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The purpose of this study is to give a broad overview of the potential for housing rehabilitation in Historic Cairo. It provides a brief description of the housing rehabilitation and it provides an initial characterization of the housing sector, outlines housing rehabilitation issues, opportunities and constraints related to Historic Cairo. Moreover, this study provides and prioritizes recommendations for further action and details of a comprehensive rehabilitation study.

الغرض من هذه الدراسة هو إعطاء لمحة عامة عن إمكانية إعادة تأهيل الإسكان في القاهرة التاريخية. توفر الدراسة وصفاً موجزاً لإعادة تأهيل الإسكان وكذلك توصيفاً أولياً لقطاع الإسكان. وتحدد قضايا إعادة التأهيل وكذلك الفرص والقيود المتعلقة بالقاهرة التاريخية. كما توفر الدراسة وتعطي أولوية لتوصيات للعمل وتفاصيل دراسة شاملة لإعادة التأهيل.
Cairo has been a dominant political, cultural, commercial and religious capital throughout history playing a prominent role during Fatimids, reaching its golden age during Mamluks, and sustaining its cosmopolitan significance during Ottoman times. Due to its unique peculiar skyline, it has been known to scholars and historians as “City of the thousand minarets”. Historic Cairo was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979 recognizing its “absolutely unquestionable historical, archaeological and urbanistic importance.” Upon ICOMOS recommendation, the inscription was based on the following criteria:

1. Several of the great monuments of Cairo are incontestable masterpieces;
2. The historic centre of Cairo groups numerous streets and old dwellings and thus maintains, in the heart of the traditional urban fabric, forms of human settlement, which go back to the middle Ages;
3. The historic centre of Cairo constitutes an impressive material witness to the international importance on the political, strategic, intellectual and commercial level of the City during the medieval period.

URHC Goals and Objectives In July 2010, UNESCO-WHC launched the Urban Regeneration Project for Historic Cairo (URHC) in the framework of a larger program of technical assistance to the Egyptian Government concerning the management of the World Heritage Site, focusing on the following objectives:

1. The preparation of a Conservation Plan for Historic Cairo’s “Core and Buffer Zones”, which would include the Management Plan required by the WH Operational Guidelines;
2. The establishment of an institutional framework to undertake and develop a sustainable urban conservation policy, promoting coordination and collaboration amongst different institutions, administrations and agencies concerned with the management of the World Heritage Site;
3. The creation of an appropriate and shared information platform for urban conservation.

To achieve these goals, an interdisciplinary team of local and international consultants are collaborating with the concerned bodies to develop a set of protection measures in order to uphold the site’s Outstanding Universal Value, to prevent further decay of the historic urban fabric and to enhance the socio-economic conditions of Historic Cairo.
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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This housing rehabilitation study is conducted in support to the ‘Urban Regeneration Project for Historic Cairo’ (URHC project) within the framework of the program ‘Safeguarding of Cultural Heritage in Egypt’, managed by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre in close coordination with the responsible national authorities. The purpose of this study is to give a broad overview of the potential for housing rehabilitation in Historic Cairo as well as outlining a program of possible comprehensive study to further explore the feasibility of this aspect on a more detailed level.

The first section provides a background of the mission through a brief description of the housing rehabilitation study in Historic Cairo. It also demonstrates the aspects of the methods employed by the Consultant during the course of this study between October and December 2011. This includes literature review, field surveys and questionnaires with a limited sample of the local inhabitants and contractors active in construction activities in Historic Cairo.

The second section includes an analysis of housing rehabilitation issues and constraints through investigating the existing development context including aspects of demographic transformations in Historic Cairo between 1882 and 2006, traditional and modern housing types, and different conditions of residential buildings. This section also provides an overview of the existing legal environment including an outline of existing laws, decrees, policies and procedures affecting housing aspects and construction activities in general. Finally, this section includes an outline of the stakeholders involved in housing stock management and their roles, as well as a list of current and previous programs and projects addressing the housing sector in Historic Cairo.

The third section provides an initial characterization of the housing sector through highlighting the results of the field survey carried out during the study. This survey included structured interviews with 94 respondents living in different neighborhoods of Historic Cairo both in traditional and modern dwelling units. The survey also included semi-structured interviews conducted with 6 contractors and building entrepreneurs active in different areas of Historic Cairo to get their views about the real estate market in the area and prospects for housing activities in general. Finally, this section concludes with an outline of housing rehabilitation issues, opportunities and constraints based on the existing development context and the views of local inhabitants and contractors. This outline covers legal, institutional, social, financial, economic, built environment, and tourism related issues, as well as post 25th January 2011 impact on Historic Cairo.

The last section of this study provides recommendations for further action and details of a comprehensive rehabilitation study to be carried out through the URHC project activities. It illustrates housing rehabilitation priorities in Historic Cairo and what needs to be done on the short and medium terms. It also outlines further housing studies that need to be carried out to develop a sustainable housing rehabilitation study in Historic Cairo. The recommended studies include documentation of architectural and urban heritage aspects; details of a proposed physical survey; and social, legal, institutional, financial and economic aspects that need to be further investigated.

Finally, the appendices include the Terms of Reference related to this study, list of materials received from URHC project team, bibliography and documents for background readings, and report maps including a base map of the study area, map illustrating change in number of population in different Qisms between 1976 and 2006, locations of different interview respondents, and a map showing status of regulation decrees in ADAA along the Ayyubid Historic Wall in 2005.
2. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

2.1. DESCRIPTION OF THE HOUSING REHABILITATION STUDY IN HISTORIC CAIRO

The purpose of this study is to give a broad overview of the potential for housing rehabilitation in Historic Cairo as well as outlining a program of possible comprehensive study to further explore the feasibility of this aspect on a more detailed level. This study was undertaken by the Consultant between October and December 2011 in response to the Terms of Reference stated by art. 1 par. A of the contract no. 4500155422 signed on 3rd October 2011.¹

2.2. KEY ASPECTS OF METHOD

The main intention of this study is not to conduct a detailed research that is based on solid scientific grounds, rather is to give an overview of the development context of housing rehabilitation in Historic Cairo; highlight relevant trends and main issues; and finally raise questions and explore avenues for further detailed investigation of the technical, financial and legal feasibility of housing rehabilitation in Historic Cairo.

To this effect, and given the limited timeframe of this study, the Consultant employed two main methods: i) review of secondary data available through previous technical studies and reports; and ii) field investigations through questionnaires with local inhabitants and semi-structured interviews with local contractors active in Historic Cairo. The study findings also included, where applicable, comparisons with results of previous studies conducted by AKTC in ADAA in 2003 and 2009 to better understand housing trends in Historic Cairo.

The following is a description of the steps followed by the Consultant during the course of this study:

- Meet with the URHC project team, Scientific Coordinator and other sector studies consultants to establish a common understanding of the mission framework with URHC project team and verify potential mission stakeholders and parameters;
- Collect preliminary data on related programs and activities available through the URHC project team and stakeholders including:
  - URHC project reports and materials including maps, mission reports and tables of information collected and produced by the URHC team over the course of the project²
  - Historic census data of Historic Cairo on the Qism level for the years 1882, 1897, 1917, 1927, 1937, and 1947, 1960, 1966, 1976, 1986, 1996, and 2006 to better understand the demographic transformations that took place in Historic Cairo over the past century
  - Books, technical reports, maps and images from different resources for literature review purposes and to provide bibliography of relevant materials to support the study activities and provide background readings³
- Provide an initial characterisation of the development context including demographic transformations in Historic Cairo over the past century as well as housing types and conditions based on secondary data;
- Outline different aspects of the housing stock management in Historic Cairo including:
  - The legislative environment;
  - Stakeholders involved in housing stock management;
  - Current and previous programs and projects addressing the housing sector

¹ Please see Appendix I: Terms of Reference
² Please see Appendix III: List of materials received from URHC project team
³ Please see Appendix IV: Bibliography and Documents for Background Readings
- Develop and conduct household survey and quick assessment of housing rehabilitation related issues through interviews with a sample of Historic Cairo inhabitants. This assessment covers several aspects including identification of critical issues with reference to housing tenure, densities, services and facilities;
- Conduct semi-structured interviews with construction entrepreneurs and contractors active in Historic Cairo to identify and evaluate the existing ‘uncontrolled’ and ‘spontaneous’ construction, maintenance and rehabilitation practices including financial aspects and alternative housing solutions available for the residents;
- Outline a program of a possible comprehensive study on housing rehabilitation in the Historic Cairo WH site and identify risks, assumptions and sustainability issues relevant to the proposed rehabilitation program.

3. ANALYSIS: HOUSING REHABILITATION ISSUES AND CONSTRAINTS

3.1. THE EXISTING DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

3.1.1. Demographic Transformations in Historic Cairo between 1882 and 2006

The study covers the area identified by the URHC as the domain for intervention in Historic Cairo. This area covers 89 Shiyakhats distributed over 11 Qisms of Cairo Governorate with total population of 431,580 inhabitants in 2006. Through the study it was possible to obtain demographic data for the 11 Qisms, however this data was available for some certain years on the Qism level only. Therefore in order to utilize this data for analytical purposes, some of the study statistics refer to all Shiyakhats included in the administrative boundaries of the 11 Qisms amounting up to 137 Shiyakhats with total population of 908,614 inhabitants in 2006.  

The demographic analysis shows that Historic Cairo population has been slowly growing between 1882 and the middle of the 20th century; when Historic Cairo started to lose its inhabitants mainly to other parts of the City of Cairo. However, when compared to the rate of population growth of the City of Cairo it is evident that the percentage of Historic Cairo population compared to the total population of the City of Cairo has been constantly decreasing since 1882.

---

[4] It is worthy of note that Manshiet Nasser Qism represents a significant portion of this population with total of 262,050 inhabitants in 2006 and that data available for this Qism only covers the years of 1986, 1996 and 2006.
This decrease of population did not uniformly take place all over the different Qisms of Historic Cairo. According to CAPMAS data, this decrease started to take place at an early stage in 1947 in areas close to Khedival Cairo including Bulaq, Abdin and Al Azbakiyya. Two decades later and starting from 1966 as per CAPMAS data, other Qisms of Historic Cairo started to witness a similar decrease except for Al Gamaliyya, Misr Al Qadima and Al Muski which all started losing their population starting from 1976.

The rate of decrease also differed from an area to another within Historic Cairo. For instance between 1976 and 2006, northern Qisms of Historic Cairo such as Al-Gamaliyya and Bulaq have been losing their inhabitants at a faster rate than southern Qisms including Sayeda Zeinab and Al Khalifa. However, this is still considered as rough analysis that still needs to be confirmed by further studies on the ShiyaKhats level. For instance, Al Khalifa Qism reflects an increase in population starting from 1986 most probably due to addition of new ShiyaKhats and the development of the Moqattam area which is located outside of the geographic boundaries of Historic Cairo.

---

5 For more information on the percentage of population decrease in different Qisms of Historic Cairo please see Appendix V: Report Maps: Change in Number of Population (1976 - 2006)
This continuous decrease of population was not only quantitative, but was also paralleled by a qualitative loss of social assets. This was primarily due to the reason that a significant portion of the families that left Historic Cairo were privileged with higher educational and economic levels. For instance, a baseline survey carried out by AKTC in 2003 in ADAA shows that almost 70% of the families living there where living under poverty line by that time (Shehayeb & Salkeld, Darb al-Ahmar phase II, Baseline Survey 2003, 2004).

3.1.2. Housing Types

Over the past decades Historic Cairo witnessed major transformations in its housing typologies. One of the different approaches to understand existing building typologies was the approach employed by AKTC in a comprehensive housing study that took place in ADAA in 1999 focusing on a stretch of the urban fabric along the Ayyubid Historic Wall. The methodology employed assessed buildings in terms of several factors, namely their plan, elevation, design, use, setting, construction technology, and materials. This approach allows for better understanding of the socio-economic status of the area, as well as the lifestyles and needs of the residents (Historic Cities Support Programme, The Aga Khan Trust for Culture, 1999).

In general terms, existing housing in Historic Cairo can be categorized into two main categories: i) traditional buildings that were built before the 1950s using traditional building techniques and materials and share certain architectural features; and ii) modern buildings that were built post 1950s where traditional materials and techniques were mostly abandoned, leading into new building typologies that reflect modern lifestyle that started slowly changing the face of Historic Cairo. Each of these two main categories includes sub-typologies that mostly differ based on the housing solution they offer and residents’ lifestyle they serve.

However, similarities still can be found in some traditional and modern building typologies given that the residents’ lifestyle has not significantly changed over time in some areas of Historic Cairo. For instance, spatial arrangement of traditional townhouses that used to exist in Historic Cairo’s mostly residential alleyways can still be traced in similar post 1950s modern structures built to serve a very similar lifestyle.

On the other hand, declining economic conditions resulted into the gradual disappearance of some traditional building types (such as mansions) that nowadays can be considered too luxurious for the area. This process of gradual replacement of former mansions with less luxurious high-rise modern apartment buildings can be easily traced when comparing the cadastral maps of the 1930s with the existing urban fabric especially in areas such as ADAA and el-Helmíyya. A quick analysis of these maps can show that large plots of land that used to be occupied by mansions where subdivided into smaller plots and are currently occupied by completely different building types.

Finally, some building types have evolved over time into more modern building types such as Rab’ – a collective housing unit occupied by multiple families – which has evolved into modern apartment buildings that are more economic and capable of housing large numbers of inhabitants. Despite these different transformations, one common feature continued to render Historic Cairo’s residential buildings. It is the existence of commercial spaces in the ground floor of residential buildings – whether traditional or modern – located along main streets and thoroughfares of Historic Cairo. In the case of modern structures, commercial activities in the ground floor are almost always provided, even in small alleyways, where traditionally there were no commercial activities.

It is also evident that the transformations that took place in Historic Cairo’s housing types and typologies over the past decades resulted into less diverse housing solutions that can cater for the spatial needs of different social and economic groups. This is clearly shown in this study through the field investigation results in regards to difference between traditional and modern dwelling units’ sizes.

The following is an outline and brief description of traditional and modern housing types that still can be found in Historic Cairo:
Traditional Structures

Traditional Townhouse

Traditional townhouses are residential buildings that were initially constructed between the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. This housing typology was developed to meet certain urban, social and economic conditions that still exist; therefore their architectural principles remain popular until today. Most of these traditional buildings are built with bearing walls and wooden floors on small and narrow plots of land with a linear-based arrangement of interior spaces since most of them have only one façade. They are often found in groups of 2-4 storey high attached buildings representing continuous street facades, especially in small residential alleyways.

