

A Policy Document
Cultural heritage: a tool for development

**The Rehabilitation of Historic Centers and Buildings in the occupied
Palestinian territories**

Prepared by: Suad Amiry and Farhat Muhawi
Riwaq: Center for Architectural Conservation

Date: April 2008

Cultural heritage a tool for development

Introduction

The main objective of this document is to explore how the Cultural Heritage Sector (CHS) in the occupied Palestinian territories (oPt) could become an important tool for social and economic development.

This paper proposes a framework for structuring a national policy document that deals with the protection, rehabilitation and development of the CHS in the oPt; thus, this is a policy document that addresses cultural heritage issues and approaches.

Hopefully, with the support of the UNDP, this document will stimulate much needed debate amongst all relevant stakeholders in the field of cultural heritage and such dialogue can lead to a communal understanding and vision towards **placing** the cultural heritage sector on the national agenda of the PNA and thereby on that of funding agencies. It is hoped that such **methodical / systematic** discussions will form a foundation for a shared **message** that would ultimately define a Palestinian program and aid in the realization of **better / more effective** results in the field of architectural heritage.

The CHS has traditionally and continues to be viewed as an economic liability rather than as an important tool for economic and social development. Despite the huge amount of activity and the numerous governmental and non-governmental organizations working in the CHS for the last two decades, no collective effort has focused on establishing policy guidelines to outline priorities and provide an appropriate methodology for this sector.

This document addresses the need for a **comprehensive approach** towards the rehabilitation of whole historic centers rather than individual buildings. Such an approach means that the emphasis must necessarily shift from the traditional physical approach to a holistic one that addresses the social, economic and cultural. In other words the physical rehabilitation will have to be accompanied by a number of economically viable projects as well as social and cultural activities, the aim of which is to find **ways** to revitalize the deserted historic centers. This approach of course implies the serious involvement of all sectors of the community.

It should be noted that the First Draft of this document was discussed with a group of local and international experts during Riwaq's Second Biennale in October of 2007 and has been amended as a result of their comments and feedback.

With the help of the UNDP, it is hoped that this revised Second Draft will be disseminated, re-discussed, developed and adopted by all governmental and non-governmental cultural heritage organizations in the oPt, and that it will ultimately be translated into projects for the main funding agencies.

Chapter 1 examines the diversity and richness of cultural heritage in the oPt, and hence its great potential for developing tourism and providing housing.

Chapter 2 reviews the efforts of the different institutes working in the field of cultural heritage (CH).

Chapter 3 aims to identify the main challenges and obstacles hindering the development of the Cultural Heritage Sector (CHS) as a tool for social and economic development. It also discusses at length two key obstacles: namely, the need for an appropriate legal framework and the need for human and institutional capacity building.

Chapter 4 contains a full discussion of the integrated method as the main rehabilitation approach.

Chapter 5 proposes a National Rehabilitation Program called “Protect 50 villages protect 50 % of architectural heritage in the oPt”.

Chapter 6 offers the policy document’s conclusions.

1. CHAPTER ONE

The richness and diversity of architectural heritage in the oPt

1.1 Basic Definitions:

In accordance with internationally accepted definitions, the term CH covers the tangible and the intangible as well as the movable and immovable remains of past generations. Movable cultural heritage includes costumes, jewelry, furniture, artifacts and all that could be transferred to future generations, whereas the immovable cultural heritage normally includes sites (archaeological and natural sites), groups of buildings (such as historic centers), and monuments. Accordingly, architectural heritage includes historic centers and monuments.

1.2 Diversity and Richness:

In addition to the sites that are considered of exceptional universal significance such as the Dome of the Rock, the Holy Sepulcher and the Church of Nativity, the oPt contains a range of significant **historic city centers** such as the old cities of Jerusalem, Hebron, Nablus, and Bethlehem. Furthermore, Palestinian **villages** with their organically beautiful peasant architecture add to the variety and richness of this heritage. The **desert monasteries** located in the eastern slopes of the West Bank illustrate another form of architecture in the oPt, as does the “**throne village** architecture” (*Qura l-Karasi*) - the feudal palaces of eighteenth and nineteenth century rural Palestine. The diversity and wealth of the oPt’s cultural heritage is also visible in the **caravanserais** along historic trade routes, in addition to the scattered **holy shrines** (*Maqamat*), and the beautifully constructed dry stone **farm houses** set in the traditionally **terraced hills**.

