street light	524	4.67	0.519	6th
Security (police)	517	4.60	0.511	7th
Educational facilities	513	4.56	0.507	8th
Garbage disposal	499	4.44	0.493	9th
Drainage system	491	4.37	0.486	10th

SOURCE; Author field Research 2019

The foremost part of Table 1 above presents the opinions of the respondents on the three selected resettlement scheme and how they availability of infrastructural facilities affected them. The result shows the R.I. I. of the infrastructure in the three resettlement housing schemes. This was revealed in their order relative importance index as well as worst deficit infrastructures facilities. Table 3, reveals that Access roads network was indicated as the most important infrastructure in the resettlement scheme and ranked 1st (R. I. I. = 0.634). This was followed by Power supply (electricity)which ranked 2nd (R. I. I. = 0.572), and Portable water (R. I. I. = 0.567) 3rd respectively. Others Mean transportation (R.I. I. = 0.563) 4th, Health facilities (R. I. I. = 0.556) 5th, Street light (R. I. I. = 0.519) 6th, Security (police) (R. I. I. =0.511) 7th, Educational facilities (R. I. I. = 0.507) 8th, Garbage disposal (R. I. I. = 0.493) 9th and Drainage system (R. I. I. = 0.486) 10threspectively.

TABLE 4: THE STATE OF INFRASTRUCTURE AS PERCEIVED BY THE RESPONDENTS IN THE STUDY AREA

infrastructure	RESETLLEMENT SCHEME								
Variable 1: infrastructure facilities	APO			WASA			SHERE-GALUYI		
	SWV	MWV	STD.D	SWV	MWV	STD.D	SWV	MWV	STD.D
Access roads	284	2.53	0.843	194	1.73	0.576	162	1.44	0.480
Power supply (electricity)	290	2.59	0.863	152	1.35	0.450	136	1.21	0.403
Portable water	285	2.54	0.846	152	1.35	0.450	136	1.21	0.400
transportation	282	2.51	0.836	140	1.25	0.416	147	1.31	0.436
Health facilities	291	2.59	0.866	132	1.17	0.392	139	1.24	0.413
Street light	260	2.32	0.773	130	1.16	0.386	134	1.19	0.398
Security (police)	257	2.29	0.764	134	1.19	0.398	126	1.12	0.375
Educational facilities	250	2.23	0.744	123	1.09	0.366	126	1.12	0.375
Garbage disposal	235	2.09	0.699	126	1.12	0.375	130	1.16	0.386
Drainage system	272	2.42	0.747	116	1.03	0.345	125	1.11	0.372
total		24.11			12.44			12.11	
Apo Mean of ΣMWV = 24.11 / 10 =2.41									
Wasa Mean of ΣMWV = 12.44 / 10 =1.24									
Shere-Galuyi Mean of ΣMWV = 12.11/ 10 =1.21									

SOURCE; Author field Research 2019

FINDINGS

The guide to degree of significant impact assessment is contained in table 2. The survey from Table 4 above concluded that the condition of sampled infrastructures in Apo, Wasa and Shere-galuyi Resettlement Scheme with the analysis of the 10 factors of infrastructural variables as perceived by the respondents. These factors have been identified and ranked according to their descriptive analysis using the sum of Mean Weight Value and standard deviation to rate the degree of impact significant. The result as presented in Table 2 above shows that in Apo resettlement scheme the condition of access roads has (M=2.53, SD=0.843), Power supply (electricity) (M=2.59,SD=0.863), Portable water (M=2.54,SD=0.846), transportation (M=2.51,SD=0.836), Health facilities (M=2.59,SD=0.866), Street light (M=2.32,SD=0.773), Security (police) (M=2.29,SD=0.764), Educational facilities

(M=2.23,SD=0.744), Garbage disposal (M=2.09,SD=0.699) and Drainage system (M=2.42,SD=0.747) were all rate Most significant and present. Next, the analysis revealed that Wasa and Shere-Galuyi Resettlement Scheme has gross insufficient infrastructural facilities thus: Access roads (M=1.73,SD=0.576), Power supply(M=1.35, SD=0.450), Portable water (M=1.35 , SD=0.450), are rated insufficient, others are transportation (M=1.25, SD=0.416), Health facilities (M=1.17,SD=0.392), Street light (M=1.16, SD=0.386), Security (police) (M=1.19, SD= 0.398), Educational facilities (M=1.09,SD=0.366), Garbage disposal (M=1.12,SD=0.3750 and Drainage system (M=1.03,SD=0.345) were all rate by the respondents as not present in the resettlement scheme. Finally, the analysis revealed that Shere-Galuyi Resettlement Scheme infrastructure Access roads (M=1.44,SD=0.480)as the only insufficient infrastructural facilities rated by the respondents , other were not available thus; Power supply (M=1.21SD=0.403), Portable water (M=1.21,SD=0.400), transportation (M=1.31,SD=0.436), Health facilities (M=1.24,SD=0.413), Street light (M=1.19,SD=0.398), Security (police) (M=1.12,SD=0.375), Educational facilities (M=1.12,SD=0.375), Garbage disposal (M=1.16, SD=0.386) and Drainage system 9M=1.11,SD=0.372) respectively.