Given that most of these buildings are developed on small plots of land rarely exceeding 40 square meters, they often include lightwells to allow light and air into the building; and the upper floors usually project over the street to provide additional living space. When these buildings are located along main streets, their ground floor is often occupied by commercial activities and only an entrance and a staircase leading to the upper residential floors of the building. In smaller alleyways, however, buildings were constructed to be solely residential.

Usually, such a building was developed for a single extended middle-class family, but following the different demographic transformations in Historic Cairo these buildings are often subdivided into smaller residential units occupied by lower income groups. It is also possible to distinguish if these buildings where originally built for a single extended family or a small group of nuclear families by tracing if their staircases are clearly separate from their living areas, creating a distinction between public and private space or not. In buildings originally constructed for single families, there is no such differentiation and the staircase is fully integrated with the rest of the house, an arrangement that is often altered when these buildings are later occupied by different nuclear families.

This transformation of the type of occupants has lead into a situation where different families share one bathroom that used to serve one family in the past. In addition, most of these buildings did not originally include a separate kitchen or a space dedicated for cooking activities. As a result of this situation, living conditions in such buildings have severely degraded over the past century. While these buildings were initially constructed a century ago, they have remained functional even today. In part, their success lies in the fact that they generally consist of small spaces that are versatile and multi-functional. The qualities of their architectural solutions and spatial arrangements remain attractive to many residents in Historic Cairo (Historic Cities Support Programme, The Aga Khan Trust for Culture, 1999).
Traditional Mansion

Traditional mansions are indented to house one or few families and can take two main forms; both are considerably larger than traditional townhouses. The first form is generally an upper middle-class, three- to four-storey structure, consisting of a few semi-separate apartments, mostly with similar floor plans. In general, these structures are greatly influenced by European architectural trends that emerged in Downtown Cairo at the end of the 19th century and early 20th century. Buildings of this type consist of formal floor plans with a central hall surrounded by rooms. The façade detailing is generally inspired by neo-classical and neo-baroque architecture. This type of buildings was popular in other areas of Cairo between 1900 and 1925 such as el-Daher area and it reflected a more bourgeois lifestyle.

The second form within this category is a much more palatial structure, generally constructed surrounding a large courtyard. Buildings of this type usually date from the second half of the 19th century, when wealthy families still resided in Historic Cairo. The architecture of these buildings reflect a combination of both local and foreign architectural styles where the idea of a central courtyard is inherited from upper-class Cairene houses while the arrangement of the rooms follows a more European pattern. These elaborate structures, reflecting a lifestyle and socioeconomic status that no longer exist in Historic Cairo, were one of the most vulnerable building types to encroachment and demolition. And although very few such buildings remain in Historic Cairo, there is evidence that they were not uncommon at the turn of the century, before the economic decline of Historic Cairo. The majority of what remains of these structures to date is ruined, irreversibly altered, subdivided and occupied by large number of low-income families, small commercial activities and workshops (Historic Cities Support Programme, The Aga Khan Trust for Culture, 1999).

Rab’

In addition to the previous building types there were also buildings built to house numerous families, representing an early model of social or communal housing. This building type, known as the Rab’, was initially developed in the Mamluk era as a housing solution for the lower and middle classes. It generally follows the spatial arrangement of commercial Wakals (Caravanserais) where small residential duplex or triplex residential units are arranged around a central courtyard with controlled access from the street. However more recent Rab’s developed at the end of the 19th century where slightly different since most of their residential units are single-storey apartments. These structures where highly efficient and used to house large number of mostly nuclear families in one building with shared utilities.
The Rab’ was not as common as the traditional townhouse since it required higher level of investment and some kind of organizational framework to coordinate the rental of different units, whereas traditional townhouses were mostly privately owned and owner-occupied. Since the beginning of the 20th century Rab’s started to disappear and were gradually replaced by modern apartment buildings (Historic Cities Support Programme, The Aga Khan Trust for Culture, 1999).

Traditional Apartment Building

Buildings of this type are often 3-4 storeys high and were generally built between the 1920s and 1940s to house multiple nuclear families. Usually, floors of these buildings are clearly divided into 2-3 separate apartments, each one with its own utilities. These buildings were usually built with bearing walls and wooden or concrete floors. They also reflect more modern infrastructure such as electricity, water and sewage connections. When located on main streets, the ground floor of these buildings often includes spaces for commercial activities on the street façade, in addition to one or two apartments on the rear side of the building.

Modern Structures

Modern Apartment Buildings

These are residential apartment buildings that were built after the 1950s and are often located on main streets and thoroughfares. They are generally built on plots that are larger than the ones used to build traditional and modern townhouses. In terms of construction, they consist of concrete skeleton structure with brick walls and are often finished with gunite cement plaster. Given their different construction technology they have four or more storeys with balconies and oriel that project over the street and facades that are more uniform and modular. They are also larger in size than traditional apartment buildings, but not necessarily with larger size apartments. This is especially typical to modern apartment buildings that were built over the past 3 decades since, for commercial reasons, they were subdivided into much smaller apartments with average unit size of 50-60 square meters.

In the 1970s and 1980s the facades of these buildings had more functional look and almost seemed neutral. However, over the past decade owners started to decorate the façades of these buildings with...
their own interpretation of high-end neo-classical buildings that are rapidly spreading in new urban communities around Cairo. The result of this attempt is an awkward architectural product that does not fit within the context of Historic Cairo. Contrary to other housing types in the area, these buildings are designed with spaces for shops or workshops on the ground floor, irrespective of whether the street is a commercial thoroughfare or a residential alleyway, resulting into negative impact on the existing social networks in the area.

**Modern Townhouse**

These buildings resemble traditional townhouses in terms of footprint, floor plan arrangement, general configuration and massing. They were mostly built staring from the 1950s until today since, as mention earlier, they represent a successful architectural solution that meet the needs of lower middle-income classes in the area. Modern townhouses are usually 2-4 storeys high, built with concrete and brick masonry with oriel s that project over the street to provide more living space in the upper floors.

**Substandard Housing**

**Makeshift Structures**

Such structures are often located in isolated pockets on relatively large plots of land within the urban fabric and are generally poorly constructed out of rubble, bricks or other makeshift materials such as wood or corrugated metal sheets. They are mostly one storey high and consist of small units that contain one or two rooms occupied by poor residents who share facilities such as bathrooms or water tabs. They also suffer from severely deteriorated physical and social conditions.

**Total and Partial Ruins**

These are remains of former structures that now consist of a ground floor either totally or partially full of rubble and garbage. However, many of these ruins still maintain valuable architectural features such as ornamented stone gateways, iron work windows and stone or wooden corbels. Partial ruins are often occupied with workshops, used as informal storage space and in some cases, used as dwelling units for poor families.
3.1.3. Housing Conditions

Given the limited scope of this study, it is difficult to assess the general housing conditions in Historic Cairo since this would involve a building survey with an acceptable level of detail to cover different parts of Historic Cairo’s urban fabric. Such comprehensive surveys took place in small segments of the urban fabric by different entities and institutions. However, these surveys can not be compared to each other or compiled to present the bigger picture of Historic Cairo since they took place in different periods of time and do not follow the same identification methodologies.

However, it is possible to refer to the surveys conducted by AKTC in 2005-2006 during the preparation ADAA Conservation Plan which was ratified by Cairo Governorate as the detailed plan for ADAA area. These surveys covered a significant area of the urban fabric including approximately 4,800 buildings. The results of these surveys show that in 2005-2006 building conditions (including mostly residential buildings) were as follows: 14% of the buildings were in good condition, 44% in deteriorating condition, 35% in poor condition and 7% were identified as ruins or partial ruins. In terms of type of construction: 38% of the buildings were traditional, 46% were modern, 9% were mixed traditional/modern structures and 7% were ruins or partial ruins.

The ADAA 2005-2006 physical survey included a general assessment of the external condition of all structures in addition to assessment of structural elements, finishes, roofing, and fittings to give a general description of the building condition. In order to better understand the terminology of each building condition category, the following is a description of each category as per AKTC definitions (Historic Cities Support Programme, The Aga Khan Trust for Culture, 1999):

**Good**

“Buildings in good condition appear structurally sound and show evidence of maintenance. Considered to be relatively new buildings, they usually have minor ground-floor damage caused by rising damp. With routine maintenance and upkeep, they have avoided many of the problems associated with other traditional structures, which for the most part were found to be in deteriorating to poor condition.”

**Deteriorating**

“Buildings in deteriorating condition do not have structural defects, but do show unmistakable signs of deterioration and no evidence of recent repairs: missing exterior plaster, exposed stonework and loose mortar, damaged roof surfaces, as well as doors and windows in poor condition indicate a need for prompt repair and general maintenance work.”
Poor

“Buildings in poor condition are in advanced state of deterioration and may have serious structural problems such as large structural cracks and missing components. These buildings are in need of urgent intervention, and, in some cases, complete sections may have to be rebuilt. Most of the structures in this category are shoddily built out of rubble and other materials, and therefore have not aged very well.”

Partial Ruin

“Buildings in a partially ruined condition mostly consist of only a ground floor, are generally the remains of traditional two- to three-storey buildings. Often, the remaining ground floor still retains several valuable architectural features such as iron window grilles, elaborate stone portals, stone corbels, and other decorative detailing. Used mainly for commercial purposes (shops and workshops occupy several of these structures), they usually have a certain level of upkeep, unlike the totally ruined structures.”

Total Ruin

“Buildings consisting of rubble or only a portion of the ground floor, total ruins are usually the remains of two- to three-storey buildings. Several of these structures collapsed during the 1992 earthquake, and what is left is beyond repair. These ruins are often vacant and used as garbage dumps.”

However, it is worthy of note that following the 25\textsuperscript{th} January Revolution the situation of the built environment in Historic Cairo, as well as many urban areas in Egypt, has dramatically changed. The absence of the already compromised State control during 2011 has lead to the demolition of a significant number of traditional buildings and flagrant building violations in terms of building heights that mushroomed all over Historic Cairo. The impact of 2011 building activities still needs to be assessed to get a better picture of the current built environment status in Historic Cairo.

3.2. LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENT

The housing stock in Historic Cairo is controlled through a set of institutional, legislative and financial tools. However, some of these tools are not effective, and are sometimes counterproductive, especially laws and decrees. Despite the fact that ‘Rule of Law’ is not effective in terms of controlling the built environment in Historic Cairo, especially after the revolution, but it would be useful to outline some of the existing legal instruments and assess their impact on the built environment. These laws, policies and procedures need to be further studied in detail to understand their complex relationships, deficiencies and, sometimes, their contradictions with heritage conservation requirements.

Existing Laws

The Unified Building Law no. 119/2008

This law controls planning and building activities in Egypt, thus affecting all building activities in Historic Cairo except for listed monuments which are controlled through the Antiquities Law. The following is a list of issues in the law that is relevant to housing rehabilitation aspects in Historic Cairo:

- The law clearly states the role of NOUH in relation to “Areas and Buildings of Peculiar Value” and the procedures to declare such areas and buildings;

- The law states the procedures for issuing “Detailed Plans” for urban areas which is relevant to the case of Historic Cairo in order to modify the existing plans;

- Most importantly, the law includes a set of planning and building regulations that contradict with the urban and architectural heritage of Historic Cairo. These regulations need to be revisited given the urban context of Historic Cairo, which can be achieved through extensive planning efforts with Cairo Governorate and NOUH.
The Antiquities Protection Law no. 117/1983

Despite the fact that this law is not directly related to housing and building issues in Historic Cairo, but it has an indirect impact on building activities as follows:

- The law gives the right to the authorities to surround existing monuments by a buffer zone where all types of construction or development are prohibited (Ibrahim, Housing rehabilitation: towards building community responsibility, 2007). The depth of this zone differs from a monument to another. One of the clear cases of the implementation of this policy was the eviction and demolition of dozens of residential buildings along the Northern Historic Wall of Cairo in mid 1990s in a claim to protect the Wall. In other case, the enforcement of this buffer zone takes place gradually through putting on hold any construction activities within the zone and leaving existing buildings to decay until they collapse to clear the area around the monument. It is evident that this policy has very negative impact on both the built environment and the monument itself, in addition to creating urban spaces and building lines that never existed before. It is worthy of note that AKTC, through piloting some housing rehabilitation initiatives along the Ayyubid Historic Wall in ADAA, managed to convince the SCA to abolish this policy at least along the Wall, allowing for the ratification of the ADAA Conservation Plan which is more sympathetic with the existing urban fabric.

- Another role of the SCA is to approve building permits within Historic Cairo to ensure that the proposed developments do not violate the permitted building heights or buffer zones. This approval is mandatory to obtain a building permit.


With the escalating responsibilities of the SCA the Egyptian parliament issued this law to protect buildings with peculiar architectural or historic value that are less significant than listed monuments. Buildings registered under this law are called ‘Buildings with Peculiar Architectural, Historic or Urban Value’ and in most cases their private ownership and occupancy status remains the same. Hence, their restoration, protection, and maintenance become a shared responsibility between the occupants, the owners, and the State (MoC and the competent governorate). In this case, the function and use of these buildings remain the same. Accordingly, the State protects such registered buildings against modification or demolition (Ibrahim, Extract from a Diary: Marginal Notes on the Soft Dialectics of Historic Cairo, 2009).

The main issue regarding this law is that it does not provide legal or financial incentives to building owners where they can benefit from the registration status. It does not either provide a financial mechanism through which these buildings can be rehabilitated and regularly maintained and this becomes the responsibility of the owners with no assistance from the authorities.

On a different note, very recently there have been some legal arguments and disputes regarding this law and some owners managed to delist their buildings though court orders. The main argument has to do with the contradiction of this law with the private ownership rights granted by the Egyptian constitution. This is a critical issue that needs to be further investigated.

