

Final Outputs – Fact Sheet

16 September 2011



## 1. SHORT DESCRIPTION IN A NUTSHELL

REPAIR explores how abandoned military sites can trigger urban regeneration.

## 2. NAME OF THE PROJECT: Realising the Potential of Abandoned Military Sites as an Integral part of Sustainable Urban Community Regeneration (REPAIR)

Project Start: January 2009

End of the project: June 2011

## 3. PARTNERS

Medway Council, UK

City of Rostock, Germany

Kaunas City Municipality, Lithuania

City of Karlskrona, Sweden

City of Paola - Malta

City of Utrecht represented by the New Dutch Waterline, the Netherlands,

City of Avrig, Romania

City of Opava, Czech Republic

City of Florence, Italy

Two partners Charente Maritime in France and Thessaloniki in Greece decided to step out during implementation.

## 4. WHAT WERE THE CONCRETE CHALLENGES ADDRESSED BY THE PROJECT?

The urban challenges addressed by REPAIR are linked to abandoned or disused military sites or prisons. The withdrawal of the military presence from an urban area often happens suddenly leading to extremely adverse circumstances for the economy and communities affected. Consequently, these military areas often fall into ruins and the local population generally has a negative perception of them. The challenge is to transform these abandoned sites into thriving sources of economic activity, employment and social cohesion.

The challenge for REPAIR is the vital need for the “successful socio-economic re-use of abandoned military heritage sites to harness sustainable urban development”. All REPAIR network partners recognise that the socio-economic re-use of military sites, and therefore the local “Lisbon Agenda” achievements in relation to economic competitiveness, will ultimately be undermined in the medium to long term if sustainable urban development is not placed at the heart of this heritage site regeneration. The network of partners has focused on the development of innovative new local policy, which places sustainable urban development at the heart of regeneration action to achieve the socio-economic re-use of redundant military heritage. This recognises that it is not sufficient solely to focus on achieving local economic competitiveness goals in line with the “Lisbon Agenda”. Instead have emphasized that in the medium to long term such local competitiveness is not sustainable without adhering to the local delivery of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy. The overall outcome of the project is based the on the interrelationship of four pillars taken from the principles laid down in the Gothenburg Agenda. We refer to these 4 Pillars in simple terms as Energy, Preservation, Transport and Local Jobs.

To address this challenge how to “successfully socio-economic re-use of abandoned military heritage sites to harness sustainable urban development”. the Partners had to try to find constructive solutions on how to:

1) Make these sites attractive to the local population and investors but at the same time ensure sustainable development and strong integration of sustainable energy and environmental objectives.

- 2) Regenerate the sites while safeguarding the need to protect cultural and historical heritage. This for instance, put restraints to the degree the regeneration could incorporate energy efficient standards in the built environment.
- 3) Better connected isolated or difficult located sites to the general public transport network. For instance, the prisons and military sites were often located on hills or in areas without direct connection to other city parts. It was especially challenging to get the regeneration project taken up in a larger public transportation plan ensuring the site's overall integration in the city mosaic. In Malta, the project developers managed to address through trying to create synergies with the local transport plan and to create bicycle paths between the various site buildings. Furthermore, Opava has historically problems with roads and heavy transit traffic which causes difficulties especially for pedestrians and bikers.
- 4) Ensure to a greater extent that urban plans on regeneration of brownfield sites are fully corresponding to EU legislation, policy and priorities. In the final recommendations, one common shortcoming in the partnership was the insufficient responsiveness to EU policies and priorities, which also reduces the chances for support of EU funding programmes.
- 5) Prioritise the efforts taking into account the local needs and resources and the overall policy context but still reflecting all 4 REPAIR priority areas in an integrated way. Those Partners that engaged in early consultations of stakeholders and authorities managed to get the full picture and match priorities with needs. This applied to Medway, Malta, Karlskrona in particular applying an efficient Triple Helix cooperation.
- 6) Engage the managing authorities in the regeneration plans and to ensure sufficient funding from Regional Operational Plans
- 7) Motivate investors and public authorities to invest in brownfields rather than greenfields highlighting the advantages of built up environment, access to infrastructure and road connections.

These challenges applied to the partners in various degrees. For instance, the challenge to make the sites attractive to the local location and to attract sufficient interest from government and funding applied to most of them. The recourse to sustainable development taking a systems, holistic approach focusing on needs, resources, BAT with linkage to regional and national sustainable development agendas good be strengthened for most of the Partners.