DISCUSSION OF INFRASTRUCTURAL SCORES OF THE RESETTLEMENTS

The findings showed a high level of disparities and dissatisfaction of infrastructure condition among the respondents of the three resettlements of study. In Apo resettlement scheme, the study show that more than 50%of the respondents rated the access roads as being tarred, good access distribution and connectivity by commuters and pedestrian movement. Meanwhile Wasa and Shere-galuyi resettlement scheme lack all these basic infrastructural facilities. Sulyman (2014) that posit reasons for such inadequate delivery of infrastructures facilities as being hinterland. All other infrastructural faculties are seem in this order, from table 4, access roads, Power supply, Portable water, transportation, Health facilities, Street light, Security, Educational facilities, Garbage disposal and Drainage system were all present in Apo and according to table 2, they were 'most significant', while Wasa and Shere-galuyi respondents underscores this facilities as not insufficient and not present. Omole (2001), Ebehikhalu (2004), Ebehikhalu et al. (2016) and UNCHS (2006) opined that the rural settlements lack electricity, potable water supply, educational and health facilities which are mostly found in the urban settlement of the city. The study of both Adeponle (2013), Unah (2019b) concurred that most resettlements are developed at the suburban fringing peripheral of most surrounding towns and settlements. COHRE and SERAC (2008), IPA (1979) opted that the Federal Capital Development Authority (FCDA) have over the years neglected the study area and as well have failed to realize that provision of infrastructure with functional housing to the people was crucial to the socioeconomic development of the area Ayuba (2014). The respondent's perceptions in the provision of public infrastructure and services in these schemes remained unsatisfactory. Dhammika and Wijayasinghe (2010) and Wokekoro (2017) posit with the fact that respondents rating of provision of public infrastructure and services did not account to achieve user satisfaction. To generalize the provision of infrastructural facilities in these selected resettlement schemes, the study finds out that the scheme has not creates an enable and sustainable human planned resettlements and

the set goal of raising the standard of living of the displace people are not actualize. This is also in tune with Lethukuthula (2016) in the 'evaluation of Umlazi settlement of Philani.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper reports the result of a questionnaires survey, purposively administered to one hundred and twenty (120) respondents in the three (3) selected resettlement housing scheme in the federal Capital Territory, Abuja. The aim of the survey was to evaluate the provision of Sustainability Infrastructural development in this housing Scheme. The study that from the respondent's view; that basic infrastructural amenities were present and found to be very much significant in Apo resettlement scheme, whereas Wasa and Shere-galuyi Resettlement Scheme lack these basic infrastructural facilities, which includes: Power supply, Portable water, transportation, Health Facilities, Street Light, Security (police), Educational facilities, Garbage disposal and Drainage system, except Access roads which cut across the three resettlement scheme that is provided. The level and awarness of these infrastructural presences in Apo resettlement was due to it proximity to the hub of City metropolis, as Apo is gradually becoming a satellite town of it own. The expansion of residentiall housing unit and government re-allocation of plot settlement from double allocation has immensely improved the standard of this resettlement scheme. Where the respondent is aware of the fact that all three resettlement projects were kick start at the same time. The significant impact of this basic infrastructure disparity is so overwhelming that both Wasa and Shere-galuyi Resettlement Scheme where abondoned project at one time or the other as a priopty by various government in power, as such construction is still on going till date in these two latter resettlement scheme. The study should therefore serve as a good feedback measure to federal capital development Authority and all government policy maker and guide in remedial measures in distribution of funds in developing infrastructure in these resettlement schemes. In addition, the study will bring to the forefront of the major infrastructural deficit in these schemes and every other resettlement schemes in Abuja generally. With increasing demand for efficiency, effectiveness and sustainable housing delivery for her aborigine inhabitant and workers in the public sector by the populace, this study assesses the relationship between infrastructure facilities and deficits in government resettlement scheme.

.