Other law affecting housing rehabilitation in Historic Cairo

In addition to the above mentioned list of laws, there are some other laws that affect housing rehabilitation in Historic Cairo that merit further study and investigation. This list of laws includes but not limited to the following:

- Different rent laws including laws no. 49/1977, no. 136/1998, no. 4/1996, and no. 137/2006. These laws control the relationship between tenants and owners for residential and non-residential units. Currently there are further attempts to amend these laws to provide more rights to the owners to terminate the rental relationship. This will have significant impact on
housing issues in Historic Cairo since ‘old rent’ agreements are still a widespread housing solution to many residents;⁶

- The Law Promulgating the Real Estate Finance no. 148/2001 and its bylaws concerning real estate finance, guarantees and subsidy fund. This law can play a significant role in financing housing rehabilitation and new housing developments in Historic Cairo. However, the full potential of this tool is still not explored in the Egyptian context and it faces numerous obstacles;

- The Local Administration Law no. 43/1979 which states the subdivision of local administration levels and the relationship between different administration units and levels. This law is important to understand the roles and responsibilities of different local administration units including Governorates and Districts, and to propose new institutional frameworks;

- The Egyptian Awqaf Authority Law no. 80/1971 which regulates the role of the Authority in controlling Awqaf owned properties;

Existing Decrees

In addition to the aforementioned laws, Historic Cairo’s built environment is controlled by a set of official decrees. Among these decrees, there are two decrees that are most relevant to this study:

- Ministerial Decree no. 250/1990 which regulates building activities in Historic Cairo through a set of building guidelines and regulations, among which the building height regulation that was put into effect over the past couple of decades;

- The Decree Defining Boundaries and Building Regulations of Historic Cairo issued in 29th July 2009. This decree is an improved version of the above mentioned decree since it clearly states the boundaries of Historic Cairo and provides more detailed building regulations. However, the content of this decree can be further improved based on the findings of the URHC project

Existing Policies and Procedures

Policies and procedures governing the built environment in Historic Cairo do not only stem from the aforementioned list of laws and decrees, but also the institutional relationships between different stakeholders. The following is a brief outline of the most important issues related to these policies and procedures:

- **Regulation Lines**: these are building lines within which building activities are not permitted. These building lines are inherited from previous outdated plans prepared for Historic Cairo since the early 1970s and in some cases are based upon SCA buffer zones. These lines are set to widen existing roads, open new roads cutting through the old city or along important monuments. Despite the fact that this policy has proved to be futile, these lines still exist - hindering some upgrading plans;

- **Regulation Decrees**: these are administrative decrees issued by the Local District to decide - based on technical investigation – whether an existing building should be rehabilitated, partially demolished or totally demolished. These decrees are mandatory to issue a permit regulating the recommended action. The main problem with these decrees – which represents a major obstacle against rehabilitation of existing buildings in Historic Cairo – is that they are issued without any heritage related consideration. In addition, demolition decrees, once issued, cannot be reversed by the executive authorities and can only be abolished through a court case. As a result, hundreds of traditional and architecturally significant buildings in Historic Cairo are endangered by these decrees;

⁶ According to ‘old rent’ agreements, owners are not able to increase the rent value which is unreasonably meager or to unilaterally terminate rent contracts unless the building collapses or the contract is inherited to more than one generation. Therefore, many owners tend to deliberately demolish their buildings in order to benefit from their frozen asset
Building and Rehabilitation Permits: these are permits regulating building and rehabilitation activities issued by Local Districts. The permit process is often lengthy, complex and requires the involvement of different administrations including Local District and the SCA.

3.3. Stakeholders Involved in Housing Stock Management

In order to better understand different aspect of Historic Cairo’s housing stock management, it is important to complement the legislative environment with an outline of different stakeholders involved in this process. The following is a brief mapping of different institutional stakeholders, their interrelationships and responsibilities:

Cairo Governorate

According to Law 43/1979 (Local Administration Law), Cairo Governorate as a local administration unit, is responsible for the establishment and management of all public utilities within its domain except for national utilities. As part of its urban management related competences, the Governorate is responsible for proposing urban planning projects; approving housing, construction, and utilities’ plans and projects; and regulating building activities such as issuing building or demolition permits. A Governor heads the Governorate and he/she is in charge of supervising the execution of the State’s general policy, and has complete authority over all services and utilities within the scope of the Governorate.

The Governorate plays a key role in the housing sector given its mandate. More specifically it is responsible for:

- Development of detailed urban planning schemes and projects which has direct influence on existing districts and neighborhoods. Most importantly, these schemes entail ‘Regulation Lines’ which indicate areas of demolition or ‘freeze’ of construction activities with the purpose of widening existing roads or opening new ones through the existing urban fabric. Despite the fact that ‘detailed planning’ is the Governorate’s responsibility, but due to Governorate planning department’s weak level of capacity it is often assigned to the GOPP or external consultants;

- Supervision of the Local Districts’ role of issuing building, rehabilitation or demolition permits for individual buildings

These two specific roles have direct impact on shaping the built environment especially in Historic Cairo. Recently, Cairo Governorate established the ‘Cairo Urban Conservation Center’ to address issues of urban conservation in Cairo’s historic urban neighborhoods. Despite its important role and since its establishment the center has been under staffed and its activities have been almost on hold.

Local Districts

According to Law 43/1979 (Local Administration Law), Egyptian cities can be subdivided into Districts. Local Districts are the operational arm of the Governorate, especially when it comes to the implementation of different urban planning projects proposed and approved at the Governorate level.

Local Districts are also responsible for issuing building, rehabilitation or demolition permits in addition to monitoring and supervising all building activities within its domain. Each District is headed by a District Manager who is considered as the Governor’s representative for all financial and administrative matters within the District.

Given their mandate, Local Districts are highly influential on the individual buildings’ level as well as public open space maintenance and upgrading activities. Despite their influence on the built environment in areas such as Historic Cairo, District officials are not trained nor qualified to address building or urban conservation issues. Thus, their decisions in regards to the built environment in historic areas are often counterproductive. In some occasions NOUH decisions supersede the District decrees. However, and given the daily presence of the District officials on the micro level, their decisions have more impact on the built environment than other governmental agencies.
NOUH

MoC established NOUH in 2004 as an agency with a mandate to control the built environment through building regulations and other regulatory tools in an attempt to improve Egyptian cities' aesthetically deteriorated urban condition. NOUH’s main goal is to “permit the values of beauty to prevail all over the Egyptian urban space”. NOUH aims at applying the values of beauty to the exterior image of buildings, urban and monumental spaces, the bases of visual texture of cities and villages and all the civilized areas of the country including the new urban communities.

According to Law 119/2008 and its bylaw issued in 2011, NOUH’s main tasks are to:

- Assign scientific committees to devise ‘urban harmony’ criteria, regulations and guidelines in different fields including heritage areas, city centers, inner-city areas, advertising signs and internal/external lighting. Consequently, the Minister of Culture presents the criteria, regulations and guidelines to SCPUD for approval;
- Identify ‘Areas of Peculiar Value’ based on the criteria and guidelines developed by NOUH for protection to be decreed by SCPUD. The selected areas should include one or more of the following elements: i) peculiar urban character, road network or urban fabric that represent a stage of the city’s historic urban development; ii) areas that have a considerable number of listed monuments or “Buildings of Peculiar Architectural Value” that impact the area’s overall urban character; iii) areas related to cultural, historic or political events; representing social or economic values; or related to historically significant events or characters; iv) areas representing axis or path to peculiar areas, buildings or land uses; v) areas with culturally distinguished past or present ethnic groups; or vi) areas with peculiar natural value or National Parks;
- Identify and register ‘Buildings of Peculiar Architectural Value’ based on the criteria and guidelines developed by NOUH; and establish database for these building. Once approved; Buildings included in this list are protected by the State against any demolition or addition of architectural features;
- Implement urban harmony guidelines when permitting building and public open space upgrading activities;
- Approve and provide technical support to construction activities related listed ‘Buildings of Peculiar Architectural Value’;
- Develop guidelines for streetscape and design of public open spaces;
- Partner with governmental agencies, public and private sector companies, CSOs and individuals as a ‘Consultancy’ entity to prepare urban harmony studies and projects;
- Develop guidelines for enlisting consultants and experts in the field of urban harmony

Recent NOUH activities included launching some architectural competition for the upgrading of Ramses Square; Ataba and Opera Squares and rehabilitation/adaptive reuse of a historic department store in Ataba area. In 2009, and following some work with different governmental agencies, NOUH issued the ‘Historic Cairo Boundaries and Regulations’ that were approved by SCPUD according to Law 119/2008 and its bylaw issued in 2011. This document describes in detail the boundaries of what is defined as Historic Cairo and its different related zones of protection. It also provides building guidelines for new development within the different zones of protection.

ISDF

The ISDF was established in 2008 through a presidential decree to develop plans to deal with informal settlements, co-ordinate government efforts in this respect, and identify informal settlements that are ‘unsafe’. The ISDF has a clear mandate to address these ‘unsafe areas’ which are estimated to amount up to 404 locations all over Egypt. The ISDF follows a cost recovery approach where it provides governorates with loans to address problems of unsafe areas where cost is recovered through enhanced
land value and services. To this effect, the ISDF has a mechanism where these unsafe areas are identified in a national map and classified into 4 levels based on the intensity of the existing threat in each area:

- **Level one:** threat to life (risk of unstable geological formations, flooding or railway accidents). This level requires immediate intervention and no cost recovery can be achieved;

- **Level two:** unsuitable shelter conditions (shacks and makeshift or crumbling buildings). This level requires rapid intervention and cost recovery can be achieved;

- **Level three:** health risks (lack of access to water or sanitation, polluted sites or under high-voltage wires). This level requires improvement through relevant local authorities;

- **Level four:** instability of tenure (homes built on state-owned land). This level requires action depending on priorities of local governorates.

The ISDF has strong technical capacity and has been working through external consultants on developing comprehensive redevelopment plans for a various number of unsafe areas in many governorates all over Egypt. However when it comes to GCR - where these unsafe areas represent almost 5% of GCR’s informal settlements - less progress has taken place since ISDF has not started to date the implementation of any of its plans in GCR.

The ISDF has already identified a number of unsafe areas within Historic Cairo where consultants assigned by the ISDF are to produce redevelopment plans for these dilapidated areas. These areas include: Arab Al Yassar and Al Hattaba both located close to the Citadel and Bab Al Wazir areas. Following the approval of the redevelopment plans by the ISDF, Cairo Governorate and other relevant authorities these plans can be implemented through a loan from the ISDF to Cairo Governorate.

**SCA**

Until early 2011, the SCA was affiliated to the MoC and following the January 2011 events there have been several attempts either to separate the SCA as an individual entity directly affiliated to the Egyptian Cabinet of Ministries, or to establish a new independent Ministry of Antiquities. The SCA is responsible for the conservation and protection of all antiquities. The SCA is also responsible for the regulation of all archaeological excavations either carried out by the SCA itself or through foreign missions.

Among many other responsibilities, the SCA is responsible for the listing of ‘Monuments,’ which are different from the ‘Buildings of Peculiar Architectural Value’ in terms of the listing procedures, legal status, and responsible governmental agencies. Due to its substantially broad mandate and its partially limited human and financial resources, the SCA can hardly keep up with the listed number of buildings under its jurisdiction. Accordingly, it is often reluctant to list additional historic buildings, as they would require acquisition, financial compensation for the owners and occupants, conservation, and protection, adding an additional burden to the SCA’s already limited resources.

The SCA does not intervene directly in the provision or protection of housing stock in Historic Cairo. However, the SCA has direct impact on the housing sector in two specific areas:

- According to the ‘Antiquities Protection Law’ (Law 117/1983), listed monuments in areas such as Historic Cairo are protected through a ‘Buffer Zone’ designated to each individual monument. The depth of this ‘Buffer Zone’ is identified on a case-by-case basis depending on the urban context of each monument and usually varies between 5 to 30 meters in Historic Cairo. Within the boundaries of this ‘Buffer Zone’ new building activities are not permitted and usually exiting buildings are left to decay to clear the immediate areas surrounding monuments. In some cases, this process has been enforced by the State similar to the case of Historic Cairo’s Northern Fatimid Wall where a strip of existing houses have been demolished in the late 1990s to clear the area along the Wall. This policy has severe impact on Historic Cairo’s built environment and is considered, together with the ‘Regulation Lines’ issued by the Governorate, as one of the main reasons of dilapidation of significant segments of Historic Cairo’s urban fabric;
This report was produced in the framework of Urban Regeneration project for Historic Cairo – UNESCO, World Heritage Centre

- The second area of influence has less impact than the latter. The SCA has to approve all new building permits in Historic Cairo and usually this approval is based on two major elements: i) ensure that height of the proposed development does not exceed the permitted building heights in Historic Cairo nor the height of adjacent monuments, if any; and ensure that the proposed development does not violate the boundaries or ‘Buffer Zones’ of existing monuments.

GOPP

The GOPP is the national Egyptian authority responsible for all physical planning activities in the country. Currently the GOPP is engaged in organizing the planning process on all levels (regional, urban, and detailed) and preparing planning guidelines, urban development programs and coordination of the planning processes. This involves monitoring the implementation of plans through cooperation with the local authorities, conducting and supervising urban studies (e.g. concerning transportation system, infrastructure, waste handling and treatment plants and environmental studies) proposing and developing planning related legislations, monitoring urban extensions to stop urban sprawl over agricultural and environmental sensitive areas and preparing village planning strategies and policies. The GOPP is also responsible for building capacity of planning professionals in different planning levels and areas.

In recent years, the GOPP has conceived a strategic plan / vision called ‘Cairo 2050’. According to this vision, GCR population is expected to grow from 16 million inhabitants in 2006 to 30 million by 2050. This study attributes the degradation of the quality of living in GCR to high residential density in existing areas, traffic congestion, lack of adequate services and utilities. To overcome these problems and present a comprehensive strategic plan for GCR, in addition to some other urban interventions aiming at improving accessibility between different parts of the city, GOPP has been developing with technical assistance from UN-Habitat a series of mega-projects such as: i) the development of a new public transportation network, ii) the revitalization plan for Khedival Cairo, and iii) redevelopment of cemetery areas especially around Historic Cairo into green public open spaces. Following criticism of the latter project, activities to redevelop Cairo historic cemeteries has been reduced to focus on the area of al-Imam al-Shafie.

However, most of these plans fall short of a solution to down-to-earth urban management problems such as addressing existing public services and utilities needs, or handling problems of existing housing stock in urban areas. Therefore, there is a need to develop urban management tools and policies that are capable of achieving tangible results in existing urban areas.

Egyptian Awqaf Authority

This authority represents the Ministry of Awqaf (Islamic endowments) in management of different Awqaf properties all over Egypt. Hence, this authority is a key player in Historic Cairo given their ownership of various properties including plots of land, residential and non-residential buildings, and listed monuments. However, there is a general tendency to overestimate the number of these properties within Historic Cairo. Records of these properties are maintained within the authority but they are not organized in easily accessible database or maps.

It is possible through contractual or cooperation agreements with the Egyptian Awqaf Authority to either rent or buy their properties which paves the way for adaptive reuse projects, or sometimes the demolition of some architecturally significant buildings when sold to investors without regulations protecting these buildings. A few years ago there were some similar cases where some valuable buildings were demolished in Historic Cairo after they were sold to private investors. On the other hand, there were also some successful models for this partnership including adaptive reuse of some Awqaf properties in ADAA and Al-Gamaliyya.

