revitalizing Bungamati
after the earthquake of 2015
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the larger context

- the EQ of April 2015 has damaged more than 52 traditional towns in Kathmandu Valley
- Kathmandu Valley alone lost 138771 houses (23% of total destroyed)
- traditional towns and settlements were in the neglect and unattended from long time
- most of these towns lies in new municipalities where the municipalities are institutionally weak, financially poor and technically yet to develop their capacities
the larger context

- At community level all the settlements formed local committees one way or other to support the affected population.
- They helped to coordinate and distribute the support made available.
- These communities can be supported for longer term assistance REBUILDING- and Building back better.
challenges of heritage towns

- How to revive the traditional settlements?
  - the question of land-
    - division of property- fragmentation/disputes/
    - issues of land tenure and ownerships
    - differential economic status of property holders
    - unplanned development of expansion areas
  - the questions of architecture
  - the questions of engineering
  - the questions of urban layout
  - the questions of society and culture
  - the questions of economy
challenges of heritage towns

- Most of the rebuilding initiatives are limited to building of houses- its facades and structures
  - this is rebuilding of settlements
  - this is rebuilding of societies, and
  - this is rebuilding of economy

- The biggest challenge is investment on traditional private houses:

- What is the take of government on heritage houses is not yet clear

- The bank financing is very complex and beyond the reach of affected families
piloting Bungamati

- the thinking behind
  - can we convert the earthquake as an opportunity to change the status quo?
  - can there be an example of comprehensive people-centric re-development in participatory approach?
Introducing Bungamati

Bungamati is one of the 52 traditional settlements in Kathmandu damaged heavily during the 2015 Earthquake.
Introducing Bungamati

Population: 3908
Households: 1095
Houses: 856
Damages in Bungamati

- 7 persons lost their lives
- Total no of houses collapsed in Bungamati Core: 563 out of 856 (65%)
- Most of those buildings survived are also badly damaged - unusable
- Major temples and shrines were lost
strategies and principles

- **Build back better**
- **Urban recovery and reconstruction interventions to be community-driven** wherever possible;
- Prioritize **technical assistance** linked to local government structures to promote quality compliance, enforcement;
- Ensure **access to information** on risk and available support mechanisms- **transparency** to bring communities on board
- Build on **pre-crisis policy instruments**, development plans and funding mechanisms, reprioritize their use; (by-laws, periodic plans,....),
- **Comprehensive development**- physical, social, economic
Approach

- **Integrated area-based approach** towards ‘urban neighborhoods’

- **Addressing the urban poor and vulnerable communities** impacted by the earthquake. We need more than 'equal' approach

- **Addressing the EQ recovery** in an integrated way fostering more resilient, safe and prosperous inclusive neighborhoods

- **Working on a double track** of recovery and risk resilience quick wins at neighborhood level (track 1), combined with institutional capacity strengthening for pro-poor urban development (track 2)
Double track approach

Institutional Planning Capacity Support

Inclusive Neighborhood Development

Vertical track

Horizontal track
what is needed at community level

- Local resources
- The Charter
- Materials supply
- Institution
- Fund
- Human resource
- Technical Assistance
what are we trying to do?

- support to build local institutions
  - Settlement level institution
  - Neighbourhood level institutions
  - reviving socio-cultural institutions

- support to build local CHARTER

- support to build funding mechanism
  - COMMUNITY RECONSTRUCTION TRUST FUND
  - For common good
  - Not necessarily equal- but equitable
Bungamati Rebuilding Council

Political party representatives
Representatives of local clubs
Representatives of women groups
Representatives of cooperatives
Representatives of religious, cultural groups

Bungamati Rebuilding Committee

Tole 1 Committee
Convener 1
Members 6
(at least 2 women members)

Tole 2 Committee
Convener 1
Members 6
(at least 2 women members)

Tole 3 Committee
Convener 1
Members 6
(at least 2 women members)

Tole 4 Committee
Convener 1
Members 6
(at least 2 women members)

Advisory Committee
KVDA
KB Municipality
DoA
DUDBC

Technical Support Committee
Municipality
UN-Habitat
DoA
SONA
NSET

Bungamati Rebuilding Trust Fund
external support

- Bungamati Rebuilding Committee
- Bungamati Rebuilding Trust Fund
- Individual donations
- Support from trusts
- Govt/municipal resources
- Support from NGOs/INGOs
- Community own fund

- Support coordination
- Centralized planning decentralized implementation
- Support in the form of
  - services,
  - kind
  - cash
economic development

- 30% of the people in Bungamati are in handicraft - wood carving - convert it into an opportunity
- developing artisans and skilled labour
- developing new tour package for tourists to visit Bungamati
- Can there be pre-financing by private sector in these heritage houses?
Responding the disaster
Lessons so far........

- Community and only community approach is possible for sustainable rebuilding
- More investments in community - institutional capacity
- More investments in local government - delivering the community
- More investments on building the local economy:
  - Skills, livelihoods
  - Culture
  - Local infrastructures
- If the nation takes pride of the heritage they should INVEST on private houses that builds the NATIONAL HERITAGE
Thank you