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INTRODUCTION
Freetown from the water.
Freetown has a complex history that is inextricably linked to both the slave trade and the struggle for African independence. The population is projected to double within the next fifteen years, driven primarily by rural to urban migration, and the City Council is currently seeking ways to incorporate heritage sites into its plans for rapid growth and densification.

It is the oldest capital established by African Americans, having been formally founded in 1792 by a group of formerly enslaved peoples who had been liberated by the British during the American Revolution. Some of these people had been enslaved decades before in nearby West Africa. In 1808, just after England outlawed the Trans-Atlantic slave trade, Sierra Leone was officially established as a British Crown colony, and the port of Freetown became the capital of British West Africa as well a critical hub for liberated people of color. That same year, an infamous slaver’s castle upstream from Freetown on Bunce Island was finally closed, after having been used to gather enslaved individuals for the transatlantic crossing for over 130 years. Through time, the Krio people—descended from those who had been liberated—built the city alongside members of Sierra Leone’s other ethnic groups, including the Temne and Mende.

Population growth in Freetown has been accompanied by increasing urbanization.
Since Sierra Leone gained independence in 1961, Freetown has faced a series of challenges that have shaped the built environment. Over the past half century, it has experienced unprecedented population growth, increasing by tenfold, and unemployment rates have remained high despite the development of the diamond market. During the 1990s, a brutal civil war played out on the streets of the city, and some vital infrastructure has yet to be restored. Devastating mudslides in 2017 laid bare the vulnerability of Freetown and the dire need for comprehensive urban planning and policy to ensure its social, economic, and environmental resilience.

While local and international actors are working to develop a vision and tools for sustainable densification, none of these efforts has sought to integrate the heritage of the city and of its multi-ethnic population as part of comprehensive planning. Current efforts to update heritage legislation present a timely opportunity to reconsider the role of heritage as a tool in urban planning and policy.

As the Freetown City Council advances urban planning efforts to accommodate growth in the capital city of Sierra Leone, the Monuments and Relics Commission of Sierra Leone is working to update its 1946 Heritage Law to ensure protection of historic resources. There has been limited examination of the role of heritage in the future development of the city to date, and thus limited connections between these policy agendas.

This advanced studio focused on the heritage–planning intersection, to better understand the current and potential uses of heritage in the social and physical fabric of the city, and to inform these dual policy efforts. As a multi-disciplinary studio, students of both Historic Preservation and Urban Planning collaborated to research, analyze, and propose recommendations for future policy action in Freetown. The existing planning and heritage governance infrastructure in Sierra Leone affords an opportunity for creative thinking at a policy level that moves beyond concepts of heritage as architectural vestiges to be designated and protected. Rather, heritage stands to be instrumentalized as a tool in promoting civic dialogue, equity, and sustainability in the urbanization of Freetown.
Approach

The studio team began the research process by examining archival materials and existing literature related to Freetown and Sierra Leone’s broader history and context. Background research focused on three primary topics: the social history, political history, and spatial development of the city. This research informed later policy analysis and eventual fieldwork by providing a historical context for the current state of affairs in Freetown. Subsequent policy analyses aimed to understand the contemporary policy landscape at a national and municipal scale, with a particular focus on existing sustainable urban development and cultural heritage policies.

Based on this preliminary research, the studio team identified priorities for data collection in the field, including general types of heritage resources that were expected to be on the ground in Freetown, as well as information on specific places and place-based resources of interest. The team simultaneously gathered information on key stakeholders who could inform the studio’s understanding of heritage in context.

Using this research, the team created a set of basemaps to be deployed in the field with the available building footprint and street grid data taken from the 2019 Open Street Map of Freetown. Additional layers of historical data were extracted from a series of maps produced by cartographers in Sierra Leone and the United States Army from the early 1800s through the 1960s. The creation of a basemap led to the identification of eight “nodes”—areas for focused data collection during the field survey week. These nodes, or bounded areas of the city, were selected based on a variety of factors determined throughout the background research process, including: heritage sites documented by previous architectural surveys, historical photographs, maps of early and ethnic settlements, and the recommendations of colleagues in Freetown. These boundaries were further refined when the team began fieldwork in Freetown.

The work of this studio differed from traditional historical resource surveys in that it sought to understand how different aspects of Freetown’s heritage are represented and encountered in the built environment by every day users and potential visitors. The aim was to prioritize areas where diverse heritage and other public assets were co-located. To this end, the team ultimately developed four tools for acquiring data on heritage within the larger urban context of Freetown: an architectural survey for historic resources and the adjacent built environment, a user survey recording public opinion within the identified nodes, a series of interviews conducted with key stakeholder organizations, and comparative photography to record change through time.

Architectural Survey

Collecting and adding additional information to the basemap of Freetown was facilitated using Esri Collector software. This app, deployed on a number of mobile phones and tablets, enabled members of the field survey team to download
portions of the basemap, collect and add relevant data and photographs associated with polygons representing individual buildings while remaining “offline” without a data connection, and then push these new contributions to the centralized geodatabase once a data connection had been reestablished. This work constitutes the first time ESRI Collector was employed to conduct a field survey in a Columbia GSAPP studio, and it significantly streamlined data collection and analysis. In approaching each resource in the field, the joint Columbia University/Fourah Bay College field team recorded information such as the resource’s location, use, apparent heritage status, physical and visual accessibility, historical narratives and associations, and physical condition. The architectural survey was meant not just to document heritage sites, but all types of resources within each of the eight nodes. A more extensive description of this survey is included as an appendix to this report.

**User Survey**

The user survey allowed the team to record people’s perceptions of heritage in Freetown. In order to streamline data collection, the team used KoBo Toolbox, a web-based, open-source platform to create this survey. The survey was then deployed on mobile phones and tablets, enabling members of the team to record responses from residents and visitors in Freetown within the pre-identified survey nodes. Responses to this survey were significantly strengthened by the participation of Fourah Bay College students, who introduced the research to respondents before delving into survey questions intended to examine the public understanding and appreciation of heritage sites around the city. A more extensive description of this survey is included as an appendix to this report.

**Stakeholder Interviews**

The team conducted conversations with local officials and community representatives in the heritage and planning policy realms. This included government and non-governmental actors who are instrumental in developing and implementing heritage-oriented policy in and around Freetown, including representatives of the Freetown City Council, the Monuments and Relics Commission, the National Museum of Sierra Leone, the National Archives of Sierra Leone, and the Sierra Leone Urban Research Center, as well as representatives of individual religious and historic sites. These meetings and visits directed the team’s attention toward issues most relevant to the residents of Freetown today.
Comparative Photography

Gary Shulze, a long-time collector of historic Sierra Leone postcards, provided a trove of historic photographs representing Freetown at different points in its history. In addition to the resources publicly available through Sierra Leone Web (www.sierra-leone.org), he provided several boxes of previously unscanned postcards that the team utilized heavily. Locating the vantage point from which these photos were taken, the team captured contemporary images from the same location, producing rich documentation of the visible changes that have occurred in Freetown over the last century. The team specifically focused on the scale, density, and use of buildings as well as the nature of street life through time.

Limitations

This study faced several important limitations. Fieldwork consisted of a single session in Freetown that lasted less than a week. Given more time and resources, the Columbia/Fourah Bay College team was well positioned to expand this same approach to additional parts of the city. While conducting the architectural survey and assigning specific historic narratives to individual structures, students recognized that their own lived experiences and initial research may have biased their interpretation of these resources. Finally, the team recognized that given the diverse linguistic environment of Freetown, even the collaborative efforts of students from both universities were occasionally insufficient to record public perceptions about heritage sites.
Infill along the Freetown coastline.
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW
Freetown is experiencing rapid change. Today, the growing capital city is home to more than 1 million residents, its population having doubled since 1990 (UN World Population Prospects 2019). Located on the coast of a mountainous peninsula at the Sierra Leone River, the port city’s urban footprint has recently expanded into the hills that once framed it. Densification has led to formal redevelopment in the city center, while informal settlement has filled many previously undeveloped areas. Urban economies, like the city itself, have grown and changed. And migration, which fuels much of Freetown’s recent expansion, has contributed greater cultural diversity to a city known as a melting pot of people and traditions.

Recent dynamic growth has raised questions about the city’s future—including questions about how it might continue to grow sustainably, and how sustainable growth might interface with urban heritage. These questions stem from circumstances in Freetown today. But today’s context was born out of the city’s rich and turbulent history.

From its earliest settlement to today, Freetown has been shaped by migration and diaspora, cultural multiplicity and exchange, colonialism and international influence, aspiration and independence. It has also experienced formative moments of conflict, hardship, resilience, and adaptation. Understanding these histories gives insight into the city’s heritage and the places that are associated with it. It also clarifies the changing nature of the city and its urban fabric today, and can serve to inform decision making and planning for its future. The following section reviews the history of Freetown into the present.

**Pre-Colonial History**

Sierra Leone and the Freetown coast have a long and diverse pre-colonial history. Archaeological evidence and historical accounts describe the migration of people to the region dating from at least 2,500 years ago into the colonial period (Fyfe 1962). By the fifteenth century, many independent cultural groups occupied Sierra Leone. Among the earliest coastal inhabitants were the Shrebro (Bulom) and the Krim, as well as the Limba people. The Temne, early migrants from the interior, also settled in the coastal region. By the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, further migration brought the Mende and Kono people, among others. While these groups may have shared similar languages, religion, or lifeways, they were politically autonomous and self-governing. Together, they have been described as the early “chiefdoms” or “kingdoms” of Sierra Leone (Fyfe 1962, 2).

Sierra Leone’s early chiefdoms were villages, communities, and territories that vested political authority in a chief and their supporting political council. Chiefdoms often confederated under the leadership of a king or “high chief” (Abraham 1975, 4; Fyfe 1962b, 4). Such confederations—as well as conflicts among chiefdoms—reflected the complex political and cultural dynamics of the region. They also were influenced by trading networks, like Islamic trade routes from the African interior, which played an important role in shaping pre-colonial Sierra Leone, and contributed to coastward migration into the period of European influence.
The Slave Trade and Diaspora

Following Portuguese explorer Pedro de Cintra’s first trip to the area dubbed “Ser-ra Lyoa” in 1462, Europeans traders began to visit Sierra Leone’s coast seeking to enslave people and expand an emerging West African slave-trading network. The Portuguese slave trade began around 1450 in West Africa, likely around Mauritania. By the end of the fifteenth century, it was firmly established in Sierra Leone. According to one contemporaneous account, more than 3,500 enslaved peoples were “exported” annually between the years of 1480 and 1500 from an area south from Senegal through Sierra Leone (Pereira 2010). Today, it’s thought that at least 1,350 enslaved people were moved annually from along the Sierra Leone and Guinea coast between the years 1500 and 1510 (Elbl 1997, 73). Captured in coastal raids or bartered for with local chiefdoms or traders, enslaved people were sold into captivity in the triangular trade between Africa, the Americas, and Europe.

Sierra Leone became an important point of capture in West Africa just as new markets for slave labor were opening in the Americas (Fyfe 1962; Rodney 1967). As Portuguese power waned in the seventeenth century, the English came to dominate its former trade routes and to supply the demand for labor in its newly established North American colonies. The English built their first trading post in the Sherbro Island region just south of the Freetown Peninsula in 1628. In the decades after, the English crown granted a charter to the Royal African Company for trade in Sierra Leone, and after 1670 a fortified trading post, or “factory,” was constructed at the site of Bunce Island in the Sierra Leone River. The site was advantageous as a deep-water harbor and offered additional access to trade from the mainland interior. The nearby Freetown Peninsula was also one of the closest points to the Americas in West Africa.

By the eighteenth century, Sierra Leone was known abroad as part of the West African “Rice Coast,” due to the rice growing traditions of its people. The cultivation of rice was quickly becoming the most profitable venture in North America, and enslaved people with knowledge of rice cultivation techniques were highly sought after. The English slave trade, including the operation at Bunce Island, continued to prosper through much of the eighteenth century as captured Africans from throughout Rice Coast and elsewhere on the continent were funneled through Sierra Leone for sale in North America. Many who survived the Middle Passage across the Atlantic were sold into forced labor in the English colonies of Georgia and South Carolina.

The Province of Freedom and the Founding of Freetown

By the late eighteenth century, the institution of slavery had become an economic pillar of the colonized Americas. Many West Africans were considered to be enslaved or held ambiguous status in England. But abolitionist sentiment in England during this period reshaped Sierra Leone’s role in the transatlantic slave trade. In 1772, abolitionist Granville Sharp brought the case of James Somerset before English courts; Somerset, a West African sold into slavery in the Virginia colony, had escaped to England to claim freedom. The court’s ruling established thereafter that those who had been enslaved would be considered free upon arriving in England, and while the ruling did not abolish slavery or the English slave trade, it was a boon to abolitionists.

The Somerset verdict came during the American colonies’ revolt against England. Following the outbreak of the American Revolutionary War, the British offered
freedom to slaves in America who supported their military cause. At the end of the war, many of the formerly enslaved who had fought beside the British made their way to London or to English-controlled Nova Scotia. Granville Sharp advocated for the British government to create a settlement on the African continent where those who had been liberated—many of them born in America—could establish a self-governing community. It was decided that a settlement called “The Province of Freedom” would be established on the coast of Sierra Leone where the English slave trade had taken root. In 1787, a group of approximately 400 formerly enslaved people and Europeans established “Granville Town” at the contemporary site of Freetown, having been ceded land through a treaty with local Temne chiefs (Fyfe 1962b, 27).

The settlement at Granville Town was unstable initially, and in 1791 an abolitionist-led English charter called the Sierra Leone Company took over the land grant at the Province of Freedom. The renewed settlement was renamed Freetown. The following year, approximately 1,100 emigrants from Nova Scotia arrived in the new colony (Fyfe 1962b, 32). By 1807, the Company solidified its control over the Freetown Peninsula and grew to include a population of Jamaican Maroons who also emigrated there. But by 1808, the Company was financially burdened by conflicts with local Temne and was forced to cede control of Freetown to the English crown. A crown-appointed governor assumed authority over administration of the new colony.

The Crown Colony and the Protectorate

Despite an abolitionist presence in Freetown, the slave trade continued along Sierra Leone’s coast until the English Anti-Slave-Trade Act of 1807. The act empowered the crown’s navy to seize ships participating in illicit trade, and other European powers soon joined in the practice. By 1819, Freetown was home to an international court where the operators of captured slave-ships were tried (Clarke et al. 1966). Freetown became the primary site in Africa where “liberated Africans” settled after being intercepted in the Atlantic. Seized goods also were deposited there, cementing the importance of Freetown as a port of trade. It’s thought that thousands of liberated Africans from throughout the continent landed in Sierra Leone every year during the 1820s and 1830s (Fyfe 1962b, 61). And as the population grew, so did Freetown. The diverse groups of people that took up residence there established distinct ethnic neighborhoods during this period.

In the 1800s, the colony also asserted its influence in the territories beyond Freetown. Competition between English and French imperial interests in West Africa led the crown colony to enter trade treaties with chiefdoms stretching into the interior. In 1895, British and French authorities agreed to draw boundaries distinguishing their geographies of influence, and England claimed authority over the area that today makes up the country of Sierra Leone. To the dismay of chiefdoms and their people, the crown decreed in 1896 that all Sierra Leone’s territories beyond Freetown were a British Protectorate and would be ruled by the colony. The Protectorate was divided into districts and the title of “Paramount Chief” was given to leaders, often installed or removed based on their willingness to cooperate with colonial administrators (Fanthrope 1998).

Colonial hegemony, and the introduction of a household tax in the Protectorate, were broadly opposed by its chiefdoms. Two rebellions against the colony took place in 1898, together known as the Hut Tax War. One rebellion led by Temne chief Bai Bureh engaged colonial “Frontier Police” and British military forces in
months of warfare before its end. Bai Bureh was ultimately captured and exiled; today, he remains a hero of colonial resistance in Sierra Leone. A second rebellion by the Mende people brought months of warfare before being suppressed. In the wake of the Hut Tax War, colonial rule through two interrelated political systems—one for the colony and one for the protectorate—was cemented, with Freetown as their combined center.

In the early twentieth century, the diverse people of Freetown and the districts of the Protectorate both were governed by appointed European colonial administrators. Laws for the colony and Protectorate were written in a combined Legislative Council. But by the 1920s the Krio community, a group descended from liberated Africans, had emerged as a sizeable elite in Freetown and began to decry its lack of political representation. The arrival of new industries and the introduction of the railroad also gave rise to trade and labor unions that pushed for structural reform. Responding to pressure, the governor of the colony in 1924 introduced a new constitution, expanding representation within its overarching legislature to include three elected seats. In the first election, two seats were filled by Krios and one by a Paramount Chief. Power remained with colonial authorities, but the shift in governance foreshadowed future political developments.

Independence and the New Nation of Sierra Leone

The Second World War brought change to Freetown as the English undertook wartime industry and infrastructure projects to support its local military base and regional operations. But the English state was largely depleted by the end of the war, and in 1945 its policies necessarily began to shift toward affording greater local autonomy to its colonies. This policy shift also corresponded to a period of growth for political parties in Sierra Leone. With the promise of increased autonomy afloat, a proposal was developed to form a single government system for the colony and the Protectorate. This proposal proved controversial and tensions arose between leadership in Freetown and leadership in the Protectorate over its potential to decrease long-sought representation for Krios in the colony (Fyfe 1962b, 174). But in 1951, the new unified constitution was introduced, and a Protectorate-oriented party led by Milton Margai, the Sierra Leone People’s Party (SLPP), won a majority in the legislature in the election that followed.
Milton Margai and his political party ascended through further changes to the colony’s government. Margai became “Chief Minister” when the crown granted the colony local ministerial powers in 1953; that same year the longstanding Legislative Council was reframed as a House of Representatives. These changes reflected a broader shift in British policy toward its African colonies. In Ghana, similar government reorganization coincided with an independence movement that gained traction with English authorities. That movement ultimately led to its independence in 1957. After Ghanaian independence, political leadership in Sierra Leone also sought to secure full autonomy from Britain.

In 1960, Milton Margai led a delegation to negotiate independence at a conference held with the crown and the British colonial secretary in London. On April 27th, 1961, the former colony became the independent nation of Sierra Leone, with its capital at Freetown. Milton Margai became the country’s first Prime Minister.

Sierra Leone experienced prosperity in the first years following its independence. Industries, including mineral resources production, continued to develop, bolstering Freetown’s importance as a port city. Nevertheless, changing policies and allegations of corruption against Sierra Leone’s second prime minister Albert Margai incited political unrest toward the end of the 1960s (Fyle 2013; Kallon 2003). In the wake of a contested election that instituted opposition leader Siaka Stevens as the nation’s third prime minister, three consecutive coups took place during 1967 and 1968. Ultimately, Stevens and his All People’s Congress (APC) political party assumed power and led the country until 1985. But the Stevens’ administration came to be characterized by corruption, political discord, and economic decline (Reno 2008). Attempted coups and the establishment of one-party rule preceded further unrest in the 1990s.

The Civil War and Reconciliation

In 1991, Sierra Leone entered into a decade-long Civil War that violently reshaped the nation and Freetown. The precise origins of the conflict remain a matter of debate, but consensus holds that failures of post-independence governance met historical inequities and contemporary economic stresses to create a context favorable to conflict (Witness to Truth Vol. 3A, Ch. 1 & 2, 2004). Mistrust of government had grown since the 1960s, access to opportunity had decreased, and resources were increasingly distributed unequally; many were left hungry, poor, and without work or public support (Fyle 2013). Within this context, a violent rebellion in neighboring Liberia led by Charles Taylor inspired revolutionary sentiment in Sierra Leone. The Revolutionary United Front (RUF), which sought to topple the government in Freetown, formed in 1991 with the assistance of Taylor and his forces. That year, the RUF began an insurrection that lasted 11 years, witnessed the deaths of tens of thousands, perpetrated countless human rights abuses, and displaced more than 1 million Sierra Leoneans (Guberek et al. 2006; Pagonis & Dobbs 2008).

In the first years of the Civil War, the rebel RUF forces seized territory in eastern and southern Sierra Leone and clashed with the Sierra Leone Army, with numerous atrocities reported (Witness to Truth Vol. 3A, Ch. 3, 2004). In 1997, the war reached Freetown. A group of former Army officers and their forces joined with the RUF and seized control of the city, resulting in a wave of violence that
propelled international powers to act. A West African multilateral military intervened, retaking the city for the former government. But the rebellion was not put down, and another RUF assault on Freetown in 1999 was among the most violent of the war. Armed forces reportedly targeted civilians and killed upwards of 5,000 individuals, with human rights abuses perpetrated against many more (Physicians for Human Rights 2002; Witness to Truth Vol. 3A Ch. 3 & 4, 2004). Freetown’s built environs and critical infrastructure also saw extensive damage. Rebels reportedly burnt entire city blocks, hospitals, and landmarks; housing authorities registered the destruction of nearly 6,000 homes in the city (Human Rights Watch 1999).