It is also worthy of note that there is the ‘Coptic Awqaf Authority’, which is a separate entity responsible for the management of Coptic endowments. This authority already controls various traditional and architecturally significant buildings near Al-Ataba, however its role is often overlooked in different upgrading plans.
3.4. CURRENT AND PREVIOUS PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS ADDRESSING THE HOUSING SECTOR IN HISTORIC CAIRO

Over the past couple of decades, Historic Cairo has been subject to different upgrading project. Besides monuments restoration, many of these projects started to address the existing housing stock. It first started with renovation of housing stock surrounding important monuments that were subject to restoration in a process to improve the back scene around these monuments. Later on, this slowly developed to improvement of entire streets and houses surrounding some important public spaces. And finally, this evolved in some projects into a standalone program targeting housing as a vital sector in the development of Historic Cairo.

The following is a brief description of some of these initiatives that have been already completed and their activities are currently on hold except for Al-Mu‘izz and Al-Gamaliyya Upgrading Project, still active in Al-Gamaliyya area:

Al-Darb al-Ahmar Housing Rehabilitation Program

This program was one of the different components of the ADAA Revitalization Project launched by AKTC in 1997 aiming at the improvement of the living conditions of local inhabitants in ADAA. Less than two centuries ago, ADAA was one of the wealthiest neighborhoods in Cairo. Today, however, the inhabitants of this historic district are among the poorest. While featuring rich concentration of monuments, ADAA suffers from lack of adequate infrastructure and services as well as official demolition plans. A baseline survey of ADAA carried out my AKTC revealed that 22% of the dwelling units have no private lavatory, subsequently many families share public toilets. Moreover, 51% of the households were deprived of a consistent water source in their kitchens, while 32% of the dwellings had non-ventilated rooms. In the survey an alarming percentage of residents complained from health related issues such as poor eyesight, rheumatism, and chest diseases. Findings also showed that 86% of residents wished to continue residing in ADAA except for declining living conditions.

Accordingly, planned interventions had to accommodate the different needs while meeting health standards. Hence in an effort to consolidate the existing urban fabric the ADAA Housing Rehabilitation Program (HRP) was established to improve the quality and quantity of housing while maintaining their original architectural features and fairly providing secured tenure. The first identified success factor for the intervention is to lay the legislative ground to facilitate secured tenure. Second, is to mobilize local potential to meet necessary technical capacity. Third factor is to secure funds and instigate loan packages for residents to financially cover rehabilitation cost. Finally, is to combine all these factors into a mechanism capable of improving the living conditions of deprived residents. The HRP was close to actualizing its objectives with the mechanism it had set as its strategic goal tested and recognized. The HRP was active in ADAA since 2003 and was selected by UN-Habitat in 2008 as an international best practice. However, and following the rehabilitation and construction of more than a hundred residential buildings including more than 330 households, the project activities came to an end in 2008 with the completion of its second phase. Today, and despite the lack of a post-implementation maintenance program resulting into the deterioration of some of the rehabilitated buildings, this program managed to draw attention to the value of housing rehabilitation as a potential to revitalize the historic city. It also managed to develop and test a successful housing rehabilitation mechanism where residents were able to financially contribute to the rehabilitation of their buildings, which was not the case in many other similar projects. That housing rehabilitation mechanism can be, with some adaptation, replicated to provide solutions to low income residents of houses suffering from deteriorated living conditions and endangered by official demolition plans (Ibrahim & Khalifa, 2008 Best Practices Database: Al-Darb Al-Ahmar Housing Rehabilitation Programme, 2008).

Al-Mu‘izz and Al-Gamaliyya Upgrading Project

Following the 1992 earthquake, and the release of the ‘Rehabilitation of Historic Cairo’ report by the UNDP and SCA in 1997 (United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Supreme Council for Antiquities - Egypt, 1997), the MoC lunched in 2000 the ambitious Historic Cairo Rehabilitation Project, with the aim
of protecting, conserving and preserving Historic Cairo with a view to developing it into an open air museum. The project activities included the restoration of 34 listed monuments along Al-Mui’zz Street and 67 listed monuments in other parts of Historic Cairo. The project itself was not targeting housing rehabilitation as one of its main objectives.

However, and as part of the project plans to revitalize Al-Mui’zz Street the project activities extended to cover aspects of infrastructure utilities – a chronic problem facing the area of Al-Mui’zz and Al-Gamaliyya – as well as street paving and renovation of the street facades along the northern part of the street extending from Bab Al-Fotouh to the north and Al-Azhar Street to the south. These rehabilitation efforts were limited to buildings façades and did not extend to cover structural or utilities interventions inside the houses as it was the case in ADAA HRP. Another issue regarding this project is that the treatments of the façades were not fully sensitive to the aspect of ‘authenticity’ resulting into end products that look similar from an esthetic point of view and do not reflect the historic evolution, architectural intricacies and differences or building conditions of different buildings along the street. However, the value of this project to housing rehabilitation activities in Historic Cairo is that it represents one of the important interventions of the MoC, usually not concerned with housing rehabilitation since it does not fall under its mandate. It also sends a positive message to visitors and local inhabitants that housing is an inseparable part of the city fabric that can not be neglected during the course of urban rehabilitation projects. The project activities are still ongoing and have been extended to cover entire residential blocks in both Al-Gamaliyya and the southern stretch of Al-Mui’zz Street located between Al-Azhar Street to the north and Bab Zuwayla to the south.

Al-Darb Al-Asfar Project

This project started in 1994 with some studies aiming at the restoration of one of Cairo’s most important historic mansions – Beit Al-Suhaymi, an originally 17th century house that was extended in the 18th century by incorporating several of its adjacent houses. Based on these initial studies, Beit Al-Suhaymi – located in Al-Darb Al-Asfar off Al-Mui’zz Street – was subject to a major restoration project by Mashrabiyya Foundation that started in March 1996. The project was funded by the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development.

A few months after the project has started, the foundation came to realize that in order to protect Beit Al-Suhaymi, it was imperative to restore and rehabilitate its surrounding environment including two other historic mansions adjacent to Beit Al-Suhaymi, the repair of existing infrastructure utilities, street paving, installation of public lighting, and finally the renovation of the street façades including all residential buildings in the street. At that point of time, and within the Egyptian context, this was one of the first attempts aiming at ‘Area Conservation’ or addressing conservation issues from a point of view that takes into consideration the built environment surrounding existing monuments. Despite some criticism directed to the project regarding what some critics called ‘disneyfication’ of the built environment through rendering different residential buildings along the alleyway the same color and treatments, but the project is still considered a valuable addition to urban rehabilitation practices in Historic Cairo. This is primarily due to the fact that it was one of the very early implemented projects that started taking local inhabitants into consideration and highlighting the importance of approaching the traditional urban fabric in a comprehensive manner.

Housing Rehabilitation Initiative in Bab Al-Wazir Area

This initiative started by efforts of Professor Salah Zaki (Al-Azhar University) in the mid 1990s to document and restore some of the residential buildings located in Bab Al-Wazir area at the southern end of ADAA. Through an incremental process of documentation, cooperation with the local inhabitants and gradual rehabilitation, this initiative managed to save and restore a group of significant residential buildings in the area. Later on, this effort grabbed the attention of ARCE that became interested in supporting this positive and pioneer effort. Through financial support from ARCE, this initiative managed to expand its activities and rehabilitate a few more buildings in the area.

The importance of this initiative that it managed to demonstrate that local resources and incremental efforts, if coupled with proper technical support and long-term vision, can lead to the gradual
rehabilitation of existing architecturally significant buildings in Historic Cairo. It also managed to positively engage the local inhabitants from the beginning of the project, where they became effective stakeholders throughout the entire rehabilitation process.

**The Old Cairo Development Project (Mugamma’ El-Adyan)**

This project targeted the area of Fustat around Amr Ibn El-Aas Mosque between 1998 and 2001 with the aim of ‘revitalizing an area of great importance to the three religions interwoven in the history of Egypt’. The significance of this area stems from the concentration and coexistence of important Islamic, Coptic and Jewish religious buildings in a geographically limited zone, making it an attraction for visitors and tourists. In an attempt to upgrade this important area, left for neglect and decay over many decades, the MoT and Cairo Governorate co-financed an urban upgrading scheme proposed by Dr. Mona Zakaria.

The project, completed in 2001, included the construction of some public facilities including a crafts market and bus stop, upgrading of public open spaces, and the renovation of façades of existing residential buildings surrounding the area. Similar to Al-Darb Al-Asfar project, this initiative had a comprehensive approach towards addressing the built environment and managed to incorporate local inhabitants in the rehabilitation process from its early steps. A few years later, a similar initiative took place in Al-Saliba Street linking the Citadel to Sayeda Zeinab area.

**Other Urban Upgrading Initiatives**

Following the 25th January 2011, Egypt’s exiting urban areas became the focus of attention of different development agencies and international donors. Despite the fact that there are no foreseen major urban upgrading projects addressing Historic Cairo in the near future except for the URHC project, other agencies including the AFD, GIZ/PDP, WB/SDD, EIB and SFD are currently working on different integrated urban rehabilitation projects mostly in GCR’s unplanned areas and informal settlement including focus on public infrastructure and housing rehabilitation issues. These initiatives and plans are expected to be implemented over the coming 4 years with support from the EU in areas outside of Historic Cairo. However, links can be established between these projects and the URHC project to exchange lessons learned and coordinate institutional policies.

### 3.5. Initial Characterization of the Housing Sector in Historic Cairo

In preparation for this study, a field survey was conducted to capture the essence of the current housing status in Historic Cairo from the view of local residents and construction entrepreneurs active in this area. Geographically, the survey covered the 89 Shiyahehats identified by the URHC distributed over 11 Qisms. The survey employed the following tools:

- Structured interview with 94 respondents of which 67 respondents inhabiting traditional dwelling units that were built before the 1950s, and 27 respondents inhabiting modern dwelling units that were built after this era;

- Semi-structured interview with 6 contractors and building entrepreneurs covering 8 Qisms

The 94 structure interview respondents are geographically distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bulaq</th>
<th>Manshiyet Nasser</th>
<th>Azbakiyya</th>
<th>Bab El Sha’ria</th>
<th>Al Gamaliyya</th>
<th>Al Muski</th>
<th>ADAA</th>
<th>Abdin</th>
<th>Sayeda Zeinab</th>
<th>Al Khalifa</th>
<th>Misr Al Qadima</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of selecting traditional and modern dwelling units was to investigate the differences of their views and whether this would have an impact on their housing needs. This differentiation has been systematically used in the majority of the survey aspects. Also for analysis purposes, the survey findings

---

*For more details, please see Appendix V: Report Maps: Location of Interview Respondents*
were compared to the findings of two important studies that took place in ADAA through the ADAA Revitalization Project by AKTC:

- Post-Implementation Survey conducted in 2009 (Shehayeb, Post-Implementation Survey 2009 (Final Draft Report), 2009)

However, it is important to note that this field survey is not based on solid scientific grounds where proper representative sample was selected given the scope and timeframe of this mission. Rather, the purpose of this survey was to give an overview of the development context of housing rehabilitation in Historic Cairo and prevailing housing trends from the point of view of local residents and entrepreneurs.

### 3.5.1. Occupancy Status

**Dwelling unit size**

Dwelling unit sizes vary from single-room dwellings (less than 60m²) up to dwellings with more than five rooms excluding toilets and kitchens (more than 240 m²). The majority of the dwelling units (79%) were found to be 120m² (approximately 4 habitable rooms) or less. The most common dwelling size varies between 60m² to 120m² (3-4 habitable rooms) with a percentage of 60%. This is slightly higher than the findings in ADAA where the average dwelling size was found to be 2.8 rooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Area Group</strong></th>
<th>&gt; 60m²</th>
<th>60m² - 120m²</th>
<th>120m² - 180m²</th>
<th>180m² - 240m²</th>
<th>&lt; 240m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional (%)</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modern (%)</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However it is important to note that traditional dwelling units provide more diversified spectrum of unit sizes, catering for wider variety of needs compared to modern dwelling units. While 85% of traditional dwelling units range from less than 60m² up to 180m², 81% of modern dwelling units fall between 60m² and 120m². This could be attributed to recent building regulations limiting the options for smaller unit sizes on the one hand, and economic conditions and market demand for more unified unit sizes on the other.

**Household size**

The survey respondents reported a total of 470 occupants with an average household size of five occupants per household, which is identical to the ADAA findings in 2003 and 2009. These findings are higher than the CAPMAS data for the survey area where the average household size in the 11 Qisms and URHC area is reported to be 3.62 in 2006. This is also higher than the average household size for the City of Cairo of 3.75 in 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Unit Size</strong></th>
<th>&gt; 2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 and more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional (%)</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modern (%)</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey shows that average household size in modern dwelling units of 5.3 is slightly higher than the average household size in traditional dwelling units of 4.9.
Occupation status

The majority of the respondents (62%) are tenants of ‘old’ leases, which is slightly less than the findings in ADAA in 2003 and 2009 of 78% and 72% respectively. Almost 30% of respondents are partial owners of the building they reside in, while none of them is sole owner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sole owner of building</th>
<th>Partial owner of building</th>
<th>Tenant (new lease)</th>
<th>Tenant (old lease)</th>
<th>Informal agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of partial owners is significantly higher in traditional dwelling units than modern dwelling units. Meanwhile, it is worthy of note that the majority of the respondents prefer ‘old’ lease over ‘new’ lease. This extends to modern dwelling units where respondents prefer ‘old’ lease which grants tenants long-term agreements and security of tenure. It is also important to note that ‘new’ lease agreements are taking place in traditional dwelling units where original tenants of the unit either have left or passed away. Thus, the owner rents the dwelling unit to new tenants on ‘new’ lease basis.

Electricity meter registration

The majority of electricity meters (65%) are registered in the name of the occupying family member, which reflects stability of tenure. These results are different from the ADAA findings in 2003 and 2009 where almost 64% of electricity meters were registered in the name of non-occupying family members or others, in most cases, a previous resident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Occupying family member</th>
<th>Non-occupying family member (inc. dead)</th>
<th>Illegal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regards to traditional and modern dwelling units, there is not much different between both cases.