According to the final evaluation by the Lead Expert, Partners found sustainable transport the most important issue in urban development context followed by sustainable energy, local jobs and heritage preservation. This says something about the need in dire financial times, to focus more on local jobs but in activities contributing to the other 4 pillars.

## 5. WHAT CONCRETE CONCLUSIONS DID YOUR PROJECT ACHIEVE? WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS DO YOU PUT FORWARD?

### Conclusions:

1) Most of the REPAIR partners have large areas of former military and heritage land and individual sites in its territory. Many of these sites are located within the urban envelope and have high heritage significance. These former military sites provide a wonderful opportunity to develop the local community in a sustainable way, providing that examples seen in Europe as used as a guide to follow. The Partners generally recognise the need for using these sites for the betterment of the city and for its inhabitants but it can be difficult to establish prioritise, the political backing and financial support. The project managed to bring forward several outstanding good practices such as "TelecomCity" in Karlskrona, which is a result of the application of the 'Triple Helix' approach to development to achieve a vibrant new economy engaging business, university and the local authority together in a joint venture. Initially 100% funded by public funds now a 100% privately funded venture.

2) Project Partners agreed on the importance of all REPAIR pillars, in line with Lisbon Strategy, and the need for a balanced approach. Sustainable transport was on average perceived as the most important REPAIR pillar to ensure sustainable development in urban environment especially relating to the regeneration of abandoned military sites. This priority might partly be due to its importance at EU level and partly that transport links are essential for access to these sites especially since some of the military sites are not

located in easily accessible city areas. However, the priority on local jobs was on average perceived as the least important, despite of increasing unemployment rates and the fact that projects and developments generating jobs are normally those most positively perceived by the local population.

3) Urban development and spatial planning strategies and policies have to address some gaps in supporting brownfield development. For instance, in Florence, on main barrier is the high cost of land reclamation, due to the strict environmental laws. In Italy is still difficult to apply the concept “who pollutes pays”, so the local authorities have to deal with high cost of reclamation and often this blocks the process. More integrated concepts are needed focusing on job creation and economic development to facilitate the involvement of private developers in the process of regeneration actions also having them cover some of the reclamation expenses. Furthermore, the development of brownfield territories requires significant investments. Other barriers remain the restrictions of using culture heritage objects and territories, and legal grounds (land usage etc.) are the main barriers to use EU structural funds support and to invite private investors to participate in planned activities.

4) The intention of REPAIR to link the revitalisation of former military sites to the broader sustainable urban development is paramount. The intention recognises the need to not maintain former military or heritage sites in isolation. It is essential that the development around such sites be taken into the broader context and the benefits available to all.

5) In most countries funding is not readily available for the development of any site, let alone the ‘brownfield’ sites related to former military locations. The reparation costs are usually so high as to discourage developers that often prefer Greenfield investments. Demonstration of the REPAIR concept could help them to realise that there is value in progressing a development in this way.

#### **Specific recommendations targeting local authorities:**

1) URBACT financed projects and their objectives and outputs must be better reflected and endorsed in a larger policy context, e.g. in local/regional urban planning and strategy documents, especially as a best practices example of how to integrate social, economic, cultural objectives benefiting a larger audience

2) More focus is needed on local jobs and especially in domains and activities supporting sustainable development. This win-win perspective will lead to high recognition and support for URBACT funded projects where tangible results are presented to the local stakeholders.

3) More devotion to national/local barriers to brownfield development to facilitate Triple Helix constellations in planning and investing in regeneration actions.

4) The REPAIR partners recommend that proper attention be given, within the EU institutions, to the impact of EU regulations on the historic environment, especially to ensure that the implications of EU Directives (such as those on Habitats, air quality, water, waste, energy and noise) for the management of heritage buildings and landscapes are well understood

5) The REPAIR partners recommend adoption of an EU strategy for landscape that covers both built and natural heritage sites in the context of environment policy for green infrastructure and the Territorial Agenda.

#### **Specific recommendations for EU action:**

##### **Recommendation 1 - On EU regulation**

The REPAIR partners recommend that proper attention be given, within the EU institutions, to the impact of EU regulations on the historic environment, especially to ensure that the implications of EU Directives (such as those on Habitats, air quality, water, waste, energy and noise) for the management of heritage buildings and landscapes are well understood.

##### **Recommendation 2 – on EU funding programmes**

The REPAIR partners consider that some programmes focusing on innovative local solutions currently give insufficient attention to the special features of such sites, for example, further technical work on energy

efficiency and renewable energy solutions in historic buildings, especially in urban centres, might be supported by EU programmes such as Intelligent Energy Europe and FP7.