Later in 1999, rebel forces and the government of Sierra Leone signed a peace accord following international intervention. In 2002, President Ahmad Kabbah declared an official end to the conflict, and two post-war justice and accountability mechanisms were implemented: The Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the Special Court of Sierra Leone. The Commission and the Court worked in parallel with the shared goal of defining a truthful understanding of the war and building lasting peace and stability.

The Civil War had a profound impact on Sierra Leone. Forced displacement and migration were lasting ways that conflict reshaped the nation and its capital city (Witness to Truth 2004). Freetown saw the massive influx of internally displaced people and refugees who sought safety and aid during the war (Global IDP 2003, 39-43). Many migrants stayed in the city after the war’s end. While the full extent of sustained migration to Freetown during the Civil War remains unquantified, it’s known that 37,000 formally-registered internally displaced people took refuge there between 1991 and 2002, and that a significant portion of them remained (National Recovery Strategy 2002, 98-100; IDMC 2006, 18). Lasting socio-economic impacts also drove more people to Freetown seeking opportunity in the wake of the conflict. Migration across this period contributed to the city’s rapidly densification. Displacement, overcrowding, and increased poverty also created many of Freetown’s informal urban settlements at this time (Johnson 2009).

**Ebola Epidemic**

The decade after the Civil War was characterized by reconciliation and rebuilding. But in mid-2014, an epidemic of the deadly Ebola virus disease began in Sierra Leone. The outbreak is thought to have originated in Guinea one year earlier, and was first identified in Sierra Leone’s Eastern Province that borders Guinea and Liberia (WHO 2015a). Within months, cases were reported in Freetown. Soon thereafter the president declared a national emergency. By the start of 2015, 10,000 cases were reported across Sierra Leone, and Freetown had become an epicenter of illness (WHO 2015b). Since the epidemic’s severity had overwhelmed national healthcare capacities early on, international aid became critical to the response. Medical treatment, quarantine and movement restrictions, emergency awareness and public health initiatives, international travel bans, national government mobilization and international aid all characterized the campaign to combat the epidemic, until 2016 when Sierra Leone and the city of Freetown were declared Ebola free. Over the course of the crisis, nearly 4,000 reported deaths were caused by the virus in the country (WHO 2016).

The Ebola epidemic’s effects were far ranging. Beyond those individuals, families, and communities directly impacted by the virus, life across Sierra Leone and within the city of Freetown were broadly disrupted—not least through economic decline. While it had been on course to attain middle-income status by 2035, over
the course of the epidemic, Sierra Leone’s economy contracted by 21 percent, in part due to indirect impacts on agriculture and international trade. Today, the country remains in recovery, having only grown its economy 3.8 percent in 2017, and 3.7 percent in 2019 (World Bank 2019). The city of Freetown was also changed by the epidemic. The crisis’s direct and indirect effects on people, resources, and opportunities in the rural provinces sparked further migration, though not to the extent seen during the Civil War. Even as Freetown became the center of the outbreak and registered the most deaths nationally in 2015, the capital city and the western province’s population grew by 2.5 percent (Statistics Sierra Leone 2015).

Contemporary Freetown

Freetown, like the country writ large, remains in recovery from the Ebola epidemic and other hardships of the recent past. A sharp decline in Sierra Leone’s mineral resources industries occurred concurrent with the epidemic and had a significant impact on the national economy. Natural disasters in Freetown, including devastating floods in 2015 and mudslides in 2017, were additional setbacks for the capital city. Sierra Leone’s recovery has been slow, but the national economy is projected to see greater growth in the coming years (World Bank 2019, 39–41). Importantly, recovery and continued economic development is thought to be tied to the ongoing growth and urbanization of its capital city, which is currently creating more than 30 percent of the country’s total GDP, including through commerce and its port activities (World Bank 2018, 47–70).
Freetown's demography today is characteristic of the city's diverse past and reflects its histories of migration and diaspora. A 2015 national census enumerated 15 ethnic groups within the country, and all but two were represented with statistical significance in Freetown (Statistics Sierra Leone 2015, Population and Housing Census, Western Area Urban District). Temne, Mende, and Limba people make up a majority of Freetown's population at 37.2 percent, 14.6 percent, and 14.21 percent, respectively. Fullah, Krio and Loko people comprise 7.3 percent, 6.2 percent, and 5.0 percent of Freetown's total population, respectively, while other ethnic groups make up less than 5 percent each. Freetown has the highest percentage of non-Sierra Leonean residents in the country, representing 1.3 percent of the total population (Statistics Sierra Leone 2015). The city is also religiously diverse: a majority of its residents are Muslim, representing 67.9 percent of total, with Christians making up 31.3 percent of the population in 2015 (Statistics Sierra Leone 2015). Ongoing urbanization in Freetown has only contributed to the city's diversity.

Over the past half-century, Freetown's growth has been significant. From a population of 276,247 in 1974, the city grew to encompass 1,055,964 residents in 2015, and is expected to continue to grow at a rapid rate (Statistics Sierra Leone 1974, 2015). Much of the current trend of urbanization has been solidified since the Civil War. Between 2004 and 2015 Sierra Leone's Western Area—which encompasses the Freetown Peninsula—grew 2.5 percent (Statistics Sierra Leone 2015). During this time, population growth has also been paralleled by increasing density. In the Western Area, population density increased by 58 percent between 2004 and 2015, the highest in the country (Statistics Sierra Leone 2015).
Freetown has been a melting-pot of people and traditions since its earliest settlement. This mixture forged an urban culture reflecting both African heritage and Western values (Ojukutu-Macauley and Rachid 2013). The prevalence—and the tolerant coexistence—of both Christian and Islamic religious life are key aspects of that culture. Both religions have long roots in the city. The histories of both religions are well-represented in the spiritual life and urban fabric of Freetown today.

**The Islamic Tradition**

Islam is the majority religion in Freetown, representing approximately 67.0 percent of the city’s population. It is also the most prominent religion nationally, representing 77 percent of the total population (Statistics Sierra Leone 2015). Today, Islam is a pillar of Freetown's spiritual life. It is also a prominent feature of its culture, especially in the city’s historically Muslim neighborhoods.

Freetown’s long Islamic tradition originated with the migration of Muslim people and the establishment of trade networks to Sierra Leone’s coast from the thriving kingdoms of the Niger River valley. The spread of Islam in Sierra Leone has been attributed in part to the arrival of the Mende people, who were influential in the region by the mid-eighteenth century (Skinner 1978). Trade routes terminating in the Freetown, as well as the arrival of Muslim liberated Africans, resulted in the establishment of Muslim communities in the colonial settlement by the early nineteenth century (Skinner 1978). Muslims played a dominant role in regional trade that could not be ignored:

> “Officials of the Sierra Leone Company were acutely aware of the vibrant commercial landscape in the hinterland in the eighteenth century and, consequently, sought to tap into that trade very early on. The company was also immediately aware of the almost symbiotic connection between Islam and commerce” (Cole 2013).

Between 1810 and 1820 two sizable Muslim communities were founded in Freetown: Bambara Town and Foulah (Fullah) Town (Skinner 2016, 31). Yuruba Muslims (later known as Aku/Oku) who arrived as liberated Africans, also grew in numbers and established a community at Fourah Bay during the first half of the century. Mosques and schools were established in these Muslim settlements, along with systems for leadership, decision making, and courts, often lead by an “alimami,” or “headman” (Skinner 2016, 34). However, in the 1840s British colonial officials accused Muslim landholders and traders of participating in the illicit slave trade, and two mosques were burnt down in Fourah Bay and Foulah Town (Skinner 2016,
Tensions between the Christian colony and its Muslim communities were ultimately allayed and the mosques rebuilt.

By the turn of the twentieth century, colonial administrators sought to further integrate Muslim communities within the social and political life of colony. In 1891, a “madrasa” educational system, which merged Islamic and Arabic studies with English and British subject studies, was realized at the Madrasa Harunia in Fourah Bay with financial support from the colonial government (Skinner 2016, 35). Around this time, the colony also recognized the existing “alimami” political structure that governed life in many Muslim communities, and official relationships were established between alimami and administrators (Skinner 2016, 35).

In the twentieth century, the Muslim population of Freetown continued to grow in size and prominence. In 1957, the Governor appointed the first Muslim, Shaik Sesay, to the Freetown City Council. As political governance began to change around the time of independence, more and more Muslim officials were elected to public office in Freetown and came to hold important roles in national politics. In the second half of the twentieth century, the contemporary significance of the Islam tradition in Freetown and Sierra Leone was cemented.

Some of Freetown’s earliest mosques, dating to the nineteenth century, are extant today in Fourah Bay and Foulah Town. In Fourah Bay, the Jamiul Atique Mosque was erected at its current site around 1876. The mosque is associated with a neighboring school and a nearby open space called the Yarde Compound, which is said to be the site of the original mosque built around 1836 (Historical Sketch of Jamiul Atique n.d.). The Jamaat ul Salaam Mosque in Foulah Town was established in 1882, the original mosque having been burnt prior at a point prior. The mosque was expanded in 1927, and today serves a congregation of 800–1000 people.

Freetown Central Mosque in the Central Business is the largest mosque in Freetown today. Ten of Sierra Leone’s sixteen ethnic groups are Muslim, including the two most prominent in both the country and Freetown, the Temne and the Mende. Most Sierra Leonean mosques adhere to the Sunni tradition.

The Christian Tradition

Christians make up 31.3 percent of the population of Freetown — a figure slightly higher than the national ratio of 21.9 percent (Statistics Sierra Leone 2015).
Sierra Leone’s long Christian tradition originates with colonial settlement at Freetown. The founding communities of Freetown, including its liberated African populations, brought with them a variety of Christian churches (Cole 2013, 4). Christian missions established in and around Freetown influenced the spread of Christianity throughout Sierra Leone. Within the city, Christian churches and their diversity grew through the colonial period; they continue to have a significant presence in Freetown today.

Among the first Christian institutions in Freetown were those established by the Nova Scotian settlers of 1792. Nova Scotians were variably Baptist, Congregational, or Methodist. A Baptist church was erected in 1792, and Methodist chapels established by Nova Scotians soon followed though none of these eighteenth-century sites remain extant today (Porter 1953).

In the nineteenth century, the continued immigration of liberated Africans and others expanded the city’s Christian character. Church membership contributed to both the spiritual and social life of the city, giving prestige to its leaders and membership (Porter 1953). One of the oldest houses of worship in the city, St. John’s Maroon Methodist Church, dates from about 1820. This house of worship was established by the Jamaican Maroons who arrived in Freetown in 1800, and settled the area of the city known as Maroon Town. It’s thought that the Maroon Methodist church seceded from Nova Scotian Methodist congregations (Wise 2002). The church is still in use today, and is a designated national monument.

Freetown also hosted a notable Anglican congregation early on. The Church Missionary Society, established in 1799, marked the Church of England’s foundational presence in the new colony. The Society served a Freetown congregation and conducted missionary work in the regions beyond. The Church of England, which became the official church of the colony, grew to be one of the largest in Sierra Leone (Porter 1953). St. George’s Cathedral was a principal Anglican church of the Church Mission Society in Freetown, built between 1817 and 1828. St. George’s remains active in its original location today. The old campus of Fourah Bay College, founded by Anglicans in 1876, is another prominent reflection of this denomination’s history in Freetown. Today the vacant Old Fourah Bay College building is a designated national monument.

Roman Catholics in Freetown have a lineage that dates to Catholic missions from at least the nineteenth century (Farren 2013).

Today, the city hosts a large Protestant population, which includes Methodists, Evangelical Protestants, Presbyterians, Baptists and others. Roman Catholics, Anglicans, and Jehovah’s Witnesses are other groups active in the city.
Freetown has grown into a dense, multilayered city in which different periods of its history remain immediately apparent.
URBAN DEVELOPMENT OF FREETOWN
Percival Street, c. 1915.
Early Spatial Development

As described in the previous section, Indigenous populations have continuously occupied the land that is now Sierra Leone for thousands of years. Permanent settlement on the elevated, coastal plateau that became Freetown dates to the establishment of Granville Town in 1787 as a resettlement colony for the formerly enslaved who had travelled from Britain and Canada. Contemporary Freetown is the result of the second attempt to establish a more protected colony for the formerly enslaved in Sierra Leone. Guided by the geography of the region, including the deep water port and prominent topographic features, the initial Freetown area was bounded on the north by Sierra Leone River, on the east by Susan’s Bay, on the south by a wall extending eastwards from Thornton Fort to Susan’s Bay, and on the west by another wall running diagonally from Thornton’s Fort to St. George Bay (Fyfe 1968). Since 1792, Freetown has evolved into a heterogenous urban landscape, drawing architectural and infrastructural influence from across the Americas, Africa, and England.

In addition to defining the city’s geographic boundary, the first settlers created a rectilinear street-grid for the town. The original layout consisted of nine streets running north-west to south-east, with three perpendicular cross streets. In total, this first plan consisted of 452 plots of 48 by 76 feet approximately. The original grid remains legible in the Central Business District (CBD), the urban core of Freetown and one of the oldest areas in the city.
If Freetown was initially established as a refuge, it was soon deeply connected to the broader world. Trade shaped the growth of the city, as residents became increasingly reliant on the commerce afforded by the deep, protected waters along its shore. The four largest ports of Sierra Leone are located in Freetown and the city remains the country’s only import destination. The import of foreign goods and export of agricultural products such as palm kernels, cocoa, coffee, ginger, and kola nuts through Freetown enticed a substantial population from the rural interior to the urban center (Cran et al 1966).

Initially, water routes were the only means of communication and transportation to the interior of the country, but the construction of the national railway between 1895-1916 finally physically linked Freetown with the Protectorate. Connection to the port via railway encouraged the establishment of smaller agricultural towns in the hinterlands. At the same time, migration from these provinces into Freetown was the primary source of population increase.

**Urban Expansion**

As early as the 1880s and 1890s, Colonial government reports indicate that housing and poor sanitary conditions resulting from overcrowding were already primary concerns in Freetown (Doherty 1985). The well-planned grid of Freetown struggled to accommodate this new growth. As the pressure of rapid rural-to-urban migration increased throughout the twentieth century, Freetown remained poorly equipped to handle this growth. When the city expanded beyond the original grid, it did so without the guidance of an overall masterplan.

Faced with a growing population and the physical expansion of the city, municipal authorities repeatedly attempted to shape the city by planning for three key aspects of growth: clearance of informal settlements to make way for alternate affordable housing, expansion of roadways to improve circulation, and provision of centralized sanitation systems. Unfortunately, while similar plans were developed over more than sixty years, the city lacked the means to implement them. In the meantime, ad-hoc growth continued as new arrivals in Freetown carved out places for themselves on the ever-expanding margin of the city.
The first implementable planning scheme seems to have been the 1900 City Improvement Act, targeted at improving public health and housing conditions. The 1900 Act created a set of legal sanctions to enforce public health standards, physical planning and building code regulations—all to be administered by the Public Works Department (Doherty 1985). The 1911 provisional plan under revision by the director of the Sierra Leone Direction of Public Works gives a sense of the extent of the city at that time.

The next era of planning and housing policies began between the World Wars and extended until Sierra Leone’s independence in 1961. Most of these policies attempted to provide better housing accommodations, since informal settlements were one of the most pervasive problems at the time. Two Slum Clearance Reports (1939 and 1941) were the foundation of many planning proposals and housing development measures that took place during this era. “The recommendations of the Slum Clearance Committee for a limited degree of positive state involvement in housing provisions were implemented, at least in plan form, in succeeding decades” (Doherty 1985).

The 1939 Report of the Slum Clearance Committee resulted in a series of proposals for cheap housing for lower income groups to be built in lesser developed areas between Kissy Road and Ross Road, the eastern part of King Tom peninsula, and at Brookfields. Most of these plans were determined to be infeasible by 1966 because the identified areas for lower-income housing had already been absorbed into the growing extents of Freetown.

British architect Maxwell Fry and planning assistant K. W. Farms developed the first comprehensive planning scheme for Freetown in 1945. The scheme designated large swaths of land for different land-use categories, with more specificity in the central core of residential and office spaces. Large portions of the “Greater Sierra Leone” protectorate regions were designated as agricultural and forest lands.
in the draft plan. The plan did not detail zoning regulations at a block scale, but instead focused on creating larger areas of similar-types of land use. There were also two types of residential categories as the plan stressed the need to maintain class and racial distinctions in the town’s residential structure (Doherty 1985). Despite multiple draft comprehensive plans during this era, including the Fry and Farms Plan, very few policies were actually adopted into practice, resulting in a piecemeal planning scheme in Freetown. One example of isolated policy implementation was the construction of the State-sponsored Kissy low-cost housing estate in 1959. “[T]his estate remains today the most tangible manifestation of direct government intervention in housing provisions in Freetown” (Doherty 1985).

The third period of planning policy began after Sierra Leone’s independence in 1961. Again, no official plans were adopted during this era, but a series of redevelopment plans were proposed. Most notable was the 1963 Borys Plan for Freetown, which argued for comprehensive redevelopment of the city center. This plan focused on introducing high-rise residential, a new commercial precinct, and the creation of planned neighborhood units. Other urban planning schemes during this era also reflected the need for extensive redevelopment. From one such plan: “Residential areas will be developed on an integrated basis to provide not only housing, but also other facilities like schools, shopping centres, recreational and community centres, parks and gardens” (Frye 1966).

Scholars researching Freetown during the 1960s acknowledged the difficulties in planning for such a rapidly growing urban population, especially affordable housing, but they advised against unplanned ribbon developments on the hills due to steep slopes and potential resulting problems. They also noted the social and economic development of Freetown as integrally linked to planning issues, and believed that these problems needed to be solved at a central governmental level (Frye 1966). Despite this prescience, unplanned ribbon developments continued to grow, and the problem remained unsolved at every level of government.

A 1966 map, produced by J.I. Clarke and W.B. Fisher helps to spatialize the establishment of multiple ethnic communities that influenced the city’s development over time. Broadly speaking, by 1966, Freetown consisted of a relatively low-density urban core, sandwiched between two belts of higher density. 1966 Map of Freetown’s growth over time by J.I. Clarke and W.B. Fisher.
As the city continued to grow during the end of the twentieth century and in the early decades of the twenty-first, the lack of available land between the ocean and the hills has pushed development westward. The need for housing has resulted in informal settlements that currently cover a significant part of Freetown’s total footprint.
A comparison of the 1947 coastline to today’s also demonstrates that an artificial coastline has been established to accommodate further growth of these informal settlements, especially along Kroo Bay, Susan’s Bay, Fourah Bay, and Cline Bay.
As Freetown has continued to expand, the adjacent ecosystem has deteriorated significantly. As the landscape has become more fragmented, cleared both to make way for housing as well as to provide fuel for cooking fires, the city has lost much of its adjacent forests, wetlands, and mangroves (Mansaray, Huang, Kamara 2016). In addition to increased coastal erosion due to climate change, the decline of this ecosystem has contributed to an increased risk of natural disasters. Two devastating mudslides have occurred in the past five years on slopes that had been denuded of all protective vegetation.