Owners living in the building

More than half of the buildings (51%) where the respondents live are owner/partial-owner occupied. This also confirms previous findings in ADAA in 1999 where 52% of the buildings were owner/partial-owner occupied. This aspect improves future potentials for proposed housing rehabilitation schemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No (neighborhood)</th>
<th>No (elsewhere)</th>
<th>Awqaf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents occupying modern dwelling units reported a higher percentage of ‘owners living in the building’ than traditional dwelling units. This needs to be further investigated to explore to what extent modern buildings have been developed and occupied by the same owners.
3.5.2. Duration of Stay and Nature of Occupancy

Respondents’ origins according to birthplace

Respondents reported a significantly high percentage (81%) of origins from Historic Cairo according to their birthplace. This confirms previous studies in ADAA where residents of origins from Historic Cairo amounted up to 92% in 2009. This percentage, in addition to different findings in this section, reflects a very stable population in Historic Cairo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Same neighborhood</th>
<th>Other neighborhood in Historic Cairo</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents living in traditional dwelling units reported even a higher percentage of origins from Historic Cairo (85%) than respondents living in modern dwelling units (74%).

Length of residence in the same house

Confirming the previous result, 82% of the residents have been living in the same house for more than 20 years. This also confirms the ADAA findings in 2003 where 60% of the respondents reported more than 20 years length of residence in the same house.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; 1 year</th>
<th>1 – 5 years</th>
<th>6–10 years</th>
<th>11–20 years</th>
<th>21–40 years</th>
<th>&gt; 40 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is not a significant difference in the results between respondents living in traditional or modern dwelling units, although residents of modern dwelling units reported a slightly higher result for respondents living in the same house for more than 40 years.

Living outside of the neighborhood during the duration of stay

When asked if they lived outside of the neighborhood during their duration of stay, the majority of respondents (84%) responded with (No). This again confirms the stability of population in Historic Cairo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of traditional and modern dwelling units are almost identical in regards to this point.

3.5.3. Area Related Aspects

Access to utilities

All buildings investigated in the survey are connected to electricity, potable water and sewage. However, this result does not indicate the ‘quality’ of the utility or service itself which is reported to be a problem in many previous surveys. This aspect needs to be further investigated in a later stage.
Traditional and modern dwelling units are identical in regards to access to the above mentioned utilities except for access to natural gas. Natural gas companies have preference to provide access to natural gas only to modern or ‘structurally sound’ buildings for safety reasons. Thus, this preference prevents inhabitants of older traditional buildings from access to natural gas networks.

**Work and study location**

The majority of the respondents’ family members (82%) work and/or study in Historic Cairo. This confirms previous studies in ADAA where 56% of the economically active inhabitants in 2003 were working inside ADAA and go to work on foot, and a significant portion of the remaining inhabitants were working in adjacent neighborhoods and also go to work on foot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Same neighborhood</th>
<th>Other neighborhoods in Historic Cairo</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional (%)</strong></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modern (%)</strong></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inhabitants of traditional and modern dwelling units reported similar results in regards to this point.

**Advantages of living in the neighborhood**

The majority of the respondents (70% to 76%) appreciated access to services and utilities; proximity to work location; proximity to family and friends; and low rents as positive values and advantages in their neighborhoods. Advantages such as the strategic location of their neighborhoods within Cairo or safety of the locality came far less important to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Access to services &amp; utilities</th>
<th>Proximity to work location</th>
<th>Proximity to family &amp; friends</th>
<th>Low rents</th>
<th>Strategic location within Cairo</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional (%)</strong></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modern (%)</strong></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inhabitants of traditional and modern dwelling units reported similar results in regards to this point.

**Main problems of the neighborhood**

Solid waste was the most critical problem for the majority of the respondents with a percentage of 62%. Second ranking problem was quality and adequacy of existing services and utilities. The respondents also identified 3 other problems with a lesser degree of importance: social problems and disputes among family and neighbors; infiltration of commercial activities inside the dominantly residential segments of
the neighborhoods which attracts new ‘comers and strangers’; and finally increased crime levels which was not the case in previous surveys due to the current circumstances Egypt is going through. Deteriorated physical condition of buildings and public open spaces was not a top priority for the respondents with a low percentage of 18%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quality of services &amp; utilities</th>
<th>Social problems &amp; disputes</th>
<th>Solid waste</th>
<th>Physical conditions</th>
<th>Infiltration of commercial activities</th>
<th>Crime levels</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inhabitants of traditional and modern dwelling units reported similar results in regards to the majority of the problems identified, except for deteriorated physical conditions where inhabitants of traditional dwelling units had more concerns than the ones occupying modern dwelling units. Also, inhabitants of traditional dwelling units had more concerns in regards to infiltration of commercial activities of the residential parts of their neighborhoods as well as social problems and disputes.

3.5.4. Willingness to Stay

Willingness to continue living in the same neighborhood in the future

At the area level, a high percentage of the respondents (74%) wish to continue living in the same neighborhood. This high willingness to stay was mainly attributed to the advantages of the neighborhoods identified by the respondents. This confirms previous studies in ADAA where 86% of the respondents were willing to continue living in ADAA in 2003.

Respondents who expressed willingness to leave the area were mainly complaining from noise, pollution, infiltration of commercial activities and solid waste. When asked where they wish to move to, they indicated either areas that are close to Historic Cairo or new urban communities around Cairo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inhabitants of traditional and modern dwelling units reported similar results in regards to this point.

Willingness to continue living in the same house in the future

At the building level, respondents reported similar results where 72% of the respondents expressed their willingness to continue living in the same building. This also confirms the ADAA findings in 2003 where 75% of the respondents were willing to continue living in the same building.

Respondents who expressed willingness to leave the house were mainly complaining from the limited floor area of their apartments, lack of maintenance by the landlord, the landlord wants to demolish the building, the building is in need for costly rehabilitation, infiltration of commercial activities and workers living in the building, and high rents in old buildings.
Inhabitants of traditional dwelling units were less willing to stay in the same building than inhabitants of modern dwelling units. This needs to be confirmed through further studies, but can be attributed to the deteriorated physical condition of traditional buildings.

3.5.5. Rehabilitation and Maintenance

Repairs or improvements made by the inhabitants to the unit/building

Respondents were asked about the repairs or improvements they made to their dwellings units or buildings. The majority of the respondents (77 respondents - 82%) had made repairs in their dwelling units or buildings; and 76% of the respondents had made these repairs during the last 24 months. The most common type of repair was plumbing with a percentage of 54%. Repair of structural elements (walls, floors, roofs, etc.) ranked second with a percentage of 49%. Internal finishes (plastering, painting and tiling) followed with a percentage of 35%. Finally electricity and external finishes were the least common type of repairs. These results confirm the ADAA findings in 2009 where repair of structural elements and plumbing ranked highest with percentages of 56% and 42% respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Structural elements</th>
<th>Plumbing</th>
<th>Electricity</th>
<th>External finishes</th>
<th>Internal finishes</th>
<th>No improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nature of the dwelling unit had a tangible impact on the types of repair made. Structural repairs in traditional dwelling units ranked first and much higher than those made in modern dwelling units (58% vs. 26% respectively). On the other hand, plumbing repairs ranked higher in modern dwelling units than traditional dwelling units. These discrepancies can be attributed to the deteriorated structural conditions of traditional dwelling units, and possibly low quality plumbing craftsmanship which is a chronic problem in the Egyptian context.

Implementation of repair or improvement works

Respondents were asked about who did the repair or improvement works. The majority of the respondents (77%) hired a paid worker to undertake these works. Few respondents hired a contractor to do the works with a percentage of 19%, while the percentage of respondents who used a household member was insignificant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Household member</th>
<th>Paid worker(s)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inhabitants of traditional dwelling units tended more towards hiring a contractor to undertake these works. This can be attributed to the need for more complex structural interventions given the deteriorated condition of their buildings and the need for more organized and experienced craftsmanship.

**Cost of repair or improvement works**

Only 62 respondents out of 77 were able to identify cost of repair and improvement works mostly implemented in the last 24 months. Average household expenditure on repair or improvement works during this period of time amounted up to EGP 4,400. The highest expenditure band was EGP 2,000 and less with a percentage of 33%. Second ranking band was expenditure between EGP 2,001 and EGP 6,000. Very few respondents had higher expenditure levels over EGP 10,000 per household. Most of these respondents were owners/partial owners of their buildings. These results are higher than the ADAA findings in 2003 were the majority of respondents reported costs between EGP 101 and EGP 1,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EGP 2,000 &amp; less</th>
<th>EGP 2,001 - 6,000</th>
<th>EGP 6,001 - 10,000</th>
<th>EGP 10,001 - 40,000</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>No improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inhabitants of modern dwelling units had slightly higher level of expenditure on repair or improvement works than inhabitants of traditional dwelling units. This is possibly attributed to relatively higher levels of security of tenure in modern dwelling units.

**Source of finance for repair or improvement works**

Respondents reported that savings and gam’iyas (saving clubs) were the most frequent source of money spent on repair or improvement works with a percentage of 76%. This result is consistent with ADAA findings in 2003 were these two sources were reported to be the most frequent. This shows high potential for self-financing and building upon existing social capital and networks through the gam’iya system. On the other hand, this result also exposes the lack of formal financing mechanisms for rehabilitation such as access to housing mortgage system, personal bank loans or microcredit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Landlord</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Bank loan</th>
<th>Personal borrowing</th>
<th>Gam’iya (saving club)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landlord contribution and personal borrowing were notably more frequent sources of money in traditional dwelling units. While savings and gam’iyas were more frequent in modern dwelling units.

**Problems met during repair or improvement works**

A considerable percentage (43%) of the 77 respondents who carried out repairs or improvements did not meet problems during implementation of the works. The most common type of problems met by the remaining percentage was financial problems with a percentage of 31% due to inconsistent financial affordability of different residents when works are related to the entire building and lack of financial capabilities in some cases. Technical problems represented 13% and were mainly related to poor quality...
of works done and the immediate recurrence of the original problem that was the cause for the repair primarily due to lack of proper technical supervision. Finally, legal and administrative problems also represented 13% and were mainly related to corruption of local administration and difficulties met to acquire required rehabilitation permits. These results confirm the ADAA findings in 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Legal/administrative</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>No problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditional (%): 16% 31% 10% 43%
Modern (%): 5% 29% 24% 43%

Inhabitants of traditional dwelling units faced more legal and administrative problems due to the need for undertaking structural works that require more paperwork and permits. On the other hand, inhabitants of modern dwelling units faced more technical problems.

3.5.6. Desired Improvement / Rehabilitation Works

Desired improvements or rehabilitation works in the building

The respondents were asked to select repairs/improvements they would like to see done in their dwelling units or in the buildings they live in from a list of possibilities. The majority of the respondents (86%) expressed a desire to carry out improvements or rehabilitation works in their dwelling units or buildings. Repair of staircases and building entrances; and toilets/bathrooms repairs were the most desired improvements (65% and 60% respectively). These were followed by repair of walls and need for external plastering and painting of the buildings (both at 52%). The results indicate greater need for repair in common areas of the building where inhabitants scarcely invest since they are more interested in repairs within their dwelling units. These results are to some extent consistent with the ADAA findings in 2003 and 2009 where need for structural, plumbing and common areas repair were the most desired repairs by that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Staircase/entrance</th>
<th>Kitchen</th>
<th>Toilet/bathroom</th>
<th>Windows</th>
<th>Internal painting</th>
<th>External painting</th>
<th>No need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditional (%): 64% 55% 70% 48% 63% 52% 46% 55% 18%
Modern (%): 22% 22% 52% 30% 52% 19% 30% 44% 4%

There is a significantly higher desire for improvements or rehabilitation expressed by inhabitants of traditional dwelling units across all possibilities. This is mainly attributed to deteriorated condition of traditional buildings. However, the need to address main areas of the building as well as plumbing problems is still evident in both types of dwellings.

Proposed schemes for housing rehabilitation

The respondents were asked in case there is a housing rehabilitation scheme whether they are willing to contribute to any building repair costs, whether they are ready to evacuate the building during this repair period which may range from 8 - 12 months, whether they agree to finance the repairs through a loan, and whether they agree to share future maintenance costs.

The respondents have shown a high level of willingness to join housing rehabilitation schemes. The majority of the respondents (82%) are willing to financially contribute to rehabilitation works and 83%
are willing to share future maintenance costs of their buildings. Also 70% are willing to take a loan to help financing the rehabilitation process. The lowest percentage of consent (46%) was related to evacuating the building during the rehabilitation process due to lack of housing alternatives. Respondents also highlighted the fact that there is lack of organizational setting that guarantees contribution of different neighbors of the same building to the rehabilitation process. They also highlighted that inconsistent financial affordability among different neighbors is an obstacle.

These results are higher than the ADAA findings both in 2003 and 2009. For instance, in 2009 53% of ADAA respondents were willing to pay, 33% were willing to evacuate, 40% were willing to take a loan and 63% were willing to share future maintenance costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Evacuate</th>
<th>Take a loan</th>
<th>Share future maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inhabitants of traditional dwelling units had higher willingness to join such schemes given the deteriorated structural condition of their buildings and their need for rehabilitation. This was specifically evident when it comes to evacuating the building during the rehabilitation process.

**Awareness of existing housing programs or organizations and approach for assistance**

The respondents were asked whether they are aware of existing housing rehabilitation programs or organizations working in this field. They were also asked whether they approached any of these programs or organizations for assistance. Half of the respondents were aware of various programs and organization although they were not fully aware of the scope of these projects. The identified programs and organizations included: ADAA Housing Rehabilitation Program, Al-Mu’izz and Al-Gamaliyya Upgrading Project (Ministry of Culture), Al-Darb al-Asfar (Mashrabiyya Foundation), Al-Saliba Street Upgrading Project (Ministry of Tourism), Old Cairo (Al-Fustat) Upgrading Project (Cairo Governorate - Ministry of Tourism), façade renovations by NOUH in Ghamra (Ramses Street), and finally a housing redevelopment project in al-Sayeda Naffissa area than needs to be further investigated.

Despite their need for rehabilitation the majority of the respondents (94%) did not approach any of these projects for assistance. Their reasons were that their houses did not exist in the geographic domain of these projects, the respondents’ view that the government or these projects are only interested in houses in the vicinity of important monuments, or that most of these interventions are only related to façade renovations.

Only 6 respondents approached some of these projects for assistance but none of them benefited from these projects’ services. Two of the respondents approached the ADAA Housing Rehabilitation Program and they were informed that the program is no longer active. The other 4 respondents approached Al-Mu’izz and Al-Gamaliyya Upgrading Project (Ministry of Culture) for assistance and did not receive any services either because their houses are outside of the geographic domain or scope of work of the project (request for works inside the house), or they could not afford the cost estimated by the project contractor for the intended works.
Inhabitants of modern dwelling units were more aware of rehabilitation programs and organizations than inhabitants of traditional building units.

