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ABSTRACT

Providing local facilities is one of the important aspects of planning sustainable neighbourhoods, while governance process is a key factor for achieving sustainable development.

This research is concerned to establish the relationship between the governance process for the provision of local facilities and neighbourhood social sustainability in Syria. The research adopts a case study approach, choosing three relatively new neighbourhoods in Aleppo/Syria as case studies for their distinctive characteristics, and applies two analytical frameworks to examine the impact of local facilities on social sustainability at the neighbourhood level as a process and as an outcome.

The governance process for providing local facilities is analysed, focusing on actors, roles, relationships, rules, resources and rationalities. The impact of this provision on neighbourhood social sustainability is analysed, focusing on accessibility, travel mode, social interaction, safety and security, and sense of place.

On the one hand, findings from the research reveal poor implementation of local facilities, which turn out quite different from what is specified in plans. The status of local facilities is due mainly to the governance processes for providing them being hampered by many challenges. These include the state continually attempting to control the provision process yet failing to deliver adequately, and the weak formal participation of the market and civil society in the governance process. On the other hand, the findings also reveal the limited potential of the local facilities provided to enhance social sustainability at the neighbourhood level in the three case study neighbourhoods which is attributable mainly to their poor provision.

The research thus supports the view of governance process as a key element of sustainable development and specifically of social sustainability. It concludes that improvement of the governance process of delivering local facilities is a must if social sustainability at the neighbourhood level is to be improved.
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APPENDICES
## Appendix 2-1 Summary of different characteristics of sustainable neighbourhoods provided by different authors and organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author or organization</th>
<th>Broad categories</th>
<th>Key elements of sustainable neighbourhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barton et al (2010)</td>
<td>Social objective</td>
<td>Improving the local community; providing equity and accessibility, increasing a healthy life style, enhancing safety and security, freedom of choice, and providing local decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental objectives</td>
<td>Improving environmental quality, enhancing wildlife and biodiversity, conservation of natural resources and reducing greenhouse emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic objectives</td>
<td>Wealth creation and promotion and provision of employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabareen (2006)</td>
<td>Seven design concepts related to sustainable urban form</td>
<td>Compact form: development should be compact to control sprawl; sustainable transport: urban design should encourage environmentally friendly modes of transport like walking, cycling and public transport; density should be high enough in order to vitalise the diversity of mix of use and public transport; mixed land uses: a wide variety of uses should be provided nearby to reduce the need to travel and to encourage environmentally friendly modes of travel; diversity: a wide range of housing types and tenures, mix of use etc.; passive solar design and use of renewable energy sources: minimising the use of non-renewable sources through e.g. environmental urban design, and greening: integrating with nature to enhance bio-diversity and reduce pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choguill (2008)</td>
<td>Economic sustainability</td>
<td>Economic sustainability: neighbourhoods should be of limited size but of high density in order to justify the provision of mixed land uses and facilities; should be built around a focal point within proximity of residences to reduce the need to use cars; local facilities should be close to this focal point to provide an opportunity for social interaction. Social sustainability: density should be small enough to allow for social interaction, and high enough to allow for participation in decision making over local issues. Technical sustainability: the neighbourhood should be integrated with its surrounding through clear boundaries but allow for efficient social interaction within. Environmental sustainability: green spaces, parks and play grounds should be provided to enhance the environment and provide an opportunity people to meet and interact, which also affect the social sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman (2007)</td>
<td>Integration between people, land and buildings</td>
<td>Diversity: neighbourhoods should accommodate people with 'different back ground but of similar interest'; adaptability: housing should be provided in a wide range and flexibility to cover different demands of the residents; new and old buildings should be integrated in harmony; mix of uses: a wide range of activities and services should be provided; resources conservation: the natural elements should be protected and development should encourage resource conservation and reduce the polluting impact; quality of landscape in private and public areas reserve natural resources; accessibility: the circulation networks should provide for efficient public and private transport, reduce the need for car use and encourage environmental modes of transport. a sense of pride: people should feel that they ‘own’ their neighbourhood, so, common spaces should be provided. Finally, social interaction and strong community should be encouraged to allow for efficient implementation of all the above mentioned aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson and Williams (2000)</td>
<td>Governance Sustainable community</td>
<td>Planning system: should be involved in implementing of sustainability and achieving sustainability should be seen as a priority in their developments; mixed land uses: should be provided to reduce the need to travel, enhance the vitality of the area, improve safety and security, increase the sense of place, and providing access for local jobs; high residential density: should be provided to reduce the use of land for residential buildings, roads and parking, and also reduce the consumption of energy, densities should be planned to correspond to the local context as it might result in more car dependency and more consumption of resources if it is remote from public transportation or existing infrastructure; Brown field site development: should be encouraged to reduces the demand for land and infrastructure, and enhances the viability of public transport and local facilities. Environmental transport modes: walking, cycling and public transport modes of travel should be encouraged. Quality of urban design; and finally Cohesive community should be encouraged and partnership between all sectors that are responsible for providing for the neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim (2005)</td>
<td>Land use and transportation</td>
<td>Higher density; proximity of key activity centre and local services; facilitate environmental mode of travel pedestrian, through providing a walking cycling and public transport network; reduce the use of non-renewable sources and provide alternative energy resources to use; reduce greenhouse gas emission; increase biodiversity; reduce chemical and biological contaminant emission; reduce water waste, and increase the benefitting from rainwater penetration; increase soil productivity and safety and increase environmental diversity; increase aesthetic value of urban design and sense of place; provide energy-efficient urban design; provide safety by design measurement from urban design; increase the reduce , reuse and recycle of material; increase mix of tenures; provide opportunities for social interaction and participation in decision making (Kim 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED-ND (2009)</td>
<td>Smart location and linkages; neighbourhood pattern and design; green infrastructure</td>
<td>Location efficiency: this include achieving efficiency in transportation through encouraging environmental modes of travel, achieving efficiency of using Water resources, better use of brown fields. Reduce, Mix used of land , less use of cars and better access to public spaces. Environmental preservation: this includes parkland, wetland, farmland, steep slope and ecological communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED for Neighbourhood Development</td>
<td>Compact, complete and connected neighbourhood: compact development, accessible services and facilities, transport efficiency, environmental mode of travel, sense of place, efficient density, efficient buildings, efficient water treatment, efficient energy, efficient management of grey water, materials, and waste (LEED 2009).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREEAM (2009) (Building Research Establishment's Environmental Assessment Method)</td>
<td>Climate and energy: reducing negative impact on climate change, Community: liveable communities, integration with surrounding areas, Place shaping: efficient urban design of the local area, Ecology and biodiversity: protecting the environmental value, Transportation: environmental transportation modes (walking and cycling), Resources: efficient use of resources, Business: create local job opportunities and support local economy, Buildings: efficient buildings (BREEM 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Craft Communities (2011)</td>
<td>Site selection: Protect Floodplains, Brownfield, grey field and infill location development, activity centre and balance between job and housing, environmental modes of travel, water management; Erosion &amp; Sedimentation Control, Storm water Management, Water Conservation, Protect Steep Slopes, Mulch On Site planning and design; involve wide range of actors in planning and design process, Density, accommodate environmental modes of travel, Minimize Building Setbacks, provide environmental transport network, environmental building design e.g. solar orientation, mixed land use mixed tenures, preservation landscape; conservation of habitat protection, wetland and landscape, community engagement; encourage public participation and community associations, residents and government education of environmental issues, green building: green building design and efficient water, energy and material management (ECC 2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQE²R (2004) (Sharifi and Akito 2013b)</td>
<td>Resources and heritage; local environment; diversity; integration; social life 1. Economic efficiency – 2. Social Equity - diversity, integration of both inhabitants and neighbourhoods, access and movement, conservation, creativity, lack of poverty. 3. Environmental caution – improving quality of life through limiting urban sprawl; more effective use of public space, provision of cycle-, walk-ways and green spaces, preserving and enhancing habitat, improving quality of local environment and ensuring diversity of population, habitat, human activities and space. 4. Long term visions and shorter term actions. 5. Alliance of local with regional, national and global. 6. Participation of ordinary citizens alongside those with expertise and power – close alliance of citizen needs with improvement in comfort and reductions in costs (Sharifi and Murayama 2013b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levedy (2005)</td>
<td>Context; urban structure; transport; energy flows; material flows; socio-economic issues; processes(Sharifi and Akito 2013b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR (2007)</td>
<td>Commercial success performance measurement; housing affordability performance measurement; community well-being performance measurement; urban design excellence performance measurement; environmental leadership performance measurement (Sharifi and Akito 2013b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InspireEast (2004)</td>
<td>Excellence criteria based on Egan’s eight components of sustainable communities: Equity, which means providing fairness for everyone through mix of tenures and households. Housing and built environment, which is concerned with encouraging the development of attractive buildings and public spaces. Environment and this demands high quality residential, and non-residential buildings, and landscape. Social and cultural liveable communities, high respect for the local culture and social interaction. The variety of services which are accessible and providing for the different needs of the population. Transport and connectivity so that good public transportation which connect residential and non-residential facilities should be provided. Governance, as communities should be well run with high level of social participation. Economic which means that local economy should be encouraged through a variety of facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H M Government, (2005) Securing the Future</td>
<td>Economic, environmental and social dimensions: active, inclusive, and safe; well served; well designed and built; well run; environmentally sensitive; well connected; thriving; and fair for everyone (H M Government 2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban village</td>
<td>Mixed housing types, mix of uses in the neighbourhood and convenient range of local facilities. Integrated transportation energy efficient design of the built environment. Neighbourhood design should achieve a 1:1 ratio between jobs and residents; The size of the development should be about 40 hectares; The population should be large enough to support a range and variety of activities, i.e. about 3000-5000 people; Density should be high enough in order to maintain social interaction and neighbourliness; Pedestrian friendly, traffic calmed environment; catering well for the car without encouraging more use. Adaptable buildings and uses. Urban design that encourages a sense of place and safety, discouraging crime; Urban form that provides for social, environmental and economic sustainability (Source: Aldous, 1992).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New Urbanism  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNU 2001</td>
<td>Walkability; Connectivity; Mixed-Use &amp; Diversity; Mixed Housing; Quality Architecture &amp; Urban Design; Traditional Neighbourhood Structure; Increased Density; Smart Transportation; Sustainability; Quality of Life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eco-village | reduce the ecological footprint of settlements | Providing for people to share common resources, Providing work for all residents, Integrating all groups of people(elderly, women, children and disabled), Encouraging diversity, Encouraging growing food locally, Encouraging the use of local building materials, Increasing the use of renewable energy, Protecting biodiversity, Encouraging conservative use of energy and management of waste, Increasing the sense of belonging, Respecting different cultures and different places (Jackson 2000) |

| Beacon Report: Neighbourhood Sustainability Framework (2005) | Housing satisfaction, an acceptable physical appearance of the neighbourhood including low levels of dilapidation, safety in the street from both traffic and other people, low noise disturbance, access to facilities and services, access to other sites in the settlement system, manageable cost of both residence in the neighbourhood and connection to other parts of the city system, ability to have pleasant, friendly and non-threatening casual social relations, ability to provide opportunities for neighbourhood action on local issues. (Beacon 2005) |
### Appendix 2-2 Range and Catchments of local facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local facilities</th>
<th>Local facilities and accessibility standards</th>
<th>Local facility</th>
<th>Illustrative catchment populations (to be adopted by local conditions and policies)</th>
<th>Minimum reasonable accessibility standards at different gross densities (assuming bendy routes)</th>
<th>Possible local catchments</th>
<th>Local facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shop selling food and fresh groceries (500m)</td>
<td>40 People per hectare ppha</td>
<td>60ppha</td>
<td>80ppha</td>
<td>100ppha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Post box (500m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. community centres</td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Children’s playground / amenity area (500m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. healthcare facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Postal facility (1000m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. district/neighbourhood centre uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>e. Bank or cash machine (1000m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Pharmacy (1000m)</td>
<td>f. Pharmacy (1000m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Primary school (1000m)</td>
<td>g. Primary school (1000m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Medical centre (1000m)</td>
<td>h. Medical centre (1000m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Leisure facilities (1000m)</td>
<td>i. Leisure facilities (1000m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Local meeting place/community centre (1000m)</td>
<td>j. Local meeting place/community centre (1000m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Public house (1000m)</td>
<td>k. Public house (1000m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Public park or public access space or village green (1000m)</td>
<td>l. Public park or public access space or village green (1000m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Children's facilities (nursery/ crèche) (1000m)</td>
<td>m. Children's facilities (nursery/ crèche) (1000m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Places of religious worship (incl. Parish halls) (1000m)</td>
<td>n. Places of religious worship (incl. Parish halls) (1000m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another important aspect of providing local facilities is the timescale of provision. In order for these facilities to contribute to sustainability and achieved their anticipated benefits, these facilities should be provided at appropriate time parallel to the provision of housing. E.g. amenities must be available by the time 25% of the development is completed and ready for occupation or within 25% of the total build time of the whole development (or the part within the required distant of the amenities) (BREEAM 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3-1 Elements of Good governance according to the World Bank and the United Nation Development Program

The World Bank (WB) 1994 identified four elements of good governance:

- Public-sector management. This is the most readily identified dimension of the World Bank’s governance work. The language of public-sector management is predominantly technical, changing the organizational structure of a sector agency to reflect new objectives, making budgets work better, sharpening civil-service objectives and placing public-enterprise managers under performance contracts.

- Accountability. Governments and their employees should be held responsible for their actions.

- Legal framework for development. Appropriate legal systems should be created that provide stability and predictability, which are the essential elements in creating an economic environment in which business risks may be rationally assessed.