CHANGE AND CONTINUITY IN THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Given the perennial growth of Freetown, many other trends of urban development are easily overlooked, particularly when examining maps that present the city in its entirety. To characterize urban change through time with greater nuance, the team compiled a series of comparative photographs throughout the study area. Seeking to identify additional patterns in the way in which the city has developed, the team focused on evaluating form, density, materials, use, and trends of circulation and street life. This work was made considerably easier with the help of the faculty and students from Fourah Bay College, who were able to identify key locations represented in the historic photographs, enabling the collection of contemporary photographs from the same vantage point. In many cases, the exact date of the historic photos remains unknown.
Changes in Scale and Context

The scale of buildings in Freetown has continued to increase, particularly in the Central Business District, where much of the high-density development has occurred over the last forty years. This change is particularly evident looking upon the city from the water.
Recently, a large office building has been constructed in the CBD, intended to house the offices of the Freetown City Council. This development, in the heart of the historic city core, dwarfs adjacent buildings such as the steeple of St. George’s Cathedral.
On nearby Westmoreland Street, there are still a few recognizable structures from the past. With the exception of the new Freetown City Council building, two- and three-story structures prevail.
The increase in scale has not been uniform. Along Wilberforce Street, near the eastern edge of the CBD, relatively little change has been observed. The amount of street activity, as well as the general scale of the buildings appear almost the same.
Likewise, the Old Railway Station (a potential heritage resource that is not officially recognized by the MRC, but is referenced and profiled in *Vistas of Sierra Leone Heritage*) remains essentially the same in the midst of change. Every building around it is of modern construction, with a new tower under construction to the left.
The buildings on Percival Street appear consistent in height, but there are some clear differences in materials used. The historic photo shows the dominance of wood and brick as a building material, whereas the contemporary photo shows the dominance of concrete. Cars have overtaken the street, shrinking liminal space that has historically belonged to the pedestrian.
Increased Congestion

In general, as the population of the city has grown, streets have become more congested. As cars have become more common, many streets in the CBD have been converted, in part, to parking spaces. Along Wilberforce, many previously residential lots have become taller commercial buildings that see intensive daytime use.
Given the close proximity to the government offices in the CBD, the area along Howe Street has been prioritized for parking. The sides of the street were once active pedestrian areas and are now filled with cars.
Market life in Freetown remains as active as it was a century ago, however market activities have expanded beyond the permanent market structures. In most cases, vendors currently rely on blue tarps to provide shade and protection from the rain, especially at King Jimmy’s Wharf, where the market building no longer exists. The facilities offered by this vital public resource have deteriorated considerably.
New layers of activity often take the form of informal housing settlements, storefronts, and street vending. Along Regent Road, the Baptist Church remains an anchor of stability in a landscape that has entirely changed. Behind the church, the growth of informal settlements on what had been verdant hills is particularly striking.
At Nichol’s Brook Bridge, nearly 130 years has elapsed between these two photographs. This section of the city is now much more densely inhabited. Near the bottom of the ravine, in the area most prone to flooding, roofs have been supplemented with makeshift materials like tarps. The growth of informal settlements on the hillside beyond the bridge is also apparent.
As the city has become more dense, informal arrangements have become common for commerce as well as residences. In front of the Old Railway Station, the street front has been adapted with a series of temporary commercial spaces.
Along Lightfoot Boston Street, the Krio board houses remain largely intact, but they cannot be seen in passing because of the trees and street commerce in front. Clearly, the street as public space has evolved, and empty space (i.e. sidewalks and portions of the street where there is no traffic) is often coopted for informal commercial purposes. As such activities intensify, it becomes more difficult to navigate the city.
CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

Despite all of the changes that have come with the growth of Freetown, there are many parts of the city where key characteristics persist. The main arteries such as Kissy Street in the east, Kroo Town Road and parts of Westmoreland Street in the west were areas where African, Lebanese, and Indian traders first engaged in street trading (Clarke et al 1966). Buildings have increased in scale along Kissy Street below, from 1-2 story buildings to 3-5 story buildings, but the area has always been and remains heavily commercial.
Commercial activity remains a character-defining feature of Kissy Street, which continues to serve as a primary artery in the city.
The Cotton Tree continues to grow and thrive while remaining a central landmark in downtown Freetown. As traffic has long been routed around its trunk and people continue to rest in its shade, it can be considered a heritage asset in its own right.
The Old Fourah Bay College Building suffered from a fire and currently sits in ruin. Nevertheless, people continue to be drawn to the site, using it as a gathering space. In the surrounding neighborhood of Clinetown where there is continuous traffic associated with the port, the yard of the Old Fourah Bay building is one of the few open green spaces. Since it continues to draw the public, it offers a prime opportunity for reuse.
Pademba Road remains rich with a vast network of diverse and co-located resources, like markets, religious institutions, and historic housing typologies such as Krío board houses. Here, perhaps because the roadway is narrower, there is less informal commercial activity on the street.
Pademba Road.
Analysis of historic and contemporary research have highlighted Freetown’s integral role in the national political, economic, and socio-cultural spheres—and yet, previous planning efforts have not adequately implemented policies to address clear societal needs. Lack of planning at the municipal, regional, and national scales have all contributed to a sprawling urban environment in need of major infrastructural upgrades and future-oriented planning and policy integration.

A working paper published in 2011 by the International Growth Centre identified land ownership and property rights as one of the key policy arenas in need of reform in Sierra Leone, stating that 1927 Protectorate Land Ordinance and the customary law system in place are prohibitive to wealth accumulation for residents of the Protectorate (Johnson 2011). The lack of individual property rights at the regional level causes legal uncertainties, which adversely affect the return on investment in agriculture and related practices, directly impacting the economy of Sierra Leone. Statutory laws recognize private land rights in Freetown and the Western Area, and customary laws govern communal land tenure in the rest of the country.

While Freetown, as a more developed urban area, has clearer individual property rights for buildings and structures, post-Civil War Freetown still suffers from similar consequences of communal law over land rights as the rest of the Protectorate—largely due to the fact that the city does not have a comprehensive cadastre of properties. Instability and corruption after the Civil War in Sierra Leone have resulted in uncertainties in land tenure and property rights, partially because land ownership still operates in a largely unofficial structure. Post-war internal displacement caused massive disruptions in land ownership and property rights mechanisms. During the Civil War, many families and landholders in Freetown and throughout Sierra Leone were forced to abandon their lands, which have since been occupied by informal settlements or squatters. These uncertainties in land tenure have strained the municipal government’s ability to collect property taxes, a major issue that recent administrations in both the national and municipal government have attempted to address. As the Land Portal Foundation explains:
The 2004 Local Government Act grants local councils the right to acquire and hold land, and it gives them the responsibility to create development plans. The Chieftaincy Act of 2009 establishes that the paramount chiefs are responsible for tax collection and for the promotion of improved land governance aimed at ensuring development at the regional level. In 2015, the government agreed on the principles guiding land tenure in the country; the 2015 National Land Policy (NLP) promotes the protection of national and communal land and calls for the protection of existing rights of private ownership and the engagement of the private sector as the engine for the growth and development of the country (Landportal.org).

The objective of land reform introduced by the NLP is to harmonize the dual land tenure system by expanding land surveying and registration of lands from the Western Area to the Provinces as a means to improving land title management and strengthening the rights of land users. The policy has also “provided for separation of title registration system for land titles from the existing deed registration” and “provided a scheme introducing land commissions and committees, which would be established at national, district, chiefdom and village levels in order to ensure the proper management of land titles” (World Bank 2019). The National Land Commission would be the central body that would introduce and operate the new land title registration system and would also be responsible for managing public and government-owned land previously overseen by the Ministry of Lands, Housing and the Environment (MLHE).

The NLP has also allowed for foreign enterprises and individuals that are not citizens of Sierra Leone, to acquire land title at a district level under 50-year lease rights. However, a threshold has been introduced stating the maximum land area acquired for any single investment should generally not exceed 5000 hectares. These attempts to streamline land use policy by decentralization in Land Administration have been slow and the dominant role of central government and the MLHE persists, despite initial expectations that local municipalities would take over various functions of Land Administration (World Bank 2019).

The Sierra Leone National Government is currently in the process of implementing a new land policy. This policy aims to introduce a land title registration system that will adequately secure land rights and permit those rights to be traded efficiently, simply, quickly, and at low cost, starting with the Western Area (World Bank 2019).

Uncertainty in land tenure and corruption have enabled individuals to enrich themselves at the expense of the state.
LAND TENURE AND PROPERTY RIGHTS

Central to the conversation about land use and urban development in Freetown (and Sierra Leone writ large) is the complicated question of property rights. The dual land tenure system in Sierra Leone is linked to the colonial period; it is a political compromise between the competing interests of elites supporting freehold versus Chiefdoms supporting customary tenure (World Bank 2019). Though this system supposedly provides a public record of transactions that have taken place, it is relatively unreliable for tracking legal ownership. (World Bank 2019).

In the protectorate and outlying regions of Sierra Leone, land held under customary tenure is the property of Indigenous land-owning families, but held in trust by Paramount Chiefs or traditional rulers. Due to variations over the past two centuries in customary land law practices among different ethnicities and tribes, there is no integrated or coherent mechanism for property rights in these regions. This has led to a legal framework, which in theory affirms customary land governance, but does not provide any safeguard or oversight against violations.

Land tenure in Freetown, as the largest urban core, operates differently than the rest of Sierra Leone. In Freetown, the dual land tenure system allows land sale and lease. The freehold system is based on general law that includes common law doctrines of equity and all enactments of the legislature in force in Sierra Leone, and as received by English Law in force from 1880 to date (World Bank 2019). The current process of registration is disorganized, which has led to a lack of credibility of the cadastre and registry; despite the City operating a freehold system, there is a similar lack of oversight as the land practices in the rest of the country. One of the biggest issues is the act of illegal land sales—in the Western Area, 50 percent of cases in local courts deal with illegal land sale cases (World Bank 2019). The ineffectiveness of the Land Administration system contributes to a difficult property tax collection situation where land markets are distorted, and urban planning associated with disaster risk management is undermined by the lack of credible data, as evidenced by the flooding and mudslides that have caused deaths every year (World Bank 2019).
Collection of property taxes is a key challenge in Freetown. Local Councils are authorized to collect property taxes as one of their own revenue sources, but collection of property taxes is low. This is because Council-elected valuers, who are responsible for the assessment and valuation of structures for the purpose of taxation, often do not have any training on valuation, due to the fact that the Local Government Act of 2004 does not provide for the minimum qualification of valuers and no valuation body or institution that would set standards and regulate the activities of valuers (World Bank 2019). As a result, the Valuation department of the FCC has its own valuation database and provides property valuation services to the city council for the purposes of rating (World Bank 2019). However, the quality of the database needs to be improved. Land Registry data is used to compile the valuation database, but due to the weak technical level and the fact that both systems are paper-based and handled manually, there is no data exchange between the Land Registry and the valuation database (World Bank 2019). The property tax database has been digitized not so long ago and currently covers only 21 percent of the housing stock (World Bank 2019).

Currently, the main focus in improving this system is by adding new constructions to the database rather than re-assessing existing valuation, mostly due to the cost of staff expenses (World Bank 2019). The Valuation Department is also responsible for cadastral measurements of the constructions and preparation of premises plans, but these processes are not yet digitized, and the data is fragmented (World Bank 2019). Property valuation process is only focused on the improvements and does not consider the value of the land. Nonetheless, taxes, fees, and charges are linked to the acquisition of land and depend on the type of acquisition (World Bank 2019). Subsequently, Assessment Committees oversee and approve the valuation rolls prepared by valuers. However, having no single definition of the Assessed Annual Value (AAV) has led councils to adopting fundamentally different approaches toward the AAV—some used area (square meter) occupied by the building, while others use the number of bedrooms to arrive at the AAV (World Bank 2019).

The FCC has also started an asset inventory and data digitization process, as the centralized property management system does operate effectively and does not meet the needs of the FCC. The FCC is using its valuation team and formed a working group in September 2018 for property identification and value tax determination (World Bank 2019). The working group consists of FCC and members of the private sector, in which a group of 16 people with mobile devices and appsheet.com apps collect information on about 70–100 property units per day. The information includes property description (area, wall, roof materials, engineering infrastructure, owner
or user data). Currently there are digital tables containing about 60,000 units of property that are subjected to the property tax (World Bank 2019). Their goal is to collect data on 250,000 units of property, with the main aim oriented on informing property taxation. The team aims to collect information on an additional 20,000 property properties this year (World Bank 2019). The Valuation Department is also in charge of performing a rigorous control of property tax accounting through transferring taxpayer information on paper books to Excel tables. Contracts with private sector representatives have been concluded in order to collect data on unregistered property (World Bank 2019).

Courts also use information on property tax held by the FCC to prove evidence of property ownership (World Bank 2019). Thus, property owners are interested in registering their properties in the Office of Administrator and Registrar General and FCC’s property tax register. Records about the owner and/or user of the property, location and other descriptive data on the property is recorded through these transactions. FCC utilizes What3words application for address determination, which provides a simple way to describe location. Since there is no functioning address register system in the country, this solution allows for temporary settlement of property issues, but cannot be the sole basis for a sustainable address system (World Bank 2019).
Current Planning Efforts

At the national level, the Government of Sierra Leone is prioritizing public private partnerships in infrastructure and increasing foreign direct investments in the minerals sector, as large-scale mining and associated investments in infrastructure have grown (Government of Sierra Leone 2011). The Tonkolili Mine investment by African Minerals and Marampa Mine investment by London Mining are salient examples (NSDF 2014). Private investors will invest in good transport infrastructure to access agricultural farms, mining sites, and ports for exporting products, while farmers will need good roads to access markets for their products and to scale up production (Brima 2019). These actions have potential in attracting more people to move toward alternate growth poles, instead of overcrowding Freetown.

In Freetown, the past few years have seen a ramping up in planning and policy proposals by the Freetown City Council due to political and social will and the pressing need for systemic changes. However, few of the numerous planning and policy recommendations throughout its history were implemented fully, leading to continued exacerbation of housing and environmental concerns in the city. Freetown is still grappling with the same housing, congestion, and national concerns that it faced in its early development, due to a lack of cooperation and coordination between ministries and the bureaucracy affected by competing interests. State and municipal governmental agencies tried, but often failed, to balance conflicting objectives and interests in the allocation of resources, resulting in tensions related to land use policy coordination. “For example, interests in the extractive sector tend to assert themselves against developmental goals in the agricultural sector” (BTI 2018).

Plans to enhance the social and economic role of provincial and district centers through Strengthening Greater Freetown, a platform for national, regional and international trade and business, were laid out in the Spatial Development Strategy in 2011-2014 by the Freetown City Council. The plan sought to connect the mining, agribusiness, fisheries, and tourism poles, and it looked to urban renewal for the “traditional” core city. Priorities included decongestive road improvements and further provision of land for residential, commercial, and production functions; deconcentrating new economic and residential activities, following the lines of peripheral suburbanization to the south and east; and planning for and rapidly commencing investment in a metropolitan area that is projected to reach 2 million people in 2025 and 4 million by 2050 (NSDF 2014).

The dump off Racecourse Road is one of the facilities targeted for improvement.
In 2015, then Mayor of Freetown, Sam Franklin Bode Gibson, declared it his mission to take on the “Herculean task” of transforming Freetown into a modern city. Gibson and the rest of the Freetown City Council drew guidance from the UN Sustainable Development Goals (also released in 2015). The main goals for the 2016-2018 Freetown City Development Plan focused on developing the health, education, revenue generation, and disaster management sectors within Freetown.

At the national level, by 2016 Sierra Leone had developed a Disaster Risk Management Structure creating a strategic framework for responding to natural disasters (Macarthy, Apsan Frediani, Kamara and Morgado 2017). Particularly from the Freetown perspective, the vision of the framework sought “a safer and resilient city in which communities, economy, and environment are better protected from negative impacts of hazards, through an appropriate and comprehensive disaster risk management.” Under those guidelines, the 2016 “Freetown City Development plan 2016–2018” outlined eight focus areas that explored concerns and solutions for anticipating, planning, and educating communities as a way of combining efforts for better risk management strategies.

Focus Area 1: Risk assessment, monitoring, and early warning system
Focus Area 2: Disaster Preparedness
Focus Area 3: Emergency Response and Post-Emergency Recovery
Focus Area 4: Disaster Risk Reduction and mitigation
Focus Area 5: Disaster Risk Reduction Mainstreaming
Focus Area 6: Disaster Risk Management Financing
Focus Area 7: Data and Information Management
Focus Area 8: Knowledge and Capacity Management

The 2019–2022 Transform Freetown Plan is the most recent comprehensive planning effort meant to address the political, economic, social, and environmental problems that have plagued Freetown and Sierra Leone since the early 1900s. Similar to the 2016 Freetown City Development Plan, Transform Freetown identified a set of target goals to achieve within the newly elected Mayor Yvonne Aki-Sawyer’s term. Based on the identification of post-war problems and institutional incapacities—compounded by the 2014-2016 Ebola epidemic—the Freetown City Council aims to address the “environmental timebomb,” water and sanitation gap, revenue demands, and urban growth projections. Four target clusters were developed by gathering input from a broad spectrum of community stakeholders; the four target clusters include: Healthy City, Human Development, Urban Mobility, and Resilience. Each of the four target clusters has a subset of targets and initiatives more specific to implementable goals such as water and sanitation, education and workforce development, and transportation infrastructure. The new master plan focuses on controlling growth and preventing urban sprawl through these four clusters of initiatives.

A key difference between Transform Freetown and previous iterations of comprehensive plans is the early integration of stakeholder feedback into the overall planning process. Such participatory planning seeks more robust and successful stakeholder buy-in to the development process.

The following sections will describe in further detail the Transform Freetown Plan and its relation to questions of planning for health and human development goals, climate adaptation, integration of heritage assets, and post-disaster recovery.
Healthy City

Major areas of concern that both the city and community have deemed priorities are water, sanitation, and road infrastructure, all of which impact the health and well-being of Freetown residents.

Only 75 percent of Freetown’s inhabitants have access to an improved water source compared to more than 86 percent on average in Sub-Saharan urban areas (World Bank 2017). Thirty percent of the population of households have access to improved sanitation, compared to 40 percent regionally—the city center and western part of the city systematically display higher access levels than the eastern area. Lack of efficient collection services also contributes to flood risk with discarded waste blocking drainage channels (World Bank 2017).

Through the Healthy City cluster, Freetown City Council is focused on improving access to efficient service delivery, public health education, counseling services, reducing maternal mortality and the spread of disease, and establishing a stronger network of health facilities, one example being the blood banks (Transform Freetown 2019).

Human Development

The Human Development initiatives are intended to address poverty and provide better economic access for Freetown residents. Through a series of interventions that encourage diversification of employment and investment in education—through infrastructure building and curriculum enhancements—the Human Development cluster serves to generate “collective prosperity” in Freetown (Transform Freetown).

One of the primary goals of this cluster is job creation through waste collection micro enterprises and tourism. In order to become a tourist hotspot, Freetown has to improve street sanitation. In an effort to confront the high youth unemployment rate, the City Council wants to encourage and support the growth of waste collection businesses. The European Union is already a confirmed a partner, providing waste collection materials and business development services to help facilitate the creation of ad hoc waste collection micro enterprises (Transform Freetown).
This focus on tourism as a means of improving livelihoods connects directly to issues of heritage, as sites of significance serve to enhance Sierra Leone as a destination. Dubbed the “Discover Freetown” campaign, this initiative is aimed at raising local and international awareness of Freetown's tourist sites by working in collaboration with the Ministry of Tourism (Transform Freetown).

**Urban Mobility**

Historically Sierra Leone's transportation and other infrastructure developed around mineral resources and areas of population growth. As Freetown densifies, residents have become increasingly under-serviced and vulnerable to natural hazards (World Bank 2017). In 2002, Sierra Leone emerged from the 11-year Civil War in which most of its infrastructure was either destroyed or in a state of disrepair. Today, Sierra Leone's infrastructure is still in a dire state despite economic growth driven by iron ore exports. Electrical power has been restored to Freetown and provincial capitals, but is still unreliable and inadequate to meet the growing demands of the population.

Roads and bridges are still in a poor state and airport and port infrastructure lack the capacity to keep up with private sector demands for import and export capacity (Sierra Leone Strategy and Policy Unit 2012). There is just one railway line in operation, which is owned and operated by a private mining company. The location of the only international airport at Lungi is a constraint on tourism as reaching Freetown requires multiple transfers and travel by water taxi or a ferry line, while much of the port infrastructure in Freetown is in need of replacement or repair.

Most road traffic is concentrated near Freetown and a few other major towns. In the central business district, traffic congestion and safety is a heightened issue. The Transform Freetown plan has a goal to reduce congestion by at least 50 percent in five locations by 2022 through eliminating parking and street trading at identified locations, and to work with the ministry of transport and aviation to set up a regulatory authority for urban mobility (Transform Freetown). Some other goals include upgrading and maintaining road signage and markings, and expanding road safety campaigns targeting drivers and school children (Transform Freetown).
Resilience

In terms of resilience and environmental adaptation, the City Council states that “the city, like others around the world, should become more resilient to the environmental, social, and economic shocks and stresses that are a growing reality of the 21st century” (Transform Freetown 2018). With this understanding, the Council has identified three priority sectors they intend to address: Environmental Management, Urban Planning and Housing, and Revenue Mobilization.

Environmental management is a critical concern in Freetown, as the waterfront city contends with a number of vulnerabilities. Though local laws prohibit illegal constructions in high-risk areas, unplanned constructions in natural waterways and on hills has only increased. Deforestation, caused primarily by scattered urban development, and an increase in population density have also increased risks of natural hazards (World Bank 2019). The City Council plans to identify areas that are prone to particularly high risk and ensure that stakeholders collaborate to mitigate these risks. To achieve both goals, the Council plans to increase community awareness about the risks associated with environmental degradation and improving community participation in greening Freetown while increasing vegetation coverage across the city by 50 percent.

Urban planning and housing are equally a priority for the municipal government. As the city has grown, rental rates have been on the rise (about 60 percent of households are tenants), pricing citizens out of the formal property market (World Bank 2019). There is a proliferation of informal settlements near the city center, while residential buildings are becoming highly overcrowded, with an average of 10 people living in an accommodation made of shared units and less durable materials; 40 percent of the housing stock is made with cement block walls and zinc sheet roofs, while 35 percent have walls made from unbaked earthen bricks (World Bank 2019).