### 3.5.7. Real Estate Aspects (value of building and rentable value)

**Price of a similar housing unit (EGP per square meter)**

The respondents were asked about what they thought would be the current price per square meter in EGP to purchase a housing unit such as the one they lived in. The majority of the respondents (47%) thought that the price of square meter would fall between EGP 1,000 and EGP 3,000. Less percentage of the respondents (12%) thought that it would fall between EGP 3,001 and EGP 6,000, while a significant percentage of the respondents (36%) could not answer the question.

In general, these findings are in accordance with the feedback obtained from building entrepreneurs during the field survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1,000 - 3,000</th>
<th>3,001 - 6,000</th>
<th>6,001 - 9,000</th>
<th>9,001 and more</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional (%)</strong></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modern (%)</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inhabitants of traditional dwelling units were more aware of market prices than inhabitants of modern dwelling units.

**Monthly rent value of a similar housing unit**

The respondents were also asked about what they thought would be the current monthly rent value of a similar housing unit. The respondents referred to extended rent agreements where the tenants pay an advance payment in addition to a monthly rent. The respondents’ average estimation of the advance payment ranged between EGP 25,000 in ADAA, Sayeda Zeinab and Al-Khalifa, to EGP 80,000-100,000 in Bab El Sha’ria and Al Gamaliyya, and up to EGP 150,000 in Al-Muski and Abdin.

In terms of monthly rent value, the majority of the respondents though it would fall between EGP 401 and EGP 1,000 which is consistent with the findings of the building entrepreneurs’ survey. A fewer percentage of respondents (16%) thought the value would fall between EGP 101 and EGP 400, while 23% of the respondents could not answer the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - 100</th>
<th>101 - 400</th>
<th>401 – 1,000</th>
<th>1001 – 1,500</th>
<th>1,500 &amp; more</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional (%)</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modern (%)</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inhabitants of traditional and modern dwelling units reported similar results in regards to this point.

**Monthly rent value of one room dwelling unit**

The respondents were asked about what they thought would be the current monthly rent value of one room dwelling unit in their neighborhood. The majority of the respondents (72%) could not answer the question. The perception of the few respondents who gave an answer was generally between EGP 101 and EGP 200.
Ownership of other properties

When asked if their families own properties other than the dwelling unit they currently occupy – either inside or outside their neighborhoods – the majority of the respondents (74%) responded with (No). Meanwhile 13% of the respondents reported that they own another housing unit, and 11% reported that they own an entire building other than the one they occupy. This shows that the majority of the inhabitants do not have other housing opportunities or second homes where they can be relocated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing unit</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inhabitants of traditional dwelling units reported slightly higher results in terms of ownership of other properties than inhabitants of modern dwelling units.

Types of housing solutions available in the neighborhood

The respondents were asked about the available housing solutions in their neighborhoods. All respondents recognized the existence of ‘old rent’, ‘new rent’ and ‘buying (tamleek)’ housing solutions in their neighborhoods with higher recognition of ‘old rent’ as a prevailing solution. However, only a small percentage (18%) recognized Public Housing in their neighborhoods as a possible option. This confirms that the vast majority of housing solutions in Historic Cairo are provided by the private sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old rent</th>
<th>New rent</th>
<th>Buying (tamleek)</th>
<th>Public housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inhabitants of traditional and modern dwelling units reported similar results in regards to this point.

Alternative housing opportunities in case of relocation

The respondents were asked to identify alternative housing opportunities for local residents if a house in the neighborhood was demolished or has fallen down. The majority of the respondents (64%) identified governmental housing in new urban communities, often offered by the government in these cases, as the most common option. The second ranking option (19%) was to find other housing opportunities in the same neighborhood. A minor percentage of the respondents selected housing opportunities in other neighborhoods outside Historic Cairo as an option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government housing in new urban communities</th>
<th>Same neighborhood</th>
<th>Other neighborhoods outside Historic Cairo</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inhabitants of traditional and modern dwelling units reported similar results in regards to this point.

### 3.5.8. Heritage Aspects

**Advantages of living in traditional houses in the neighborhood**

In order to investigate residents’ perception of heritage aspects and appreciation of characteristics of traditional buildings, the respondents were asked about the advantages of living in traditional houses in their neighborhoods according to their views. In this case, residents of modern dwelling units were asked about other traditional dwelling units they recognize in the neighborhood. Almost 67-68% appreciated two characteristics: i) design of the dwelling unit in terms of space organization and flexibility to accommodate the changing family use of space; and ii) floor area of the dwelling unit in terms of appropriateness to family needs and activities.

Meanwhile, a small percentage (15%) identified physical conditions as an advantage. Finally, 22% identified location of these units as an advantage, despite not directly related to the nature of the dwelling units themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Floor areas</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No advantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional (%)</strong></td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modern (%)</strong></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were slight differences in the feedback received from inhabitants of traditional and modern dwelling units. Inhabitants of traditional dwelling units had more appreciation of floor area aspects, while inhabitants of modern dwelling units had slightly more appreciation of design aspects.

**Disadvantages of living in traditional houses in the neighborhood**

Similar to the previous point, the respondents were asked about the disadvantages of living in traditional houses in their neighborhoods according to their views. The majority of the respondents (77%) identified deteriorated physical conditions as a major disadvantage, while they did not report other significant disadvantages of these units. This result confirms the aforementioned finding regarding the advantages of living in traditional dwelling units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Floor areas</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional (%)</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modern (%)</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inhabitants of traditional and modern dwelling units reported similar results in regards to this point.

**Importance of restoring historically significant structures in the neighborhood**

The respondents were asked whether it is important in their view to restore historically significant structure in their neighborhoods. The majority of the respondents (85%) agreed that it is important to restore such structures for several reasons. Some of the respondents identified heritage aspects and emotional attachment to this part of the city as the main reason for this opinion. However, most of the respondents identified other qualities and characteristics stemming from the socioeconomic and physical environment of their neighborhood such as low rents, strong social networks, quality of low-rise
urban environment, street networks, and proximity to services. These are all qualities related to the traditional built environment of Historic Cairo and need to be further investigated and emphasized.

On the other hand, respondent who reported (not important) as an answer were mostly driven by the impression that traditional structures can not be restored, and that investment in such buildings is futile since they are going to rapidly deteriorate. This shows the importance of implementing good quality pilot rehabilitation projects in such neighborhoods to reverse this prevailing notion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional (%)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (%)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected, inhabitants of traditional dwelling units had a higher level of consent on the importance of preserving historically significant structures than inhabitants of modern dwelling units.

3.5.9. Existing Housing Provision and Rehabilitation Practices (Contractors and building entrepreneurs interview)

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 6 contractors and building entrepreneurs covering areas of Sayeda Zeinab, Al-Khalifa, ADAA, Misr Al Qadima, Al Muski, Al Azbakiyya, Bab El Sha’ria and Bulaq. The purpose of these interviews was to illustrate existing housing provision and rehabilitation mechanisms. These interviews covered aspects of existing construction and contracting practices, maintenance and rehabilitation practices, financial aspects and means of finance, and alternative housing solutions available for local residents.

Housing market in the neighborhood (availability of dwelling units and land)

The majority of the respondents see that there is a high demand and low supply for housing in Historic Cairo due to unavailability of lands; difficulties met to evict existing residents, demolish existing buildings and build new buildings; and that existing lands are expensive to the extent that comprises the investment feasibility given the height limitations in Historic Cairo. In Bulaq, up to end of 2011 the Governorate did not allow building or rehabilitation permits to evict the area in favor of the Maspero Triangle project, one of Cairo 2050 interventions aiming at the redevelopment of this area into high end business district.

The majority of the respondents reported that vacant lots are a very scarce resource in Historic Cairo since most of available lands are full of debris and garbage, or owned by multiple owners who are not interested in developing these lots. In case the authorities clean these lots, they charge the owner(s) the cost of this process thus many owners prefer to leave these lots as they are.

In order to overcome this problem, the respondents tend to acquire existing buildings, evict their inhabitants, demolish these buildings and build anew. In some other cases, if the land owner is willing to develop the lot but can not afford the development costs, owners go into partnerships with the contractors and the land is assessed and accounted for as the owner’s share in the new building. Another solution is to benefit from new regulation lines where existing buildings can be demolished in some cases and their lots can be partially redeveloped following the new building lines.

Status of land/property market since January 25th 2011 (prices are increasing, decreasing, stable, etc.)

The respondents either indicated that the market is stable and sometime stagnant, however some of them reported increase in new buildings value due to increase of material and labor costs given the
increased demand on these resources for illegal construction activities. In some cases, especially in illegally built buildings, prices might get cheaper since the owners want to sell the apartments quickly.

Kind of new buyers in the neighborhood (local residents, outsiders, etc)

All respondents reported that local residents are the new clients buying in their neighborhoods.

Preferred housing solutions in the area

The majority of the respondents indicated that ‘old’ and ‘new’ lease agreements are the preferred solutions. In the case of ‘old’ lease, an existing tenet transfers the lease contract to a new tenant in return of a certain amount of money with the consent of the building owner who also receives a portion of this amount. Only one respondent reported buying (tamleek) as a preferred solution.

Average price of mid-sized housing unit in the neighborhood

In terms of prices of existing dwelling units:

- Sayeda Zeinab: transfer of ‘old’ lease between different tenants costs around EGP 150,000 and EGP 400,000 to 500,000 to buy a 100-120 m² apartment in el-Helmiyya and EGP 250,000 for a smaller apartment. For new extended rent agreements down payment is EGP 80,000 and monthly rent is EGP 400-500 for a mid-sized apartment;

- Al-Khalifa: ‘new’ lease costs between EGP 400-600 per month and EGP 100,000-120,000 for buying a 60-80 m² apartment;

- ADAA: contractors rent new apartments illegally built after the 25<sup>th</sup> January events for extended periods of time with a down payment of EGP 60,000-100,000 and monthly rent of EGP 400-500 for 60-80 m² apartments. For buying legally built apartments the cost is EGP 150,000-170,000 without internal finishes and EGP 180,000-200,000 finished apartment with an area of 60-80 m²;

- Misr Al Qadima: transfer of ‘old’ lease between different tenants costs around EGP 20,000. It would cost EGP 200,000 to buy a 200 m² apartment and would increase up to EGP 300,000 for a smaller apartment in the area surrounding Amr Ibn el-Aas Mosque;

- Al Muski, Al Azbakiyya and Bab El Sha’ria: buying a 60-80 m² would cost EGP 120,000-160,000. New lease is EGP 500-1,000 per month and no ‘old’ lease is available;

- Bulaq: it would cost between EGP 500,000 and EGP 1,500,000 to buy a 120-150 m² apartment depending on the location.

It is evident that there is a fluctuation in the reported prices given the location and condition of dwelling units in some neighborhoods. However, the average price to buy a new apartment is EGP 2,000-3,000 per square meter; and EGP 400-600 per month for ‘new’ lease agreements. This aspect can be further investigated through an in-depth real estate survey.

Terms of payment for buying a dwelling unit

Cash is the preferred option for all contractors. However, respondents accept a down payment that varies between 25% and 60% and remaining payments are paid over 1.5-2 years. It is also evident that new housing mortgage mechanism almost has no impact on the housing market in Historic Cairo.

Experience in the field of housing rehabilitation

All respondents are already involved in housing rehabilitation works which represents 30%-35% of their activities.

Problems facing construction and real estate market (legal, technical, financial - specify)

Legal problems included corruption of the local administration and need for illegal payments to facilitate the permit and construction process; inconsistency of ownership documents provided by the landlords,
Thus hindering the permit process; in case of temporary evacuation of inhabitants for rehabilitation works, lack of legal guarantees to return existing inhabitants to their dwelling units after the completion of rehabilitation works; and as mentioned earlier, Bulaq has a specific permitting problem due to the Maspero Triangle project. Some of the contractors avoid these problems by passing on this process to the owners to acquire the required permits.

Except for need to handle adjacent deteriorating buildings during the construction or rehabilitation process, the respondents did not report technical problems. However, and given past experience and field notes, it is clear that the majority of the contractors working in rehabilitation activities are not using proper rehabilitation materials or techniques in the rehabilitation process to maintain the historic integrity of the rehabilitated buildings.

Financial problems included weak level of tenants and owners’ financial affordability, thus payments take place on installments; the illegal payments required to issue required paperwork is a real burden on the construction economics; and finally, increased land prices and limitation of building heights compromise the financial feasibility of the investment, thus it is not considered as good investment.

Perception of percentages of different existing housing solutions in the neighborhood

The respondents were asked about existing housing solutions in their perception. Their answers confirm the same results of the occupancy status section of this report. Old rent ranked first in most neighborhoods, while new rent and buying solutions followed by a considerable gap. None of the respondents identified public housing as an existing housing solution in their neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sayeda Zeinab</th>
<th>Al-Khalifa</th>
<th>ADAA</th>
<th>Misr Al Qadima</th>
<th>Al Muski, Al Azbakiyya and Bab El Sha’ria</th>
<th>Bulaq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old rent</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New rent</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying (tamleek)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average construction and land costs

The respondents reported very fluctuating results in regards to cost of construction. However, the current practice is EGP 1,000-1,200 as construction cost by contractors for unfinished buildings (concrete skeleton and brick walls), in addition to EGP 500 per square meter for semi-finished building (plastering and main plumbing and electricity system).

Land prices per square meter are EGP 3,000-4,000 in Sayeda Zeinab; EGP 1,000-2,000 in Al-Khalifa; EGP 2,000-4,000 in ADAA; EGP 3,000-6,000 in Misr Al Qadima; EGP 4,000-10,000 in Al Muski, Al Azbakiyya and Bab El Sha’ria; and EGP 4,000-5,000 in Bulaq.

Construction and rehabilitation resources employed

The respondents were asked about the resources they employ for construction or rehabilitation activities in terms of labor, materials and equipment. The majority of the labor works on a temporary basis and is mostly from the same or adjacent neighborhoods. The materials are available through local suppliers in the neighborhoods, and payments by the contractors to these suppliers are made a weekly basis. Contractors own their equipment and storage areas within each neighborhood.

Site logistical problem and impact on construction and rehabilitation cost

The respondents reported different problems that are related to site logistical matters including:
- Inability to buy and deliver materials in bulk quantities given the complicated street network in Historic Cairo and lack of sizeable storage facilities;

- Limited supply of materials and labor due to high demand on construction activities, especially for illegal practices that took place in 2011;

- Impact of structurally deteriorated adjacent buildings that require a higher level of caution, more skilled labor, scaffolding activities, obtaining the approval of adjacent neighbors and informing the local authorities in order to avoid the failure of these buildings which has direct impact on cost and time of the operations.