1.3 Detailed information about historic centers and buildings in the oPt:

Riwaq’s Registry of Historic Buildings in the oPt (vols.1, 2, 3, 2007) provides us with basic data on architectural heritage within the oPt and the following specific information about historic buildings:

There are 50,320 historic buildings located in 422 sites. Most are located within the fabric of historic centers, but some are individual buildings scattered around historic centers.

As table #2 shows, 10,231 buildings (20%) of a total of 50,320 historic buildings are located in the four major cities of the oPt: Jerusalem (4,083 historic buildings inside and outside the city walls), Nablus (3,397 historic buildings), whilst the old city of Hebron has 1914, and Bethlehem 837. The majority (80%) of the historic buildings are in rural areas, hence the urgent need to pay attention to the small towns and villages.

Riwaq’s register of historic buildings indicates that almost half of the historic buildings are either empty or only partly being used; 4,447 buildings (8.84% of the total)

were partially used and 18,216 buildings (36.20%) were empty. Only slightly more than half of the buildings (26,019, or 51.71%) were in full use. Information regarding the use of 1,638 (3.26%) historic buildings was not available.

The structural condition of around 50% of historic buildings is either bad or medium. 23.86% (12,005) have medium structural issues, 14.26% (7,174) have serious problems, and 5.54% (2,786) buildings are not fit for habitation. This leaves slightly less than half of the buildings (25,133 buildings or 49.95%) in good structural condition. The structural condition of 3,222 buildings (6.40%) was not identified.

Historic centres in the oPt normally constitute only **1.54 percent of the master-plan areas** (see table #1, P.19). Hence protection via the imposition of stricter bylaws on such a small area can be justified.

Finally there is a need to concentrate efforts on the relatively few remaining historic village centers. By protecting the historic centers of 50 villages we can protect up to 50% of the architectural heritage in the oPt (see table #2, P.20).

2. CHAPTER TWO

Institutions working in the field of architectural heritage

Many agencies and institutions are currently involved in the field of CH in the oPt. These include governmental, semi-governmental, and nongovernmental institutions.

Governmental institutions working in this field include:

1. The Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities (MOTA)
2. The Ministry of Local Government (MoLG): historic centers are under its control in terms of master plans for cities, towns and villages
3. The heritage unit of the municipality of Nablus is also responsible for protecting the historic center of Nablus

Semi-governmental institutions include:

1. The Palestinian Economic Council for Development and Reconstruction (PECDAR)
2. The Hebron Rehabilitation Committee (HRC)
3. The Center for Cultural Heritage Preservation (CCHP) in Bethlehem

Non-governmental organizations include:

1. The Old City of Jerusalem Revitalization Program (OCJRP) of the Welfare Association
2. Jerusalem Society for Welfare and Development (Jerusalem)
3. Al-Mashhad organization (Ramallah)
4. Riwaq: Center for Architectural Conservation

The majority of CH organizations have accumulated a rich and varied experience in the last ten years. It will be thus extremely important to evaluate this experience, the needs and obstacles encountered, and to develop a shared policy paper that can help prioritize this sector within the national agenda, despite the numerous economic and political difficulties facing the oPt.

3. CHAPTER THREE

Challenges facing architectural heritage

Today, the most important challenge facing all architectural heritage stakeholders is how to reduce, if not totally halt, the alarming deterioration and demolition of historic centers and buildings in the oPt, particularly in rural areas. Such a freeze will allow a space to ultimately protect, rehabilitate and develop these significant areas.

Needless to say Israeli policies and practices in the oPt (settlements, by-pass roads, the wall, uprooting olive trees, etc.) have resulted directly or indirectly in the destruction of the landscape and villages. Indirect destruction has squeezed the Palestinian population into areas A and B, (10% of the land in the West Bank), while maintaining Israeli jurisdiction over the majority of land in area C, which accounts for the remaining 90% of the land.