To alleviate the conditions in these informal settlements and provide additional affordable housing, the FCC aspires to build over 5,000 additional affordable units by 2022 and increase compliance with the new Freetown Zonal plan. In addition to improving construction strategies, better use of land can help make vital services more accessible.

Municipal authorities are keenly aware of the need to mobilize local revenue in order to support their ambitions, and have sought to avoid reliance on international loans. The FCC plans to increase tax revenue five-fold to 35 billion Leones/year and increase non-tax revenue threefold to 6 billion Leones/year by 2020. The Council initiatives include establishing an automated property rate and business license system, optimizing local tax, and developing a framework that engages customers through facilitated payment processes (Transform Freetown 2018).

It is clear that the FCC has been working on a clear and ambitious plan for transforming Freetown in a more resilient city. One of the goals of the administration is to restore the city to its former glory as part of an integrated approach that contemplates green spaces and job opportunities through touristic development, opening the possibility to actively integrate heritage in present and future plans for the city.
HERITAGE AND CULTURAL POLICY CONTEXT
Heritage policy in Sierra Leone reflects a national commitment to protecting, promoting, and enhancing culture. This commitment is clearly established in the 1991 Constitution, which defines among the duties of the state: “promoting national culture, including music, art, dance, science, philosophy, education and traditional medicine;” “recognizing traditional institutions;” “protecting and enhancing the culture of Sierra Leone;” and “facilitating the provision of funds for the development of Sierra Leonean culture, as it supports broader national development” (Government of Sierra Leone 1991, Chap. 2, Sec. 12). In fulfillment of these duties of government, public policy for culture and heritage has been developed at the national level—but not yet at the municipal scale. The current policy landscape includes national legislation, national policy agendas, and national institutions for culture and their programming.

The origins of such policy in Sierra Leone can be found in mid-twentieth-century legislation providing for the protection of cultural heritage. The 1946 Monuments and Relics Ordinance established a national institution for the administration and preservation of national monuments and other sites or objects of cultural interest. It was supplemented in the post-independence period with new national institutions for advancing culture, including the Ministry of Tourism and Cultural Affairs (1973) and the National Dance Troupe (1961), among others. These institutions and their programs, along with the 1946 heritage legislation (as amended in 1962 and 1967), for decades have comprised Sierra Leone’s cultural policy infrastructure across all scales of government.

When considering the character, scope, and capacities of current heritage and cultural policy in Sierra Leone, an analytical framework defined by John de Monchaux and Mark Schuster serves as a useful tool (de Monchaux and Schuster 1997). According to their approach, heritage policy employs only five tools of government action to achieve goals related to preservation of culture: state ownership and operation of heritage resources; regulation of actions regarding heritage; the provision of incentives or disincentives to influence action; the establishment,
allocation, and enforcement of property rights; and the collection or distribution of information to influence public action. Within the heritage and cultural policy landscape of Sierra Leone, current legislation and institutional policy can be seen to rely on only a limited set of these tools.

Specifically, existing legislation establishes the power of the Monuments and Relics Commission to deploy the tool of ownership and operation toward the protection of heritage sites; that legislation also conveys upon the Commission the power to regulate the movement of cultural objects beyond national boundaries and access to heritage sites. The extent to which the Monuments and Relic Commission utilizes the tool of ownership and operation, however, is unclear. Less than two dozen sites have been listed as national monuments; whether or not other sites are owned or managed by the Commission is not a matter of public record. Furthermore, regulation pertaining to movable cultural objects is predicated on definitions established by the Commission relating to objects of “ethnographic or historical interest.” As it stands presently, objects that trigger regulation, and require the Commission’s permission to sell or relocate outside of national bounds, are limited to cultural artifacts that predate 1937. This definition appears to have been established in the 1962 revision to the Monuments and Relics Ordinance, and no further alterations that could constitute regulatory change have been realized since.

Beyond the limited deployment of the tools of ownership and operation, heritage and cultural policy in Sierra Leone relies most on the tool of information. Indeed, the Monuments and Relics Commission wields that tool through listing and designating national monuments. In addition, they have leveraged public awareness about Sierra Leone’s heritage internationally through the inclusion of a number of sites on the World Monuments Watch, including Fourah Bay College (2006), Freetown Historic Monuments (2008), and Bunce Island (2016). Recent cultural policies realized through the Commission and other national institutions for culture use information to raise public awareness about significant cultural sites, practices, objects and narratives in other manners – e.g. through educational programming, or social media publication. Information in the case of Sierra Leone’s cultural policy often serves the dual role of protecting culture through the recognition of its significance, and raising the profile of specific cultural aspects to engender national pride or support tourism or economic development goals.

In recent years there has been a call to formulate a new and integrative national cultural policy that is better aligned with the government’s cultural mandate outlined in the 1991 Constitution. Emerging from that call, a National Cultural Policy for Sierra Leone ratified in 2014 set out new official policy objectives, including cultural heritage. These objectives, which coalesce broadly around the idea of mobilizing policy for national and cultural development, correspond to a number of emerging heritage-oriented efforts that have taken shape through the work of national institutions and collaborative projects with local publics and international organizations. Still, while they focus on the protection and management of heritage, these efforts tend not to conceive of heritage and culture as an instrument or a tool of development—with the exception of heritage tourism, which has recently been articulated as a national priority.

These current limitations reveal opportunities to better position heritage through policy not just as a resource to be protected, but as an agent of positive change. More specifically, clear opportunities exist to mobilize heritage through municipal scale policy as an agent of sustainable urban development in Freetown. The
following analysis reviews the existing heritage and cultural landscape of Sierra Leone—and thus Freetown—considering long-standing legislation, institutions of culture, and new directions in heritage policy, including its current limitations.

**National Heritage Legislation**

The current backbone of heritage policy in Sierra Leone is the Monuments and Relics Ordinance of 1946. This law emerged out of a mid-century directive from the British Colonial Office to its colonial governors in West Africa—including the governor of Sierra Leone—to develop legislation that would curb growing international markets for West African antiquities (Basu 2012). Its expressed aim is to “provide for the Preservation of Ancient, Historical, and Natural Monuments, Relics and other Objects of Archaeological, Ethnographical, Historical or other Scientific Interest” (Public Ordinance No. 12 1946). But because the legislation did not derive from an analysis of Sierra Leone’s particular heritage or governance landscape (Basu and Abu Sam 2015), the national legislation provides only broad measures for protecting immovable heritage against undefined threats and loose mechanisms to regulate the export of movable heritage.

These responsibilities were directed toward the preservation of “ancient monuments,” “ancient workings,” “ethnographic articles,” and “relics” as defined in the Ordinance to include cultural and some natural sites in addition to a variety of moveable objects (Section 2, P.O. No. 12 1946).

The Ordinance granted the Commission the ability to identify sites for proclamation as national monuments, and to secure their ownership on behalf of the government. It also broadly forbade the alteration or destruction of monuments without the permission of the Commission – a restriction that applied both to national monuments and un-proclaimed monuments deemed to have archaeological, ethnographic, historical or scientific value in accordance with definitions outlined in the law. The Ordinance also granted the Commission the ability to assume control of such sites if requested by the owner to do so, and to preserve,
repair, and restore any asset under its control. Furthermore, it entreated the Commission to develop a register of monuments and heritage objects within the nation that had been brought to its notice. Regarding movable heritage, the Ordinance forbade the removal of significant objects from monument sites and from the country writ large without the expressed consent of the Commission (Public Ordinance No. 12 1946).

Since 1948, the Ordinance has only been revised on two occasions. In 1962, an amended Monuments and Relics Act sought to specify its legal definitions of moveable heritage (i.e. “ethnographic articles”) in light of continuing international export concerns. In 1967, an amendment established the Sierra Leone National Museum (formerly the museum of the Sierra Leone Society), and placed its administration and collections under the purview of the Monuments and Relics Commission. The National Museum was reorganized under the Ministry of Tourism and Cultural Affairs in 1973.

The powers afforded to the Monuments and Relics Commission have been asserted primarily through the designation of national monuments. Twenty-one national monuments have been recognized since 1948.
### National Monuments and Designation

The following are the 21 national monuments declared through the Monuments and Relics Act since 1948. Detailed descriptions of many of these sites can be found elsewhere (see Abraham 1978; sierraleoneheritage.org; mrcsl.org).

- Bunce Island and Ruins (proclaimed 1948)
- Heddle’s Farm, Freetown (1948)
- The De Ruyter Stone, Freetown (1948)
- The Bastions of Fort Thornton (State House), Freetown (1949)
- The Gateway to the Old King’s Yard, Freetown (1949)
- Earthworks at Masakpaidu [Masabendu], Nimiyama Chiefdom, Kono District (1949)
- Ruins of John Newton’s House and Slave Barracoons, Plantain Island, Moyamba District (1949)
- The Cleveland Tombstone, Shenge, Moyamba District (1950)
- The Old Wharf Steps and Guard House, Freetown (1953)
- The Old City Boundary Guns, Freetown (1953)
- The Old Fourah Bay College building, Freetown (1955)
- Firing point and four guns near the Old Wharf at Dublin, Banana Islands (1956)
- St John’s Maroon Church, Freetown (1956)
- St Charles’ Church, Regent Village (1959)
- Martello Tower, Tower Hill, Freetown (1961)
- Early Victorian fireplace at Waterloo House, Freetown* (1961)
- Old Military Butts, Freetown* (1962)
- Grave of Captain Lendy and others, Waiima, Kono District (1965)
- Cave near Manjoru and pottery site, Kpeje Bongre Chiefdom, Kailahun (1965)
- Madame Yoko’s Grave, Kaiyamba Chiefdom, Moyamba District (2016)
- Bai Bureh Kebalai’s Grave, Bureh Kasseh Maconteh Chiefdom, Port Loko District (2016)

Some of these monuments are presently untraceable or are in an unstable condition, according to varying sources (see Basu and Abu Sam 2015). Two monuments noted with an asterisk are thought to have been entirely lost (SieraLeoneHeritage.org).

Of all the nationally-recognized monuments in Sierra Leone, nine are located in Freetown, although two more that were previously identified in Freetown are presently untraceable (noted with an asterik in the list). Three national monuments are sited in the Moyamba District, two in the Kono District, one in the Port Loko District and one in Regent Village. A majority of the monuments were designated during the period of colonial rule. In fact, most were identified in a list presented in the Monuments and Relics Commission’s first annual report, developed by colonial administrators. As a result, many national monuments are associated with Sierra Leone’s colonial history: five are associated with pre-colonial European settlement and the slave trade; and ten are associated with the development of Freetown colonial rule. Two sites reflect the history of Sierra Leone’s pre-colonial and Indigenous societies. Two sites also were declared in 2016: Madame Yoko’s Grave and Bai Bureh Kebalai’s Grave. The recognition of these sites represents a shifting use of Ordinance authority to recognize a broader range of Sierra Leone’s history—and particularly aspects of national heritage not associated with European settlement or colonial rule.
But even as the list of recognized national monuments grows and a broader array of histories are represented, the safeguarding and management of these sites has proved challenging in spite of the Monuments and Relics Ordinance’s regulatory framework. While designation as a national monuments does provide nominal protection, in most cases it has not resulted in further efforts to safeguard or maintain these sites in practice (Basu and Abu Sam 2015: 7). As a result, many national monuments have fallen into disrepair, and two appear to have been lost entirely since their designation. Indeed, the lack of specific mechanisms within the Monuments and Relics Ordinance to ensure that national monuments are preserved in accordance with the legislation’s mandate is symptomatic of broader issues with the current extent of legislated heritage policy in Sierra Leone—issues that are increasingly recognized across both policy literature and within national governance.

The Ordinance’s efficacy relies on the Monuments and Relics Commission’s ability to acquire and manage significant properties in the name of the government, and its ability to raise public awareness of the site’s cultural value through national monument designation. Similarly, the Ordinance has been criticized for not adequately providing for financing preservation activities—although the law allows the Commission to raise funds for its activities, no specific funding mechanisms are outlined. It has also been noted that definitions of heritage outlined in the Ordinance rely on colonial-era visions cultural significance, and do not account for the broad range of heritage places and things within Sierra Leone.

These criticisms, among others, recently have been echoed in policy literature produced by and for the national government of Sierra Leone. A 2010 review by the Public Sector Reform Unit of the Ministry of Tourism and Cultural Affairs moved beyond the view that the Ordinance falls short of achieving its expressed goals of preserving culture, concluding that outdated and ineffectual heritage policy contributed to the government’s inability to achieve broad national policy goals (Public Sector Reform Unit 2010). A 2015 consultation report produced for the Ministry of Tourism and Cultural Affairs and Monuments and Relics Commission by Paul Basu and Michael Abu Sam built on that conclusion, defining a number of other limitations of current legislation. They noted that the Ordinance also importantly failed to provide for: building professional capacities within the heritage sector; devolving implementation of legislation across government; encouraging the interface of heritage preservation and other sectors; and promoting the value of heritage through public outreach and education (Basu and Abu Sam 2015).

Even in light of these criticisms, the Monuments and Relics Ordinance has not been revised or superseded by any new legislation. It remains the primary instrument of heritage policy on a national scale in Sierra Leone. Nor is there any municipal-level heritage legislation in Freetown.
National Institutions for Heritage and Culture

In addition to national legislation embodied in the Monuments and Relics Ordinance, some statutory bodies are responsible for safeguarding cultural heritage and enacting cultural policy in Freetown and Sierra Leone. Their responsibilities include: the administration and promotion of cultural heritage sites, objects, practices; the implementation of a regulatory frameworks; the facilitation of international activities and partnership to advance culture and development; and the development of public programming and policy directives.

Established in 1972, the Ministry of Tourism and Cultural Affairs is a government body whose main objective is to promote tourism for economic gain through instrumentalization of heritage assets of the country. They have a national interest in culturally empowering the Sierra Leonean people through increased awareness and participation in heritage-related activities to increase social cohesion while also engaging with international collaborators to reevaluate national legislatures and review international legislations and policies. In recent years, post-2014 revision, the ministry has opened heritage clubs in schools, held heritage-related competitions to increase awareness about available assets, and encouraged civic participation. The ministry has worked with international universities, like SOAS University of London, to reevaluate and reform national heritage legislatures while also sending their team to international capacity building workshops like the Seminar on Applied Chinese for Officials from Developing Countries in China in 2019. The ministry also assumes a supervisory role for five entities: National Tourism Board (NTB), Monuments and Relics Commission, Sierra Leone National Museum, Sierra Leone Railway Museum and Sierra Leone International Theatre Institute, and the Sierra Leone National Dance Troupe. Given the focus of this study on the built environment, the most relevant institutions will be discussed below.

Monuments and Relics Commission

The Monuments and Relics Commission (MRC) of Sierra Leone was founded in June 1947 under the Ministry of Education following the passing of a public ordinance, Public Ordinance No. 12 in 1946. The commission was established based on the edicts in the ordinance document that were applicable both in the Colony and Protectorate. The Commission was set up as a semi-autonomous body, with no “less than seven members” who were all appointed by the Governor, and was to behave as “trustee for the Government.” (Monuments and Relics Ordinance 1946). The main powers and duties of the Commission include proclamation or assumption of control over monuments after designating them as “national monuments,” protect, restore, repair or insure them, undertake excavations of archaeological sites and provide information or interpretation of sites through information notices about historical sites. The Commission is obligated to create a register of all the national monuments, file an annual report, regulate any conservation work or proposed additions and alterations of national monuments, and issue licenses for archaeological works.

Dr. Easmon, who established the Sierra Leone National Museum, was instrumental in proclaiming most of the designation of national monuments. Multiple government sources suggest the MRC thrived under Dr. Easmon’s leadership but the institution suffered during the Civil War, with monuments neglected, damaged, and defaced. Lack of funding and limited access to heritage professionals and others with proficiency in site management heavily impeded the growth of this agency (Basu and Abu Sam 2015: 7). Beginning in 2014, following a reconsti-
tution of the Commission under the leadership of Madam Isatu Smith, the MRC focused on the use of heritage to improve tourism and eventually the economic condition of the country (Ministry of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, “About us”). The Commission drafted a clear set of agendas for better organization, dedicated themselves to represent underrepresented historical narratives, and even focused on outreach to increase democracy and encourage public participation. The MRC is currently headed by Charlie Haffner, who has 35 years of experience in the heritage sector and theatre development.

**Sierra Leone National Museum**

The Sierra Leone National Museum was established in 1957 for the collection and curation of ethnographic art and artefacts of cultural and historical significance. Originally established as the museum of the Sierra Leone Society, it became the official national museum in 1967 when it was placed under the purview of the Monuments and Relics Commission through legislative amendment. In 1973, the museum was transferred to the Ministry of Tourism and Cultural Affairs during the reorganization of government departments. The National Museum currently curates public exhibitions and conducts educational programming on the history and culture of Sierra Leone, utilizing the collections and archives that are its institutional mandate. Recently the Museum has forged a number of international partnerships, including with the British Museum’s Africa Programme, which have resulted in the partial digitization of its collections (see sierraleoneheritage.org). Such efforts seek to advance the National Museum as a hub for history and culture amidst concerns that budgetary constraints, as well as inadequate facilities and conservation regimes, currently hinder the institution (Basu and Abu Sam 2015). Currently, the Museum operates largely independently from matters of public policy specific to cultural sites and urban heritage in Freetown. Yet its educational activities and agenda-setting capacity are significant to the broader heritage and cultural policy landscape of Sierra Leone and its capital city.

**The Sierra Leone Public Archives**

The Sierra Leone Public Archives hold, conserve, and facilitate public access to historical documents, maps, and photographic materials, including records dating to 1788. The Archives were formally established through the 1965 Public Archives Act, and are currently housed on the campus of Fourah Bay College. In accordance with the Public Archives Act, the collection is governed by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology.

The state of management and conservation in the Public Archives has been the subject of criticism in literature (Basu and Abu Sam 2015), while the necessity of their upkeep has been a point of national debate since the Civil War (Kargbo 2005). A lack of funding creates critical barriers in the execution of the agency’s missions. To find alternative means of support, the Public Archives have engaged recently in international collaborations toward the partial digitization of its collections. These efforts were born out of concern that current conditions in the Public Archives could lead to the loss of archival materials (Shenoy 2019). Through a partnership with the British Library, approximately 170 volumes pertaining to the British slave trade and the early colonial history of the country have been digitized and made publicly available through the British Library’s online portal (British Library Endangered Archives Programme 2011).
In 2016, a National Records and Archives Bill was drafted recognizing the value of Sierra Leone's archives and records management to governance and public use. The bill seeks to support and establish infrastructures for the management, coordination, and preservation of archives and records, and to facilitate their use in government and their access by the general public (Sierra Leone National Action Plan 2016-2018: 6). The bill has not yet been enacted as of 2019.

National Cultural Policy

Since at least the 1970s, many have argued Sierra Leone's existing cultural policy framework insufficiently provides for the protection, promotion, and enhancement of national culture. By this view, public policy also has overlooked culture as a significant driver of national development. In one formulation of that position, Arthur Abraham made the case in a 1978 UNESCO publication that culture and public policy in Sierra Leone could be better harmonized toward the reification of a national identity independent of colonial frameworks, and toward the development of stronger social, political, and economic institutions for the nation (Abraham 1978). Since Abraham's writing, the notion that cultural development can be used to achieve broader national goals is increasingly significant to cultural policy thinking—even as many concrete approaches have failed to materialize.

Developing a new national cultural policy has been a point of interest for the Sierra Leonean government since the 1990s (Basu and Zetterstrom-Sharp 2014). Yet only recently has such a policy taken shape. After a decade of trying, a draft national cultural policy was scheduled in 2007 to be put before the Sierra Leonean Parliament for ratification, only to be stalled by political change. Nearly simultaneously, the 2010 Public Sector Reform Unit review found that ineffectual legislation was inhibiting the Ministry of Tourism and Cultural Affairs from fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities (Public Sector Reform Unit 2010); that review recommended specifically that laws and conventions be reviewed and updated so as to support Sierra Leone's cultural and tourism sectors (Basu and Abu Sam 2015). Emerging from these events, a National Cultural Policy for Sierra Leone was ratified in 2014, which defined a series of new policy objectives, including the reformulation of cultural and heritage policy to achieve development goals.

The new National Cultural Policy acknowledges that, despite existing heritage legislation, significant cultural sites, objects, and practices are increasingly neglected and in disrepair; and furthermore that national institutions have fallen behind in promoting and enhancing culture (Ministry of Tourism and Cultural Affairs 2013). As a proposed remedy, it lays out strategic objectives intended to strengthen the cultural sector and promote national development through heritage. These objectives include:

- facilitating the identification and inscription of monuments, natural and cultural sites, and intangible heritage for inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List;
- the creation of a nation-wide heritage inventory for designation through a national framework;
- the nation's accession to international heritage frameworks and the development of international partnerships for heritage preservation;
- the strengthening of the National Museum;
The objectives laid out in the 2014 National Cultural Policy point to shifting agendas for cultural and heritage policy in Sierra Leone. The priorities established in that document also correspond to recent actions and new policy programs undertaken by national institutions for heritage and culture. Taken together, these objectives and actions realize a series of new directions for public policy, which focus categorically on: education and public participation; information as public policy; and international engagement and collaboration.