3.6. **Housing Rehabilitation Issues, Opportunities and Constraints**

Based on the analysis of the development context and the findings of the preliminary field survey, this section illustrates critical issues related to management of housing stock in Historic Cairo and feedback received from the survey respondents. Among other aspects, it sheds light on: impact of demographic, social and cultural change in Historic Cairo on existing housing; need for sustainable housing rehabilitation mechanism that addresses technical, financial and logistical rehabilitation aspects; existing legislative and policy related deficiencies; existing needs for utilities, services and facilities; and last but not least impact of post 25th January 2011 building practices. These aspects are outlined and categorized under different subjects.

3.6.1. **Legal and Institutional Issues**

- The main problem with management of Historic Cairo’s housing stock is not conflicting laws or roles of different agencies; it is simply about governance. Historic Cairo lacks an institutional framework that is efficient, transparent and accountable. The existing conflicts between laws, policies, procedures and different agencies are all symptoms of lack of good governance practices. For instance, despite their deficiencies, but existing laws such as Law 144/2006, are capable of protecting at least a portion of the existing architecturally significant buildings. However, lack of efficient implementation mechanisms and in some cases lack of accountability and transparency on the local administration level lead to the eventual loss of such buildings;

- Similarly, lack of an administrative framework that perceives Historic Cairo as one unified site or entity leads to conflicting policies and modes of operations between different Districts. For instance, the study area is distributed among 11 different Qasms, of which many include huge areas that do not belong in nature or characteristics to Historic Cairo such as areas of Manshiet Nasser and Moqattam;

- In terms of human resources, local officials either in the Local Districts or the SCA are not trained or aware of urban conservation aspects. District engineers and Governorate planners are trained to handle conventional modern buildings, while the SCA officials are trained only to handle listed monuments. Therefore, urban heritage aspects, traditional buildings and dealing with the sophisticated issues of heritage sites management often fall between the cracks. The result is a series of daily decisions that stand in flagrant contradiction with recognized urban conservation practices, that irreversibly change the face of the old city;

- Existing regulation lines, building lines, buffer zones and sometimes political decisions inherited from outdated plans and policies lead to freeze of building activities (moratorium) in some locations of Historic Cairo such as Arab al-Yassar, al-Qa’a and Masiero. This moratorium results into gradual decay of significant portions of the urban fabric, freezing existing assets and creation of new urban fabrics and realities that never historically existed. This policy needs careful revision in order to reverse it, while putting in place new development policies in the areas subject to this policy in order to prevent uncontrolled development following allowance of building activities in these areas;
- One of the major threats to urban rehabilitation in Historic Cairo is the existing ‘Demolition Decrees’ that can only be reversed through court orders which is a very lengthy and complicated process. This will require the intervention of high level authorities and political will to seek legal trajectories to overcome this problem;

- The existing official Detailed Planning process does not accommodate for heritage planning requirements. For example, detailed interventions on a plot-by-plot basis or maps of significant buildings are not recognized through the existing formal planning process recognized by the Governorate, hence are not implemented on the micro level;

- Some of the current building regulations in Law 119/2008 and Historic Cairo’s building guidelines issued in 2009 are not realistic given the existing urban context of Historic Cairo and need to be revisited to become more supportive to heritage conservation aspects. For instance, there are no rules or regulations that protect ordinary traditional buildings or continuum of traditional street facades from demolition of insensitive interventions;

- The existing legal and administrative procedures to issue building or rehabilitation permits in Historic Cairo are quite complicated and need to be addressed within the proposed institutional framework of the intended Historic Cairo Management Plan;

- There is a need to work closely with some entities such as the Egyptian Awqaf Authority to develop efficient management plans for their properties that often suffer from neglect and deterioration. This could also extend to preparation of adaptive reuse plans for these assets;

- Historic Cairo, as many other areas in Egypt, lacks organized database that maintains ownership records of different plots or different regulations decrees issued for existing buildings. This opens the door to illegal practices such as illegal acquisition of plots of land and existing buildings especially when the owners are absent or if the property is publically owned;

- Within the context of high level of multiple ownership of residential buildings, absence of the owner in many cases and low rent values, residential buildings suffer from lack of periodical maintenance especially in common areas such as entrances, staircases and facades. The GoE was recently working on a law to protect and maintain existing buildings through organizing what is called ‘Occupants’ Unions’ to take care of these matters, but this law has not yet materialized. Such mechanism is lacking and it until it is in place, proposed rehabilitation schemes would propose an alternative process to organize maintenance efforts;

- There is a need to address the complex relationship between tenants and owners in Historic Cairo given the existing laws. According to the old rent law, owners do not really benefit from their valuable assets and can not terminate the rent contract without the consent of the tenants. Therefore, the only way to terminate this relationship is to demolish the existing building and evict the tenants. On the other hand, approval of a rehabilitation permit for an existing building requires the formal consent of the owners who often object such process for the above reason. This dilemma leads to lack of investment in existing buildings by the owners, and put major obstacles in the face of rehabilitation efforts in Historic Cairo;

- On the other hand, the Egyptian Parliament is currently working on a new law that would eventually abolish old rent agreements for existing buildings. Despite the fact that this would help owners retrieve their buildings and terminate old rent contracts, but this also would lead to massive demolition of traditional buildings and old structures. Despite the fact that old rent agreements are not fair to the owners, but the existence of long generations of tenants within such buildings has to a great extent protected them from demolition. This law, if approved, would lead to remarkable changes in the urban fabric of Historic Cairo and similar urban areas;

3.6.2. Social Issues

- Infiltration of commercial activities into residential segments of Historic Cairo’s neighborhoods is one of the most expressed problems by local residents. This process takes place horizontally
through extension of commercial uses into residential alleyways and cul-de-sacs, and vertically through using upper floors of existing residential buildings as commercial facilities and workshops. This process has direct impact on privacy issues and degrades the environmental quality of semi-private spaces and residential areas; resulting into social disputes and in some cases residents leave the area to seek better residential environment;

- Inhabitants of Historic Cairo appreciate their neighborhoods for many reasons including: low rents, security of tenure, homogeneous socioeconomic levels, strong family ties, social solidarity, strong economic networks, and existence of local markets and services.

- As mentioned earlier, Historic Cairo is privileged with stable population with considerable length of residence. The preservation of existing traditional buildings, not only maintains the architectural heritage of the area, but more importantly maintains a unique lifestyle, positive community values and empowers the existing social networks. Potential threats to the relationship between the exiting built environment and existing social networks such as major urban projects or proposals to abolish old rent laws could lead to the eventual loss of these valuable social assets;

- For the above reasons, a significant portion of the inhabitants are in favor of rehabilitation and would like to continue living in the same neighborhood if not the same house. However, they lack mechanisms to organize this process among different tenants and owners and refuse to leave their homes during the rehabilitation process unless there are enough guarantees to return them back after the rehabilitation is over;

3.6.3. Financial and Economic Issues

- The majority of the inhabitants can not afford direct cash contributions to costly rehabilitation processes. Therefore, affordable financing mechanisms should be in place since the inhabitants can cover rehabilitation costs but on extended periods of time. Inhabitants’ contributions are possible given the existing security of tenure due to old rent agreements. Use of instruments such as microcredit to finance housing rehabilitation programs proved successful in the case of AKTC’s ADAA Housing Rehabilitation Program, and results achieved in this regards need to be further explored and capitalized upon;

- There is a need to demonstrate high quality and cost-effective housing rehabilitation models. Inhabitants who financially afford to restore their buildings believe it is futile to invest in restoration or rehabilitation under the impression that this process does not work and structural problems will reoccur in a short period of time. They simply prefer to invest in new buildings;

- Existing building regulations limiting building heights and illegal costs associated with lack of transparency makes real estate investments in Historic Cairo uneconomic and finically unfeasible. Therefore, local entrepreneurs tend to violate the existing regulations to build extra floors or use low quality materials and craftsmanship;

3.6.4. Built Environment Related Issues

Planning, services and infrastructure level

- The residential fabric of different parts of Historic Cairo is quite diverse and requires more in-depth studies in order to prepare different intervention packages that address the needs of each specific action area;

- According to the inhabitants, traditional buildings with wooden floors and structurally deteriorated buildings do not get access to natural gas networks currently being extended to neighborhoods of Historic Cairo. With the reoccurring crisis of limited access to cooking gas this issue is becoming more important for local inhabitants. This regulation by natural gas companies needs to be further investigated;
- Poor quality of existing services and facilities (local markets, schools, public transportation, etc) and infrastructure networks in Historic Cairo is a general problem that needs to be addressed through long-term plans. This specific problem has direct impact on the areas’ middle class and their willingness to continue living in Historic Cairo;

- Traffic problems, lack of car parking for private car owners, penetration of high velocity transportation (motorcycles, vespas and Suzuki trucks) into residential parts of Historic Cairo’s neighborhoods is an issue that worth considering though traffic studies;

- As previously mentioned, infiltration of residential parts of Historic Cairo neighborhoods (alleyways and cul-de-sacs) by commercial activities and street vendors, thus bring strangers and new comers into strictly residential streets and semi-public spaces resulting into privacy problems and increased level of social disputes. One way to address such problem is through detailed planning regulations and land use proposals sensitive to such consideration;

- Deteriorated conditions and solid waste problems in the public open space due to lack of maintenance and proper management is a rampant phenomenon. This problem can be addressed within a larger framework related to Cairo Governorate solid waste programs;

- Deteriorated residential buildings and ruins of collapsed buildings are often turned into storage, workshops or commercial facilities resulting into a reduced level of residential uses and increased level of environmental and health hazards. Efficient utilization of such underused resources in Historic Cairo needs to be addressed on the planning level;

**Design and building level**

- New housing developments do not follow any building guidelines that fit within Historic Cairo’s traditional urban and architectural context. Despite the fact that NOUH and Cairo Governorate have issued such building guidelines in 2009 but they are not followed or implemented by local administration levels;

- Existing traditional buildings provide more diversity of housing products in terms of unit sizes than modern residential buildings. This is highly appreciated by the inhabitants since this diversity accommodates for the needs of different income and social levels;

- Inhabitants appreciate design qualities of traditional buildings such as ceiling heights, windows proportions and stone construction. These qualities are perceived by the inhabitants as promoting ‘healthier’ living environment;

- New illegally constructed buildings cause a major problem to local inhabitants of existing buildings given their configuration that violates permitted building heights in Historic Cairo. These new structures reduce the amount of natural light and ventilation in their vicinity, violate privacy of upper floors apartments; and bring new comers to exiting local communities;

- Modification of a large portion of traditional buildings originally designed for extended families, into multiple nuclear family apartment buildings results into structural damage and sharing of facilities such as bathrooms and kitchens between multiple families leading to deterioration of the living conditions in these buildings;

- Modification of residential buildings into commercial facilities also results into structural damage to existing buildings and environmental hazards for local residents;

- Lack of technical knowledge on how to address structural problems of traditional buildings and low quality craftsmanship in contributes to the rapid deterioration of existing buildings;

**3.6.5. Tourism Related Issues**

- Lack of appropriate tourism facilities (toilets, restaurants and cafes with acceptable hygienic level); infrastructure (roads, lighting, street furniture, etc); and interpretative and directional signage stand against maximizing the potential of responsible tourism within the area;
- Lack of adaptive reuse plans of existing monuments, especially non-religious buildings, results into neglect of these building and accumulation of solid waste around them. The survey respondents propose to reuse these monuments for new functions serving not only tourism but also the local community;
- The respondents complain from looting of historic buildings and visual/physical (horizontal and vertical) encroachment on monuments through illegal construction activities

3.6.6. Post 25th January 2011 Impact on Historic Cairo

- In general, and despite its long-term positive impact, the Revolution resulted into almost complete absence of the State over the past year, allowing local contractors and residents to violate building regulations and existing laws through demolition of a considerable number of existing buildings, building anew and adding additional floors to existing residential buildings;
- Encroachment on the public space and building new commercial and residential structures especially in Manshiet Nasser Shiyakhats has been rampant over the past year;
- The Maspero Triangle project in Bulaq resulted into putting permits for new construction and rehabilitation of existing housing on hold in order to acquire existing buildings and plots to redevelop the entire area into high end business district. Local inhabitants have been resisting this process and protesting against these practices until Governor of Cairo allowed access to building and rehabilitation permits to local inhabitants in December 2011. However, these redevelopment plans are still in place.

4. FURTHER ACTION AND COMPREHENSIVE HOUSING REHABILITATION STUDY

Housing rehabilitation prospect in Historic Cairo and investment in inner-city development proves to be an untapped potential that would benefit the city of Cairo at large, since it contributes to the revitalization of the social, economic and cultural vitality of its center. However, this is a long-term process that involves well coordinated and integrated efforts, complex institutional frameworks, cooperation of different governmental and non-governmental entities, and most importantly, taking Historic Cairo’s inhabitants into account as the main partners and driving force behind this process. To this effect, this section outlines the priorities of addressing housing rehabilitation issues in Historic Cairo and recommends some further studies leading to better understanding of this process and its potentials.

4.1. HOUSING REHABILITATION PRIORITIES IN HISTORIC CAIRO

1. Documentation and immediate protection of “Buildings with Peculiar Architectural Value”: even before 25th January 2011, these architecturally significant buildings were threatened by different attempts of their owners to demolish them and benefit from their real estate value. Following the Revolution the rate of these attempts has incredibly increased and immediate protection measures for these buildings should be in place. In addition, there is a need to conduct detailed architectural documentation of such buildings in case they are demolished, vandalized or irreversibly altered since they represent a fine example of different types and typologies of Cairo’s domestic architecture. This should be also combined with medium-term program for the rehabilitation of these buildings, including development of appropriate financing mechanisms, legal and technical assistance and adaptive reuse plans when applicable;

2. Development of protection measures for traditional buildings and continuums of traditional street façades; unfortunately there are no laws or regulations protecting ‘ordinary’ traditional buildings that used to constitute Historic Cairo’s traditional urban fabric. The problem with these buildings, that when perceived in isolation from their context, they can not be considered significant from an architectural point of view. However, when they exist together in neighborhood blocks or continuum of street facades, they represent the essence of Historic Cairo’s urban heritage that should be maintained and protected. However, they are not protected since existing laws and regulations are
not sensitive to ‘Urban Conservation’ and mostly deal with heritage issues on the individual building level. The current rapid rate of demolition of these buildings is one of the major threats facing Historic Cairo and would eventually lead to the loss of Historic Cairo’s urban character, in addition to the eviction of their original inhabitants;

3. Development of legal and institutional measures to reverse exiting demolition decrees for traditional buildings: this is a serious problem facing hundreds of traditional buildings in Historic Cairo. For instance, a quick assessment of 409 residential buildings along the Historic Wall in ADAA conducted by AKTC in 2005 shows that 36% of the existing buildings are subject to partial demolition or total demolition decrees (22% total demolition and 14% partial demolition). Such problem needs to be addressed by higher political levels and effective measures need to be devised to: i) resolve potential legal conflicts related to this problem between tenants and owners; ii) structurally stabilize such buildings in case there were in severely deteriorated condition; and iii) develop housing rehabilitation mechanisms to address the legal, technical, social and financial related aspects;

4. Maximizing value of frozen and underused assets: contrary to prevailing impressions about Historic Cairo, significant portions of the area suffer from low density of population. This mainly stems from the fact that a considerable number of existing properties is either empty plots of land full of garbage and debris; partially ruined structures, or empty buildings. This misuse of existing resources hinders urban revitalization of different neighborhoods since most of these properties are either owned by multiple owners or governmental agencies that are not interested in the effective use of these assets. Such a problem needs to be addressed on the planning level to identify concentrations of these properties and develop localized revitalization plans for each area including financial mechanisms and sovereign measures required to expropriate these properties if applicable. This process should take place while allowing the owners of these properties to become shareholders in such development schemes. Some of these properties can be also used to provide required neighborhood services in different areas of Historic Cairo;

5. Development of long-term housing rehabilitation objectives: housing rehabilitation is not an end in itself; rather it is a tool to achieve goals and objectives related to a long term vision of the historic city. Therefore, valid questions about the future of Historic Cairo should be raised in order to frame the housing rehabilitation objectives within its larger context. These questions might include:

- Who are the targeted groups by these housing rehabilitation efforts? Do they target existing households, attracting middle class families who still have their businesses and origins in Historic Cairo to move back, or injecting new housing typologies into to attract high end users?