This land scarcity has led to land speculation in the restricted areas A and B. As a result, land prices have soared and it has become impossible to protect a historic town sited on an expensive piece of land. Thus many historic centers were partially demolished in almost all villages, or totally demolished (Dura and Kufur Niemeh) to provide space for a football pitch, a new mosque or school, or more commonly to accommodate newly constructed houses or a five to six floor apartment buildings.

First we need to ask why neither the Palestinian National Authority (PNA) nor the aforementioned organizations have succeeded in stopping this alarming damage despite their tremendous work and effort so far. Then we must to consider what steps are needed to ensure the protection, rehabilitation and development of this valuable heritage?

It is possible to summarize the main obstacles facing the Palestinian architectural heritage as follows:

1. Decision makers have neither viewed nor considered heritage as a tool for development; hence there is **no real commitment** from their side. As a result heritage has no place on the National Agenda. This is reflected in weak legal and executive powers, as well as a lack of human and financial resources.
2. There is no appropriate **legal framework** for protection and hence unclear structures and division of responsibilities between institutions and agencies (government, private sector and civil society organizations) exists.
3. Unplanned **urban expansion and sprawl** have resulted in the destruction of historic centers and buildings and other cultural heritage sites and features.
4. The **destruction and looting** of archaeological sites and features as well as historic centers and buildings is ongoing.
5. Low **levels of social / cultural awareness** of the importance and value of cultural heritage continues.
6. Unlikely implementation of projects due to complex and fragmented family **ownership** patterns persist.

7. Financial and human **resources** are lacking.
8. **Investment guidelines** are limited.

For cultural heritage to become a real tool of development two key obstacles need to be examined more fully: the legal framework and ways to build and develop human and institutional capacity.

3.1 The Need for a New Legal framework:

3.1.1 Existing Laws:

Up until now there has been no specific legislation for protecting architectural heritage in the oPt. The current legal regime for the protection of CH in the oPt is obsolete and stems from the British mandate period. It is highly centralized, and only protects pre-1700 A.D. archeological sites. Thus other elements of CH such as historic centers have no legal protection. Moreover there is no single unified legal framework for the oPt where a range of different laws apply. In addition to the lack of any solid constitutional basis for protecting CH, there are no clear structures or divisions of responsibilities between institutions. Existing laws do not consider the public as stakeholders and deal with antiquities as isolated objects.

3.1.2 Proposed New Law

In 2004 a new Law for Cultural Heritage Protection in the oPt was prepared by the Institute of Law at Birzeit University in cooperation with Riwaq in an effort to assist the Bethlehem 2000 project and MOTA.

The main contribution of this new law was to widen the **scope of protection** to include the different elements of CH, to centralize protection, to decentralise rehabilitation, management and implementation, and to comply with international standards and approaches. This new law was intended to apply in all Palestinian territories providing a unified legal regime. In addition it ensured an active role for the general public, civil society, local government institutions as well as the private sector. This law proposed a semi-governmental heritage body which would allow greater flexibility in funding and decision making.

This new proposed law tried to stress the following aspects:

The central government should adopt a decentralized system of protection, utilize the existing networks, capabilities and resources of CH institutions, and coordinate the work of those institutions based on a set of priorities. Without such a proposed system, the central government, having limited resources would not be able to protect and manage the large volume of cultural heritage properties in the oPt. The central government should establish the norms, guidelines, and regulations as well as supervise the implementation of the work.

Protection cannot be achieved through regulation alone. It has a much greater chance of realization through the empowerment of local government and communities, the involvement of the private sector, and also by providing positive incentives to local communities. Those incentives should be provided by the state through the creation of a “Heritage Fund”.

In addition to declaring all historic centers protected areas, a buffer zone surrounding historic centers should also be identified by law. The main aim of these buffer zones is to

integrate the protected area with its surroundings and to allow an opportunity to consider whether the impact of surrounding development would be harmful to the historic context.