Heritage Education

The Monuments and Relics Commission, through its Education and Outreach Office, has recently developed a series of programs aimed at advancing cultural heritage education. Among their most notable actions was the creation of Heritage Clubs for schools in Freetown and across Sierra Leone. According to the Monuments and Relics Commission (2018), the strategic objective of this program is to bring about a shift in cultural mentality by generating knowledge about the history of the country, enhancing cultural memory, and inspiring engagement with heritage, history, and tradition.

The first efforts of this program were in October 2016, when ten secondary schools in Freetown were selected by the Commission for establishing Heritage Clubs. And following a series of initial explanatory and awareness raising events, the Monuments and Relics Commission has undertaken a number of specific actions within the Heritage Club program aimed at cultural and historical education and engagement, including: a celebration for World Heritage Day (Monuments and Relics Commission 2018); a cross-cultural video contest, where—and with financial aid from the International National Trust Organization—students

The MRC recently launched Salon Kontri Pot, a heritage education TV show.
produced short videos about a traditional or cultural activity (Monuments and Relics Commission 2019); and visits to Bunce Island (Monuments and Relics Commission 2018).

In addition to outreach events, Monuments and Relics Commission launched a Cultural Heritage Education Toolkit for secondary schools in 2019. The toolkit consists of a step-by-step methodology aiming to guide school teachers to include cultural heritage in education.

**Heritage Tourism**

Culture and cultural heritage are increasingly cited in policy as key to tourism generation and associated economic development. A primary goal of the Ministry of Tourism and Cultural Affairs is to use tourism as a vehicle for economic growth, with the aim of transforming the nation into a middle-income country in a manner akin to Kenya, which has successfully mobilized policy toward foreign commercial interest and created one of the most impactful tourist economies in Africa (Dieke 2003). This vision for culture and cultural heritage is echoed in the 2014 National Cultural Policy—and relevant initiatives have emerged in recent years as the nation has sought to increase tourist visitation. This policy however, has diverse challenges to overcome.

After the Civil War (1991–2002), the number of international visitors, tourists or business travelers to Sierra Leone increased more than 100 percent, from 16,000 in 2001, to 40,000 in 2005, and to 81,000 in 2013. Nevertheless, with the onset of the Ebola crisis, the number of tourists again decreased by more than 70 percent in 2015.

According to the World Tourism Organization, the number of international tourists to visit Sierra Leone in 2016 was 55,000, representing the lowest visitation for international tourists to any country in West Africa that year.

Since 2016 and in the wake of the ratification of the National Cultural Policy, the Ministry of Tourism and Cultural Affairs and other national institutions have undertaken initiatives relating to heritage and tourism. In one 2018 action, Sierra Leone...
Leone became a signatory to the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) regional tourism policy and Ecotour plan (2019-2029) in partnership with 15 other national members that share cultural and geopolitical ties and economic interests (Ministry of Tourism and Cultural Affairs n.d.). The plan comprises five programs, nine objectives, and thirty-nine priority actions—among them, approximately half are directly related to cultural heritage, specifically its protection and development. The bloc also plans to seek aid from other international agencies, such as the African Union and the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), particularly in the areas of finance and youth development.

The Sierra Leonean government through the Ministry of Tourism has also undertaken a series of regional workshops under the theme “Education Through Culture for Social Cohesion and the Development of Sustainable Tourism” in 2019 (Monuments and Relics Commission 2019). Due to the effects of the Civil War and other crisis on the nation’s tourism industry, the maintenance of peace is considered a significant factor in sustainable development. These workshops engage communities across the country in dialogue as a means of achieving social cohesion, and have promoted the importance of both civic education and cultural heritage education in school curricula.

Some localized actions regarding heritage tourism development also have been undertaken by national institutions. The Monuments and Relics Commission and the Ministry of Tourism in September 2018 conducted two “Comprehensive Tourism Surveys.” These surveys had two goals: to understand the current conditions of heritage resources in select areas, and to identify other possible sites of interest for tourism (Monuments and Relics Commission 2018). One of those surveys took place at the gravesite of Bai Bureh, in Port Loko District, where findings suggested an urgent need for restoration that would increase tourist interest in the site.

Both the Ministry of Tourism and the Ministry of Relics and Commission have been putting effort in promoting international tourism in Sierra Leone and Freetown. Their goal is to use the local assets and history—specifically the colonial and slavery themes—to bring revenue to the country. Therefore, the focus of both organizations is to integrate heritage and tourism goals.
Heritage in Post-War Recovery and Memorialization

The Sierra Leone Truth and Reconciliation Commission report (Witness to Truth 2004) established a roadmap for how heritage sites might play a role in post-war reconciliation. Reconciliation tasks refer to social events and symbolic activities to bring victims and ex-combatants together. Commemoration ceremonies were to be hosted by religious groups and civil society and a National Peace day was to be established on the 18th of January, the day the Civil War officially ended. While this holiday has not been recognized, a Victim Commemoration Day was celebrated in Freetown on March 24, 2007. However, it does not appear to have been repeated. International Peace Day has been celebrated on September 21 (“International Peace Day Celebrations in Sierra Leone Sponsored by UNIPSIL” 2010); among the festivities of the celebration, 500 men and women are said to have marched to the “Peace Bridge” in Freetown, “which is up to where, during the Civil War, the rebels managed to intrude and devastate Freetown. At that location, the youths had erected a peace pole to commemorate the day and remind citizens of the need for peace.” Another reconciliation task was the symbolic building of monuments and marking mass graves. These monuments were meant to be built with community input and with victims and ex-combatants working together to create memorials. Likewise, these two groups were meant to reconcile through collaboration on development projects and traditional activities.

Both a Peace Memorial and a Peace Museum were established as part of this process. In the case of the memorial, a previous military memorial was adapted for a broader purpose to promote civilian unity, strength, and peace through a shared national history (Basu 2013). The Museum now occupies the site of the former Special Court of Sierra Leone, where the Truth and Reconciliation hearings were held. The design for the memorial garden came from a nation-wide design competition. However, despite the promised prize of 10 Million Leones (equivalent to around $1,000 USD), it appears that only ten designs were submitted (Peace Museum Facebook Page, n.d.). The final product combines elements from multiple contest entries and is meant to evoke the shape of a refugee tent (Sierra Leone Truth and Reconciliation Commission, n.d.).

The Civil War was particularly destructive in Freetown. Housing authorities registered the destruction of 5,788 homes and residential buildings within greater Freetown (Human Rights Watch, 1999). In 1999, the New York Times described Freetown as “a city in ruins” (Onishi, 1999). Hospitals, churches, and mosques were targeted along with historic structures such as the Big Market building (Human Rights Watch 1999). Almost every area of the city was impacted to some degree. Over 60 percent of residents had their property burned, and 73 percent had their homes destroyed (de Jong et al. 2000). Since the end of the war, Freetown has enjoyed considerable recovery. While the legacy of conflict is not always readily legible in the built environment, some scars remain. During the fieldwork, members of the Fourah Bay College team occasionally indicated neighborhoods that they remembered as being burned down or destroyed during the war, though rebuilding has occurred.
Bunce Island.
DEFINING
AND REDEFINING
HERITAGE
To better understand Freetown’s heritage, the studio examined the typologies, geographies, and perceptions of heritage within the city today. Seeking to identify resources beyond the existing list of officially designated heritage sites, the team recognized several broader heritage typologies that deserve special consideration as community assets in any future planning framework. Given the limited time in the field, the focus of study was narrowed to particular neighborhoods that appeared to be uncommonly rich in heritage resources. Describing the prospects and challenges faced by these neighborhoods is intended to be emblematic of Freetown as a whole. The studio team identified several recurrent themes by compiling results from the architecture survey, a user survey conducted among anonymous members of the public in each of these neighborhoods, and a social media and sentiment analysis. These themes point toward ways in which heritage assets in Freetown might serve broader policy objectives.

**Confronting Existing Heritage Limitations**

Eleven of Sierra Leone’s national monuments are located in and around Freetown. Each of these national monuments was designated between the 1948 passage of the Monuments and Relics Ordinance and Sierra Leone’s national independence in 1961. All of these officially recognized heritage sites relate to the colonial history of the city, though their typologies differ: St. John’s Maroon Church is an example of religious architecture; the Bastions of Fort Thornton and Martello Tower are defense architecture, like the Old City Boundary Guns; The Old Fourah Bay College, institutional architecture.

*Plants now grow on and within Old Fourah Bay College.*
Bunce Island and Ruins

Bunce Island was established as an English fort and slave-trading post in the late 1600s, which became increasingly lucrative in the eighteenth century (Wise 2002). The island and the fort served as a critical point in the region: enslaved people were held there prior to being transported for sale in the Americas, often in the North American colonies of South Carolina and Georgia. While the Freetown colony was established on the mainland in 1792 for people who had been liberated from slavery, operations at Bunce Island only ceased after the British prohibition of the slave trade in 1807, and its buildings were abandoned (DeCorse 2014). Today, the fort at Bunce Island is a ruin, but the Monuments and Relics Commission have been collaborating with World Monuments Fund, with the support of the Ambassadors Fund for Cultural Preservation, to stabilize the remains and conserve the heritage of the island. Bunce Island was the first site to be declared a national monument and appears frequently in tourism literature and travel guides (Manson 2009).
The Gateway to the Old King’s Yard

The Old King’s Yard Gate is associated with the early history of Freetown and its liberated African settlers. It was built in 1817 and served as the entrance into a compound that received those Africans who had been liberated at sea (Wise 2002). The King’s Yard was the first holding site for liberated Africans and was incorporated later into the Connaught Hospital. In addition to its status as a national monument, the Old King’s Yard Gate recently received a commemorative plaque as part of the “BBC History Project.” The plaque calls out the role that British forces played in liberating enslaved Africans, reinforcing a colonial reading of this national monument.
The Wharf Steps

The Wharf Steps date to 1818, when Sir Charles MacCarthy (the governor of the colony) ordered the construction of several public buildings and structures to benefit the early colony and its port (Wise 2002). They are a series of stone steps with a small guard house at the top located along the waterfront at the end of Wallace Johnson Street in the Central Business District. The steps and guard house were proclaimed a National Monument in 1953 and are associated with the arrival of Freetown's early nineteenth century settlers, including liberated Africans.
Martello Tower

Martello Tower, located on Tower Hill, was an English colonial “security system” from 1805 until 1825, then partially demolished and used as water tank (Wise 2002). The site was associated with the colonial military until 1932 when English troops left Sierra Leone. Now, the area contains the Sierra Leone Parliament, Office of National Security, and the British Council Building.

The Bastions of Fort Thornton

Fort Thornton, an early West African fort of the English colonial military, was erected beginning in 1794 (Wise 2002). It was named after Henry Thornton, chairman of the Sierra Leone Company (Wise 2002). The fort was later adapted to house the Governor’s residence within a stone wall fortress, defended with cannons. The State House was later built on the fort’s foundation walls between 1903 and 1953 and remained the official residence of the Governor until after 1961 independence. Today, it houses the President of Sierra Leone. Its location on a hill is prominent, surrounded by primary civic buildings, as seen in the image below.
Old Fourah Bay College was constructed by Anglican missionary Rev. James Beale between 1844 and 1847. The site of the building was previously associated with the slave trade, and to memorialize this history the decision was made to construct the building’s roof with timber from dismantled slave ships. The college was the first institution of higher learning established in the region, and soon after its completion, Freetown developed a reputation as the “Athens of West Africa.” The building was used as shelter for displaced people during Sierra Leone’s Civil War but was burned sometime after 1999. Currently, the building is in a deteriorated state.
St. John’s Maroon Church

St. John’s Maroon Church was constructed in 1822 (Wise 2002). The Maroons were settlers from Jamaica who arrived early in Freetown’s history. This group was purportedly Christianized by the Nova Scotians already settled there and separated to create a new church (Wise 2002). The building was constructed by stone masons and metal workers, using their own traditional techniques for a Christian church.
As noted previously, heritage education is a priority that is manifested through the National Cultural Policy and recent work of the Monuments and Relics Commission (MRC). This involves efforts to promote civic engagement with diverse publics and connects to the promotion of tourism in Sierra Leone through the use of social media (Bertot, Jaeger, Hansen 2012). To better understand the information published by the MRC and how people react to and engage with the commission and heritage in general, a social media and sentiment analysis was conducted as part of the studio. The analysis had some limitations: the internet connectivity in Sierra Leone is relatively low, and only nine percent of the population have access to the internet, according to the World Bank (World Bank n.d.). While data about connectivity in Freetown specifically is not readily available, it is probable that it is higher than the overall country. Given that more than 60 percent of Sierra Leone internet users reported using Facebook as a primary means of communication and social connection (Statcounter 2019), this study included an analysis of Facebook posts.

The analysis extracted data about all posts in the MRC Facebook pages, comments, and likes per post, which resulted in more than 200 social media posts, 1688 likes, 120 comments, and 316 shares. The data was then organized by year (2015 to 2019) and by topic. The topics included individual monuments, the work of the MRC, traditional African cultural practices, ethnic groups, Heritage Clubs, Diaspora, tourism promotion, and UNESCO World Heritage proposals. Analysis considered what was being publicized by MRC and, conversely, what was receiving public attention through likes or comments. Also, the content of the comments was analyzed, with the aim of understanding if the community had a negative or positive perception of what was being publicized.

The Facebook activity of the Commission started in 2015 but increased significantly in 2016, a year that saw peak activity. There was news about the Diaspora population, especially about people from the United States that found their roots in the country, Heritage Clubs (a recent initiative of the MRC), the Sierra Leone National Museum (that reopened in November of that year), and the Zion Methodist Church in Freetown, which was formally recognized in that year.
Not all historic landmarks were featured equally on the MRC page. Approximately 75 percent of the monuments that received attention on the Facebook page were located in Freetown. Exceptions are the Bai Bureh Gravesite in Port Loko District, the Bonthe Sherbro Island in Bonthe District, the Clock Tower in Tonkolili District, and the Madam Yoko’s Grave in Moyamba District. The focus on heritage located in Freetown led to criticism by users who commented, for example, “Freetown is not Sierra Leone.”

Bunce Island featured in a number of posts. This may be a result of the restoration efforts, international aid they are receiving, and also its inclusion on the World MonumentsWatch. Although it received significant coverage on the MRC Facebook page, the level of engagement was not as significant, suggesting that public awareness about the site and its history is still developing.

In terms of engagement, the Clock Tower on Bonthe Sherbro Island had only three posts but received more than 50 reactions, probably due to the restoration of the clock tower carried out in 2018 and 2019. Also, Old Fourah College showed its importance in terms of virtual participation, although no major interventions took place on-site (a cleaning effort was reported in 2017).

![Social Media Posts and Engagement per Landmark](image)

More than half of the monuments featured in posts related to colonial history, with few exceptions since 2016, such as the graves of Bay Bureh and Madam Yoko. In late 2016, the MRC articulated that goal of more prominently recognizing local culture and history. As a result, several posts about different ethnicities and cultures (Indigenous peoples, Krio, and Temne) and traditional practices featured in 2016 and 2017.

Most of the “negative” heritage content in posts related to the slave trade, represented by Bunce Island and Kings Yard Gate. Other traumatic historic narratives of the country, such as the Civil War (1991-2002) and the Ebola outbreak (2014-2014), are not represented. Nevertheless, some have raised the need to bring the Ebola Outbreak into the heritage record by advocating for designation of the house where Ebola first emerged in Sierra Leone, in Kpongudu Village, Kailahun District, as a national monument (Monuments and Relics Facebook Page 2016).
Expanding Heritage Typologies

Through the architectural survey, the studio identified several heritage typologies that are common in Freetown but that remain underrepresented in official accounts of heritage. Beyond the 11 designated national monuments located in and around the city, Freetown’s vernacular residential buildings, its religious sites, its markets and its concentrated corridors of street vending are features that help define the spirit of the city and are pillars of strength worth recognizing.

Residential Vernacular

There is a growing awareness that Freetown contains a significant collection of historic residential vernacular properties. So called “Krio board houses,” a style of vernacular housing tied to the city’s early liberated African settlers, are a key aspect of this built heritage typology. In addition to the board houses, Krio houses were also partially or fully built using blocks of local red laterite stone. This red stone appears to be common in buildings throughout the history of the city.

The form, style, and materiality of Krio houses can be traced back to liberated African settlers from the Americas, who brought their ideas of housing form and fabric back with them starting in 1792 (Trenchard 2016). The early wood-frame structures can be found throughout the city, but previous mapping projects suggest they are more concentrated in some areas (Architectural Field Office, n.d.). In 2016, it was estimated that a few thousand of them remain standing (Trenchard, 2016), though many more are thought to have been destroyed by fires during the Civil War. These numbers continue to decline due to material decay, development, and their current lack of popularity as residential architecture.

Of the Krio houses that remain, many have been repaired with corrugated sheeting or scrap metal, resulting in colorful, multi-textured facades that stand out amongst more recently constructed structures. Many Krio board houses near the Central Business District have been converted to mixed-use with the addition of small shops or storefronts. Residents often continue to live in other portions of the house while selling items out of street-facing sections of the building. These storefronts can be elaborate, with entire lean-to additions erected, or very simple, encompassing only an open door or window. These Krio shops are particularly prevalent along the commercial corridor of Pademba Road.
Religious Sites

In addition to the St. John’s Maroon Church and St. Charles Church national monuments, Freetown contains a variety of long-active religious sites that reflect the spiritual and cultural life of the city and its diverse communities. Beyond their historic character, these institutions often continue to provide vital services to the surrounding community and remain important assets.

Christian denominational churches are frequently represented in tourism publications and noted as important historic sites. St. George’s Cathedral, one early Christian church in Freetown, was built beginning in 1817. It is considered the Flagship of Anglican Communion in Sierra Leone, and is a particularly well-known example of a heritage resource hiding in plain sight.

Although the majority of the population of Freetown is Muslim, not a single Islamic religious site has been recognized as a national monument. Jamaat ul Salaam in Foulah Town is one example of a mosque that has long contributed to the city. It is among the oldest mosques in the city, founded in 1882 by immigrants from Nigeria. Early in its history, the building was burned by the Christian community. The Foulah community rebuilt across the street, and expanded the building in 1927. The Mosque runs a nearby school and community center, and owns a local playing field open for public use. Renovations and another expansion were under way at the time of this study, and are projected to be completed by the end of 2019.
Markets

Freetown’s markets are a significant aspect of the city’s social, cultural, and economic life, and many have persisted in place over time. Standing structures such as the “Big Market,” located on Wallace Johnson Street in the Central Business District, were damaged during the Civil War and have since been rebuilt. Likewise, the structure once associated with the King Jimmy Market along the Kroo Bay waterfront has been demolished. Even though much of the original material fabric has been lost, the persistent use of these market spaces should be considered a community asset worth leveraging in future planning initiatives.

According to documents prepared for a 2014 urban plan, many longstanding markets have been targeted for redevelopment projects that aim to demolish existing markets in favor of creating new, modern market buildings with the goal of attracting tourists (GOPA Consultants 2014, Pg.106). The plan also highlights a perceived need for tourist-driven businesses, but seems to ignore the potential value of the businesses that already exist (and are presumably more locally-oriented).

Street Vending

Beyond formal markets and “Krio shops” facing the street, a third and critical component of Freetown’s commercial urban environment is more easily overlooked from the historical perspective: street vending. While less formal, street vending is no less consequential. Comparing historic photos to the street scenes of today, it is clear that street vending represents a vital and tenacious feature of city life. Street vending is mobile, and it intrinsically lacks the material permanence of other urban heritage typologies. However, the persistence of street vending along certain corridors of the city across history confirms that it is a significant aspect of Freetown’s place-based heritage.

Street vending is ubiquitous in Freetown. Yet some corridors are particularly active sites of street vending. Kissy Street is one of the corridors within the city where street trading is particularly concentrated today. Historical photographs indicate that Kissy Street has been an active site of street trading since at least the turn of the century. Similar historical continuity can also be identified in other commercial corridors in Freetown, including Fourah Bay Road. The persistence of street vending in Freetown over time speaks to its value as a part of the economic and socio-cultural life of the city, also to its historical significance as a feature of the urban environment.
Identifying Heritage Geographies

In order to maximize the utility of the week-long field workshop, the studio identified a series of “nodes”—neighborhoods in which heritage resources appeared to be particularly concentrated. These served as targeted areas for the field survey. Node boundaries were drawn using heritage sites documented by previous architectural surveys, historical photographs, maps of early and ethnic settlements, and the recommendations of our colleagues in Freetown. This node-based approach sought to prioritize areas in which heritage and other public assets were co-located and to describe conditions that are indicative of the city as a whole. This meant surveying not only properties that were officially recognized or apparent heritage assets, but others in the node as well to understand contextual and co-locational relationships. Individual properties were described according to a number of criteria, including apparent heritage status, associated historic narrative, primary material, accessibility to the public, use, and height (additional information regarding the survey and data fields is included in the appendix at the end of this report). The aggregation of this data provides the basis for the following brief characterization of each of the eight surveyed nodes.