- Transparency and information. The themes of transparency and information pervade good governance and reinforce accountability. Access to information for the various players in the market is essential to a competitive market economy.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1997) identified the following:

- Participation. All men and women should have a voice in decision-making, either directly or through legitimate intermediate institutions that represent their interests. Such broad participation is built on freedom of association and speech, as well as on the capacity to participate constructively.

- Rule of law. Legal frameworks should be fair and enforced impartially, particularly the laws on human rights.

- Transparency. This concept is built on the free flow of information. Processes, institutions and information should be directly accessible to those concerned, and
enough information should be provided to render them understandable and monitorable.

- **Responsiveness.** Institutions and processes should serve all stakeholders.

- **Consensus orientation.** Good governance should mediate differing interests in order to reach broad consensus on the best interests of the group and, where possible, on policies and procedures.

- **Equity.** All men and women should have equal opportunity to maintain or improve their well-being.

- **Effectiveness and efficiency.** Processes and institutions should produce results that meet needs while making the best use of resources.

- **Accountability –** Decision-makers in government, the private sector and civil society organizations are accountable to the public, as well as to institutional stakeholders. This accountability differs depending on the organization and whether the decision is internal or external to an organization.

- **Strategic vision -** Leaders and the public have a broad and long-term perspective on good governance and human development, along with a sense of what is needed for such development. There is also an understanding of the historical, cultural and social complexities in which that perspective is grounded.

Source: copied from IFAD (1999)

Flyvbjerg (2011 pp 302-312) discussed five misunderstandings of the case study approach as follows:

1. ‘General, theoretical knowledge is more valuable than concrete case knowledge’: Flyvbjerg claims that: Predictive theories and universals cannot be found in the study of human affairs. Concrete case knowledge is therefore more valuable than the vain search for predictive theories and universals.

2. ‘One cannot generalize on the basis of an individual case; therefore, the case study cannot contribute to scientific development’: Flyvbjerg argues that “One can often generalize on the basis of a single case, and the case study may be central to scientific development via generalization as supplement or alternative to other methods”; however, the careful selection of appropriate case studies can ensure that there is great opportunity to generalise findings.

3. ‘The case study is most useful for generating hypotheses, while other methods are more suitable for hypotheses testing and theory building’. Flyvbjerg argues that: This misunderstanding derives from the previous misunderstanding that one cannot generalize on the basis of individual cases. And since this misunderstanding has been revised as above, we can now correct the third misunderstanding as follows: The case study is useful for both generating and testing of hypotheses but is not limited to these research activities alone.

4. ‘The case study contains a bias toward verification, that is, a tendency to confirm the researcher’s preconceived notions’. Francis Bacon (1853 cited in Flyvbjerg 2011) saw this bias toward verification not simply as a phenomenon related to the case study in particular, but as a fundamental human characteristic.\(^\text{136}\)

5. ‘It is often difficult to summarize and develop general propositions and theories on the basis of specific case studies’. Flyvbjerg states that it is correct that summarizing case studies is often difficult, especially as concerns case process. It

\(^\text{136}\)This has been confirmed by psychological research in the 20th century. (e.g. Kahneman 2011)
is less correct as regards case outcomes. The problems in summarizing case studies, however, are due more often to the properties of the reality studied than to the case study as a research method. Often it is not desirable to summarize and generalize case studies. Good studies should be read as narratives in their entirety.

Source: copied from Flyvberg (2011 p 302-313)
Appendix 4-2 Interviews topic guides

**Topic guide for residents’ interviewees**

**General information about the interviewee**

**Age / gender/ area of living**

**Number of households**

**Period of living in the area**

**Car ownership**

**Education**

**Occupation**

**Accessibility to facilities, usage of facilities**

1. Do you use the local facilities in your neighbourhood, if yes please explain why? And if not please explain why?
   - Awareness of the need to support local facilities
   - Quality
   - price
   - accessibility
   - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Inside the neighbourhood, why</th>
<th>Outside the neighbourhood, why</th>
<th>Not use the facility at all, why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping facilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Corner shop,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local and district centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including: shops, pharmacies,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>café and restaurant, religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centre, community centre, gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health facilities
Nursery
Schools | Primary | secondary
Place of religious worship
Recreational facilities (Playing area and green spaces)
Other

Mode of travel

2. How do you and your households access the following facility and why? And are there other facilities you need to use, and how do you access them?

- Awareness of impact on sustainability
- Availability of car
- Lack of parking
- Short distance or long distance to facilities
- Attractiveness of environment to walk
- Risk of traffic accident
- Risk of crimes
- High or low quality of public transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>walking</th>
<th>Public transport</th>
<th>Private car</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping facilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Corner shop,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local and district centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including: shops, pharmacies, café and restaurant, religion centre, community centre, gas station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accompanied with parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social interaction

3. When using, or walking to, the local facility do you have social interaction? Please explain what kind of social interaction? And why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Yes, why</th>
<th>No, why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping facilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Corner shop,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local and district centres including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shops, pharmacies, café and restaurant,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion centre, community centre,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gas station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of religious worship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational facilities (Playing area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and green spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Security

4. Do local facilities in your neighbourhood improve safety and security? When you walk close to the local facilities do you feel safer than walking in other parts of the neighbourhood? And why?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Yes, why</th>
<th>No, why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping facilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Corner shop,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local and district centres including: shops, pharmacies, café and restaurant, religion centre, community centre, gas station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of religious worship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational facilities (Playing area and green spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sense of place** Characteristics that make a place special or unique, and foster a sense of attachment and belonging

5. Do you think that local facilities improve sense of place and identity in your neighbourhood? And why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Yes, why</th>
<th>No, why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping facilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Corner shop,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local and district centres including: shops, pharmacies, café and restaurant, religion centre, community centre, gas station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction and further improvement

6. Are you satisfied with the provision of local facilities in your neighbourhood and why?

7. Are there things you want to change regarding these facilities? Are there facilities you need but not provided in your neighbourhood? Are there facilities provided but not needed? In your opinion, what might improve the local facilities in your neighbourhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Yes, why</th>
<th>No, why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping facilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Corner shop,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local and district centres including: shops, pharmacies, café and restaurant, religion centre, community centre, gas station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of religious worship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational facilities (Playing area and green spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Perception of participation process in planning and implementing local facilities.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Are you aware of the range of local facilities that should be provided in your neighbourhood according to MHU planning standards? And are you aware of the range of local facilities that should be provided in your neighbourhood according to the detailed plan of the neighbourhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Are you aware of mechanism to participate in making decisions in your neighbourhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are you aware of your rights to object to the detailed plans of the neighbourhood within 30 days of its issuing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are you aware of the neighbourhood committee that represent you? Are you aware of the service directorate in your neighbourhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have ever been involved in making decisions regarding planning and implementing local facilities in your neighbourhood or use for public construction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Would you like to have a say in providing (planning and implementing local facilities)? And how would you like that to happen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultation in the planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultation in the implementing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>What might improve the provision process of local facilities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topic guide for Governmental organizations members’ interviews

Municipality:

The aims of the interview are to get information on:

- The process of urban development in general
- The role of the municipality in urban development
- The role of the municipality in providing local facilities in residential neighbourhoods

Questions are grouped in term of the responsibility of each directorate (based on table of responsibilities of municipality departments).

General issues:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>How has urban development process been undertaken so far? And has been any changes to this process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What is the role of the SPC in urban development? And how does the five-year plan affect plans for urban development and does this include physical planning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>In your agenda for sustainability, how do you address sustainability at the neighbourhood level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>How do you define sustainable neighbourhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Who put the standards (public, private, community sectors)? Since when has it been applied? What are the origins of these standards (universal standards?)? How were they adapted to the Syrian context? What is meant by each facility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>In term of new standards, why is it taking too long to be approved? Why has it been changes and what are the main new changes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>How was sustainability addressed in the planning standards (in term of providing facilities)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Who are the institutions responsible for providing local facilities according to the national standards (public, private and community sectors)? And what is the role of each institution?

9. Where and when has these facilities meant to be implemented?

10. How are these facilities being implemented? And who are the institutions responsible for this implementation? And what roles are there for public, private and community sectors?

- Plans
- Lands
- Approvals
- Design
- Construction
- Running(investing) the facility
- Maintenance
- Monitoring the implementation of these facilities

11. Law no 9 1974 allow the municipality to change the use of public constructions. How is this applied and what are the consequences of this?
Directorate of Technical Affairs: (planning urban development and implementing public constructions)

In term of public facilities:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>How local facilities are usually implemented in residential neighbourhoods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What urban laws are controlling the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What standards are there for range of local facility? And have these changed during the period of implementing the selected case studies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>What are the responsibilities of the municipality in developing local facilities in neighbourhoods (Plans, lands, construction, monitoring)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Plans,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- lands,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction: Which kinds of local facilities do the municipality construct in residential neighbourhoods? And which kinds do the municipality gave for other institutions to develop and what is the process for monitoring these developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In term of private facilities:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>On what bases are permission being given to shops in neighbourhoods and what benefits are expected? And what is the process undertaken?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What techniques are there for suppressing the illegal development of private shops?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What plans and techniques were there for involving the private sector in the developing of local facilities? What are the new plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>What plans were there for involving the community sector in the developing of local facilities? What are the new plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urban committee: (changes in uses)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>On what bases are changes in detailed plans or urban characteristic of residential buildings made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What is the role of the private sector in these changes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is there a role for the community sector in these changes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Directorate of Directorate of Professions and Licenses: (moving property rights-investment of public constructions)

1. What is the department responsibility for developing local facilities?
   
   - informing related institutions responsible for developing local facilities
   - moving property rights to related institutions
   - managing the investment of public constructions

2. How has the process of investing public constructions in residential neighbourhoods been undertaken? And has been any changes to these process?
   
   - Actors
   - Policy and planning laws
   - Values and interests (How do PPP investment increase the income of the municipality?)
   - Practices

3. What public properties is the directorate responsible for in residential neighbourhoods?

4. What is the role of private and community sector in making decisions regarding the investment of these facilities? And has been any changes to these roles?

1. What are the obstacles for fulfilling the directorate responsibilities?
   
   - Administrative
   - Economic
   - Technical

Directorate of Planning and Statistics: (municipality budget)

1. What types of plans does the department make?

2. How are local facility delivering been included in the municipality budget?

3. What are the obstacles in implementing the budget specified for local facilities?

Changes in building codes:

1. Who is responsible for changes in building codes? (Which result in higher density)?

   And are there any actions taken to adapt local facilities to the increase in density?
Directorate of services:

- What is the responsibility of the service directorate? And do you have a role in providing local facility? If not, do you think that you have a potential to play a role in delivering local facilities? And how?
- Which type of local facilities do you think are providing for local job opportunities?

Specifically on the case studies:

1. How have the neighbourhood been planned and implemented?
   - when
   - Who are the actors
   - Land right (property of land)?
   - Planning law and standards
   - Building codes and density
   - Planning program (Barnamege Takhteetee), Mater plan, detailed plan, structure plan and progress plan.
   - Changes in plans (if any)

2. What are the municipality roles in delivering local facilities in this neighbourhood?
   - Plans
   - Allocation of lands
   - Sharing information
   - Construction of facilities
   - Managing the investment of facilities
   - Monitoring the instruction of facilities
   - Permitting changes in uses (unplanned local facilities)
   - Ignoring unauthorised changes in uses (lack of capacity)
   - Approving changes in building codes

3. Who were the other actors involved in delivering local facilities in this neighbourhood? What kind of interaction took place? What laws influenced the process?

4. What was the role of private sector and community sector in providing planned local facilities? What planning laws influenced that role? And has been any changes to these roles?

5. What were the main challenges in providing local facilities in this neighbourhood?

6. Are there plans for improving the provision of local facilities in this neighbourhood?
**GCMH: General Company of Military Housing**

The aims of the interview are to get details on:

- Role of GCMH in developing local facilities in the neighbourhood
- Values and interest in developing facilities
- Process undertaken in delivering facilities

**General issues:**

1. Who is the company? When was it initiated? And why was it initiated?
2. What is the purpose of the company? And why was the company employed to undertake the development
3. What are the main responsibilities of the company and does it normally provide/facilitate development of local facilities? If not, who does it expect to do so?
4. What other actors does the company normally liaise with and for what purpose?

**Specifically on the case studies:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. What was the role of the company in developing the neighbourhood?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Plans (who made the plans? And if foreigner experts were hired, who and why?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. If you had a role in developing local facilities please explain what facilities? And how?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other actors/organizations that the company normally liaise with, and their roles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approval and permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• planning laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. What are your values and interests in developing this facility?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. if you had a role in developing local facilities what were the challenges and what were the potentials in you participation in developing local facilities? What are the outcomes of this and how do you evaluate these?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approval and permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What do suggest for improving housing association participation in planning and implementing local facilities?
Directorate of Education:

Please give a brief description of the directorate? What are its duties? Is it part of the local or central government? What other actors/organizations does the company normally liaise with, and what are their roles?