3.1.3 Existing Planning By-laws

Until the new law is ratified, protection of historic centers and buildings can be achieved through existing legislation, in particular the 1966 Planning and Zoning Law which allows for the demarcation of historic centers and buildings and the addition of a set of planning ordinances for their protection based on their significance. This law also includes planning ordinances to control and plan new buildings and extensions within the borders of historic centers.

In March 2006, the Higher Planning Council approved general planning bylaws for the protection of historic areas as well as single historic buildings. Those bylaws are considered part of the planning control system and are applied to all delineated historic centres and buildings in the oPt. Riwaq has developed these ordinances throughout its work on protection plans.

3.1.4 The need to lobby for the new Law

CH institutions, in addition to interest groups should lobby for the adoption of the new Heritage Law. The Law should be presented to the public in order to get feedback and ensure community involvement. A community education campaign should be part of the process as it will raise public awareness, understanding and appreciation of the law and CH protection issues.

3.2 The need for human capacity building and institutional development

Despite the existence of many CH organizations, one can generalize that with the exception of archeology, all the other elements of cultural heritage such as architecture, landscape, planning of historic centers, documentation and research, suffer greatly from a lack of expertise. There are hardly any specialists in architectural conservation, the planning of historic centers, documentation, and surveying. Most of the existing architects, planners and others, have so far gained their experience from practice in the field.

First of all there is a need to start to establish education about CH in schools by including CH in school curricula and in extracurricular activities (such as field visits).

Although there exists a great lack of expertise, none of the departments of architecture at the different Palestinian universities teach conservation, rehabilitation, the planning of historic towns, or any other fields related to cultural heritage documentation, protection, rehabilitation and management. Since school curricula and extracurricular activities do not incorporate CH in their plans, students are largely unaware of cultural heritage's existence much less its significance. As for universities, architectural heritage

is discussed only in terms of conservation work and / or archeological topics and rarely features in planning courses.

Rehabilitation not only covers the protection of architectural heritage but also the use of heritage as a tool for local community development. Therefore in addition to heritage professionals, rehabilitation should also include people with expertise in socio-economic development as well as legal and environmental issues who can look holistically at the issues. Unfortunately, these experts are not available. Consequently CH institutions should employ and train experts other than architects, archaeologists, and planners amongst their staff.

3.2.1 Government Employees

The vast majority of Governmental employees are trained to deal with historic buildings as archeological sites rather than as buildings that can fully function and be adapted to modern use. This approach makes it harder for CH institutions because of the difference in perspectives and policies. Governmental institutions should employ other experts amongst their staff and not only archeologists. A comprehensive approach towards dealing with architectural heritage would be more realistic to achieve once the new law is ratified.

3.2.2 Local Governments involvement

The major problem is the lack of involvement on the part of local government institutions in the process of development and rehabilitation which is due to their limited perspective on master plans. Councils view master plans as zoning plans rather than as tools for development. Local councils have the ability to affect the overall development of heritage sites using these plans.

Training professionals in local government institutions is of the utmost importance. Those institutions can be considered the guardians of heritage and could prevent the destruction of historic buildings in addition to controlling and inspecting new building and additions to historic buildings. Incentives should be provided for local government institutions to help persuade local population, especially the most vulnerable, of the value of rehabilitation. The establishment of heritage units in local government institutions is extremely important, since the employees at these institutions are usually overwhelmed by the volume of work and lack appropriate expertise. If possible, training and capacity building should include the residents of the building(s) and the local community, as well as professionals from different disciplines.

The above proposals would entail the allocation of specific budgets for systematic training and capacity building. Training should aim to build on the knowledge gained from existing rehabilitation projects mainly in planning and architecture conservation, as well as filling the gap in the other expertise mentioned above. Training professionals internationally through exchange programs and attendance at conferences and courses should also be encouraged.

4. CHAPTER FOUR

An Integrated Approach to Rehabilitation

The main challenge for all cultural heritage stakeholders is how to revive a social, economic, as well as cultural life in historic centers that have been totally or partially abandoned. This can only be achieved through an appropriate balance between the physical improvement of the built environment (and infrastructure) and sustainable socio-economic projects.