Each surveyed node is highlighted in orange
Central Business District

What is now known as the Central Business District (CBD) was part of the earliest settled area of the city. The CBD survey area encompasses the land from the waterfront to Lightfoot Boston Street, bounded by Percival Street to the west, and Susan’s Bay to the east. The CBD is the most visibly diverse area of the city in terms of building and land use, construction materials, and building height. The area contains a concentration of new, high-density development. Given that it is the administrative and commercial center, the CBD is less residential than the other nodes. It also features active streetscapes heavily trafficked by pedestrians and cars. Sidewalks are often encumbered by temporary and permanent vendor structures, restricting walkability.

Among the 111 resources surveyed in the CBD, 41 percent were documented as either “Identifiable Heritage” or “Possible Heritage,” which is higher than the overall calculation of heritage versus non-heritage resources across the combined survey areas (33 percent). Nearly half of these heritage resources are accessible to the public, the highest proportion of any node.

Heritage resource types like “Freestanding Public Art” were more common and more visible in the CBD than in other areas. A series of four monuments all located along Wallace Johnson Street (the main thoroughfare through the CBD) are a few of the only interpreted commemorative objects set within the urban fabric of Freetown. Related to these types of public art pieces, there is a relatively high concentration of visible narratives within the CBD area. In this node, 17 percent of the resources surveyed have an associated narrative, compared to 6 percent of resources in the other survey areas. Historical narratives are associated either with “The Colonial Past” or with “Slavery,” and could provide a strong basis for an interactive heritage trail connecting the disparate resources together.

The juxtaposition between the relatively high concentration of visually and publicly accessible heritage resources and new, high density development suggests that the development pressure in the CBD is uncommonly strong. Existing policy mechanisms may not offer sufficient protection to the remaining heritage resources in the area.

High density development in the Central Business District
Cotton Tree Area

This survey area includes the southern portion of the CBD below Siaka Stevens Street. It is characterized by the presence of a large open space, Victoria Park, and a large historic tree, the Cotton Tree, as well as a variety of administrative and commercial buildings. Any residential buildings are mixed use, serving commercial purposes as well. In many cases, gates and fences restrict access to buildings.

The most prominent heritage resource in this area is the Cotton Tree, which is also exceptional as a living heritage resource. Other notable heritage resources in this area include the National Museum and Victoria Park. Of all identifiable heritage resources, 42 percent were publicly accessible, a higher proportion than some of the other nodes. While these statistics suggest greater public access, it is worth noting that the largest open/green space in the city, Victoria Park, now requires an entrance fee of 25,000 Leones (approximately $2.50) per person. For many members of the public, this fee is prohibitively high. For those who can afford it, the fee reduces their ability to enjoy the park on a daily basis.

This portion of the CBD has the highest concentration of publicly-apparent narratives in the built environment, encompassing 20 percent of all resources (compared to 17 percent near the waterfront, and 6 percent overall). These higher percentages are largely due to the number of public-facing (national) cultural institutions sited within this node, along with a number of commemorative murals and monuments. These types of heritage-related murals were not found in most other nodes, other than the waterfront area of the CBD.

*The historic Cotton Tree*
Pademba Road

This node extends along the Pademba Road corridor from State Street to Jomo Kenyatta Road. It is a mixed-use corridor with both residential and commercial buildings, and connects to the city center at the Cotton Tree.

Pademba Road contains the greatest concentration of Krio Board houses of any node surveyed, reflecting the corridor's past settlement by Krio people. Nineteen Board houses were identified along the corridor, representing 76 percent of its identifiable heritage resources. Most of these board houses have not been re-sided with an additional material—80 percent of the identifiable heritage resources along this corridor are primarily constructed of wood.

This node contains a higher concentration of churches than is common in the city as a whole. Out of the seven religious sites located along on Pademba Road, five are Christian churches. This includes such identifiable heritage resources as Christ Church at the busy intersection of Pademba Road and Circular Road.

Pademba Road is a main commercial thoroughfare. A quarter of all buildings are entirely commercial and 36 percent have ground-floor retail with other uses above. Given this node's proximity to the CBD, similar development pressure is apparent, including several recently constructed 4+ story concrete buildings with ground floor retail, and commercial or residential uses above.

While most identifiable heritage resources on Pademba Road are private (60 percent) due to their residential uses, a good portion of them are semi-public (40 percent) due to the commercial and mixed-use nature of the corridor, meaning there was some degree of public access for shopping and the like, even though the building was privately owned or operated. Of the total resources (heritage and non-heritage) surveyed on Pademba Road, only 37 percent of them are private, and 59 percent of them are semi-public. This discrepancy suggests that a greater portion of identifiable heritage resources are private than those in the area overall. The private nature of many of the identifiable heritage resources on Pademba Road will be a significant factor in determining policies for the preservation and adaptation of these resources and of Pademba Road as a corridor.
Kroo Town Road

The busy mixed-use corridor of Kroo Town Road extends west from Siaka Stevens Street and the Central Business District to Chapel Street. This corridor is characteristic of much of Freetown—the streetscape is framed by multi-story commercial and mixed-use construction, with shops and vendors lining the streetwall. Additionally, it is home to markets and a number of religious institutions. It also includes a mix of modern and historic structures.

Kroo Town Road bisects the neighborhood of Kroo Town, which corresponds to an early ethnic enclave within the city of Freetown. And while the corridor shares a similar character to the Central Business District, the community of Kroo Bay, one of the largest and most populous informal settlements in the city, is situated only approximately 200 meters (700 feet) north of Kroo Town Road. The streetscape of Kroo Town Road conveys a clear commercial orientation, with approximately half of its buildings being solely commercial in use, the other half having ground floor retail. Only a small percentage of buildings directly along the street corridor are solely residential.

In addition to small ground floor shops and commercial retail, City Market, also called Kroo Town Road Market, is prominent along the streetwall, bearing a date marker of 1898. The City Market, which occupies a full block on the north side of Kroo Town Road between King William Street and Nana Kroo Street, provides both interior and exterior space for vendors at its two-story site.

The City Market is one of a number of buildings with clear historic character sited along Kroo Town Road. Identifiably historic sites include residential buildings, buildings with ground floor retail, and religious institutions. Of the four religious buildings located along the corridor—two mosques and two Christian churches—the Holy Innocent Parish (Pa Jox) Church at Little Kroo Street have particularly recognizable historic character, being constructed of stone masonry. In addition to the Church, three other stone masonry structures, including Kroo Court, are situated along Kroo Town Road as well as to some wooden board houses.

Maroon Town

The Maroon Town node corresponds to the neighborhood of Maroon Town, a historical ethnic enclave in central Freetown. Today, the area has a mixed-use character similar to that of the CBD located immediately to its east, but with a greater proportion of residential properties. Maroon Town is clearly in the process of developing. Out of all of the nodes surveyed, this area had the most apparent concentration of recently completed and ongoing construction projects.

The area also contains a notable number of office towers, matched only by the CDB among the nodes surveyed. These two characteristic traits—the significant presence of new and ongoing construction, and the high concentration of office buildings—suggest that Maroon Town’s present development is tied to the growth of the adjacent Central Business District.

Out of the total buildings in Maroon Town, 45 percent are either clearly or possibly historic. While there is no clear correlation between building use and apparent heritage status, recognizable heritage resources are somewhat more likely to be residential buildings. As the growth of the CBD continues to influence the
character of Maroon Town, this node is particularly well suited to serve as a test case for how development and urban densification interface with residential areas and historic fabric.

**Foulah Town**

Foulah Town, bounded by Mountain Cut Road and Kissy Road, is the most isolated node of the eight survey areas. It is a predominantly residential and historically Muslim neighborhood with a short stretch of ground-floor retail structures along Mountain Cut Road. Compared to the other highly-active survey areas, Foulah Town features lower density structures and calm streetscapes. Even when comparing the commercial corridor of Mountain Cut Road to that of Pademba Road, there is a distinct lack of street-level activity. Interestingly, the only hotel or hostel surveyed was in Foulah Town — none were identified even in the CBD and adjacent areas.

Sixteen heritage resources were identified in the neighborhood, more than three-quarters of which were private residential buildings. Half of the resources documented as either identifiable or possible heritage were wooden board houses.

Both of the religious structures identified in the area are mosques, including the Jamaat ul Salaam described previously. This is different than the other survey areas that are either dominated by Christian resources, or feature both religions equally. Considering the lack of official recognition for the Islamic heritage of Freetown, this may be a potential area in which to begin more targeted efforts to acknowledge diverse heritage within the city’s built environment.

*Jamaat ul Salaam Mosque is undergoing renovation and expansion.*
Fourah Bay Road and Savage Square define the eastern- and northern-most boundaries of the Fourah Bay neighborhood—a historically Muslim neighborhood with a strong residential character bounded by Kissy Road and Ross Road to the south and east, respectively. Despite the residential composition of the neighborhood’s interior, Fourah Bay Road and Savage Square comprise a lively mixed-use corridor with commercial orientation. This is the case especially for Fourah Bay Road, which is a paved and highly congested thoroughfare connecting Cline Town and the highway at Bai Bureh Road to the central city. Savage Square is a slightly less trafficked north-south arterial. Both corridors are lined with shopfronts and are active sites for street vending. The roads are also dotted with wooden board houses and stone masonry houses.

Most buildings on Fourah Bay Road and Savage Square feature ground floor retail. Solely residential buildings are slightly less frequent. Still, both streets share an overarching commercial character, with ground-floor retail and commercial properties making up a majority of the combined streetscape (55 percent of buildings surveyed).

Identifiable and possible heritage resources located along this corridor comprise nearly one third of those surveyed, and a recognizable correlation exists between historic character and use. This correlation suggests that development is impacting both the historic and residential character of the corridor. Despite the streets’ strong commercial orientation, street-fronting buildings with historic character are primarily restricted to residencies, often without any associated commercial use. Nearly 80 percent of clearly historic buildings are solely residential. Furthermore, sites that were deemed possibly historic had either residential or ground-floor retail use. Many of these possibly historic sites appear to have been wooden board house that were altered to accommodate additional commercial functions, often by adding small shops to the front of those residences. The residential character of heritage resources in this survey area is contrasted with the commercial character of its non-heritage resources: approximately 75 percent of non-heritage resources were commercial, ground-floor retail, or vacant.
These findings point to an ongoing process of commercial development in this area whereby property owners or renters who value store-frontage are likely to alter existing residential properties to accommodate commercial use, or tear down existing structures and redevelop their properties with a building better suited to ground floor commercial space.

Among heritage resources along the corridor, a majority are either board or masonry houses. One wooden board house features Arabic script in its historical architectural detailing, an association reflective of the Muslim character of the Fourah Bay neighborhood writ large, and of other religious resources like the Jamiul Atique Mosque, Yardee Compound, and the Madrassa Sulaima School in the neighborhood’s interior.

**Cline Town**

The area of Cline Town includes the thoroughfares of College Road, Cline Street and Racecourse Road. The area is connected to Freetown’s city center by Fourah Bay Road. The area is host to a number of significant heritage resources, including the Old Fourah Bay College, The National Railway Museum, Bishop Crowther Memorial Church complex and a substantial development along Racecourse Road of colonial-period railworks, buildings and a cemetery.

Cline Town also encompasses port and industrial operations. Old Fourah Bay College is near a large industrial port and abuts the Ministry of Labour and Social Security and Customs operations. The National Railway Museum and Bishop Crowther Memorial Church are at the other end of the node next to several industrial operations including a fishery and metal scrapyard. Cline Town’s high concentration of industrial buildings and heritage sites will require concerted attention to determine how to balance cultural and industrial uses.

College Road is an important commercial corridor that leads from Old Fourah Bay College. Mixed use properties (ground floor retail and other) comprise 19 percent of resources surveyed and are mostly concentrated on College Road and the start of Fourah Bay Road. However, College Road also has a large undeveloped lot filled with the rubble of demolished buildings, some newly built commercial structures, and a large walled off area with water towers.

Cline Town also has two residential areas: one is bounded by the commercial frontage on College Road and the industrial frontage on Cline Street, Racecourse Road, and the Customs compound. Within this area, there are four board houses mixed amongst low-scale metal and concrete houses, a mosque, and other buildings. Another board house has a commercial ground floor on College Street. An exemplary stone masonry house stands on Cline Street. The remainder of residential properties with historic character are colonial-era stone houses constructed between 1911 and 1912 as indicated by date markers. These houses are concentrated around a compound on Racecourse Road.
Key Survey Findings

In addition to a characterization of individual nodes, it is also worth considering the aggregate results of the architectural survey and the user survey of public perceptions, to get a better sense of prevailing trends throughout the city.

The studio surveyed a total of 845 physical resources in the built environment, 95 percent of which were buildings. The second largest resource type surveyed was open space, which represents just 2 percent of the survey. Other types of resources such as open space, public art, and transit infrastructure were notably rare.

Publicly accessible heritage sites are a scarce resource in Freetown. While the survey intentionally focused on nodes that appeared to have high concentrations of heritage resources, only 18 percent of buildings surveyed were clearly identifiable as heritage and a further 16 percent were identified as possible heritage. Only 31 sites (4 percent) are publicly accessible — the very limited amount of publicly accessible heritage reflected the city’s lack of publicly accessible spaces overall. Most heritage resources are either semi-public (52 percent) or private (45 percent). In light of the fact that more than half of the heritage resources identified during the survey were used as residences, this important role of private Krio board houses and masonry houses in the landscape of Freetown becomes even more clear.

The team also undertook a user survey of 235 members of the public in a variety of locations throughout Freetown in order to better understand public perceptions about historic sites and buildings. Participants were all located within the survey nodes, around high concentrations of historic resources. Participants were approached on the street, and asked a series of questions regarding their perceptions of heritage places within the local and within the city.
Krio Board and Masonry Houses Characterize Freetown’s Heritage

The Krio board houses are the most common heritage type identified in our survey, making up nearly half of the buildings identified as a heritage resource. Since almost three-quarters of all buildings surveyed were primarily concrete, these wooden board houses stand in distinct contrast and are easily identified.

The survey identified 81 wooden Krio board houses in the eight nodes. This represents 9.5 percent of the total resources surveyed. While 88 percent of these retain visible original wood cladding, about 12 percent have been altered with either metal or concrete cladding. Most (74 percent) board houses are still used as residences. However, 21 percent have been altered to accommodate commercial retail use on the ground floor while the remainder is used for residential use.

In addition to the board houses, the survey identified 24 stone masonry houses that are also among the oldest still standing in Freetown. This represents less than 1 percent of the total resources surveyed, but 8.5 percent of identifiable and possible heritage resources combined. Of the masonry houses surveyed, 75 percent are identifiable as heritage and the remainder are possible heritage. About half of them are exclusively used as residences and a further 29 percent accommodate commercial retail space on their ground floor while retaining some residential use above or behind.
Stone masonry houses were predominantly found in Kroo Town (3), Maroon Town (7), Fourah Bay (6), and Foulah Town (3). In these nodes, this represented a decent proportion of identifiable heritage surveyed: Kroo Town (33 percent), Maroon Town (23 percent), Fourah Bay (22 percent) and Foulah Town (13 percent). Spatially, most of them are found peppered in the western nodes surveyed, however some of the best examples are found in Cline Town, Fourah Bay, Foulah Town, near The Cotton Tree, and in Kroo Town. In Maroon Town, Kroo Town, and Fourah Bay many have been substantially altered.

There are generally three types of Masonry houses: Grand ones with two to three stories, pitched roofs, dormers—similar to the shape of board houses, and often with quoins, Gibbs surrounds, and other masonry decorative features; medium ones with two stories, simple planar facades and flat roofs; and small ones with a single story and similar simple rectilinear geometries. These old masonry houses have not received the same attention as the Krio board houses. Yet they seem to serve as anchors in many neighborhoods, have been successfully adapted to serve commercial purposes in addition to housing, and are worth singling out for their potential to play a positive role in future planning schemes.

Simultaneously, it is worth noting that the user survey of public perceptions revealed contrasting ideas about Krio houses as urban heritage. Some survey participants perceived Krio board houses as out-dated and potentially dangerous as residential architecture, given common problems of upkeep and maintenance. On Pademba Road, multiple people surveyed suggested that Krio board houses should be demolished. Other survey participants said that board houses are significant aspects of urban heritage and are the “heart of the city.”
Women and Youth are Under-represented in the Built Environment

Only six physical resources were identified as affiliated with women in the survey (less than 1 percent of resources surveyed). Of these, five were identified as heritage resources. These heritage resources include: two murals of Madam Yoko, one on the exterior wall of the Sierra Leone National Museum and the other on the exterior wall of Big Market; Victoria Park named for Queen Victoria; a 1947 hotel called Selina’s Choice that is today an office building but retains the signage; and The Society for Women and Aids in Africa. These are only found in the CBD Waterfront and Cotton Tree nodes, implying that there is a lack of recognition for women in the built environment of most of Freetown.

The physical survey identified 13 resources that are affiliated with youth. The majority (10) of these were educational use buildings. Of these, only three were identifiable as heritage resources and not because of their relationship to youth. These were a masonry house on Mountain Cut Road with signs for the Pan-African Union Building and Pan-African Youth Student Organization; Victoria Park; and the Wellington Street School. Possible heritage resources included an open space used as a football field on Oxley Street; Samaria Primary School on Wellington Street; and the Bishop Crowler School on Racecourse Road.
Public Consensus Strongest around Markets

When asked about other places important to the heritage of Freetown, a quarter of all respondents identified markets, such as King Jimmy Market and Big Market. Out of the various expanded heritage typologies discussed earlier, this is the category that seems to enjoy the strongest support, showing the importance of this resource to the city. The National Museum, Cotton Tree, and Victoria Park were also frequently mentioned. These resources are all centrally located near the CBD, though Old Fourah Bay College (which is further away) was also mentioned 28 times.

Heritage Sites Used Mostly by Freetown Residents

Just six of the 235 participants in the public opinion survey were visiting Freetown from international countries. International tourism is undoubtedly seasonal, and the October field workshop may have coincided with a period of low visitation. But it is likely that any planning solutions seeking to leverage the historic resources of the city must do so with a local audience in mind as the primary beneficiaries.
Grand Stone Masonry House in Fourah Bay.
INSTRUMENTALIZING HERITAGE
Big Market and Customs House, c. 1910.
Heritage is a vital part of Freetown’s cultural, social, and economic life. It is also inextricably linked to ongoing processes of urbanization. As Freetown creates its new planning department, and as heritage policy is being revised, it is important to bring an understanding of heritage as a multi-faceted asset and as a potential agent of change into broader planning processes. To facilitate this process, the studio first identified some key issues characterizing the heritage and sustainable urbanization nexus:

**Urban Expansion and Informality**
Freetown is experiencing rapid urban expansion and densification. There are tensions between purposeful densification and informal development taking place across the city. As the city looks to grow sustainably, planning and preservation must account for both of these patterns of urban life.

**Funding and Resource Scarcity**
Preservation and planning in Freetown are restricted by a scarcity of funds and narrow supportive policy and data infrastructures. Negotiating this landscape, and formulating actionable public policy, requires creativity and nuance.

**Barriers to Access and Mobility**
Public access and connectivity in Freetown are often limited. Questions surrounding access and mobility often have complex social, economic, and historical dimensions.

**Governance Challenges**
Tensions between national governance and municipal governance pose challenges in Freetown, as the capital city and urban heart of Sierra Leone. At a moment when both the Freetown City Council and national agencies are independently rethinking public policy, there are questions about who gets to set official agendas for heritage and planning.

**Community-Engaged Heritage Decision Making**
Officially recognized heritage in Sierra Leone and existing heritage legislation both reflect a colonial paradigm. While there is momentum behind new participatory approaches to planning and preservation, they have yet to broadly engage the public with heritage.

In light of those key issues and the data compiled over the course of the studio and field workshop, a series of policy recommendations were developed around the idea of instrumentalizing heritage. These recommendations go beyond adding sites to existing heritage lists, or assuming that protection alone will generate the social or economic benefits often associated with heritage. Instead, these policy recommendations recognize the ways in which heritage resources already support broader societal goals and find ways to intentionally pursue these goals by supporting heritage. In the case of Freetown, this means defining policies that advance heritage as an active contributor to sustainable urbanization.
Recognize Diverse Heritage

Preserving and advancing cultural heritage is already a critical part of Sierra Leone’s national policy (Monuments and Relics Ordinance 1948; National Cultural Policy 2014), and eleven national monuments are located in Freetown. However, the studio's research found that there are a variety of heritage sites and typologies that are not recognized within the city, but that play important roles in urban life and are valued by the people of Freetown.