REFERENCES

Abuja Geographic Information Systems (Agis), 2006 and 2007, various overhead images.in Deanna Fowler (2008) Urban Planning Hypocrisy in the 'City of Unity' – Forced Evictions in Abuja, Nigeria

Chima, P. and Ahmadu, J. (2014) Implementation of Resettlement Policy Strategies and Community Members' Felt-Need in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, Nigeria, Architecture Research, 4(2): 48-53 DOI: 10.5923/j.arch.20140402.03

COHRE and SERAC (2008*) The Myth of the Abuja Master Plan: Forced evictions as urban planning in Abuja, Nigeria*, pp14.

Dhammika, S.L and Wijayasinghe K. (2010) *Factors contributing to the failure of development induced resettlement projects*: A case study of the "Sahaspura" slum relocation project, Colombo, Sri Lanka.

Ebehikhalu, N.O. (2004). The Impact of Infrastructural Facilities on the Development of Rural Areas of Esan Community, Edo State, Nigeria‖ *Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis,* Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.

Ebehikhalu, N. O., Dawam, P.D and Kasim,U.(2016) A Study of the State of Infrastructure in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja. *Journal of Resources Development and Management* Vol.18,www.iiste.org ISSN 2422-8397

International Planning Associates, (1979), *The Master Plan for Abuja the New Federal Capital of Nigeria*, Federal Capital Development Authority, Federal Republic of Nigeria, p. 171.

Lethukuthula, M. (2016) Evaluating the Socio-Economic Impact of Relocating Residents from Informal Settlements with the Purpose of Creating Sustainable Human Settlement, Case Study of Philani Valley, Mlazi., MSc thesis School of Built Environment and Development Studies, University of Kwazulu-Natal South Africa.

Levan, A.C. and Olubowale, J. (2014) I am Here until Development comes': Displacement, Demolitions, and Property Rights in Urbanizing Nigeria. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of Royal African Society. African Affairs, 113/452,387–408, doi:10.1093/afraf/adu030. Downloaded from http://afraf.oxfordjournals.org/

Morenikeji,W, Sanusi, Y.A. &Jinadu, A.M. (2000). *The Role of Private Voluntary Organisations in Community and Settlement Development in Niger State.* A Research Report submitted to the Centre for Research and Documentation, Kano, Nigeria. p.5.

Niger State Government (2004). *Niger Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NSEEDS),* Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Minna.

Nasir Ahmad el-Rufai, (2005) *Repositioning the Federal Capital Territory*, (2005).

Omole, F.K. (2001). *Basic Issues in Housing Development.* Ondo: FemoBless Publications. p.38

Online Nigeria (2003). *Nigeria: Niger State On-line.* Accessed on 29, April 2009 from http://www.onlinenigeria.com/links/Niger-adv.asp.

Re-inventing the FCT: resettlement identified as 'Quick Win'

Senecal, G.(2002) Urban Spaces and Quality of Life: Moving Beyond Normative Approaches ''http://policyresearch.Gc.Ca/page.Asp?Pagenm=vsnl-art-06Accessed 18/12/2002

Sulyman, A. O. (2014) infrastructure provision and classification of rural settlements in Niger state, Nigeria. *An International Journal of Science and Technology* Bahir Dar, Ethiopia *AFRREV STECH, Vol. 3(1)* S/No. 6,

Unah, M.O. (2019a) *Residential Housing Redevelopment and its Impact on Asokoro District of Abuja Nigeria*, Online Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Sustainable Infrastructural Development (ICSID) Covenant University Canaan Land, Ota Nigeria, June 24th -28th, 2019. Available online at: open access: IOP Conf. Series|: Materials Science and Engineering 640 (2019) 012011, Doi:10.1088/1757-899X/640/1/012011

Unah, M. O.(2019b) Post-Occupancy

Evaluation of Sustainable Urban Infrastructure Development in Selected Resettlement Scheme of the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja. *Proceedings of the 4th annual conference on Social and Management Science Research, Yusuf Maitama Sule University, Kano, 15th – 17th October*.

UNHSP (2008). *The State of African Cities, A framework for Addressing Urban Challenges in Africa.* UN Habitat. Nairobi, Kenya. 206pp.

UN-HABITAT (2005) *The Challenge of Slums. Global Report on Human Settlements 2003* pp. 174-175.

United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UN-HABITAT) (2001), *State of the World's Cities,* HS/619/01E, p. 125.

Wokekoro, E. **(**2017) Rating of Neighborhood Quality Indicators in Port Harcourt Municipality *Int. J. Innovative Environ. Studies Res. 5(1):1-12*, www.seahipaj.org ISSN: 2354-2918

Wokekoro, E. (2017) Rating of Neighborhood Quality Indicators in Port Harcourt Municipality, *International Journal of Innovative Environmental Studies Research 5(1):1-12.*