Rehabilitation can be defined as a process (as opposed to a rigid historical preservation approach) in which a series of interventions and actions are carried out in order to improve the physical and develop the social, economic and cultural environment for people living in historic centers. It is about improving the quality of life of the local population, while at the same time ensuring the protection of the historic buildings and the value embedded in them. Rehabilitation includes reviving the ideals of the historic landscape whilst also allowing for modern interventions and adapting to the needs of contemporary modern living standards.

Rehabilitation also entails moving away from a fragmented approach to each element of cultural and natural heritage and adopting a more integrated approach. This integrated approach considers heritage in its global historical, social, and economic contexts. Such an approach is not just a policy statement but requires a genuine shift in attitude, from one concerned with objects into a policy concerned with spaces. This would encourage an approach that protects, enhances and develops a whole site (rather than dispersed or separate objects) and would emphasise their interconnectedness.

Moreover, implementing this integrated approach implies the systematic cooperation of all stakeholders at every level; it specifically requires that cooperation over the management of cultural and natural heritage assets and in relation to all relevant aspects of protection, enhancement, conservation or re-use of protected heritage. It is also essential to ensure the involvement of the residents and users throughout the process of rehabilitation.

4.1 Socio- economic development:

The oPt faces economic difficulties typical of all third world countries in addition to an occupation that prevents the development of an independent Palestinian economy. As a result, a whole nation becomes totally dependent on funds allocated for “humanitarian relief” which feeds into the “dependency paradigm”.

Given the enormous constraints and restrictions imposed by this context, the real challenge is how to encourage some elements of development within the type of projects which are currently being funded? In other words in this difficult political and economic situation, how can cultural heritage projects become a tool for economic and social

development (poverty alleviation, job creation and income generation) rather than an economic liability?

In the case of the oPt today, cultural heritage projects would be valued in the short term for their ability to generate economic and social development and higher standards of living and in the long term (whenever peace prevails) as the most viable economic component (tourism and housing) in the future Palestinian national and regional economies.

As a matter of urgency, international funding agencies should be asked to focus their efforts on long term development projects rather than on short term relief projects. CH institutions should be lobbied and networked in order to secure a united approach for the use of international funds.

Below we laid out the elements that contribute to the socio-economic development of the poor and most vulnerable:

4.1.1 Poverty Alleviation

- Generally speaking, architectural heritage is concentrated in run-down areas that are mostly inhabited by the poorest and most vulnerable sectors of society. Rehabilitating this heritage is not only an incentive for development in the general sense, it is also a means for alleviating poverty and creating a more equitable distribution of resources and infrastructure. This goal is highly possible since according to Riwaq's registry, about half of the historic buildings are either empty (36.2%) or partially used (9%). These buildings can be used for housing projects, community centers and activities (cultural institutions, women's associations, youth activities, health organizations, schools, etc.), as well as economic activities appropriate for historic centers (commercial areas, tourist services, etc.).
- The creation of meaningful jobs functions to alleviate poverty. Conservation is a labour-intensive, skilled activity that requires extensive use of local materials. Based on Riwaq's experience, 80% of the budget is allocated for labour in the case of preventive conservation (conservation of buildings on the outside) and 65% in the case of complete conservation (outside and inside).
- Improving the physical environment (conservation, preventive conservation, and infrastructure) dramatically changes the perspective of a local community towards their historic environment, as previous slums are regenerated and developed. It also increases the real estate value of properties, which can help improve the economic as well as social situation of low-income families living in historic centers (this issue requires further impact studies so as to avoid the pitfall of gentrification).
- The local population accesses a broader range of cultural inputs through exposure to cultural and social activities that take place inside historic centers.