A policy of recognizing more diverse heritage can serve a range of goals, while helping to achieve a more inclusive future that includes a greater variety of communities in both heritage conservation and as part urban development and regeneration. It could enhance public engagement with heritage and planning; and ensure that vital assets are included in planning for development, while promoting equity. The recognition of the following heritage typologies is important because they each hold significance to the city and its people today.

Krio Houses

Krio houses represent the history of liberated Africans and the diaspora of formerly enslaved people to and from the Americans around the time of Freetown’s early settlement. The survey data shows that both wooden board houses and masonry houses of local laterite stone hold equal importance to the colonial history of the city. Of additional importance, is the fact that some of these houses were adapted to accommodate shops, which allowed for continued use of this heritage resource as areas and corridors became increasingly commercialized. The adaptations use different materials, including concrete. Still, the Krio house typology, with its associated Krio shops, represent a significant architectural tradition in Freetown that remains unrecognized officially as heritage.

Markets and Street Vending

Formal markets, like King Jimmy and Big Market in the CBD and City Market in Kroo Town, continue to play a vital role in the city, and have seen some recognition in tourist-oriented literature as cultural sites. Sites like these deserve to be recognized as key heritage assets for the city and the country.

During the field survey, street vending also quickly emerged as a significant cultural and economic resource. Through historic photographs, it became apparent that such activities have persisted over time along specific city corridors. One of these sites is Kissy Street, where street trading remains very active today. Along such corridors, there are market stalls lined along the sidewalk and vendors who walk the street, often in front of ground-level shops. The combination of these three layers of economic activity creates a dynamic streetscape and a characteristic “informal” market experience. Street vending similarly remains an under-recognized aspect of Freetown’s place-based urban heritage.

“The notion of heritage can be understood from multiple perspectives for producing memory and the future, restore monetary wealth and culture, tell ethical stories, and extol aesthetics” (Marini 2017).
Islamic Sites

A majority of Freetown residents are Muslim. However, there is no official recognition of Islamic heritage in Freetown. Field interviews conducted with Imams from two Freetown mosques underscored the importance of the history of Islamic sites to communities across the city. Also, it showed their desire for being recognized as part of the official heritage of Freetown and Sierra Leone, having felt neglected by the preservation authorities. Islamic heritage takes on different forms within the built environment of Freetown. For example, there are many associated schools with mosques and some adapted Krio houses that reflect Muslim influence in their facades. Moreover, the Yardee Compound, which was the site of the first mosque in the Fourah Bay neighborhood (Jamiul Atique), is an open space associated with the city’s early Islamic history. The Yardee Compound also continues to be the dispersal point for the Jamiul Atique’s Jummah and Eid prayers.

Open Space

Open space constitutes another under-recognized heritage typology in the city. Open spaces are often important gathering places for Freetown communities. The survey identified a number of open spaces that had the potential for greater use, but that are currently barred from public access. Some are directly related to other heritage assets. For example, the surrounding area of Old Fourah Bay College used to be a wide, green space filled with vegetation, which currently is walled off to protect the deteriorating building. Victoria Park in the Central Business District is the largest green space in the city but is currently always empty due to the recent imposition of an entrance fee.

POLICY: RECOGNIZE DIVERSE HERITAGE

Why?

» Enhance public engagement with heritage and planning
» Ensure assets are included in planning for sustainable development
» Promote equity

How?

» Community-engaged heritage surveys
» Broaden the scope of informational programs (eg. Heritage Clubs)
**Improve Data Infrastructure**

Freetown lacks a strong system for managing city data — and there hasn’t been any known attempt to integrate historical data within its current structures. Improving data infrastructure in Freetown is important for developing an evidentiary platform for heritage planning and sustainable development. Some ways to enact this policy would be to integrate contemporary and historic data repositories like the city system and the national archives; to establish standards for data collection and management; and to mobilize participatory data collection projects that account for change over time.

**Connect Heritage Resources to Existing Data Portal**

The national government of Sierra Leone currently utilizes an Integrated GIS (Geographic Information Systems) Portal. The portal was recently launched by the Sierra Leone Directorate of Science, Technology, and Innovation (DSTI) to inform government and development partner decision making (DSTI 2019). The portal currently includes diverse geospatial datasets, including those relating to cell towers, courts, schools, financial institutions, health facilities, demographics, etc. The GIS portal is intended to support Sierra Leone in implementing the policies outlined in its National Development Plan.

The website states that the “geodatabase is not yet exhaustive and we are committed to forming new data partnerships to improve the portal in support of better, effective and efficient decision-making” (DSTI 2019b). There is potential for this national platform to be a departure point for standard-setting for digital data and integration of national and municipal datasets. Furthermore, this platform could be a space in which heritage-oriented and historical data can be integrated toward more informed planning and decision-making.
Expand Freetown Mobility Project

During the rainy season of May through November 2018, many Freetown students who live far from school are at the mercy of the flooded streets and often miss class. As a result, a project was developed through the national government in partnership with the World Bank to “operationalize four key sectors of data relevant to Freetown: flooding data, poverty data, mobility data of supply and demand, and complementing sectors such as health, education, and tourism” (Arroyo and Espinet 2018a). Fourah Bay College engineering students used mobile phones to map transportation routes and gather other information, such as fares and bus frequency to understand where people are going for their jobs, how mobility patterns change between dry and rainy seasons, which areas are most impacted by rain (Arroyo and Espinet 2018a).
In the future, Sierra Leone’s Directorate of Science, Technology, and Innovation (DSTI) plans to host a hackathon for Fourah Bay College students and local developers to use Big Data to create apps to solve other local issues. Heritage preservation should be one of the local issues DSTI focuses on, and proposed project areas could be sited at tourist hot spots and nodes that are central to the city’s history and economy (such as Pademba Road, the CBD area, Cline Town).

**POLICY: IMPROVE DATA INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Why?**

» Develop an evidentiary platform for planning and sustainable development

**How?**

» Create standards for data collection and management
» Integrate contemporary and historical data repositories (eg. city + National Archives)
» Mobilize participatory data collection projects
It is critical to recognize the diversity of actors and stakeholders engaged in Free-town's heritage and in ongoing processes of urbanization. Empowering an array of stakeholders would ensure more participatory processes and promote community-engaged decision-making. The field workshop identified at least four major groups of stakeholders: owners, vendors, religious site stewards affiliated with the inter-religious council network, and educators/students.

There are many ways in which policy might be tailored to support specific stakeholder groups, a somewhat more manageable prospect than supporting a specific kind of heritage site, particularly sites under private ownership. Recognizing that access to capital is a common challenge for all of these stakeholders, one policy proposal that could be applied to the Freetown context is the creation of informal financial institutions, known as Rotating Savings and Credit Associations. While generally deployed among family and friend networks and with trust as the central enforcement agent, ROSCAs have proved to be remarkably successful, giving low-income communities and property owners access to economic power they would otherwise not have. The creation of a ROSCA for business owners operating within the mixed commercial/residential Krio Houses along a specific corridor like Pademba Road could be a strategic entry point in advancing economic equity for communities.

**POLICY: EMPOWER DIVERSE ACTORS**

**Why?**

» Ensure participatory processes and promote community-engaged decision-making
» Facilitate collaboration to marshal resources and knowledge
» Drive economic access

**How?**

» Mobilize vendor, owner, or religious networks
» Recognize collaboratives through municipal government
» Allow for use of creative financing tools
Ensure Community Benefits

A policy of ensuring community benefits would principally seek to ensure that the residents of Freetown are the foremost benefactors from actions taken and policies enacted regarding heritage and development. Such a policy might incorporate community-based tourism, which seeks to promote local community ownership and empowerment, socio-economic development, increased self-reliance, and equity. Second, heritage conservation projects and their outcomes are directed toward improving the wellbeing of the people of Freetown through mobility, access, public realm, infrastructure improvements, and programming. Third, ensuring communities benefits means allowing heritage to evolve with the needs of Freetown's property owners, renters, and users so that communities and business are not displaced by heritage conservation.

POLICY: ENSURE COMMUNITY BENEFITS

Why?

» Ensure local community to be the foremost benefactors
» Avoid negative impacts of tourism
» Encourage decision-making and ownership within the local community

How?

» Empower community decision-making around tourism
» Draw on existing decision-making structures within communities
» Localize revenues
**Improve Mobility, Access, and Connectivity**

In Freetown, there are opportunities for improving access to, and making connections between, heritage places and narrative histories. Many heritage sites that could be open to the public are walled off and gated making access to these sites discouraged or unclear. Measures to improve physical access could include the addition of lighting on buildings, streets, and public spaces; wayfinding signage and information; regulation of gates and walls; and maintenance of grounds and paving.

A policy of improving connectivity could link heritage sites located throughout the city. Heritage in Freetown often lacks any kind of signage to direct visitors. This keeps residents and tourists alike from being able to easily access historic places. This policy would help to make currently less visible or invisible narratives more apparent in the built environment of Freetown. It would provide visitors with an itinerary of sites, information, and modes of accessing those sites, which would enable visitors to have a wider understanding of the relationships between heritage sites throughout Freetown. A key vision of this policy approach is the use of heritage trails. A partnership between the Monuments and Relics Commission and local and international heritage organizations could be responsible for implementing such a policy.

**POLICY: IMPROVE MOBILITY, ACCESS, AND CONNECTIVITY**

**Why?**

- Impediments exist to accessing, using, and recognizing public resources and heritage

**How?**

- Improve public realm infrastructure (e.g. street lighting)
- Improve pedestrian experience (e.g. building sidewalks)
- Improve interpretation (e.g. wayfinding)

**Creative Financing and Incentives**

Freetown poses a unique opportunity to develop and engage in creative financing. The city currently lacks funding and has a limited tax base through which the preservation and revitalization of historic sites could be financed and incentivized. But the city is already utilizing alternative instruments for financing and incentives, like through the waste management program mentioned earlier in this report. This policy proposes further use of these tools in heritage and urban planning. Together they could supplement scarce public resources and limited tax base.
It is possible that creative financing tools will also facilitate broader sustainable development of the city by ensuring that benefits reach local communities and offer investment opportunities to a broader public. Some of the creative financing tools that could be used in heritage-oriented projects include the following: bond funds, like diaspora bonds; community-oriented credits, like social capital credits; and public-private partnerships. Opportunities and challenges associated with the use of these financing tools are outlined in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Opportunity for Use in Freetown</th>
<th>Challenges for Use in Freetown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diaspora Bonds</strong></td>
<td>• Relatively stable source of external investment, non-traditional investment type</td>
<td>• Diaspora bonds to fund infrastructure projects or social investment may require additional capital and credit enhancements that are not available currently;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capitalizes on evidence of the existing network of Sierra Leonean community that exists in the US and UK who already contribute financially to community organizations in Freetown (Religious institutions, but also strong Gullah Geechee connection)</td>
<td>• Requires government oversight: where would this live within the existing government structure? Not much trust between national and municipal government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High remittance fees for transferring money directly into personal African accounts (highest in sub-Saharan countries), bond investment with interest generation alternative way of sending money home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Bonds</strong></td>
<td>• Bond administered by local and community-oriented non-profit</td>
<td>• Depends on a community with shared interests and available amounts of capital (however small) to invest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aimed specifically at community-based projects with concrete deliverables</td>
<td>• Requires management of the bond, annual payment of interest, and eventual repayment of full investment amounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low minimum investment to be accessible to more individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public-Private Partnerships</strong></td>
<td>• Brings in higher capital investment than may currently exist within Freetown/ Sierra Leone government and nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>• Would need a means of ensuring public benefits go to Freetown citizens; no current structure in place to do this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Brings in international collaborators</td>
<td>• PPPs intend to have government involvement and are complicated to arrange. Government currently has limited involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expressed interest by municipal leaders in Freetown to create more PPP-like structures in order to get larger infrastructure projects done</td>
<td>• Restricts amount of decision-making agency at the local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Would require identification of large-scale private partners with interest in Sierra Leone</td>
<td>• Would require identification of large-scale private partners with interest in Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Opportunity for Use in Freetown</td>
<td>Challenges for Use in Freetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Social Impact Bonds**  | • Reduces burden on service providers by providing working capital and reducing risk of repayment to investors through the outcome-based payment clause  
• Government agencies in place/in pipeline who will be able to oversee operations  
• Encourages innovation within the labor market to come up with better solutions for heritage issues  
• Good for specific outcome-based social initiatives with shorter timelines and concise expectations, could be used by Freetown City Council for heritage zone/route development | • Would require large-scale private investors interested in investing large amounts of money in a politically-volatile and relatively short peace-time duration  
• Corruption within governmental agencies that most likely will result in favoritism with a tangible impact on selective fund allocation and service provision, as is already seen and recognized by MRC in the designation of heritage sites in SL  
• Corruption reduces investment desirability among investors  
• Specific outcomes have to be identified for impact investment with intelligible deadlines and progress expectations  
• Diminished agency of government as an intermediary and service provider can be possibly seen as a loss of sovereignty |
| **Development Impact Bonds** | • Freetown can leverage already formed collaborations with international organizations/educational institutions or replicate such a setup to plan focused strategies that contextualizes heritage  
• Organizational setup in pipeline, like the planning department of Freetown, can help bridge gap between local skill set and international perspectives | • By assuming the interest of private investors meets the needs of communities, especially in underprivileged nations, SIBs risks turning communities into commodities.  
• Too many stakeholders with high transaction costs for implementation  
• Requires a fairly large-scale organizational setup/ workforce to implement ground-work  
• Lack of local skill set and education about heritage could increase and complicate onboarding process |
| **Revolving Loan Funds** | • Sustainable short-term, goal-oriented funding mechanism could offer opportunity to fund Krio house restorations  
• System drives success if there is a need for short-term, small amount loans  
• Low transaction costs  
• Skill-generation and job opportunities for local people | • Requires an initial capital for establishment of revolving loans  
• Difficult to regulate and ensure repayment  
• Success depends on Krio house owner’s value for home (demand for loans) and ability to repay loans on time as per contract |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Opportunity for Use in Freetown</th>
<th>Challenges for Use in Freetown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Community Lending**| • Could use religious institutions and their influence on congregations to use this financial tool  
• Apt for small-scale improvements to street-vending facilities, Krio house improvements;  
• Reduces burden of long-term debts                                                    | • Requires oversight and management- Possibility of exploitation of disadvantaged publics within community through unregulated interest rates  
• Small scale funding opportunities like this may not meet large-scale developmental goals |
| **Revenue Generating Adaptations** | • Krio houses offer an opportunity to operate as potentially revenue-generating adaptations if property ownership is undisputed and uncontested;  
• Does not require large capital investment for this to work beyond initial investment on restoration of property  
• Revenue generated through property reuse is a sustainable source of income for maintenance | • Requires comprehensive and large-scale mapping of properties likely to generate revenues through adaptations  
• Requires oversight and management/ market feasibility study to assess need for adaptations followed by clear definition of what programs will work and who will use services  
• Risk of losing material authenticity of heritage structures if not regulated closely  
• Difficult to regulate in Krio houses- disputed properties and a lack of legal system supporting ownership claims (power of attorney?) |
| **Real Estate Fund** | • Krio houses offer an opportunity to operate as potentially revenue-generating adaptations that could support this after initial outside funding, but there is likely a critical mass after which this would not be sustainable  
• Fund can act as a guaranteed purchaser of a building, making it easier to get traditional loans for restoration work; lowers risk for lender and borrower | • Krio houses offer an opportunity to operate as potentially revenue-generating adaptations that could support this after initial outside funding, but there is likely a critical mass after which this would not be sustainable |
| **Land Bank**        | • Municipal government or MRC could acquire vacant Krio Houses  
• Strategy for City Council with help of local community leaders (informal settlements, religious leaders?) to possibly assume control over abandoned properties  
• Possible opportunity to concentrate street-vending zones                                   | • Land tenure and property sales are extremely difficult to define in the Freetown/Sierra Leone context.  
• Very limited availability of open space in Freetown and unknown ownership structure for most of the vacant properties that could otherwise be included  
• Could demand management and cooperation with an unknown/not-yet-defined urban planning department |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Opportunities for Use in Freetown</th>
<th>Challenges for Use in Freetown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital Credits</strong></td>
<td>• Does not require capital to implement these types of incentives</td>
<td>• Requires some form of government oversight and participation, especially during the inception if benefits such as public improvements are traded; alternatively, would need a non-profit with capital to create new public benefits to be traded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Could tie to religious institutions to be the administrators of public benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotating Savings and Credit Associations</strong></td>
<td>• If it is an association among Krio houses it could help finance the renovation and conservation of important heritage sites, as well as economically empower owners</td>
<td>• Works better when done amongst friends and family where guarantees are associated with trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY: CREATIVE FINANCING + INCENTIVES**

**Why?**

» Supplement scarce public resources and limited tax base  
» Promote collaboration and public engagement  
» Localize benefits

**How?**

» Bonds and funds (e.g. Diaspora bonds)  
» Community-oriented credits (e.g. Social capital credits)  
» Public-private partnerships
Target Areas of Testing and Application

A policy of targeted and decentralized development recognizes the potential for heritage and its local context to be a driver of positive change at the urban scale. Such an approach focuses on locales where historic resources or development pressures may be concentrated, but also where heritage and other public and community resources coexist. This policy seeks to leverage coincident assets to achieve localized effects, while contributing to broader heritage-oriented or sustainable development goals in Freetown. A policy of targeted and decentralized development also has the advantage of concentrating the investment of limited public and private resources to discrete areas of the city, where tangible outcomes could inform broader municipal actions in the future.

Regulation, incentive, or information-based policies are suited for targeted development within zones or corridors, and these tools can be applied independently or together to achieve a range of outcomes. While specific intentions may vary, a targeted and decentralized development policy seeks to mobilize the heritage and other community-scale assets of select zones and corridors toward sustainable economic, physical, and community development. Given the local focus of such a policy, targeted and decentralized development may also serve to foster community agency in municipal governance; promote community cohesion or enhance resilience at the zone or corridor scale; and allow for policy efficacy to be evaluated at a small scale. It also serves the broad goal of integrating heritage preservation and municipal planning.

POLICY: TARGET AREAS OF TESTING & APPLICATION

Why?

» Build on strength where co-located assets exist
» Concentrate scarce public resources and infrastructures
» Test policy before broad implementation
» Integrate urban planning and heritage conservation

How?

» Planning tools (e.g. regulation, incentives)
» Information (e.g. heritage trails)
» Combined tools (e.g. street vending zones using creative financing)
INCUBATING POLICY
As Freetown seeks to expand its policy toolbox in the context of the development of its new planning department, applying and monitoring policies tailored to specific neighborhoods will provide vital information in helping craft policy appropriate for the scale of the entire city. As explained in the previous section, applying targeted policy to discrete areas could serve as an important means of instrumentalizing heritage as part of sustainable development, leveraging co-located resources within identified heritage geographies and addressing conservation and planning issues in tandem. While such an approach is not always warranted, there is merit in considering where and when it can be effective in testing and incrementally refining policy tools before they are scaled up. The studio developed specific policy recommendations for target areas, based on their survey nodes, which could serve as potential “policy incubators.” These proposals combine tools to achieve outcomes in a way that could incubate policies, which might be useful in other discrete parts of the city or might be considered in relation to the city as a whole.

Central Business District

As one of the oldest areas in the city, and the area facing the greatest development pressures, the Central Business District (CBD) is a vital area to address how heritage can play an instrumental role in sustainable development. The CBD features most of the city’s publicly-accessible heritage resources related to the slave trade and the colonial era, including the Old Wharf Steps and the Portuguese Steps—both of which were originally critical connections from the waterfront into the city.

In light of the momentum surrounding plans for the International African American Museum, there are incredible opportunities to tie the heritage resources in the CBD with these larger institutions across the Atlantic. To that end, this proposal seeks to connect the disparate heritage resources in the CBD through a heritage trail.

Many of these resources, like King Jimmy Market, St. George’s Cathedral, and the Central Mosque all have existing constituencies that can be tapped when tying these sites together. This ensures that there is a built-in community that can maintain a trail, but it also creates opportunities for new community connections. Despite being outwardly tourism-focused, this proposal prioritizes the local community as part of the heritage experience.