1. What is the directorate responsibility in delivering schools and nurseries in residential neighbourhoods?
   - Standards
   - Lands
   - Constructions
   - Running the facility
   - resources
   - other

2. What are your values and interests in developing this facility?

3. How is the process of delivering schools and nurseries in residential neighbourhood being undertaken? And who are the other actors involved in the process?
   - Standards
   - Information sharing
   - Lands
   - Approvals
   - Resources
   - consultation

4. Is there a specific timescale for delivering schools and nurseries?

5. Is there a role of residents of neighbourhoods in the provision process? If yes, please explain?

6. In term of private provision of local facilities, please explain the role of the directorate in this provision takes place?
   - Interests and values
   - Laws controlling the private provision
   - Standards for private provision
   - Approvals and permissions
   - others

7. What are the main obstacles in providing nurseries and schools in neighbourhoods?

8. What suggestions have you got on ways to improve provision of schools and nurseries in neighbourhoods?
Specifically on the case studies:

Public facilities:

1. Are school and nurseries in the neighbourhood fulfilling the standards? If not, why?
2. Over which period have these schools and nurseries been implemented?
3. Are all specified lands for schools and nurseries implemented in this neighbourhood?
4. In term of implemented facilities, how did the implementation process of schools and nurseries take place? Who was involved? And what kind of interaction took place? What are the outcomes of this and how do you evaluate them?
   - lands
   - fund and recourses
   - What other actors/organizations does the company normally liaise with, and what are their roles?
   - information sharing
   - routines and long time for approvals
5. In term of unimplemented local facilities, what were the main obstacles for the implementation?
   - lands
   - fund and recourses
   - information sharing
   - routines and long time for approvals
   - monitoring
   - others
6. Was there a role of private sector and community sector in developing local facilities in the neighbourhood?

Private facilities:

7. What was the directorate role in delivering private local facilities in this neighbourhood?
8. What was the initiative of permitting this private delivery? And does private delivery fulfilled this initiative?
9. What are your future plans for this neighbourhood?
Directorate of Health:

1. What is the directorate responsibility in delivering health centres in residential neighbourhoods?
   - Standards
   - Lands
   - Constructions
   - Running the facility
2. How is the process of delivering health centres in residential neighbourhood being undertaken?
   - Standards
   - Information sharing
   - Lands
   - Approvals
   - Resources
3. Is there a role of residents of these neighbourhoods in the provision process? If yes, please explain?
4. In term of private provision of local facilities, please explain how this provision takes place?
   - Interests and values
   - Laws controlling the private provision
   - Standards for private provision
   - Approvals and permissions
5. What are the main obstacles in health centres in neighbourhoods?
6. What suggestions have you got on ways to improve provision of health facilities in neighbourhoods?

Specifically on the case studies:

Public facilities:

1. Are health facilities in the neighbourhood fulfilling the standards? If not, why?
2. Over which period have these health centres been implemented?
3. Are all specified lands for schools and nurseries implemented in this neighbourhood?
4. In term of implemented facilities, how did the implementation process of schools and nurseries take place? Who was involved? and what kind of interaction took place?
   - lands
   - fund and resources
   - information
   - routines and long time for approvals
5. In terms of unimplemented local facilities, what were the main obstacles for the implementation?
   - lands
   - fund and resources
   - information sharing
   - routines and long time for approvals

6. Was there a role of private sector and community sector in developing local facilities in the neighbourhood?

Private facilities:

7. What was the directorate role in delivering private local facilities in this neighbourhood?
8. What was the initiative of permitting this private delivery? And does private delivery fulfilled this initiative?
9. What are your future plans for this neighbourhood?
Union of Women:

1. What is the Union responsibility in delivering nurseries in residential neighbourhoods?
   - Standards
   - Lands
   - Constructions
   - Running the facility

2. How are the process of delivering schools and nurseries in residential neighbourhood being undertaken?
   - Standards
   - Information
   - Lands
   - Approvals
   - Resources
   - Consultation

3. Is there a role of residents of these neighbourhoods in the provision process? If yes, please explain?

4. What are the main obstacles in providing nurseries and schools in neighbourhoods?

5. What suggestions have you got on ways to improve provision of schools and nurseries in neighbourhoods?

Specifically on the case studies:

Public facilities:

1. Are nurseries in the neighbourhood fulfilling the standards? If not, why?
2. Over which period have these nurseries been implemented?
3. Are all specified lands for nurseries implemented in this neighbourhood?
4. In term of implemented facilities, how did the implementation process of nurseries take place? Who was involved? and what kind of interaction took place?
   - Lands
   - Fund and resources
   - Information
   - Routines and long time for approvals
5. In term of unimplemented local facilities, what were the main obstacles for the implementation?
   - Lands
   - Fund and resources
   - Information
   - Routines and long time for approvals
6. What are your future plans for this neighbourhood?
Housing Association:

The aims of the interview are to get details on:

- Role of housing association in developing local facilities in the neighbourhood
- Values and interest in developing facilities
- Process undertaken in delivering facilities
- Role in formal planning and implementation of local facilities
- Suggestion for improvement the private participation in the process of planning and implementation of local facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Who is the housing association? When was it initiated? And why was it initiated?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- What is the purpose of the housing association? And why was the association employed to undertake the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are the main responsibilities of the company and does it normally provide/facilitate development of local facilities? If not, who does it expect to do so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What other actors does the company normally liaise with and for what purpose?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. What was the role of the association in developing the neighbourhood?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. If you had a role in developing local facilities please explain what facilities? And how? What other actors/organizations does the company normally liaise with, and what are their roles?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Approval and permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- planning laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 4. What are your values and interests in developing this facility? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. if you had a role in developing local facilities what were the obstacles and what were the potentials in you participation in developing local facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Approval and permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- planning laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are the outcomes of this and how do you evaluate them?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. What do you suggest for improving housing association participation in planning and implementing of local facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Topic guide for Private providers:**

The aims of the interview are to get details on:

- Values and interests of private sector for delivering local facilities
- Process undertaken in delivering facilities
- Role in formal planning and implementation of local facilities
- Suggestion for improvement the private participation in the process of planning and implementation of local facilities
- Local facilities role in providing local job opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How do you define the facility you provided (is it local facility)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Does the facility serve local people or does attract outsiders?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. What are your values and interests in developing this facility?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Please explain the process of providing the facility? and What other actors/organizations does the company normally liaise with, and what are their roles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approvals and permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. What are the challenges you face in delivering this facility? And how do you describe the role of government in promoting private participation in delivering local facilities? What are the outcomes of this and how do you evaluate these?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approval and permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• planning laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5. Were you involved in planning local facility at the neighbourhood? |
| 6. What do you suggest for improving private participation in planning and implementing local facilities? |
| 7. Is providing local facilities creating local job opportunities? Do you live in the neighbourhood, and is this your main job? |
Appendix 4-3 Participants in the interviews

The second field trip took place between April 2010 and July 2010. Interviews were held with members of the three main sectors involved in the governance process (State, market and civil society).

**Interviewees from the state sector** (66 interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Official in the Studies and Records section in SD (Halab-AlJadeeda)</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Director of SD (Halab-AlJadeeda)</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official in the Studies and Records section in SD (Halab-AlJadeeda)</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official in the Execution and Taxation section in SD (Halab-AlJadeeda)</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Architect/planner in the Department of Urban Planning-Municipality of Aleppo</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Director of SD (Hamdanya)</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Official in the Studies and Records section in SD of Hamdanya</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official in the parks, fountains, and wells section in SD (Halab-AlJadeeda)</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Director of the Health centre in Halab-AlJadeeda</td>
<td>DoH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Head teacher of a Primary School in Halab-AlJadeeda</td>
<td>DoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official in the Execution and Taxation section in SD (Hamdanya)</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Director of GCoMH-Main Office (Seferah)</td>
<td>GCoMH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official in GCoMH- (Branch 3)</td>
<td>GCoMH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official in the Studies and Records section in SD (Hamdanya)</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official in the department of Investment planning-Directorate of Finance</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official in the department of Properties - Directorate of Professions and Licenses</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Head teacher of the public nursery in Hanano</td>
<td>UoW-DoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Architect/planner in the Department of Urban Planning-Directorate of Technical Affairs</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Head of Directorate of Technical Affairs</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Director of the Licenses and Monitoring of buildings Department</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Head of Survey and Planning Department</td>
<td>DoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Head of the Private Education Department</td>
<td>DoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Deputy Head of the Directorate of Technical Services</td>
<td>DoTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Official in the Directorate of Technical Services</td>
<td>DoTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Director of Directorate of Health</td>
<td>DoH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Coordinator of Madeenatuna Project</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official at Survey and Planning Department</td>
<td>DoH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Head of Department of Urban Planning- Directorate of Technical Affairs</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Deputy head of Department of Licenses and Monitoring of buildings (responsible for licencing informal shops) – Directorate of Technical affairs</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Head of Division of Topography- Directorate of Technical Affairs-member of the Urban committee</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Member of city council and regional committee and former senior planner in Urban planning department,</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Former head of Urban planning department,</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Member of city council, Director of Madeenatuna Project</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official in Division of Topography-Directorate of Technical Affairs- member of the Urban committee</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official in Department of Licenses and Monitoring of buildings</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Official at Department of Planning and Studies</td>
<td>UoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Director of Urban Observatory</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official at Directorate of Technical Service</td>
<td>DoTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Head of Planning and Survey Department</td>
<td>DoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official at GCoMH-(Branch 3)</td>
<td>GCoMH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Planning and Survey Department, member of Aleppo city council.</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Coordinator of services directorates</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Official at Department of Planning and Studies</td>
<td>UoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official at DoC</td>
<td>DoC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Official at DoC</td>
<td>DoC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Head of Directorate of Planning</td>
<td>Directorate of planning of Aleppo-SPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Architect/planner in GCEC, member of team preparing and revising Aleppo Master Plan.</td>
<td>GCEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Head of Mokhtars and RCs</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official at Worker Union</td>
<td>WU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Head of Department of Traffic</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Official at Department of Traffic</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Member of Branch of Baath Party (Branch of Education)</td>
<td>Baath party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Chairman at Branch of Baath Party (Branch of Education)</td>
<td>Branch of Baath party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Chairman of the executive office of Aleppo Governorate (Education)</td>
<td>Governorate of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Official at Urban development Office</td>
<td>Governorate of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman of the executive office of Aleppo Governorate (Health)</td>
<td>Governorate of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Member of the Technical office in Aleppo Governorate, affiliating to executive office</td>
<td>Governorate of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Head of Local councils - responsible for managing local neighbourhood plans</td>
<td>Governorate of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Architect at DoA</td>
<td>DoA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Director of Planning execution in the ministry of local administration</td>
<td>MLAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Head of properties department, Directorate of Professions and Licenses</td>
<td>DoA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Chairman of the Executive office of Aleppo governorate</td>
<td>Governorate of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Official at The General company for trade</td>
<td>The General Company for Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Head of the General company for trade</td>
<td>The General Company for Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Doctor in the public health centre (Hannao)</td>
<td>DoH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Head of SD (Hanano)</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Official in the Technical Services Department</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleppo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting attended:

- Meeting at SD Halab-AlJadeeda 19-4-2010 : Mokhtar, head and members of RC (only the head was available, head of the different departments.

- Meeting at SD Hamdanya 27-4-2010 : Mokhtar, head and members of RC (only the head was available, head and members of the different departments.

- Meeting at SD Hamdanya 11-5-2010
**Interviewees from the private sector**  (45 interviewees)

Interviews were held with people who run private facilities in the neighbourhoods: shops (formal and informal providers), shopping centres, private nurseries, private clinics, officer in the company of Aleppo markets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Planned/Unplanned provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal market</td>
<td>Planned (RC centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pharmacy owner</td>
<td>Formal market</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal market</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal market</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal market</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal market</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal market</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal market</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Private-nursery owner</td>
<td>Formal market</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Private clinic</td>
<td>Formal market</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Private Dental clinic</td>
<td>Formal Market</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal market</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pharmacy owner</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Planned (small groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pharmacy owner</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal (the small shop groups)</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal (neighbourhood centre)</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Private nursery owner</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Private clinic owner</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Role/Entity</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Informal shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Informal shopkeeper</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Planned (old centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Planned (commercial street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Planned (new centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Planned(commercial street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Private clinic</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Private clinic</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Head manager Hanano market</td>
<td>Formal / Aleppo city markets - Aleppo commerce chamber</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civil society: 64 interviews including:

Interviewees from member of community organizations, charity facilities and academics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic at University of Aleppo and consultant at GCEC</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>University of Aleppo, GCEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Head of Residents Committee in JM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mokhtar of Halab-AlJadeeda</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mokhtar of Hamdanya,</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mokhtar</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Head of the NC of JKN</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Head of RC of KTA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Head of the RC of Halab-AlJadeeda</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Doctor in the charity health centre in Hamdanya</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Charity organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Head of the NC of Hamdanya</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Head of RC of Hanano</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mokhtar</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Academic at University of Aleppo and consultant at GCEC, member of the committee responsible for updating the national planning standards</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>University of Aleppo, GCEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Academic at University of Damascus and consultant at GCEC, member of the committee responsible for updating the national planning standards</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>University of Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Number of household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>University education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>University student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>University education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>University education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>University education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>University education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>University education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>University education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>University education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5-1 Responsibilities of the different directorates in the Municipality of Aleppo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible department</th>
<th>Activities related to urban development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Noting and documenting the correspondence coming to the municipality from citizens, others, other directorates and departments of the administrative bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Technical Affairs which includes the following departments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Department of Urban planning</td>
<td>1. Conducting planning studies and making master plans according to applicable laws and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Department of Licenses and Monitoring of buildings</td>
<td>3. Building permits according to building codes, control and suppression of breaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Service Acquisition</td>
<td>5. Preparation of acquisition documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Department of Industrial licenses</td>
<td>6. Application of laws regulating plot division and urban development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Division of Topography</td>
<td>7. Granting licences for shops and industrial facilities and monitoring their application and suppressing their irregularities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Others</td>
<td>9. Monitoring the implementation of the law of urban development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of finance</td>
<td>1. Preparing the budget plan for the municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Monitoring and reporting the implementation of the fiscal plan of the municipality</td>
<td>2. Monitoring the response to complaints from citizens, public sector agencies and media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Preparing suggestions for improving the fiscal activities and simplifying the process</td>
<td>3. Monitoring the activities of Mokhtars and NCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Seeking improvement and increasing of the municipality income</td>
<td>4. Monitoring cultural and sport activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of administration affairs</td>
<td>5. Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Department of Archive</td>
<td>1. Noting, documenting and saving correspondence to and from the municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Department of Executive Office and City Council</td>
<td>2. Monitoring the response to complaints from citizens, public sector agencies and media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Department of Public Affairs</td>
<td>3. Monitoring the activities of Mokhtars and NCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Monitoring cultural and sport activities</td>
<td>4. Monitoring cultural and sport activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Others</td>
<td>5. Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Directorate of Maintenance & Services, which includes: | 1. Maintenance of sidewalks, streets and sewerage system in the city.  
2. Supervision of repair works and asphalt and pavement.  
4. Participation in the study of traffic in the city and implementation of approved solutions.  
5. Maintenance of traffic lights and signs.  
6. Coordination between maintenance sectors. |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
2. Control of food manufacturing and selling.  
3. Certifying of food shops.  
4. Ensuring the cleanliness of the city and waste treatment and other sources of pollution.  
5. Control of insects and rodents. |
| 2. Department of the traffic | | |
| 3. Division of movement of vehicles | | |
| 4. Division of public lighting | | |
| 5. Division of Maintenance of City Council built properties. | | |
| Directorate of Health Affairs | | |
| Directorate of the Old City | Managing urban development in the old city | |
| Directorate of Vehicles | | |
| Department of Informatics and Digital Maps | Improving the work of the municipality through:  
1. Preparing plans for administrative modernising of the municipality and implementing these plans  
2. Digitising the work of the municipality directorates and departments  
3. Saving all documents and information and drawings in digital form and establishing a mechanism to gain access to it by the directorates and departments of the City Council as needed.  
4. Drawing up plans and a mechanism for the exchange of information, charts and documents with different administrative bodies | |
<p>| Directorate of Employees’ Affairs | | |
| Directorate of Legal Affairs | | |
| Directorate of Professions and Licenses which includes: | 1. Participating in preparing plans of public property development and increase their resources. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate of Properties</th>
<th>1. Department of Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Department of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Division of Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Documenting the city's property and changes made in this regard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Follow-up properties offered by city council for sale or rent or investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Collecting fees from occupants, investors and tenants of public city property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Granting licences for the investment of public property and suppression of irregularities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate of Open Parks</th>
<th>1. Prepare the necessary studies for the establishment of parks and forests, wells and ponds on the land allocated to it in order.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Studies and Implementation which consists of:</td>
<td>2. Implementation of the studies within the resources available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Supervise the implementation of parks, forests, wells and ponds if it is implemented by other organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate of Hygiene</th>
<th>1. Collection of garbage and dust from city streets and neighbourhoods and transfer to landfills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cleaning the city streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Suppression of hygiene irregularities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Handling public complaints and follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Directorate of Fire | Suppressing all types of fires, supervision of all fire stations and tasks within the city, rescue in disasters and floods |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate of Planning and Statistics which consists of:</th>
<th>1. Analysing the current status in order to prepare a draft for the five-year plans and annual plans.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Department of Planning and monitoring</td>
<td>2. Preparation of a draft budget for the municipality and follow up its implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Department of statistics</td>
<td>3. Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Internal Monitoring | Observing the commitment of the administrative body to the policies, laws and codes |

| Directorate of Services Departments | 379 |
Appendix 5-2 The process of preparing the Master Plan

The preparation of Master plans, according to *Planning Policy: Preparing Master and Detailed Plans* (1982), should go through the following process:

The preparation stage includes topographic analysis of the location of the master plan.

The survey and analysis stage includes evaluating the current master plan in terms of what has been implemented, what modifications to plans have been made and why. It also involves analysing the current situation of the area in terms of understanding its historic development, economic situation, natural environment, built environment (buildings, social services, utilities, green spaces and playgrounds, building use and types, demography of the settlement, density, transportation, finance and property rights). This analysis should help develop information about the different capacities to implement projects: municipal, private, collaborative and technical capacities (the document does not explain the meanings of these capacities). The survey and analysis are supposed to help in influencing government plans and projects and in predicting future increase in population and future socio-economic conditions.

The design stage aims to initiate a zoning plan according to planning standards and a draft of the final executive plans. The zoning plan includes a map that specifies residential areas, street networks, services and facilities areas, green spaces and industrial areas. On this map residential densities and housing categories should be identified.

The final stage is divided in two steps.

The first one includes preparing the draft master plan accompanied with the building codes and two stages for implementation for a 10-years period (in two 5-years plans).

The second step includes:

- The final Master plan with its building codes.
- The location of schools.
- The location of industrial areas.
- Roads and streets.
- The progress plan which includes two parts: first are the main stages of implementation (ten years for each stage), and the second is details of the first
implementation stage: includes instruction for the municipality regarding expropriation.

- Suggestions for developing detailed plans for specific areas.
- Map of population densities.
- Report including standards and data used in developing the master plan: land use and building types in each area.
Appendix 5-3 Examples of the laws and orders on licensing changes of land use

Orders of urban committee 4842 /1971 amending decision 45/1968: the decision permitted the change of garages in certain types of housing to other uses (pharmacy, barber and hair salons, book store, clothes store, ironing, and conventional store, flower shop). The committee agreed to legalize the unauthorised (illegal) change of use through payment of a fixed penalty fee, which is called reconciliation of illegal actions HasemMokhalafah.

Order of city council 2/1984-1985: in which the executive bureau discussed the changing of flats in ground floors and other floors in residential buildings to other uses such as professional offices, and barbers and hair salons; this add more flexibility to the previous order which permitted the change from garages only. The executive bureau thought that these changes are not harming the neighbourhood. It was agreed that professional offices can be established in residential buildings as long as it can be changed into residential activities afterwards. Pharmacies and barbers and hair salons were allowed in ground floors and basements as long as they have a separate entrance.

Order of city council 100/1988: Amending the previous orders, the city council showed more openness in permitting the change of uses of ground floors to a wider range of facilities including flower shops, antique shops, art shops, toy shops, furniture stores. These shops had to have separate entrances.

Order of city council 28/1993 and 12/1995: This order agreed to legalize the unauthorised (illegal) change of use in ground floors and basement of residential buildings through fixed penalty paid HasemMokhalafah (2500sp per m2). This can be applied to frame construction where the change of use will not harm the construction of the building. Uses include, apart from the previous shops: computer stores (of which some turn into internet cafes), jewellery shops, photographers, tourist agencies, sports activities shops. The new facilities should have a separate entrance.

Order of city council 37/1995: in correspondence to the results of the decisions 28/1993 and 12/1995 many people have breached the two decisions as other uses were developed than those permitted. The council agreed to cancel decision 28 and amend decision 12 to
be limited to change of use to professional offices only in ground floors and basements; pharmacies are permitted only in garages.

**Order of city council 75/2002:** DTS is to note the unauthorised change of uses and report these to the executive bureau for a decision. The executive office will issue a decision to remove the unauthorised change of use and return the use to a residential one. Owner of the unauthorised activity can apply for reconciliation and pay a penalty. The reconciliation will be accepted if it corresponds to the specific conditions (separate entrance, specified uses).

**City council decision 64/2004 and 112/2005** regarding change of use to educational facilities including nurseries: these decisions were based on a legislative decree regarding private education organizations 55/2004 and 1903/1999 MoE: the decision permits establishing private education facilities on plots allocated to education facilities in master and detailed plans. It also permits the change of use from residential facility to private education facilities in ground floors. This change of use would need to be permitted by the urban committee; it should correspond to building codes. These changes should be agreed by 70% of residents in the building. (Before 2004, the agreement of neighbours was not necessary).
Appendix 5-4 Evolving urban development of Aleppo

Aleppo ‘Halab’ is the most populous city in Syria and is regarded as the capital of North Syria. Aleppo is considered to be one of the oldest continuously inhabited cities in the world. It has been inhabited since the Stone Age137. Aleppo became Christian in 380 AD. In 638 AD Aleppo became part of the Islamic state. It was ruled by the Ummayaed, Abbasi, Hamadani, Sljouki, Ayyobi and Mamloki. In 1516 it became part of the Ottoman Empire. It was the Empire’s third largest city after Istanbul and Cairo. At the fall of the Ottoman Empire after World War 1 Aleppo fell under the French mandate from 1918 till Syrian independence in 1947.

Aleppo has witnessed great demolition and destruction through its long history (e.g. by the Tatars in 1260 and again in 1400), but the city was always able to survive and urban development of Aleppo continued through history.

From the early ages till the 7th century

The first settlement in Aleppo started where people lived in Magarat (caves); later they established residential settlements on the nearby hills (Tal Assouda and others). The city continued to grow and new neighbourhoods were established; Tal AlKala’a (the hill of the Citadel) was the religious centre of the city. In the Hellenistic period 305BC to 64 BC the city of Aleppo flourished and took a shape of an urban city due to its economic role and defensible location. The city had a grid planning in which neighbourhoods had straight streets and a common orientation: a north-south, and an east-west. Public buildings were located in the middle of the city. The city had its agora (were the Ummayed Mosque is located today) and acropolis (were the citadel is located today) and was surrounded by a defensible wall. The city reached 24 ha in area in the Hellenistic period and Aleppo enjoyed a period of peace and commercial prosperity.

The Roman and Byzantine period lasted between 64BC and 636AD. During the Roman period Aleppo witnessed only a slight expansion of its size. This expansion much increased in the Byzantine period when new neighbourhoods were established within the

---

137 Excavations at Tell Al-Hariri and Mary show that the area was occupied since at least the 18th century BC.
city walls and a suburb started outside the walls. The city reached 60 ha in area. The Romans and Byzantines provided buildings like roads, bridges, canals, theatres, and churches.

**Figure A.5.5.1** Map of Aleppo in Hellenic Period according to Sauvaget

**Figure A.5.5.2** Map of Aleppo in Roman and Byzantine Period according to Sauvaget

**From the 7th century till the early 20th century**

This period started when Muslim armies took possession of the city in 660AD. Urban development of Aleppo flourished in the Ummayed period which lasted until 750AD, then the city suffered from neglect during the Abbasid period (750-968). In the 10th century Aleppo became the capital of the Hamdanien Empire, when it enjoyed prosperity despite the continuous conflict between the Muslims and the Romans. In 962 the city was
subject to huge destruction when it was invaded by the Byzantines. The Hamdanien repaired large part of the city. At the end of Hamdanien rule the city suffered from war and destruction due to a series of external interventions which lasted till 1128. These situations encouraged the initiation of the defensible planning of gated neighbourhoods which formed the basic units of the city. Each neighbourhood had central streets which end with gates at each side. The neighbourhoods were self-sufficient where residents could live independently of other parts of the city when necessary. Each neighbourhood had its own local facilities which provided the daily needs of its residents: mosques; public baths, souks; etc. These neighbourhoods also enjoyed economic independence.

Aleppo enjoyed security and safety during the Noory and Ayyubid period (1128-1260). The city grew within the city walls while suburbs outside expanded, a new wall was built on the eastern side of the city, making the citadel inside the walls rather than on the eastern wall. The area of the city reached 66 ha. In this period services continued to be provided, with a special focus on religious schools. New services such as Bimarstan (hospitals) were introduced. The central souks of the city flourished to reach 39, each specialized in a particular trade. Aleppo continued to flourish during the Mameluki period (1260-1516), when it witnessed great urban and architectural development. The city reached about 100 ha in area. New suburbs appeared outside the city walls as a result of population growth and economic prosperity. Commercial services expanded into the residential neighbourhoods which also result in relocating residents in new neighbourhoods. A large number of facilities was provided in this period, especially in terms of schools which in turn encouraged the development of new neighbourhoods close to these new facilities. The new suburbs were usually located close to the wall gates to keep in contact with the main centre. However, the new neighbourhoods were equipped with all kind of local facilities necessary to residents’ daily life: worship places, baths, markets (souks) and wood square. These facilities allowed the neighbourhoods to survive independently in case of emergency and helped to limit the centralization of the city. Facilities and movement were designated in correspondence to density of the neighbourhoods.
In 1516, Aleppo became part of the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman period lasted for four centuries (1516–1916). In the 16th century Aleppo continued to flourish, new neighbourhoods were established and new facilities were introduced to correspond to the industrial role of Aleppo in producing fabric. The city reached around 240 ha in area. In the 17th century urban development continued at a lower rate than before, which later rose again in the 18th century when new neighbourhoods were established and the area of the city reached around 360 ha. Of the new developed neighbourhoods some were devoted to rich people while others were relatively poor. Aleppo entered a prolonged decline at the end of the Ottoman period, when the pace of urban development was slow. At the end of the 18th century till the mid of the 19th century the Ottomans aimed to make
improvements, which often included constructing military schools, high schools and medical schools, which were free to all people. In addition, primary education was also provided through private institutions, *Kuttab*, located in each neighbourhood. By 1900 65 *Kuttab* were provided. Higher education was undertaken in schools that are part of religious buildings or as separate entities financed mainly by Awqaf. Other national and international schools were also provided. A law was issued in 1846 under which the government took responsibility for providing education through providing contemporary schools. By 1882 42 schools were provided. In the 19th century, urban development continued despite the ongoing political conflicts. The Municipality of Aleppo was established in 1860. New neighbourhoods were established and the European influence began to affect new urban development of the city and the whole region in general. The new neighbourhoods were of multiple storeys and two public parks were established in 1896. In the early 20th century new neighbourhoods continued to be provided and a new centre was established outside the old city to accommodate the expansion of the city, containing commercial, entertainment, leisure and cultural facilities.