- The physical living environment as well the infrastructure are upgraded.
- Needs assessment reports will be required in order to prioritize rural and deprived areas and the services that they urgently require. This will not only result in better services but also in a change in social conditions. In addition, these areas would experience a rise in real estate values and an increase in the income and wellbeing of some of their inhabitants.
- Historic centers should include a mix of social classes and different social groups. Not only the poor should be encouraged to live in and re-use historic buildings.
- The historic center should be included in the design of development master plans, which would enable the historic center to be integrated with other areas in the town and be included in the process of development plans and future visions.

4.1.2 The Development of Tourism:

Historic centres and buildings are focal points attracting both local and international tourism. The ongoing presence of tourists (local and international) brings opportunities for increased cultural exchange and understanding of other communities and nationalities.

Tourism will be one of the major sectors in the future Palestinian economy and CH is the basis of this sector. Worldwide tourism is now moving away from the traditional monument-oriented approach and is becoming more greatly attuned to local cultures and indigenous fabrics. As a living cultural environment, historic centers and buildings offer a wide range of options to tourists.

4.1.3 Providing appropriate housing:

The rehabilitation of historic centres and buildings is considered a cheaper housing option for local communities. Per square meter, building a new house is twice as expensive as conserving a historic building.

4.1.4 Good Governance, community and private sector participation:

Ensuring sustainability through a genuine process of good governance including local community empowerment: By developing a viable process of community participation in rehabilitation and involvement in decision making, the communities themselves become the real beneficiaries, owners, and sustainers of the project.

This will allow for a decentralized system of governance and decision making which empowers local government bodies (e.g. municipalities and village councils) and local institutions. The central government controls policy but has limited implementation resources. While the local government is better equipped to implement policies while lacking human and financial resources, nongovernmental organizations (NGO) possess

both financial and human resources. This situation calls for a cooperative strategy between the central government, local government and NGOs.

Other national and local institutions need to be lobbied and networked in order to persuade them to incorporate historic buildings in their activities and outreach plans. We have witnessed many cases in which new buildings have been constructed as clinics and community centers on land either outside the centers or in place of older buildings, whilst tens of historic buildings that could have been used are left abandoned. Using historic buildings provides one of the best ways of preserving them.

4.1.5 The Private Sector

So far, the role of the local **private sector** in the process of development in historic centres has been marginal. Although in the oPt political and economic instability is the main obstacle to investment, none of the numerous windows of opportunity that have existed and still remain for private investment have included heritage. The private sector should play a part in the process of rehabilitation. Investment by the private sector in historic centers and buildings facilitates the process of rehabilitation. The right balance should be found so that the well-being of residents and historic buildings takes precedence. It is important to diversify financial resources for the rehabilitation and management of architectural heritage and to include the international and local private sectors.

4.1.6 Financial and Human Resources:

Rehabilitation includes capacity building and training components. A “Heritage Fund” should be established to provide incentives, to subsidize soft loans for conservation work and to deal with the emergency protection of historic buildings and monuments. It will be important to provide incentives (such as services and conservation work) for the people living in historic centers, especially for those who have no other housing alternative, if the construction of new buildings and extensions is to be controlled.

5. CHAPTER FIVE

National Rehabilitation Priorities and Program

5.1 Whole centers vs. single buildings

Due to the accelerating destruction of cultural heritage in the oPt, one can argue that we need a more forceful and comprehensive approach towards the protection and rehabilitation of architectural heritage. This entails focusing efforts on the rehabilitation of historic centers rather than single historic buildings. With the partial exception of the case of Hebron, there has been no experience of the revitalization of an entire historic center. So far, the activities of CH institutions have mainly concentrated on the rehabilitation of individual historic buildings. This approach, of course, entails seeking larger amounts of funding (local and international) for each site.

5.2 Rural vs. urban

The main focus for most institutions has been on urban rather than rural areas. Although urban historic centers are important, more effort needs to be directed towards marginalized rural areas where most of historic centers are located.

5.3 All stakeholders

The process of rehabilitation is rooted in a one-sided process, that of CH institutions. The role of local government and communities as well as of the private sector has so far been marginalized. Local government institutions should be empowered and should involve local communities as well as the private sector in the process of rehabilitation.