- To what extent should population densities with the existing fabric be encouraged? And more importantly, how would this contribute to maximizing the value and better use of existing underutilized assets? How can current densities of different activities within Historic Cairo be redistributed to improve the urban environment?

- How can the existing housing stock evolve to accommodate the continuously changing socioeconomic and cultural needs of local inhabitants, modern life requirements and existing urban development pressures; without compromising the heritage conservation aspects of Historic Cairo?

These questions, and many others, should be raised through dialogue with different stakeholders to reflect on a long-term housing rehabilitation policy within the larger framework of the proposed Conservation and Management Plans for Historic Cairo.

6. Conduct further in-depth studies on housing rehabilitation prospects in Historic Cairo: there is a need to further explore the prospects of housing rehabilitation in order to develop realistic solutions for this sector based on solid understanding of its parameters, the results achieved through previous

---

8 For more details, please see Appendix V: Report Maps: Regulation Decrees Along the Historic Ayyubid Wall (2005), source: AKTC
4.2. **FURTHER HOUSING REHABILITATION STUDIES**

In order to further explore potential and prospects of housing rehabilitation in Historic Cairo, these is a need to: i) confirm and improve the findings of the current housing rehabilitation study; and ii) collect necessary information leading to the development of a sustainable and effective housing rehabilitation program in Historic Cairo. To this effect, the following is an outline of different components (that can be amended as required) of a possible comprehensive study on housing rehabilitation in the Historic Cairo WH site:

- **Architectural Heritage Aspects**: documentation and comprehensive understanding of residential buildings in different locations of the urban fabric. This will include architectural documentation of a selected number of residential buildings (including buildings with peculiar architectural value) reflecting different architectural typologies; and the types of internal and external alterations that took place in these buildings due to demographic, social economic and physical developments in the area;

- **Urban Heritage Aspects**: documentation and comprehensive understanding of selected ‘action areas’ of the urban fabric that still maintain the main features of Historic Cairo’s urban heritage. This will include documentation of selected semi-private open spaces, how they are used by the inhabitants and their interface with residential private spaces. This can also extend to highlight the importance of traditional housing blocks and traditional façades continuum to the overall urban character of Historic Cairo;

- **Physical Survey**: the above two points can be either implemented in the form of a relatively quick assessment of some selected examples, or extended and be linked to a comprehensive Physical Survey of the selected ‘action areas’ to document (on a plot-by-plot basis) aspects of: land use, infrastructure and services, land ownership and tenure, building types, physical conditions, assessment of different transformations within the built environment, street morphology and open spaces.

- **Social Aspects**: better understanding of the existing community profile through a parallel ‘Social Survey’ including the same social aspects addressed by the current report but through questionnaires and focus group meetings with a more representative sample of the local community within the selected action areas. This will also include a better in-depth understanding of the existing lifestyle profiles, interaction with the built environment, existing social networks, possible measures against potential gentrification, etc.;

- **Legal and Institutional Aspects**: detailed mapping of the relationships between existing laws, decrees, policies and procedures and their impact on heritage aspects and the built environment in general. This will also cover aspects of institutional relations between different entities; existing opportunities and means to benefit from ongoing development projects, donor agencies and support from existing governmental agencies; measures to address existing legal hurdles related to tenure, regulation decrees, permit process, etc.; and capacity building needs for different administrative level in different entities active in Historic Cairo;

- **Financial and Economic Aspects**: this will primarily focus on 4 areas: i) relationship between housing patterns and existing economic networks within Historic Cairo (home-work patterns); ii) real estate market and demand-supply models; iii) existing housing finance mechanisms and potential role of microcredit and housing mortgage facilities; and iv) interface with tourism and potential for economic development within this sector;

- **Sustainable Housing Rehabilitation Program in Historic Cairo**: the above studies should eventually lead to realistic recommendations, action plans and the development of a housing
rehabilitation program for Historic Cairo. The components of the proposed program should include different technical, social, financial, legal and institutional aspects including propose measures and implementation modalities to be included in the intended Conservation and Management Plan for the Historic Cairo World Heritage Site. This can also include the development of fairly accessible Housing Rehabilitation and New Development Manuals covering aspects of architectural design; building regulations and guidelines; and construction / rehabilitation techniques and materials.
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APPENDIX I: TERMS OF REFERENCE

The present report refers to the following Terms of Reference:

1. Establish a common understanding of the mission framework with URHC project team and verify potential mission stakeholders;
2. Collect preliminary data on related programs and activities available through the URHC project team and stakeholders (projects reports, CAPMAS data, etc.);
3. Provide an initial characterisation of the different housing types and conditions in the different types of urban fabric of Historic Cairo based on statistical data and sample surveys;
4. Outline the institutional, legislative and financial aspects of the housing stock management (i.e. rent control, public/private ownership, etc.). This will include an outline of:
   a) Mapping of different institutional stakeholders, their interrelationships and responsibilities;
   b) Existing laws relevant to housing aspects in Historic Cairo;
   c) Existing policies (decrees controlling the urban fabric: the new Cairo Governorate decrees in line with law 119/2008, NOUH, SCA, Ministry of Culture, etc.);
   d) Existing procedures (regulation lines, regulation decrees, building permits, etc.);
   e) Types of ownerships and occupancy.
5. Outline research methods to identify and evaluate the existing “uncontrolled” and “spontaneous” construction, maintenance and rehabilitation practices including financial aspects and alternative housing solutions available for the residents;
6. Interview different stakeholders and evaluate the housing interventions in the recent and on-going urban rehabilitation programmes including the following initiatives:
   b) Al-Darb al-Ahmar Revitalization Project (AKTC);
   c) Mui’zz and Gamaliyya upgrading project (Ministry of Culture);
   d) Al-Darb al-Asfar (Mashrabiyya Foundation);
   e) Housing Rehabilitation initiative in Bab al-Wazir (ARCE);
   f) Al-Saliba Street upgrading project (Ministry of Tourism);
   g) Old Cairo upgrading project (Cairo Governorate - Ministry of Tourism)
7. Identify the critical issues with reference to housing tenure, densities, services and facilities;
8. Outline the program of a possible comprehensive study on housing rehabilitation in the Historic Cairo WH site (including reference to the international best practices); and identify risks, assumptions and sustainability issues relevant to the proposed program.
APPENDIX II: SURVEY FORMS EMPLOYED THROUGH THE STUDY

Building (Basic Information)

Street Address: ___
Building Height: ___

Building Condition (good - deteriorating - poor)

Type of Construction (traditional - modern - mixed - makeshift structure)

State of Integrity (building with full historic integrity - reversibly altered building - irreversibly altered building - new construction - semi-permanent housing)

Type of Building Use (residential only - residential + business: specify type of activities)

Status of Ownership (private - government - awqaf)

Type of Occupancy (tenants only - owner occupied - owner occupied with tenants)

No. of Families in the Building

No. of Housing Units in the Building

Occupancy Status

What is the floor area of the housing unit?

How many persons live in the housing unit?

What is the respondent’s current occupation status?

  - Sole owner of building
  - Partial owner of building
  - Tenant - new lease
  - Tenant - old lease
  - Informal agreement
  - Other - specify

Electricity meter is in whose name?

  - Occupying family member
  - Non-occupying family member (inc. dead)
  - Other - specify

Does owner live in this building?

  - Yes
  - No, where (in the neighborhood, elsewhere)?

Duration of Stay and Nature of Occupancy

What is the respondent’s origin according to birthplace?

  - Same neighborhood
  - Other neighborhood in Historic Cairo
  - Elsewhere

How many years has respondent lived in this house?

  - < 1 year
  - 1 – 5 years
Area Related Aspects

What utilities does this house have?
- Electricity
- Piped water
- Mains sewage disposal
- Natural Gas

Where do the family members work (or study)?
- Same neighborhood
- Other neighborhood in Historic Cairo
- Elsewhere

What are the advantages of living in this neighborhood?
- Access to good services & utilities
- Proximity to work location
- Proximity to family & friends (social network)
- Low rents
- Others - specify

What are the main problems of living in this neighborhood?
- Scarcity of services & utilities
- Social problems & disputes among neighbors
- Solid waste
- Others - specify

Willingness to Stay

Does the respondent want to continue living in this neighborhood in the future?
- Yes
- No - why not? Where to go?

Does the respondent want to continue living in this house in the future?
- Yes
- No - why not? Where to go?

Rehabilitation and Maintenance

What are the improvements made in the last 24 months to the (unit - building)?
- Structural (walls, floors, roof, windows, etc.)
- Plumbing
- Electricity
- External plaster/painting/tiling
- Internal plaster/paint/tiling
- Other - specify
- No improvements made to (unit - building)
If improvements were made to the (unit - building), who did the work?

- Household member
- Paid worker(s)
- Contractor
- Other - specify

What was the cost of the work?

How was it paid for?

- Landlord
- Savings
- Bank loan
- Personal borrowing
- Gamiyya (saving club)
- Other - specify

If any work was done to the (unit - building) in last 24 months, describe any problems met?

- Legal or administrative (permissions)
- Financial (e.g. getting landlord to pay, getting loan)
- Technical (quality, on-time work, etc.)
- Other - specify

**Desired Improvement / Rehabilitation Works**

What improvements would you choose to make to this building?

- Repair walls
- Repair roof
- Repair staircase and entrance
- Kitchen (new, repair)
- Toilet/bathroom (new, plumbing, repair)
- Repair windows
- Internal painting
- External painting
- Other - specify

Proposed schemes to enable residents to improve units and buildings:

- Contribute to costs
  - Yes
  - No
- Leave house during work
  - Yes
  - No
- Able to contribute to cost of future maintenance
  - Yes
  - No
- Willing to finance repairs through a loan
  - Yes
  - No - specify reasons

Do you know of any project, program or organization that work / can help you in rehabilitating your house?

- Yes
- No
If yes, did you approach it for assistance?
- Yes: what type of assistance? And what happened?
- No: why?

Real Estate Aspects (value of building and rentable value)
How much would a person have to pay to buy a housing unit like this in this neighborhood?
- (Amount): ___
- Don’t know
How much would a person have to pay to rent a housing unit like this in this neighborhood?
- Advance money (amount)
- Monthly rent (amount)
- Don’t know
How much would a person have to pay to rent a room in a building like this in this neighborhood?
- Advance money (amount)
- Monthly rent (amount)
- Don’t know
Does the family own other properties (housing unit, building, land) in the same neighborhood or elsewhere?
What are the types of housing solutions available in the neighborhood?
- Old rent
- New rent
- Buying (tamleek)
- Public housing
- Others - specify
In case a house is demolished or has fallen down, where do residents go?
- Governmental housing in new urban communities
- Find other housing opportunities in the same neighborhood
- Other neighborhoods outside of Historic Cairo - specify
- Others - specify

Heritage Aspects
What are the advantages or disadvantages of living in traditional houses in this neighborhood?
- Design (space organization, flexibility, etc.)
- Floor areas (appropriate for family use, not appropriate, etc.)
- Conditions (deterioration, lack of maintenance, etc.)
- Other - specify
How important is restoring historically significant structures in the neighborhood?
- Important: why?
- Not important: why?

Construction Entrepreneurs Interview Topics
How is the housing market in the neighborhood (price, availability)?
What is happening to the market for land and property since January 25th 2011 (prices are increasing, decreasing, stable, etc.)?
What kind of people are buying into the neighborhood (local residents, outsiders, etc.)?
What types of housing solutions are preferred in the area?

- Old rent
- New rent
- Buying (tamleek)
- Public housing
- Other - specify

What is the average price of mid-sized housing unit in the neighborhood?

What are the terms of payment?

Do you work in the field of housing rehabilitation? If not, why?

What are the problems facing construction and real estate market in the neighborhood (legal, technical, financial - specify)?

In your personal perception, what are the current percentages of the following housing solutions in the neighborhood?

- Old rent
- New rent
- Buying (tamleek)
- Public housing
- Others specify

What are the prevailing average prices (per square meter) for the following:

- Unfinished housing unit
- Half finished housing unit
- Fully finished housing unit
- Vacant lot

Are vacant lots available in the area? If not, how do you overcome this problem?
APPENDIX III: LIST OF MATERIALS RECEIVED FROM URHC PROJECT TEAM

- 07- Legislation_list_urhc.xlsx (laws relevant to Historic Cairo)
- 08- Bibliography most recent.xls (references on Historic Cairo)
- Comparison48-2006.jpg (overlap of different maps between 1807 and 2006)
- HC Restoration Projects.jpg (map of conservation projects in Historic Cairo)
- WHS Shiakhas.xlsx (list of Historic Cairo Shiakhats)
- WHS-Core-Buffer-3diff.jpg (map for World Heritage Site - Historic Cairo Buffer Zone)
- WHS-Core-protection.psd (map with layers for World Heritage Site - Historic Cairo Buffer Zone)
- 2010 12-16.jpg (Historic Cairo Building Use Map from CAPMAS)
- الشياخات و الأقسام.jpg (Historic Cairo Shiakhats and Qisms Boundary Map from CAPMAS)
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