Source (Rifai 1996, Samman *et al* 2008)
Appendix 5-6 The role of Awqaf in urban development of Aleppo since the Islamic period

Awqaf (religious endowments) played a significant role in the urban development of Islamic cities in general and in Aleppo in particular. The Awqaf was responsible for the development of not only religious services but also a great deal of social services including, among others, educational and health services (Kahf 2006). Aleppo used to be named Madinat AlWakef (the City of Awqaf). Many of the services, both free services and paid ones, was provided in Aleppo through the Wakef. Donors provided free facilities like mosques, schools, and hospitals but at the same time, they would provide additional paid facilities like markets, souks, public baths [Hamam], inns, khans, etc. Profits from the paid services would be used to operate and maintain the free services. In some cases the same facility would provide free and charged services where the revenue from the charged ones would be used to pay for the free ones (Heretani 2006, Rifai 1996, Series 2007). In 1949 the Syrian government cancelled individual endowments and grouped them in the guise of the Ministry of Awqaf. Such activities were common in other countries in the region (Lebanon, Egypt, Iraq, Morocco etc). as a result the role of Awqaf became hardly limited to the development of religious buildings (Kahf 2006). The Ministry of Awqaf became the single largest landholder in the country (Haddad 2009). However, managing properties and activities of Awqaf had to be undertaken then through formal procedures.
Appendix 6-1 Analysis of the governance process for delivering local facilities in Hamdanya

*Shopping facilities: local and neighbourhood centres*

**Actors, roles and relationships**

![Figure A.6.1.1 Hamadanya Governance process for providing shopping facilities; local and neighbourhood centres](image)
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Planned shopping facilities, the central service centre (Source: the researcher)

Planned local facilities, the smaller local centres (Source: the researcher)

Shops added to religious building (Source: the researcher)

A shop built on pedestrian pavements

Informal private shops converted from gardens in residential buildings (source: the researcher)

Figure A.6.1.2 Shopping facilities within Hamdanya
The planner of the neighbourhood designated 12,500m² for a neighbourhood centre. Later the plan was amended to include 9,800m² divided into 13 plots, each of which would include some shops, bringing the total area of neighbourhood and local centres to 20,600m².

The development of the neighbourhood and local centres was undertaken by the GCMH, instead of the municipality. The process of constructing the centre started in the mid-eighties, but the centre was not opened until the early nineties, due to defects in the construction of the building. Moreover, the centre was planned to have a wide parking area, but this was occupied later by two buildings - offices of the GCMH. At the beginning the neighbourhood centre contained about 80 shops, a convenience store, two multipurpose halls, a military health centre and a nursery, in addition to extra space with no specific uses.

The 80 shops were offered for sale or rent, but only 20 shops had opened by 2010. Interviews with private shopkeepers inside the centre and illegal shopkeepers elsewhere attributed this low uptake to the centre’s poor design and to the fact that some shop owners bought the shops to sell them later for higher prices rather than to run the shops. Shopkeepers who run illegal shops outside the centre claimed that the procedure to be allocated a shop in the centre is complicated and not clear, and that obtaining information about investment in the formal shops was very difficult due to contradictory information. On other hand, shopkeepers inside the neighbourhood centre expressed that the partial operating of the neighbourhood centre, leaving part of the centre deserted, had negative impact on people’s desire to buy or rent shops in the centre. Interviewees from the GCMH said that they are considering undertaking some refurbishment in the centre to attract private developers and to activate the centre. In addition to the shops, the GCMH had provided a nursery and a convenience store until 2008, when both were closed.

138 Small area of shops; poor maintenance of the centre; and poor architectural design that have long corridors with poor lighting.

139 Some shop keepers said that the shops inside the district centre are all sold to private developers who do not want to rent or sell the shops unless they get very high prices. One illegal shop keeper noted the same thing but added that the shops are bought by officials in the GCMH who bought the shops for low prices and are not keen in investing in the shops unless they get very high prices. Other shop keepers thought that many of the shops in the district centre ae still owned by the GCMH.
based on a decision by the head of the GCoM due to failure to make profits. The two multipurpose halls were let to a private investor, who hires them for weddings and recently for other social occasions. Another part of the centre was allocated to a public news agency *AlJmaheer* until 2009 when the news agency sold the space to a private developer, who developed a private school. The newspaper was allocated another space in the neighbourhood centre. In 2007 part of the neighbourhood centre was sold to a private developer who delivered a restaurant and café, but this was closed shortly thereafter.

With regard to the 13 plots for shops, the GCMH built 7 of them and sold them to private investors who run the shops. Of the other 6: the one in the villas area is not built and is partly planted. Another plot was developed as a convenience store for military members, but was recently demolished and was being replaced by a high rise residential building. Three of the plots were not yet developed in 2010, and one was converted into a small green space.

In addition to these publicly provided shopping facilities, unplanned shops were provided in the neighbourhood: 12 shops were built on premises of three of the religious buildings, while 409 private corner shops were provided gradually in the neighbourhood through adding premises in many of the front gardens of residential buildings. This phenomenon started when a few shops were developed and run by the residents of these ground floors themselves, and increased gradually when some of these residents started to build more shops and sell them or rent them to private investors. For a long time neither the GCMH nor the municipality attempted to stop the illegal development of these shops. In 1997 the DS of *Hamdanya* was established in the neighbourhoods, but illegal shops continued to be developed. One interviewee suggested that recent illegal development was made with informal agreement between shop developers and public officials (Interviewee 7, SD). In 2009 when the plans of the neighbourhood were submitted to the municipality, the municipality formed a committee to deal with this illegal provision which aimed to

---

140 Failed to attract customers.
demolish the majority of these shops\textsuperscript{141}. Residents in the neighbourhood were not consulted regarding decisions over the development or the potential demolition of the illegal shops. However, some residents who live near some of the illegal shops complained about these illegal development either through directly approaching the municipality and the governorate, or through complaining to the SD or the \textit{Mokhtars}; these complaints were ignored in most cases\textsuperscript{142}.

Another important issue in providing corner shops in the neighbourhood was the request of the \textit{Mokhtar}, through a meeting in the DS centre, to allocate parts of green areas on main streets for corner shops; the \textit{Mokhtar} claimed that this was requested by residents, however, an official from the SD suggested that personal interests influenced this request.

**Rules, resources and rationalities**

The wide authority held by the GCMH allowed it to plan and manage the development of the neighbourhood centre and shopping facilities without going back to the municipality. The GCMH set its own planning standards; services provided in the neighbourhood centre were subject to decision by the head of the GCMH\textsuperscript{143}. The provision of neighbourhood and local centres was undertaken by the GCMH alone and not monitored by the planning authority, due to the delay in submitting the plans to the municipality. The informal change of use was not controlled by specific urban laws and decisions over change of use,

\begin{itemize}
  \item The committee decided to give provisional license to many of the shops in return of a fees and a formal agreement from the shop keeper to close the shop if a final decision is made with this regard. However, most of the shopkeepers were not interested in obtaining the temporary licence. Later in 2010 the committee was considering formalising about 20% of the shops and demolishing the rest.
  \item Residents’ complaints were ignored due to the lack of clarity about responsibilities and the lack of a clear building code and urban law to control the development in the area, which was out of the municipality’s responsibilities. For example, in 2012 residents complained about some shops developed in the residential garden of their building. However, the DoS and the municipality responded saying that the informal provision was undertaken before May 2011 when the law 40/2012 was issued preventing such development, thus the illegal development cannot be demolished”. Another example is when residents of the adjacent neighbourhood (developed also by the GCMH ) complained about constructing a mall of 5 storeys when building codes allow only 3 storeys. The answer was that the plot was sold by the GCMH and an approval was obtained to undertake the development of the mall, thus the development was considered to be legal (Municipality of Aleppo website 2009).
  \item E.g. the two halls used as celebration halls, the offices of the public newspaper agency and the nursery and the private school. At the same time, the GCMH also has the power to open and close the facilities (i.e. the super store and the nursery). Moreover, there was no restriction over opening or closing the shops, which allowed shop owners to keep their shops closed if they wanted to.
\end{itemize}
as the area was not formally affiliated to the city council of Aleppo until 2010\(^{144}\); the mixed responsibilities between the municipality and the GCMH greatly contributed to the lack of action against the development of the illegal shops. The GCMH does not have the executive authority to stop or remove illegal constructions; and the municipality did not prevent the illegal development due to the delay in handing over the area formally to the municipality.

In terms of resources, for facilities developed by the GCMH, the lack of resources was not seen as an obstacle for development, as the GCMH is well funded. However, the budget was directed to the development of the housing rather than developing shopping facilities, while funds for the development of shopping facilities were obtained from the budget allocated for investments, and no resources were allocated for maintaining or improving the facilities provided. Resources were allocated to develop facilities as an investment to make profits and not to meet a local need. In terms of investment of the neighbourhood and local centres, illegal shopkeepers revealed that it is much more affordable to rent or buy informal shops than formal ones. Moreover, the illegal shops were considered of better value due to locations on Main Street and proximity to housing.

In terms of rationalities, both officials in the GCMH and private-shop owners focused on providing the facilities as a mean of making profits rather than to meet a need of local residents. The profit motive was evident in the GCMH provision of shopping facilities (e.g. the convenience store and the nursery in the neighbourhood centre were closed when these were not providing appropriate profits). Moreover, the conflict over of responsibilities had also promoted illegal provision and a culture of blame among different actors. For example, the GCMH claimed that, despite it having direct responsibility for managing the neighbourhood up to 2010, it was still the responsibility of the municipality to prevent illegal development of corner shops. The municipality, on the other hand, argued that the GCMH should have taken full responsibility for the neighbourhood as the GCMH had not formally handed over the neighbourhood to the municipality. The municipality looked at illegal corner shops as merely illegal

\(^{144}\) Law 40/2012 only applies to breaches undertaken after 2012, while laws dated back to earlier than 2010 were not applied, as the area was not formally submitted to the municipality until 2010.
development that must be demolished, while illegal-shopkeepers thought that they should be given retrospectively a permanent licence where their shops were opened a long time ago, even before the formal provision of planned facilities. Some shopkeepers (who had recently bought their shops) added that the shops had cost them so much that they cannot afford to lose them.

Community centre

Actors, roles and relationships

Figure A.6.1.3 Hamdanya Governance process for providing community centres
As in Halab-AlJadeeda, it was not clear who was responsible for providing a community centre in the neighbourhood. The GCMH seemed to have responsibility for this provision as part of providing the neighbourhood centre. The GCMH, which played the role of the municipality in the neighbourhood, had undertaken the development of the centre, which included two multipurpose halls. The two halls were used as celebration halls (hired for people from inside and outside the neighbourhood for special occasions like weddings). The municipality have recently provided offices for the two Mokhtars of the neighbourhood in green spaces; however, residents reported rarely visiting the Mokhtar office or the SD centre for any issues apart from requesting administrative documents from the Mokhtar or complaining about issues like lighting, sewerage or building breaches. During one of the author’s visits to the Mokhtar’s office in Hamdanya, one resident came to the Mokhtar to discuss issues regarding local facilities145.

**Rules, resources and rationalities**

In addition to the uncertainty about responsibilities for provision of community centres due to lack of clear definitions in planning laws, in Hamdanya, the conflict over responsibilities between the municipality and the GCMH added further complication to the process of providing a community centre. The GCMH was acting outside the control of state planning laws; it also had its own planning standards and did not subscribe to state planning, implementation and monitoring laws and norms.

In terms of resources, although there were vacant spaces in the neighbourhood centre, the vagueness of responsibilities for and definition of community centre affected the provision of this facility. Allocation of spaces within the neighbourhood centre proved to be influenced by the desire to make profits rather than providing local needs.

When asked about rationalities regarding providing a community centre, interviews with officials in the GCMH showed that the definition of community centre was not clear to them. However, one official suggested that the two multipurpose halls which were

---

145 The resident requested changing the use of the technical school which serve at larger level than the local neighborhood into a primary school as students due to lack of space in primary schools. He noted that children using this school are of older age that they can walk across main streets safely rather than younger children at primary school age.
functioning as celebration halls could be considered as communal facilities. Moreover, the conflict of responsibilities between the GCMH and the municipality has influenced the provision process where both actors consider the responsibilities of managing the neighbourhood in general to be of the other.

**Health facilities**

**Actors, roles and relationships**

![Health facilities diagram](image)

*Figure A.6.1.4 Hamdanya Governance process for providing Health facilities*
One plot of 2600m² was designated for a local health centre in the original plans. The plot was allocated by the GCMH to the DoH after a long procedure of paperwork. An interviewee from the DoH noted that getting land from the municipality is much easier than getting land from GCMH (Interviewee 26, DoH). The DoH also had to pay a price for the land, which is usually allocated for free by the municipality in other neighbourhoods. The DoH developed a dermatology health centre at city level on this plot in the mid 1990s rather than a local health centre. Other health facilities were

Figure A.6.1.5 Health facilities within Hamdanya
provided in the neighbourhood. The GCMH provided a health centre, which served people working in the GCMH. Moreover, the GCMH allocated a ground floor in one of the high rise residential buildings to the Ministry of Defence (MoD) which provided a health centre serving mainly members of the military. The DoH did however support this health centre with medical staff and medical supplies in order that it could also serve people from outside the military.

In addition to these publicly developed health centres, the private sector has also participated in the provision of health facilities through providing around 35 private clinics by converting flats on ground floors or first floors of residential buildings. In the villas’ area a hospital serving at the city level was built on a plot designated for a villa. Most of the private health facilities were provided through formal change of use procedures. Civil society has also participated in providing health facilities when a private donor gave money to establish a health centre on a religious building’s premises. Moreover, the Mokhtars, who reported that the public health facilities were insufficient, had requested extra health centres. This request was made through the three-monthly and annual meetings, and also by directly approaching the Baath party branch in Aleppo. However, they had received no response to their requests.