5.4 A national agenda and program (defining priorities)

Within the context of scarce resources and / or limited funds we need to identify priorities as well as criteria for selecting historic centers for rehabilitation.

Based on Riwaq's Registry (2006) of the 422 listed towns and villages, at least fifty historic centers require urgent rehabilitation. According to the criteria set out below, a list comprised of 50 villages and 12 towns (a total of 62 sites) has been identified. Protecting those sites will ultimately mean the protection of 55.5% of the historic buildings in the oPt (see attached table #2, P.20).

Criteria for choosing a rehabilitation priority list:

- a. The existence of a traditional architectural **fabric** that is intact and homogenous.

- b. The **number** of historic buildings: the larger the number of historic buildings in a given site the more historic buildings are protected by rehabilitating the site.
- c. The historic, economic, social as well as political **importance** of historic centers.
- d. **Themes**: the selection should consider not only individual items but also general themes that reflect historic, social and economic as well as political phenomena; rural semi-feudal throne villages, caravanserai routes, desert monasteries, etc.
- e. **Representation**: since each age has its own concept of what is important and since science is constrained by its own history and by the limitations of methodology, protection should never be assessed solely on the basis of research priority or political considerations. The basic principle in all protection should be that cultural and natural assets should be protected in their own right and in all their diversity, as far as possible. Representation deals with the richness and variety of a nation's heritage.
- f. **Rarity** and uniqueness in the style of building and in the design and structure of the historic center and its fabric.
- g. The place of a historic center in the **landscape** (position and location) as well as the historic center's relation with the surrounding built and natural environment.
- h. The importance and value of the **surrounding environment**.
- i. The seriousness and **commitment** of the local partner/s, mainly municipalities and village councils, as well as other civil society initiatives.

6. CHAPTER SIX

Conclusion: A Summary for a Future Approach

Rehabilitation is a plan / vision that ensures a longer, more productive life for architectural heritage. It is a process that may result in further development in many Palestinian villages and towns and hence will positively impact the wellbeing of the inhabitants. In order to achieve such a goal, there is a need for a shared understanding of the challenges to and potential remedies for this development process.

The previous discussion described in detail the multifaceted policy approach that needs to be adopted. It is understood that a large and sudden change will never take place. Nonetheless, a cumulative process of incremental change is possible. Again, this needs to be based on a common goal and shared views about the process.

Finally, we summarize a list of the most important issues that need to be prioritized in order to protect our architectural heritage:

- 1- Ratifying the new **law** for CH protection in the oPt. Until that happens the existing laws for the protection of historic centers and buildings should be used.
- 2- Placing CH as a **priority** on the national agenda (hence, greater budgets).
- 3- Including architectural heritage protection and rehabilitation in the **national development plans and the master plans** for each city, town and village.
- 4- Concentrating efforts on the **rehabilitation of historic centers** rather than historic buildings.
- 5- Concentrating rehabilitation efforts on **rural**, marginalized areas rather than on the few famous existing urban centers.
- 6- Seeking multiple sources of funding (national and international), as well as establishing a national “**Heritage Fund**” (conservation and incentives).
- 7- Involving the private sector.
- 8- Empowering **local government** institutions as well as **local communities**.
- 9- **Coordinating** the work of CH institutions based on a set of defined criteria.
- 10- Investing in human **capacity building and training** of professionals as well as engineers, contractors, workers, etc.

Table #1: Average percentage of historic center area to master plan area in 14 sites

no	Town name	Historic Centre Area (dunum)	Master plan Area (dunum)	Percentage (Historic Centre area over Mater plan area) %
1	Deir Ghassaneh	52.832	5629	0.94
2	Deir Istia	50.68	1527	3.32
3	Jamma'in	74.03	2907.3	2.55
4	'Ebween	46.26	2345.58	1.97
5	at-Tayiba	55.55	3455.9	1.61
6	Mazari' en-Nubani	44.81	3059.7	1.46
7	Adh-Dhahiriya	132.5	15123.7	0.88
8	Bruqin	17.85	1860	0.96
9	Al-Mazra'a Al-Qibliya	19.77	3426	0.58
10	Birzeit	39.14	6663.5	0.59
11	Ramallah	121.2	11358	1.07
12	Sabastiya	70.7	2104	0.33
13	El-Jeeb	30.3	790.4	3.83
14	'Ein Siniya	15.4	886.96	1.7
Percentage average				1.56