This incubator area focuses on two main policy avenues: information/education through the recognition of diverse heritage and the empowerment of diverse actors, and incentives through creative financing. Incentives, in this case, would take the form of financial credits or social capital credits. Wayfinding and interpretive signage are obvious components of a heritage trail, also supporting connectivity. Tours could be led by students in the Heritage Clubs already established by the MRC, and informed by community-curated information. And design of the actual wayfinding and signage could come from local artists.
To ensure that economic benefits go directly to the community surrounding this heritage trail, tax credits could be awarded to participating businesses that offer public services to those traveling the heritage trail, and additional incentives might include advertising and marketing of participating businesses through an official heritage trail page on Freetown’s tourism website. Business owners and operators along the heritage trail could trade an investment in public realm improvements in the area adjacent to their business—such as improved lighting, pavement, signage, etc.—for other social capital credits like health care credits or additional street trees.

A heritage trail within the Central Business District might also serve as an important launch point for the exploration of heritage elsewhere in the city, particularly Cline Town and Old Fourah Bay College. With that in mind, a ferry route is proposed that could connect these two heritage hubs.

Ferry route connecting Cline Town and Old Fourah Bay College to other parts of Freetown and beyond.
Heritage Resources

**Recognized Typologies**
1. Government Wharf
2. Portuguese Steps
3. Old Wharf Steps
4. St. George’s Cathedral
5. Series of Colonial Monuments

**Expanded Typologies**
6. Old Bus Depot
7. Central Mosque
8. King Jimmy Market
9. Big Market
10. Krio Masonry House

Critical Heritage Corridors

Heritage Trail Development Zone
Old Fourah Bay College’s location in Cline Town presents another potential incubator area to test out policies. Established in 1827, it was the first university in sub-Saharan Africa and remained the only one for over a century. Freetown was known as the “Athens of West Africa,” with scholars from the greater continent coming here for their education. The college outgrew its original location, and following abandonment of the site in 1990, the building suffered deterioration due to fire and heavy rains, resulting in the collapse of most of the structure’s interior. In 2006, the site gained renewed international recognition when it was included on the World Monuments Watch.

Recent proposals envision the rehabilitation of the building as a museum and tourist destination. The International African American Museum, which is currently under construction in Charleston, South Carolina, is considering establishing an outpost museum in Freetown given the its critical role in the history of enslaved peoples; The Old Fourah Bay site is a potential location. To support this future vision for the Old Fourah Bay College, proposed policies for Cline Town take into consideration the broader neighborhood to ensure that the surrounding community benefits from tourism and infrastructure improvements.
In addition to Old Fourah Bay, there is a diversity of heritage in Cline Town, including the National Railway Museum and the Bishop Crowther Memorial Church. It is also the locale of the early Granville Town settlement. Given its waterfront location, the area serves as an active port and has a prominent industrial use, as reinforced by the architectural survey and observations. Cline Town’s waterfront access, its co-location of heritage resources, and its mix of industrial, commercial, and residential uses present both challenges and opportunities for incubating policy.
Policy tools addressing three issues could be tested in the Cline Town node:

- Mobility, envisioned through traffic regulations and infrastructure improvements;
- Land use regulations, such as zoning; and
- Public space activation, making them accessible and amenable to area residents, workers, and visitors alike.

Mobility barriers prevent access and movement around Cline Town. Travel to Cline Town from the CBD and other areas is challenging due to heavy traffic, and industrial truck routes present additional obstacles. From stakeholder interviews, the studio learned that children who attend the school at Bishop Crowther enjoy visiting the Railway Museum to play, but intersections are unsafe, which discourages free movement.
Mobility improvements could include designated lanes, sidewalk improvements, and the addition of traffic lighting, signage, and crosswalks.

In the Cline Town node, Freetown could also test land use regulation tools, as its industrial, commercial, and residential mixed-use character creates tensions within the built environment that are replicated in other parts of the city. The city could appoint a design review board comprised of architects, planners, heritage management professionals, lawyers, and local residents to both establish a set of design guidelines to inform future improvements, as well as review proposed new developments and demolitions within the area. A particular point of focus for these measures would be the corridor of College Road, which serves port and industrial workers and residents alike. Old Fourah Bay College stands prominently at the end of this corridor, and it is key to connecting and supporting heritage resources.
Public open space within Cline Town is limited, and the grounds of Old Fourah Bay College are still used as an informal public gathering space by community members, particularly youth. Any plans for development of the site as a museum should incorporate and support continued use as a public open space.Maintenance of the grounds and provision of public amenities such as public restrooms, wi-fi, and outdoor furniture could facilitate public use of the site. Additionally, lighting up the building and surroundings at night would allow for evening use and additional programming, such as outdoor film screenings.

These proposed policy tools would incur significant infrastructure improvements. Creative financing tools, like bonds and public-private partnerships, would be needed to offset public investment. As demonstrated by the international interest in Old Fourah Bay College and its proposed development as a museum, engaging the diaspora to invest in development around this site is a viable opportunity. Community Bonds can allow for the flow of capital within the local community. The economic potential of the area as a tourist destination can also attract private investments and partnerships. Careful consideration and judicious use of tax-based incentives for larger development investment, which often benefit private developers rather than neighborhood interests, would ensure that the local community is a principal benefactor.
**King Jimmy Market**

King Jimmy is an active market, located at the waterfront of the Central Business District. It is also well known for its history as a market for slave trading. Signs of this former use are still present at the site, such as chains on the stone walls, the old jetty, and the nearby De Ruyter Stone, which is a recognized national monument. The user survey’s data showed this market as one of the most important historic sites in the city, because of its connection to colonial history and slavery. At the same time, responses frequently focused on the condition of the market, and half of all respondents characterized the area as being in “poor” condition. Respondents described concerns over sanitation and dissatisfaction with how the city has maintained this public space. These concerns are echoed by local media and organizers.

**User Survey Responses:**

“You can see that the market is not clean. Look around, this is just landfill. If our produce falls on the ground, we cannot sell it.”

“Here is a historical place and it shouldn’t be left like this.”

“The market has changed in a negative way, there has been no development here at all.”

“We need job opportunities and infrastructural development.”

“Nobody would like to buy food at a dirty place.”

“Even though the city’s mayor, Yvonne Aki Sawyer, has come to our rescue this time around by providing us with sticks, tarpaulin sheets and other items to roof the market, this is just not sustainable. The heavy winds have taken off the tarpaulin from the rickety structure constructed by some youth. This market needs to be taken care of much more seriously.”

Hawa Conteh, Vice Chairlady, King Jimmy market (AYVN Newspaper, Nov. 1, 2019)

“You know we are neighbours with FCC, so quite often than not, they are here to collect dues from us without doing what is expected of them. I’m really disappointed in them.”

Adama Kamara, Vice Chairlady, King Jimmy market (Concord Times, Nov. 1, 2017)

“I have written many times to the city council who are responsible for here. We asked them to come so we can explain, we need tools to do the work. We can gather the men to work, but if they don’t support us, we can’t do it.”

Augustine Komanda, King Jimmy Youth Empowerment (2007)
The current market has a long history of operation in this location, with an established infrastructure for goods to be sold. But the conditions of the market have been declining due to lack of investment from the government or disaster risk. In 2013, a landslide caused the road above the market to collapse, which affected the slabs used by vendors. It took several years for the market to return to usual business. Under the current mayor, the city provided sticks and tarps for the temporary construction of market stalls. This was well-received by the vendors who work there, but they still need a sustainable solution to the lack of proper infrastructure. It is apparent that taxes are being collected from vendors, and traders who bring goods in from surrounding provinces on boat are required to pay landing fees.

The tax revenue generated from the city’s collection could be directed into a fund that would benefit this specific site. The fund could be used to create proper public infrastructure, fronting costs associated with durable vending stalls and ongoing waste collection. Over time the tax fund would be gradually incorporated back into the general coffer for other users in the city.
Fourah Bay Road

Fourah Bay Road is one of the critical corridors where street vending is a vital part of urban life and of neighborhood heritage. As a way of ensuring the sustainability of street vending, and in support of recognizing diverse heritage and empowering diverse actors, it is proposed that the municipal government regularize street vending in situ within this area.

As a policy incubator, Fourah Bay Road could be a testing ground for this approach before its application to busier trading corridors. It could also experiment with how such a policy might dovetail with other preservation and development goals. For example, the survey found that commercial development along Fourah Bay Road is likely causing owners to convert residential properties to include store frontage, or to redevelop them for more commercial space altogether. Almost all historic properties on the street are residential but heavily altered, and non-heritage resources have mixed and commercial uses. One person interviewed said that having more job facilities along this street would decrease pressures on historic properties. It is possible that a street vending policy could decrease certain development pressures while enhancing the value of multiple heritage types.

Regularizing street vending means creating a system for organizing and licensing vendors and creating public-space infrastructure for their activities. By investing in this policy, the city government could increase its tax base through license fees. Such an initiative could take shape equitably on Fourah Bay Road through a partnership between authorities (Freetown City Council) and an existing network of street vendors, the Sierra Leone Traders Union. Organized within a Community Development Corporation, these stakeholders together could develop a model and guidelines for the vending zone.

» Recognize Diverse Heritage

» Empower Diverse Actors
One of the key challenges of regularizing street trade is space. On Fourah Bay Road, heavy traffic and almost non-existent sidewalks leave little public space for installing vendor stalls. Needed public space can be negotiated by layering policy strategies within the incubator area—and there are a number of potential solutions, for example, by changing how transportation works on the street—bus only, or keke only—or regulating when the street is used to account for daytime vending, congestion pricing, etc. Financing for these upgrades could be through Community Lending funds or through granting advertising rights at new stalls to private companies.

Applying setback regulations for new development could also be a way to create needed vendor space while reinforcing the prominence of existing and heritage businesses along the street wall. Overall, when formulating the design of infrastructure and a layered policy approach for street vending, the city government should address the following guiding considerations:

1. Determine the size and orientation of street vendor’s stalls to enhance and not restrict public space
2. Determine the spacing between street vendors and their spatial relationship to Krio House shops, to integrate them in the street vending
3. Consider time in relation to when vendors operate and natural rhythms of street life.
Foulah Town

Foulah Town may be a potential area in which to begin more targeted efforts to acknowledge and invest in diverse heritage within Freetown’s built environment, focusing on both Krio board houses as well as Islamic heritage. While these resources may be prime candidates for inclusion on the MRC’s list of national heritage, an alternate approach of documentation and public engagement may be complementary and equally fruitful, and could work toward improving heritage data infrastructure. One potential way of recognizing diverse heritage is to start a crowd-sourced data collection workshop in line with others that have previously happened in Freetown, documenting and valorizing the existing Krio homes and Islamic heritage sites in the area. While valorizing the city’s Islamic heritage, this project could serve as a preliminary test for how to incorporate heritage data into the city data portal and cadastre. This process could be facilitated through conversations with stakeholders such as the Freetown City Council, the Freetown Islamic Council, and the Monuments and Relics Commission.
Pademba Road, which stretches from Jomo Kenyata Road to Siaka Steven Street, has a rich and varied architectural history. It is home to a variety of Krio board houses, many of which serve dual purposes as residences and storefronts.

As described previously, Krio board houses are one of the most distinctive, yet underrecognized heritage resources in Freetown. Deferred maintenance and deterioration have taken their toll, and many of these buildings are structurally compromised as they function as homes, businesses, and community gathering places. Development pressures are also increasing in the area, and many Krio houses have been replaced with modern concrete structures in recent years.

These factors suggest that Pademba Road could serve as a prime incubator for policies seeking to leverage the Krio board houses as community resources, in ways that recognize underrepresented heritage and empower diverse actors. Vendor collectives and Krio House owner collectives could be established in order to help formalize the relationships between house owners and shopkeepers. Establishing collectives could give owners and operators a larger voice and bargaining power, and could help them in negotiating infrastructure improvements from the Freetown City Council. Collectives could also pursue other goals, such as community-based material sourcing and repair programs or the development of rotating credit programs.

Conservation easements could be used to preserve some of Pademba road’s heritage while allowing residents to improve their living situations. Conservation easements could work in tandem with incentives that reward owners for maintaining or investing in the historic facades of their Krio houses. These rewards traditionally include money or tax relief in exchange for the property rights to the building’s facade or structure. In the context of Freetown, other incentives may be a stronger fit. Such alternate incentives could include access to infrastructure improvement projects like providing plumbing or streetlights or sidewalk repairs in exchange for easement and ongoing maintenance of the facade.
Example of a private Krio board house.

Survey area on Pademba Road. Private Krio board houses depicted in orange and semi-private depicted in green.
Existing.

Phase I: Krio Board House after minor improvements to its facade
After Phase I: Street and Public space with minor improvements

After Phase I Night View: Street and Public space with minor improvements
### APPENDIX I: USER SURVEY

**HERITAGE RESOURCE NAME:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the Heritage Resource</th>
<th>Purpose for being in the area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Public</td>
<td>☐ Work at the heritage site (including workers at/owners of a shop in a board/historic house, museum staff, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Semi-public</td>
<td>☐ Work/business near the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Private</td>
<td>☐ Live nearby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Shopping or other commercial activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Educational or cultural activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Religious activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where are you from?</th>
<th>Other purpose for being in the area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Freetown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Sierra Leone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your age?</th>
<th>How did you arrive at the site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 18-29</td>
<td>☐ Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 30-49</td>
<td>☐ Taxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 50 or Older</td>
<td>☐ Private Car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No response</td>
<td>☐ Keke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Ferry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender?</th>
<th>How did you learn about the site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Male</td>
<td>☐ Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Female</td>
<td>☐ Travel Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
<td>☐ Personal recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you here to</th>
<th>Other way you learned about the site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Visit this site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ In the area for another purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you visiting independently or as part of a group?</th>
<th>Other way you learned about the site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Independently</td>
<td>☐ Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Part of a group</td>
<td>☐ Travel Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Personal recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you think this is an important site to the heritage of Freetown?
- Yes/important or very important
- Maybe/not so important
- No/not important
- Don't know

What is the primary value of this site?
- Historic
- Social
- Aesthetic or environmental
- Other

Other primary value

---

Historical Value or Association
- Colonial history
- Nation building
- Independence
- Civil war
- Ebola crisis
- Place of gathering or social engagement
- Slavery
- Other

Other historical value or association

---

Social Value
- Religious
- Ethnic
- Place of gathering or social engagement
- Recreational
- Other

Other Social Value

---

In what ways could the site be improved?
- Improved access
- Improved services
- Improved facilities
- Improved interpretation
- Other

Other ways the site could be improved

---

What did you learn at the site that you did not know before?

---

What do you think about the current condition of the site?
- It is in good condition
- It is in fair condition
- It is in poor condition

Have you witnessed or experienced any change at the site in the last few years?
- Positive Change
- Negative Change
- BOTH Positive + Negative Change
- No Change
- Don't know

What change did you experience or witness?

---

Are there other places that you think are important to the heritage of Freetown?

---

Additional Notes
ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY

Street Name and Address Number

Resource Name

Resource Type

» Building(s): Describes a structure (or associated clusters of structures) with roof and walls that is fixed (as opposed to those that should be temporary uses)

» Open Space: Such as parks, plazas, and undeveloped sites

» Cemetery: Describes burial site(s) (e.g. planned cemetery; mass grave)

» Natural Feature / Tree: Any natural feature (e.g. cotton tree; forested area)

» Freestanding Public Art: Monuments, statues, fountains, not attached to a building

» Transit Infrastructure: (e.g. highway overpass; bus stop enclosure; train station)

» Archeological: (e.g. earthworks; ruins)

» Other: (e.g. gate, “Portuguese Steps”)

Apparent Heritage Status

» Identifiable as a Heritage Resource—Appears to be a heritage resource—Does it have interpretive signage, a date, or has it been previously identified by a prior heritage survey?

» Possible Heritage Resource—Appears as if it could be a heritage resource—based on studio’s prior research, is this place representative of values (architectural, age, cultural, narrative) studio has have identified?

» Does Not Appear to be a Heritage Resource—Does not look to be a heritage resource

Interpretive Signage

» Is there any signage (e.g. plaque) that interprets the resource with regards to its historical associations?

Public Art

» Any public artwork (e.g. Mural, Monument, Statue, Fountain, etc.) that is affixed to a building.

Condition

» Uninhabitable (for buildings only): collapsed, unfinished, or structures deteriorated beyond habitability

» Poor: resources such as informal structures, and other poorly constructed or maintained structures

» Fair: resources of acceptable maintenance levels

» Good: resources that appear to be well maintained

Use

» Residential: e.g. single family, multi-family, informal housing, etc.

» Commercial (Retail): e.g. shop, restaurant, nightclub, hairdresser, bank, cinema

» Government - e.g. town hall, prison, police station, courthouse, embassy, etc.

» Religious: e.g. church, mosque, shrine (not cemetery)

» Office: Office park or office building

» Industrial: e.g. Factory, warehouse

» Educational (schools, libraries): e.g. schools and libraries

» Cultural: e.g. museum, theatre, monument

» Recreation: e.g. park, swimming pool, stadium, playground, etc.

» Ground Floor Retail + Other: e.g. shop with residential units above

» Agriculture: e.g. urban farming, garden

» Hotel/Hostels: e.g. hotel or hostel

» Public Health: e.g. hospital, health clinic

» Vacant: any building that is clearly vacant, or undeveloped land

» Other: cemeteries, transit infrastructure, parking lot, and any other use that does not fit

Physical Access

» Public: (e.g. parks, plazas, markets, library) Can you freely access it?

» Semi-public: (e.g. restaurants, museums, Cafe, boutique) There is a possibility to exclude

» Private: (e.g. residence) Do you need an invitation, appointment, or to know someone to enter?

Visual Access

» Is the resource visible from the street/public right-of-way?

Number of Stories (only applicable for buildings)

» Count the stories (round up half stories)

Primary Material (only applicable to buildings)

» Most prominent construction material

Religious Association

» Clearly associated with religion

Government Association

» Clearly associated with government body

Ethnic Association

» Any visible association with an ethnic community, especially with the historic ethnic enclaves
## Narrative

» **Ebola Epidemic**: Resources clearly associated with the Ebola Epidemic.

» **Natural Disaster/Environmental Change**: Resources clearly associated with natural disaster or environmental change. This may include an interpreted resource, or area of devastation.

» **Civil War**: Resources clearly associated with the Civil War, either through interpretation, presentation, or otherwise (e.g. damage clearly related to wartime destruction).

» **Post-Independence/Nation Building**: Resources clearly associated with actors or events related to post-independence and nation building (e.g. Siaka Stevens resources).

» **(The Fight For) Independence**: Resources clearly associated with actors or events related to the fight for independence, and achievement of independence (e.g. Chief Bai Bureh mural; monument to independence).

» **Colonialism/The Colonial Past**: Resources directly associated with British colonial rule, or the colonial period (e.g. "Portuguese Steps”; canons from colonial era; Krio houses; Hill Station).

» **Slavery/The Slave Trade/Formerly Enslaved Peoples**: Resources associated specifically with slavery through interpretation, depiction, etc. (e.g. Nova Scotian town, Krio town; mural; Bunce Island ‘factory”).

» **Traditional Societies/Ethnic Identities**: Resources clearly associated with ethnic or native populations.

## Associated with Women

» Is the resource clearly associated with women? (e.g. named after a woman; public art depicting women; interpretive signage referring to women)

## Associated with Youth/Children

» Is the resource clearly associated with children or youth? (e.g. a playground in an open space; public art depicting children)

## Notes

» Any additional comments relevant to the resource that further identify its use or value...

## Photos

» 1–2 photos of the resource and any associated resources such as mural, plaques, interpretive signage, etc.

## TEMPORARY USES SURVEY

### Street name(s) or intersection

**Resource Name**

(e.g. “___” Market; “___” Festival)

### Resource Type

» **Open Air Market**: Non-fixed structures set-up for selling goods, usually along sidewalks and streets; not contained within a built structure

» **Festival**: Parades, street festivals, etc.

» **Public Gathering**: For non-market, non-festival related gatherings (e.g. protests, general gathering areas)

» **Street Lighting/Illumination**: Areas heavily illuminated after dark

» **Coastal Activities**: Activities along the coast like boating, fishing, etc.

» **Other**


PKF. 2012. Sierra Leone Tax Guide.


Tripadvisor. n.d. “King’s Gate.” https://www.tripadvisor.com/LocationPhotoDirectLink-g293833-d480725-i232934618-King_s_Gate-Freetown_Western_Area.html.


IMAGE CREDITS

Unless otherwise listed, images, maps, and drawings within the report are provided courtesy of the Columbia GSAPP and Fourah Bay College students and faculty.


[31] Plan for the City of Freetown. 1815. The Philanthropist.


[37] Mark Stedman, CC BY 2.0. Wikimedia Commons.

[38] Freetown Central Wharf. c. 1910. Wikimedia Commons.


[53] Cotton Tree. c. 1940. Wikimedia Commons.


[70–71] Old Fourah Bay College. c. 1930. Wikimedia Commons.


[121] OSM and whereismytransport GTFS. Route Network by Mode. 2019.