**Rules, resources and rationalities**

As mentioned above, national planning standards were not applied in preparing the neighbourhood detailed plan. The wide authority of the GCMH to manage the development complicated the procedure of allocating the land to the DoH. The DoH was able to provide a specialised health centre rather than the designated local health centre, which shows poor monitoring process to ensure implementation of designated land uses. Moreover, the laws and decisions on change of use from residential to health facilities encouraged the provision of private health facilities. However, these changes were not considered as a significant modification of plans and did not follow law 5/1974 regarding modifying plans.

---

146 The clinics are of one doctor or one midwife. Most of the doctors are without speciality while few have subspeciality.
In terms of resources, the lack of resources, in terms of land for specialised health centres at the city level, encouraged the DoH to replace the designated local health facility by the one city level. Moreover, resources available from the GCMH and the Ministry of Defence was helpful in terms of providing two other health centres but was not directly devoted to serve the local residents.

In terms of rationalities, the provision of local health centres as a neighbourhood facility was not seen by the different providers as essential. While the DoH interest focused on providing facilities at the city level rather than the local level, the GCMH and ministry of defence interests focused on providing facilities for their employees. The need to provide for local people was evident only in the cooperation between the DoH and the GCMH to provide service for civilians in the military health centre. The private health facilities were provided to meet demand not met by public provision.
Schools

Actors, roles and relationships

Figure A.6.1.6 Hamdanya Governance process for providing schools
The original plans for the neighbourhood included seven plots for schools. Five plots were allocated by the GCMH to the DoTS which provided the school buildings between 1980 and 1995. On the other two plots GCMH undertook the development on behalf of the DoTS. The DoE used one of these schools as a technical college serving a catchment wider than the local neighbourhood. Of the other six schools, five were run in two shifts while only one was run in one shift. Later in the 1990s, plans of the neighbourhood were amended by the GCMH to include another seven plots for schools – converted from those designated for green areas. However, in 2010 the DoE and DoTS had still not been informed of land available for schools in this neighbourhood despite the need. In the meantime, two new plots were planted with some trees and considered as green spaces. Moreover, a suggestion was made by the Mokhtars and officials from the SD to provide a public garden on some of these plots. The private sector participated in providing one private school through converting the former centre of AlJamaheer news agency into a private school serving at the city level. Some residents participated through complaining about lack of schools, but these complaints were not answered.

---

147 This suggestion was made in a meeting held in the DoS centre in May 2010, there was no reference to the designated land use of these plots despite that the DoS had a copy of the updated plans.

148 During the researcher visit to the office of one of the Mokhtars, a resident came to complain about the shortage of primary schools within the area that his children was not granted a place in one of the near primary school, he suggested that the DoE should use the technical school as a primary school to respond.
Finally, in term of sharing school facilities with the community, only one school was used sometimes to hold the annual meeting between representatives of the community, the municipality, other public sector organizations, and residents\textsuperscript{149}. Moreover, some interviewees reported that the courtyards of some schools are used by youngsters to play informally (Residents 20, 22, Hamdanya).

**Rules, resources and rationalities**

First of all, as mentioned before, the GCMH set its own standards rather than applying the national planning standards. Responsibilities for developing the schools were shared between the GCMH, the DoTS which were seen to be complicating the process. Planning laws over implementation and monitoring of the provision were not applied as information sharing between the GCMH, the DoTS and the DoE was weak and no action was taken to ensure the development of the planned facilities. In terms of private provision, laws accompanying the 2001 reform regarding private sector participation encouraged the development of the private school; however, the allocation of the space from part of the neighbourhood centre is questionable.

Lack of resources did not appear to affect the provision of schools as much as the lack of information sharing. However, if plots designated for schools were allocated to the DoTS, the shortages in finance would have probably affected the provision process.

In terms of rationalities, the concept of locality and catchment area was not seen to be essential for officials in the DoE (e.g. one of the plots allocated for a high school was used as a technical school). Running schools in two shifts and accommodating more students than the standard was quite normal. Moreover, the mix of responsibilities between the GCMH and the municipality has significantly influenced the provision process and encouraged a culture of blame, as the GCMH claimed that the municipality should have taken responsibility for managing the provision of schools, while the

\textsuperscript{149} Most of the residents interviewed were unaware of these meetings.
municipality claimed that these responsibilities should be undertaken by the GCMH until
it formally handed the neighbourhood over to the municipality.

Nurseries

Figure A.6.1.8 Hamdanya Governance process for providing nurseries
Original plans of the neighbourhood allocated only one plot for a nursery. The GCMH allocated this plot to the UoW which provided the nursery in 1989; the UoW let part of the building to be used as a private school (the Private French school), when the school was closed later, the space was left empty. In the 1990s, when the GCMH amended the plans, six more plots were allocated as nurseries through changing the use of six green spaces to nurseries. However, these plots were still undeveloped in 2010: one was merged with the church premises in the villas area; another two were planted with trees and the rest were left empty. The property of the plots still belonged to the GCMH in 2010 despite that the neighbourhood was handed over to the municipality in 2009. In 2010 the GCMH

**Figure A.6.1.9 Nurseries within Hamdanya**

**Actors, roles and relation**
attempted to sell some of the nursery plots to private developers but these attempts failed as the aimed price was not accomplished. In addition to the planned nurseries, the GCMH provided a nursery in 1997 in part of the neighbourhood centre; the nursery was closed in 2008 with a decision from the head of the GCMH due to failure in making appropriate profits.

The private sector also participated in providing nurseries in the neighbourhood. Five private nurseries were provided since 1988, four were converted from ground floors in residential buildings and one was converted from a villa. The five nurseries was provided following formal procedures of change of use.

**Rules, resources and rationalities**

The original standards set by the GCMH included only one nursery; the new standards included additional area, which was however still less than what addressed in the national planning standards. In terms of implementation and monitoring process, in a similar situation to the provision of schools, information sharing between the GCMH, the municipality and the other bodies possibly responsible for the nurseries was very weak, while no action was taken to ensure the development of planned nurseries or to further question the UoW for letting part of the nursery building become a private school. Moreover, the mixed and unclear responsibility for the development influenced land allocation. The wide authority of the GCMH also allowed it to keep the property of the nursery plots rather than handing them over to the municipality. The GCMH also took advantage of the 2001 economic reform to advertise the plots for sale to private developers, which was against the norms of developing planned nurseries. Finally, recent amendments to the laws on change of use and licensing private nurseries were seen to be limiting new development of private nurseries in Hamdanya due to new restrictions on buildings, staff and taxation.

---

150 In Halab-AlJadeeda, a private developer request to buy or rent a nursery plot was rejected with a claim that this can only be develop by public sector a civil society organization like UoW.

151 The recent amendments set new conditions in terms of the building, qualification of staff, etc.
Resources were not mentioned as a reason for not building the nurseries, as the UoW is a well-funded organization. On other hand, providers of private nursery expressed that it is much more affordable to provide a private nursery in a ground floor of a residential building than to buy a plot from the GCMH.

In term of rationalities, the importance of providing local nurseries at the neighbourhood level was not seen to be essential in the original plans; however, it was given more importance in the amended plans. The profit motive was evident in the UoW’s attempt to let part of the nursery building to another use to generate income; it was also evident in the attempt of GCMH to sell the plots to private developers before the municipality took ownership of the plots when GCMH handed over the neighbourhood to the municipality. As with other facilities in Hamdanya, the mixed responsibilities between the GCMH and the municipality affected the implementation process.
Religious buildings

Actors, roles and relationships

![Diagram](image)

**Figure A.6.1.10** Hamdanya Governance process for providing religious buildings

In the original plans of the neighbourhood only four sites were allocated for religious buildings. Later on three of the green areas were changed into mosques, based on requests from residents. Another plot developed originally as a pub, rarely used, was also changed into a mosque in response to a request from residents. These new uses were included in
the amended plan of the neighbourhood. The seven religious buildings were developed gradually since the early nineties. Four of the religious building (three mosques and one church) were developed with donations from individuals, while funds to build the other religious buildings were collected through committees established from residents and officials of the DoA. As with the first case study Halab-AlJadeeda, responsibilities for managing and maintaining the mosques was undertaken by the DoA, which permitted activities, restricted to wedding and funeral ceremonies in some of the mosques.

**Rules, resources and rationalities**

As mentioned in chapter 6 in analysing the rules, resources and rationalities over development of religious buildings in Halab-AlJadeeda, residents and private donors were allowed to participate in the delivery of religious buildings through managing and financing the provision process, in contrast to the normal tendency to exclude civil society from the service provision process. Finance from civil society was seen to be essential to the development of religious buildings; it was also supported by profits from the shops provided on the premises of three of the mosques, which were used to help maintain the mosques. The importance of religious buildings as a local facility and the perception of helping to provide them as a charitable deed encouraged members of the community and civil society to donate money for constructing religious buildings and to request the provision of extra religious buildings through change of land use.
Recreational greenspace facilities

Actors, roles and relationships

Figure A.6.1.11 Hamdanya Governance process for providing recreational facilities
The original plans of the neighbourhood included a large area for green spaces of which only one plot was allocated for a main public garden. The neighbourhood was also surrounded by a green belt. When the plans were amended in the 1990s, part of these areas was allocated for other uses (schools, nurseries, religious buildings, SD centre).

The GCMH, which undertook the development of the neighbourhood, established the main public garden on land allocated for this purpose and owned by it, but it was not until the mid-nineties that the public garden was opened to the public. The GCMH also planted and maintained some green areas and supplied some green corridors with lights and benches. Some of these were demolished and never again maintained. The SD, which was...
established in the early 2000s, played an important role in the care and maintenance of the green spaces, despite the fact that the neighbourhood in general was still managed by GCMH. However, the SD was not able to maintain the green areas appropriately, due to lack of resources. In general, the majority of the green spaces in the neighbourhood were poorly established and maintained. The SD produced a plan in 2010 to improve the condition of the green areas. The plan included providing smaller public gardens in different parts of the neighbourhood. However, this plan did not align to the planned land use of the neighbourhood, as some of the suggested green spaces were to be established on plots designated for other uses (e.g. school and a nursery)\textsuperscript{152}. In contrast, land designated for green spaces was used for other uses (e.g. a mosque).

Some residents had also played a role in establishing and maintaining green spaces through maintaining some of the green spaces between the residential blocks. However, these maintained green spaces were walled off and closed to the public. In addition, many of the residents on ground floors have informally built shops and flats in their private gardens, reducing the overall area of green space.

**Rules, resources and rationalities**

Green spaces were generously planned in the original plans. However, the mixed responsibilities between the GCMH and the municipality over the development of the neighbourhood significantly influenced the provision of the green spaces, as neither of them took full responsibility for this provision. Moreover, the implementing and monitoring process proved to be very weak: land designated as green spaces was used for other facilities, while land designated for other facilities was considered as green space. Moreover, no serious action was taken to prevent the illegal conversion of some of the public green spaces into private ones, and conversion of private ones into flats and shops.

Lack of resources was one of the main reasons for the poor condition of the green spaces in the neighbourhood. On the one hand, the GCMH, which is well funded, devoted its

\textsuperscript{152}Interviews with officials in the DoS revealed that a plan was made to provide a public garden on two plots (Interviewee 7, SD + Interviewee 4, NC). However, one of these plots is allocated in the amended plans for a nursery and the other is allocated for a school.
resources to providing housing rather than green spaces. On the other hand, the municipality and the SD lack the sufficient funds to care for the wider green areas in the neighbourhood.

In terms of rationalities, the tendency to allocate blame dominated the different actors’ rationalities for the development of green spaces. The municipality and the SD considered that establishing green spaces was the responsibility of the GCMH, while the GCMH considered that, despite the delay in the formal handing over of plans to the municipality, it was still the responsibility of the municipality to take care of the green areas. Similarly, residents expected the government (both the GCMH and the municipality) to maintain the green spaces, while the government expected residents to participate in maintaining the green areas. Residents appeared unwilling to take on maintenance of common areas unless they could make them semi-private.
Lands specified for public services (cultural and administrative facilities)

Actors, roles and relationships

Figure A.6.1.13 Hamdanya Governance process for providing public services land

The original plans of the neighbourhood included five plots for public services - these plots were specified for administrative and cultural facilities. The amended plans of the neighbourhood added two extra plots on land designated originally as parking for the neighbourhood centre. The allocation of the plots was managed by the GCMH, which
developed the latter two plots as its administrative offices. The GCMH allocated three plots for different public providers to develop: the GCMH petrol station; a fire station; a bakery; and a post and phone centre. Another two plots were still not allocated in 2010 and were still owned by the GCMH, even though the neighbourhood had been formally handed over to the municipality.

In addition to the designated public services plots, the GCMH allocated three plots converted from the green belt surrounding the neighbourhood to develop a police station, a small centre for paying water-bills, a power station to serve the adjacent sport-city area, and a centre for the SD.

**Rules, resources and rationalities**

The GCMH had the authority to manage allocation of the designated public services plots and to amend original plans; it also had the authority to change the use from a parking area to administrative buildings without consulting the municipality or any other planning authority. Planning, implementation and monitoring of the development of these areas was subject to decision from the GCMH rather than formal procedures.

In terms of resources, the shortages in land allocated for services at city level influenced decision over the use of the plots allocated for cultural and administrative facilities – mainly regarding the conversion of part of the green belt to other uses.