Table # 2: A provisional list of 62 sites with priority for protection

#	Governorate	Locality	Historic No. of Buildings	Year of Listing
1	Jerusalem	(Al-Quds) Old City of Jerusalem & Outside the Old City Wall	4083	1999
2	Nablus	Nablus City	3397	1995
3	Hebron	Hebron City\ (Al Khalil)	1914	1999
4	Hebron	Yatta	1283	2000
5	Jenin	Arraba	1009	1997
6	Hebron	Adh Dhahiriya	893	2000
7	Bethlehem	Bethlehem City	837	1995
8	Jerusalem	Abu Dis	554	1997
9	Hebron	Surif	548	2000
10	Tulkarem	Tulkarm City	546	1996
11	Hebron	As Samu'	530	2000
12	Nablus	'Asira ash Shamaliya	458	1997
13	Jenin	Jenin City	422	1996
14	Jericho	Jericho City (Ariha)	422	1999
15	Jenin	Ya'bad	420	1997
16	Gaza Strip	Gaza City	417	2000
17	Ramallah&Al Bireh	Deir Gassaneh & Beit Rima	411	1997
18	Bethlehem	Beit Jala	398	1995
19	Tulkarem	'Anabta	390	1997
20	Hebron	Bani Na'eem	383	1999
21	Ramallah&Al Bireh	Ramallah City	381	1994
22	Tubas	Burqa	371	1997
23	Nablus	Beita	363	1997
24	Hebron	Halhul	360	1999
25	Tubas	Tubas City	357	1999
26	Hebron	Sa'ir	354	2000
27	Jenin	Silat adh Dhahr	344	1997
28	Hebron	Idhna	343	1999
29	Ramallah&Al Bireh	Rantis	326	1997
30	Bethlehem	Beit Sahur	322	1995
31	Nablus	Aqraba	321	2000
32	Hebron	Ash Shuyukh	298	2000
33	Ramallah&Al Bireh	Ni'lin	292	1997
34	Ramallah&Al Bireh	'Abud	281	1997
35	Nablus	Burin	268	1998
36	Salfit	Deir Istiya	255	1997
37	Jerusalem	Beit Iksa	248	1997
38	Ramallah&Al Bireh	Beituniya	221	1997
39	Qalqilya	Qalqilya City	219	1997
40	Nablus	Jamma'in	217	1997
41	Jerusalem	Beit Hanina	195	2001
42	Bethlehem	Al 'Ubeidiya	189	2000
43	Ramallah&Al Bireh	At Tayba	188	2000
44	Nablus	Sabastiya	183	1997

45	Salfit	Salfit City	167	1999
46	Ramallah&Al Bireh	'Abwein	163	1997
47	Jenin	Sanur	151	1997
48	Bethlehem	Beit Fajjar	149	2000
49	Salfit	Bruqin	139	2000
50	Ramallah&Al Bireh	Bir Zeit	130	1999
51	Ramallah&Al Bireh	Deir 'Ammar	110	2000
52	Ramallah&Al Bireh	Al Mazra'a al Qibliya	97	2000
53	Ramallah&Al Bireh	Mazari' an Nubani	96	1999
54	Ramallah&Al Bireh	'Ajjul	90	2000
55	Jerusalem	Al Jib	82	1999
56	Nablus	Beit Wazan	65	1997
57	Ramallah&Al Bireh	Deir Ibzi'	62	1997
58	Ramallah&Al Bireh	Jilijliya	56	2000
59	Ramallah&Al Bireh	'Ein Siniya	44	2000
60	Jerusalem	Jaba'	39	2001
61	Tulkarem	Kur	29	1997
62	Ramallah&Al Bireh	Ras Karkar	27	2000
Total Number of Historic Buildings			27907 (55.5% of total historic buildings in the oPt)	