Rationalities over the distribution of land use varied between actors: while officials from the GCMH thought that GCMH should decide the use of this land, some professionals and planners considered that the use of public services plots within residential neighbourhoods should be restricted to services serving at that level.
Appendix 6-2 Analysis of the governance process for delivering local facilities in Hanano

*Shopping facilities: local and neighbourhood centres*

**Actors, roles and relationships**

![Diagram of the governance process for providing shopping facilities; local and neighbourhood centres](image)

**Figure A.6.2.1** Hanano Governance process for providing shopping facilities; local and neighbourhood centres
Figure A.6.2.2 Shopping facilities within Hanano
The original plans of the neighbourhood contained three main shopping areas: The first was designated as a local shopping centre; the second was designated as a high street (known as the commercial street) which contains shops in ground floors of residential buildings; and the third was designated as a convenience store. The municipality, which managed the process of developing the three facilities, did so at a very slow pace. It was not until 1996 that the municipality provided a small shopping centre of 44 shops on part of the plot allocated for the local centre (known as the old shopping centre). The shops...
were offered to let to the private sector. Less than a third of the shops was rented and run due to the complexity of the letting process\textsuperscript{153} and to poor maintenance of the centre\textsuperscript{154}. For a period of time the municipality kept offering the rest of the shops to let, and then the shops that were not let were put on hold to be allocated to private shop owners who would lose their shops elsewhere due to urban development in several parts of the city. A few shops in the centre opened for some time but then closed.

The rest of the plot of the local centre was left empty and was used informally by vendors until 2007. In 2007 the development of a shopping centre was undertaken through a partnership between the company of Aleppo markets (affiliated to Aleppo chamber of commerce) and the municipality. The shopping centre opened in 2009 including 400 shops for let, most of which had a very small floor area. The centre was secured by surveillance camera to attract people to rent the shops and to attract residents to use the centre. The majority of the shops were let in 2010. As with the case of the old centre, the vacant shopping units in the local centre were held by the municipality to compensate shop owners who would lose their shops elsewhere to urban development. However, the new shopping centre was not considered to be successful.

In 2005 the construction process started of the commercial street which contains 257 shops on the ground floor and residences in the upper four storeys. Most of these blocks were completed in 2010, except for two blocks which were still under construction. The shops were advertised to let, but only 167 were let. Of the 167 shops, in 2010 127 had opened and the rest were still closed. The municipality put on hold the other 90 shops, which was not rented, to be allocated to those who would lose their shops due to urban development in other parts of the city. Therefore only about half of the shops in the commercial street were open in 2010\textsuperscript{155}. Shopkeepers in the commercial street who were

\textsuperscript{153}Private investors had to apply each year to continue renting their shops from the municipality, which involved a long procedure that discouraged some of them from continuing.

\textsuperscript{154} The local centre lacked maintenance and management, as the municipality did not put any effort into it. There was also a lack of security.

\textsuperscript{155} A different view was expressed by some developers of illegal corner shops, who claimed that the formal provision was not well advertised and that they would have considered renting shops in the commercial street if it was delivered earlier and if they had been informed of the coming development.
interviewed claimed that some investors bought shops not to run them but to sell them on at a higher price, which affects the prices of the shops and the viability of the commercial street.

The third plot, which was supposed to be a superstore, was allocated by the municipality to the General Company of Trade (GCT) to develop as a convenience store, and the plot was still not developed in 2010. Officials from the GCT said that they were not even aware of the allocation of the plot. Moreover, another plot in the neighbourhood, designated for public services, was allocated by the municipality to the GCT and officials of the GCT were not aware of the allocation.

In addition to the planned shopping facilities, 10 corner shops were provided on the premises of two of the religious buildings. Moreover, private developers have also illegally provided 394 corner shops and 58 real-estate offices. These shops started to open soon after the first residents arrived in the neighbourhood when some residents on ground floors started to sell goods from the balconies of their flats. Later they converted a larger part of the flat or the whole flat into a shop. The conversion of flats into shops involved making structural changes, including creating windows and doorways that potentially threatened the structural integrity of the buildings. The municipality has long turned a blind eye to the illegal development of corner shops. In 2009 a committee was formed to deal with this illegal development (similar to the case in Hamdanya). Also, the opening of the CoAM shopping centre and the commercial street put pressure from formal private shop owners on the municipality to close the illegal shops. Similar to the Hamdanya case study, a temporary license was intended to be given to the shops, which did not cause damage to the construction of the buildings. Most of the shopkeepers showed no interest in obtaining the temporary licence, as they considered the fee unaffordable and they did not trust the municipality to come up with a fair decision. However, the municipality took no enforcement action to actually close them down.

156 (Private developers, 39, 41, Hanano)

157 The officials from the GCT showed interest in the matter and claimed that they would investigate further to find out about it.
Residents in the neighbourhood were not involved in the provision of the planned and unplanned facilities, and also not involved in decisions on managing the informal shops, despite the fact that the majority of residents welcomed the informal shops. However, a suggestion was made by the head of the NC to solve the problem of illegal corner shops through allocating parts of green areas on main streets to develop corner shops in different areas of the neighbourhood. Moreover, some residents were disturbed by some of the illegal corner shops; they approached the SD, the municipality and the governorate many times, but these complaints were always ignored.

Rules, resources and rationalities

As in the other neighbourhoods, the state as main provider dominated provision of formal shopping facilities in the neighbourhood until the late 2000s. The 2001 economic reform influenced provision through partnership between the municipality and the private sector (Company of Aleppo Markets). The concept of the local centre and the neighbourhood centre set out in the planning standards was not applied in plans for the neighbourhood, which merely designated shopping facilities. Moreover, Implementation and monitoring procedures were poorly applied. Laws on licensing change of use were not applied in the neighbourhood, where shops were developed informally with the municipality turning a blind eye to these illegal developments for around 20 years.

The municipality cited scarcity of resources as an important reason for the delay in provision of shopping facilities. At the same time, the budget was allocated for the construction of the facility but not for its maintenance and improvement. The new forms of partnership with the private sector provided a good source of finance to the municipality as well as providing direct finance for building shopping facilities. Moreover, resources from the informal private sector were important in providing around 400 corner shops, which for a long period were the main shopping facilities in the neighbourhood.

When asked about their rationalities for providing shopping facilities, actors focused on the provision more as a business investment rather than as a local facility. With regard to informal provision, informal corner shops were for a long time not recognised by the municipality. However, when the planned facilities were developed the corner shops were
seen by the municipality as extra facilities forming an obstacle to operating the formal shops, regardless of their importance to resident as local facilities.

**Community centre**

**Actors, roles and relationships**

![Diagram of Hanano Governance process for providing community centres](image)

**Figure A.6.2.4** Hanano Governance process for providing community centres

As in Halab-AlJadeeda, and Hamdanya, there was lack of clarity about who was responsible for the provision of the community centre. The municipality did not develop a community centre in any of the designated shopping centres. As in the other two neighbourhoods, AlMokhtar offices provided a place for meetings between the Mokhtars
and the NCs. However, residents regarded the main responsibility of the Mokhtar to be issuing administrative documents. The majority were not aware of the NCs. Another facility with potential to provide space for a community centre was the cultural centre. However, services provided in the cultural centre did not include one.

**Rules, resources and rationalities**

The lack of clarity of responsibility for the provision of the community centre affected the provision process: no provision was undertaken and no action was taken to ensure such provision. Resources for developing a community centre cannot be analysed, as no attempt was made to provide it in the first place.

In terms of rationalities, as mentioned in the previous case studies, the meaning of community centre in the planning standards was not clear to the different actors. In Hanano case study, the meaning of the community centre was even confused with the cultural centre. Some interviewees considered that a community centre is similar to a cultural centre. However, officials in the DoC saw the cultural centre as a means of providing cultural facilities mainly at the city level, as only three cultural centres were available in the city of Aleppo.
Health facilities

Actors, roles and relationships

Figure A.6.2.5 Hanano Governance process for providing Health facilities
The empty plot planned as a hospital (Source: the researcher)

Private nurse clinic (Source: the researcher)

The plot allocated for a centre for people with mental disability (Source: the researcher)

**Figure A.6.2.6** Health facilities within Hanano
The original plans of the neighbourhood included 3 plots designated for local health centres, and another area designated for a hospital. The plots were owned by the municipality. In the early eighties the municipality allocated one of the plots to the DoH, which developed a health centre to provide services mainly for residents in the surrounding informal neighbourhoods, although it also served residents in Hanano. Development of the rest of the health centre plots was put on hold until 2003, when the DoH provided a comprehensive clinic on a plot allocated by the municipality, from those designated for public uses. The project was supported by an international organization which provided funds and equipment for the centre. Another health facility was provided by a charity organization, which provided a charity health centre. With regard to the other two plots designated as health centres, the municipality allocated one in 2003 to the Directorate of Social Affairs and Work SDW to provide a social centre for people with mental disabilities. The project was however put on hold after the foundation stone was laid in 2006. The third plot was still not allocated in 2010. Finally, the plot that was designated for a hospital, and was supposed to provide important medical services in the eastern part of the city, was still awaiting development in 2010. The RCs requested the provision of the hospital several times; the DoH responded that the provision would take place when funding was available. In the meantime, residents kept complaining about the empty plot having turned into a place for dumping waste in addition to its impact on reducing security. The NCs requested that a wall be built surrounding the plot, which the municipality provided in 2010.

In addition to the publicly provided facilities, private doctors and nurses converted residential flats in residential buildings into private medical clinics. These gradually increased to reach 47 clinics.

158 According to the MoH standards, a comprehensive clinic serve for 300,000 to 500,000 people in addition to the local health centers.

159 According to the head of the NC, the DoH wanted to take the latter plot to develop an administrative facility for the DoH but the NC opposed to the development.
Rules, resources and rationalities

In contrast to the other two neighbourhoods, an area very close to the one addressed in the national planning standards was planned as health facilities. However, the implementation and monitoring procedures proved to be poor, as no action was taken to ensure the development of the planned facilities. Moreover, lax restriction over change of use encouraged the development of private health facilities.

With regard to resources, the lack of funds was mentioned as a main reason for the delay in providing the health facilities, especially the hospital. Moreover, the lack of plots for a health centre in the informal settlements resulted in using the local health centre in Hanano to serve at different levels. Moreover, the shortages of land for services at the city level influenced the allocation of one of the health centre plots to the SDW to develop social centre for disabled people.

In terms of rationalities, officials from the DoH noted that the poor socio-economic conditions of residents in the neighbourhood and its adjacent areas encouraged the development of the two centres, as low income people could not afford the private health facilities and would use the public health centres more than would those of higher income. On the contrary, the low socio-economic status of the neighbourhood did not attract specialised doctors, whose relatively high fees they would not afford. Finally, the uncertainty regarding plans for rehabilitation of the informal settlements were seen to have discouraged the DoH from providing other health centres in the area; the existing health facilities were considered to be capable of serving the local neighbourhood if users from the informal settlements had their own health facilities in their areas.
The original plans contained six plots for schools. Five of the plots were allocated to the DoTS, which undertook gradual development of the schools. The development was also encouraged by residents’ demands and complaints regarding the shortage of schools due to the pressure from the surrounding informal neighbourhoods. The DoE ran most of the
schools in two shifts to accommodate the large number of students. However, running schools in two shifts was not enough, and more schools than originally planned were built on the areas used as school playgrounds. Moreover, most of the schools in the neighbourhood were used as primary schools rather than high schools; priority was given to younger children to be accommodated within the neighbourhood. However, despite the shortage of schools in the neighbourhood, the municipality allocated one of the school plots to be developed as a rehabilitation centre for disabled people. Finally, in 2010 with the increasing demand for schools, the municipality allocated one of the undeveloped nursery plots to the DoTS to develop a school.

**Rules, resources and rationalities**

Planning standards were not strictly applied in designating the school plots, as the area designated for schools was below the national standard. In terms of implementation and monitoring, the involvement of three different actors in the provision process and poor information sharing among them was seen to complicate the process. Allocating of school plots was managed by the municipality, which was able to change the land use from school to another use and vice versa. Changing a school plot to another use is a clear breach of the 1974 law which forbids the change of use of school plots. In addition, schools were operating in two shifts and accommodating many more students than specified in standards.

Similar to the previous cases, lack of funds was seen as a main reason for the late delivery of schools in the neighbourhood and for running them in two shifts. The shortage of services plots in the informal neighbourhoods and at the city level in general affected the development of the school plots in the neighbourhood. On other hand, the recent availability of resources (allocated through the 10th 5-year plan) has improved the recent provision of schools.

In terms of rationalities regarding the provision process, DoE staff focused on the need to enrol the largest number of students in schools in order to serve the local neighbourhood.

---

160 this was plot was later developed as a nursing home for elderly
and the surrounding informal areas, with priority given to primary school children rather than older ones. Moreover, running schools in two shifts and the large number of student in one class were widely accepted as the norm until 2007 when the tenth five-year plan was issued.

**Nurseries**

![Diagram of Hanano Governance process for providing nurseries](image)

**Figure A.6.2.8** Hanano Governance process for providing nurseries
Actors, roles and relationships

The plans for the neighbourhood designated an area for nurseries, divided into six plots, which is close to the national planning standard. The municipality allocated one plot to the UoW. In 1988 the UoW provided the only formal nursery in the neighbourhood. The municipality allocated one of the nursery plots to the DCAW and the use of the plot was still not decided in 2010. Another plot was allocated in 2010 to the DoTS to develop a school. Contradictory information was received about the three other nursery plots. While officials in the municipality noted that the plots had been allocated to the UoW since 2005 and were just awaiting transfer of land title to the UoW, officials from the UoW claimed that they knew nothing of this. Finally, the desire to provide more schools, encouraged by the tenth 5-year plan, was seen to have a potential impact on the possibility of developing designated nursery plots as schools rather than as nurseries.

In addition to the planned nurseries, a few private nurseries were opened in the neighbourhood without formal approval161, but these are at risk of being closed at any time.

161 The private nurseries converted from ground floors could not fulfil the conditions set in the laws over licensing the change of use, as these ground floors do not have private gardens.
Rules, resources and rationalities

Planners adhered to the planning standard in designating land for nurseries. In terms of implementation and monitoring, providing the nurseries was mainly the responsibility of the public sector and semi-public sector organizations, but without a clear statement of those responsibilities. Cooperation between the different actors was very poor. This was evident in the conflict between the municipality and the UoW over acquisition of some of the nursery plots. Moreover, the planning laws permitted the municipality to change two plots from nurseries to other uses. In terms of private provision, the law on licensing change of use prevented the development of private nurseries where ground floors could not meet building standards; however, this law was breached, as illegal nurseries were provided.

Resources were never mentioned as a reason for not building the nurseries, as the UoW has the financial capacity to provide. However, the shortage of school land was seen as an important obstacle to providing nurseries.

In terms of rationalities, officials in the UoW showed no interest in developing new nurseries in the neighbourhood; they thought that local residents would not be able to afford the fees to send their children to nurseries. Providing new nurseries was not considered to be profitable for the UoW. The DoE, although it could also participate in providing nurseries, was more interested in providing schools.
Religious buildings

Actors, roles and relationships

Figure A.6.2.10 Hanano Governance process for providing religious buildings

A land area of 31,500m² divided into four plots was designated for mosques. The provision of the mosques was not undertaken until long after residents had arrived. Residents complained to the DoA and the municipality to build the planned religious buildings. However, as Hanano was lower-middle income neighbourhood, it took a longer
time to form committees and collect donations for building the religious buildings. Meanwhile, residents built a small prayer room on part of a public open space. They provided building materials and labour. Neither the municipality nor the DoA interfered in the process. In 1997 the first planned mosque was provided through donations collected by committees formed from residents and officials of the DoA. Provision of two other mosques followed through the same process. The second one was opened in 2001 while a third one was still under construction in 2010. There was no plan in 2010 to develop the fourth plot.

Rules, resources and rationalities

As with the previous case studies, providing religious buildings brings out differences between national planning standards and planners; religious buildings were designated as a free-standing buildings. Civil society had the main role in the provision process where the norm controlling the process allowed civil society to participate in constructing religious buildings. The informal provision of the prayer room on a green space was considered as a breach of planning law, but no action was taken to prevent it.

In terms of resources, funds for the three mosques were raised through donation which, as noted above, was constrained by residents’ low incomes. Maintenance of the buildings was provided by the DoA and supported by residents’ donations and also by profits from the shops added on the premises of the mosques. In terms of the prayer room, local residents chipped in and provided funds for the building materials, as well as providing labour for the construction. Land was provided from the public green spaces with the agreement of the residents on the ground floor overlooking the space.

In terms of rationalities, as with the other case studies, people’s perception of participation in providing mosques as an act of charity was evident in the provision of the religious buildings; however, the poor ability of residents to donate cash restricted their participation.

162 The owner of the ground floor flat overlooking the open space welcomed the provision of the prayer room in front of her flat.
Recreational greenspace facilities

Actors, roles and relationships

Figure A.6.2.11 Hanano Governance process for providing recreational facilities
Figure A.6.2.12 Recreational facilities within Hanano
The original plan of the neighbourhood included a large area of land of 145,000m² designated for green spaces, divided into a public garden of 60,000m², along with a few smaller public gardens and many small green spaces between the buildings; no private green spaces were designated. In addition, an area of 44,000m² was designated for playgrounds. However, it was not until 2001 that the municipality developed the main public garden and opened it to the public. The garden was established with plants, seating areas and a small play area. However, the municipality was not able to take care of other areas designated as green spaces, especially the small areas between the residential buildings. Some of these areas were turned into dumping areas, while only a few of them were planted and maintained by residents in adjacent residential buildings, who closed these areas to the public. When the SD was established in 2005, it took responsibility for maintaining the green spaces, which slightly enhanced their condition.

Figure A.6.2.13 The undeveloped playgrounds plot within Hanano
Source: the researcher

With regard to the playground, in 1984 the municipality allocated the plot to the Workers’ Union (WU) to develop it. However transferring title to the WU took a long time, due to disagreement over the price of land. In 2010 the plot was still empty awaiting development. The WU had only managed to develop a plan for the facilities that will be provided on the plot. These will contain a swimming pool; 3 small playgrounds for tennis; basketball and volleyball; a playground for soccer; a nursery, a health centre for the WU; a cafe and restaurant; in addition to 229 shops which will surround the plot. Residents and their formal representative (NC and Mokhtars) were not aware of decisions made
over the development of the plot\textsuperscript{163}. In the meantime, some youngsters and local teams use the plot to play football.

\textbf{Rules, resources and rationalities}

In terms of planning standards, the neighbourhood plans contained large area of green spaces that satisfy national planning standards, though a different hierarchy of green spaces was designated. The development and monitoring process undertaken by the public sector proved to be inefficient in caring for and maintaining the green spaces and in preventing breaches, like using some of the green spaces as dumping areas and also converting others into private green spaces.

With regard to the playground, the municipality had the authority to allocate the plot to the WU to develop the playground. However, no further action was taken to ensure that the facility was implemented.

In terms of resources, shortage of funds, equipment and staff were noted by DS officials as main reasons for the poor maintenance of the green spaces, in addition to the negative behaviour of some residents using the green spaces. However, the lack of resources was not mentioned by officials in the WU as an obstacle to developing the playground.

In terms of rationalities, the large area allocated for green spaces, which was meant to improve neighbourhood quality, was perceived by the SD as an obstacle to proper care and maintenance. Moreover, a significant divergence of views over responsibilities was evident between officials and residents, each claiming that the full responsibility should be taken by the other.

In terms of the playground, officials in WU focused on the project as an investment to make money rather than as a facility to serve people at the neighbourhood level.

\textsuperscript{163} The head of the NC said that “at the beginning there were plans to develop a playground, later it was decided that the plot might be given to the DoE to develop schools and lately we heard that they are going to provide car shops”.
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Figure A.6.2.14 Hanano Governance process for providing cultural facilities
Actors, roles and relationships

The plans of the neighbourhood included a cinema and a cultural centre; both were supposed to be developed by the DoC. However, it was not until 2001 that the municipality allocated the plots to the DoC which started the development of the cultural centre in 2003; the centre opened in 2006. Services and activities provided in the cultural centre were the responsibility of the DoC. These include: courses aimed at people in the informal settlements to improve their life quality; annual public meetings between residents, heads of community and representative of public organizations; and cultural events at city level. The centre also includes two libraries, one for adults and one for children, the latter funded by an international organization.

The land specified for the cinema was still empty in 2010. DoC regarded the cinema as not needed and wanted to develop a different cultural facility on the plot. In the meantime, the municipality tried to retake the plot from the DoC, which caused conflict between the two institutions.
Rules, resources and rationalities

Cultural facilities were designated in the original plans according to planning standards\(^\text{164}\). In terms of implementing and monitoring process, as with other facilities, the development of the cultural facilities was to be undertaken by the public sector (DoC). However, no further action was taken to ensure that planned cultural facilities were implemented.

Lack of resources was seen to be negatively affecting the development of the cultural facilities. The shortages of cultural centres at the city level influences the use of the cultural centre at the city level rather than local level. Moreover, the shortages in land allocated for services at the city level in general encouraged the municipality to retake the cinema plot. In addition, funds allocated by the international charity organization were seen to be of great importance for providing the children’s library.

In terms of rationalities, whereas planning standards stated that a cultural centre should serve around 50,000 people, each of the three cultural centres in Aleppo was serving more than 1,000,000 people. Officials in the DoC said that, even though planning standards stressed the importance of providing cultural centres, there was no intention to implement them according to standards. As mentioned earlier, the content of the programmes available in the cultural centre was the responsibility of the DoC through its officials administering the centre, who were more focused on providing services for people in the informal areas and for people at the city level rather than servicing the local neighbourhood. On the other hand, whereas the planners had designated a plot for a cinema, the DoC considered that there was no need for such a facility in the neighbourhood. The use of the plot was subject to personal opinions of officials in the DoC.

---

\(^{164}\) These were directed to serve Hanano and the adjacent formal residential area which were planned to reside around 45,000 people together, thus, according to planning standards, cultural facilities should be provided.


Figure A.6.2.16 Hanano Governance process for providing public services land
**Actors, roles and relationships**

The original plans of the neighbourhood included an area of 33,600m$^2$ for public uses divided into six plots. The municipality allocated the plots as follows: two plots to the General Company of Communication (GCoC), which developed a post and phone centre (serving Hanano and the adjacent neighbourhoods); 3200m$^2$ to the DoH, which developed an inclusive clinic; 5,500 m$^2$ to the police, which developed a police station on half of the plot (serving the local neighbourhood and its surrounding area), and residences for police officers on the other half. The other 9,700m$^2$ of plots were still not allocated for development in 2010 and no certain plans had been made for use of these plots.

**Rules, resources and rationalities**

The municipality managed the development of the public uses land (as specified in law 9 1974). Decisions over land use were taken by the municipality and other public organizations, but the process did not follow the procedure set out in planning law 9 1974 for changing the use of land, as no public consultation was undertaken. Moreover, RCs, which according to the Local Administration law 15 should represent residents’ needs, were not informed of the intended use of the plots; it was not clear whether these empty plots were open spaces or service land awaiting development.

---

**Figure A.6.2.17** Plots specified for public use, still empty

*Source: the researcher*
Lack of resources was not mentioned as an obstacle to the development of public service plots. In terms of rationalities, as noted in the first case study, there was a clear divergence of views over appropriate uses of this land; some professionals and planners insisted that the land should be reserved for future local facilities, but others viewed it as state-owned land that can be allocated regardless of local needs. This divergence was evident in the development of the public uses plots, as some uses considered the local needs while others did not.
Appendix 6-3 A summary of stakeholders’ diagrams for the different facilities in the three case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping facilities</th>
<th>Halab-AlJadeeda</th>
<th>Hamdanya</th>
<th>Hanano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Stakeholder Diagram for Halab-AlJadeeda Shopping Facilities]

- **State**: involving in the planning process.
- **Civil Society**: advocating for community needs.
- **Local Residents**: impacted by the development plans.
- **Governmental Organizations**: responsible for project execution.
- **Private Developers**: interested in profit margins.
- **Market**: selling goods.
- **Offices**: administrative functions.
- **Retailers**: selling goods.
- **Informal Shopkeepers**: operating without formal permits.
- **Formal Private Shopkeepers**: registered businesses.

![Stakeholder Diagram for Hamdanya Shopping Facilities]

- **State**: overseeing the development process.
- **Civil Society**: monitoring the progress.
- **Local Residents**: concerned with the environmental impact.
- **Governmental Organizations**: enforcing regulations.
- **Private Developers**: focused on market demand.
- **Market**: providing goods.
- **Retailers**: selling goods.
- **Informal Shopkeepers**: operating without formal permits.
- **Formal Private Shopkeepers**: registered businesses.

![Stakeholder Diagram for Hanano Shopping Facilities]

- **State**: involved in the decision-making process.
- **Civil Society**: advocating for transparency.
- **Local Residents**: impacted by the development plans.
- **Governmental Organizations**: responsible for project execution.
- **Private Developers**: interested in profit margins.
- **Market**: selling goods.
- **Retailers**: selling goods.
- **Informal Shopkeepers**: operating without formal permits.
- **Formal Private Shopkeepers**: registered businesses.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health facilities</th>
<th>Community centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Health facilities diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Community centres diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health facilities**

- Community centres
- Civil society
- Market
- Designating two halls with potential to serve as community centre but using them for other uses
- Providing the Mokhtars with offices
- Municipalities
- A potential opportunity for residents to discuss community issues with the Mokhtars and in the public meetings

**Community centres**

- Providing few communal facilities within the cultural centre
- Health facilities
- Civil society
- Market
- DoH
- Municipalities
- Residents, NCs and Mokhtars
- Private doctors and developers
- Providing private clinics and three hospitals
- Approving the change of use from housing to health facilities
- Health centre at city level
- DoH
- GCoMH
- NCs and Mokhtars
- Private doctors and nurses
- Providing private clinics
- Approval of providing private clinics
- Providing a specialised health centre on the local centre plot
- Providing a health centre for military people and permit local residents to use it (within a residential building)
- Providing a charity health centre within one of the Religious centers
- Requesting the provision of emergency health centre
- MoD
- Providing a health centre for members of GCoMH
Religious buildings

- Request for building religious building
- Request for the change of a green space and one of the PS plots to religious building
- Local residents, and RCs
- Cooperation through religious building committees
- Raising funds
- Donations
- Allocating the religious building plots
- Running the religious buildings

Recreational facilities

- State
- Civil society
- Market
- Municipalities
- DoA
- DoS
- RC of JM
- International organization

- Fund for providing the environmental garden
- Maintaining green spaces within its area
- Partial planting, fencing and maintaining of green spaces
- Planting and maintaining part of the public green spaces and closing these for private use
- Housing association
- Conflict over responsibilities for the green spaces
- Residents
- Private gardens
- Partial maintaining of green spaces; Intention to improve the conditions of the green spaces and to implement few small public gardens

- Allocating part of the green belt for different uses
- Different services

- Allocating the play ground plot

- Implementing the main public garden (2001)
- Partial maintaining of green spaces (the main public garden and the green island of the main streets)
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