### **Recommendation 3 – Joint Programming Initiatives for research**

The REPAIR partners welcome the establishment of a Joint Programming Initiative (JPI) for Cultural Heritage and Global Change: A new Challenge for Europe and call on the Competitiveness Council to ensure that the special issues surrounding regeneration of military heritage sites are recognised in the design of research programmes.

### **Recommendation 4 – EU2020 Flagship for Resource Efficiency / policy for environment**

The REPAIR partners call on the European Commission to develop a EU strategy for landscape that covers both built and natural heritage sites in the context of environment policy for green infrastructure and the Territorial Agenda.

### **Recommendation 5 – energy measures**

The REPAIR partners welcome the Covenant of Mayors (COM) initiative and associated guidance published by the European Commission. They recommend the development of further guidance material on energy efficiency and renewables for COM signatory cities having extensive heritage sites, including those formerly in military use.

### **Recommendation 6 – policy for transport and accessibility**

The REPAIR partners welcome the European Commission's Urban Mobility Action Plan and recommend that, in follow-up activities, greater attention should be given to the special mobility/access issues associated with military heritage sites located within or close to urban areas, especially to encourage access to such sites by multi-modal methods such as walking, cycling and water transport.

### **Recommendation 7 - policy for culture**

The REPAIR partners recommend increased recognition in EU policy for culture that the built cultural heritage is part of the 'cultural infrastructure' of Europe, contributing to economic attractiveness, job opportunities and quality of life

### **Recommendation 8 EU2020 Flagship – An agenda for new skills & jobs**

The REPAIR partners call upon the European institutions to recognise the contribution that can be made to implementation of this agenda through integrated approaches to the regeneration of abandoned military sites.

### **Recommendation 9 - EU2020 Flagship – Innovation Union**

The partners welcome the availability of EU funding to enable exchange of experience on promotion of the 'triple helix' approach and the development of clusters (for example through INTERREG IVC and the FP7 Capacities programme Regions of Knowledge). They recommend that such opportunities are continued and expanded in the proposed Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation Funding.

### **Recommendation 10 - integrated policy for sustainable urban development**

To consolidate broader work on urban sustainability at European level the REPAIR partners recommend that national ministers responsible for urban policy and spatial planning develop a Council Recommendation on Sustainable Urban Development.

## **6. WHAT WAS THE ADDED-VALUE OF BEING INVOLVED IN AN URBACT PROJECT FOR YOUR PARTNERS?**

On the basis of the final evaluation the Partners indicated that the LAP review and case study were perceived as the most important, closely followed by the policy recommendations. All three aspects were perceived as being important, which implicates that the implementation methodology was effective and appreciated.

The most important added value of the URBACT Programme for the REPAIR partners:

1) The need to develop smart LAPs that guide the regeneration activities and integrate the project in the larger urban spatial plans. Most of the Partners did not have concrete LAPs at the onset of the project but these were later developed, taking into account URBACT guidelines and with the exhaustive LAP for Paola as constructive example. The task of analysing and commenting on each others LAPs provided an added value and increased the intensity of cooperation and understanding of each others' urban challenges.

2) The Pilot Regeneration Actions in Le Murate, Florence and Corradino, Paola firstly gave these two sites concrete benefits in terms of enhanced visibility locally and transnationally, greater involvement of managing authorities, the expertise advice of the URBACT Lead Expert. In addition, the rest of the Partnership benefited from the PRAs in experiencing the steps involved in developing an URBACT LAP and Implementation Plan.

3) The Implementation Plans suggesting how the LAPs for the PRAs should be implemented taking into account the REPAIR priorities and the project recommendations. Especially, the advice on steps to be taken to make the site developments and LAPs more in line with EU policies and to be eligible for EU funding was useful.

4) The Local Support Groups were of most importance in those Partner countries where stakeholder consultations are less developed. The state of art Triple Helix stakeholder cooperation in Karlskrona, Medway provided extremely important learning that might not have been exchanged outside the URBACT programme to the same extent.

## **5 QUOTES ARE EXPECTED RELATED TO THE URBACT EXCHANGE AND LEARNING FRAMEWORK AND METHODS**

### **1) QUOTE FROM MEDWAY COUNCIL:**

*"The general implementation methodology worked very well. The flow of knowledge from partner exchanges through the Work groups, followed by understanding of policy, development of Local Action Plans added value in the construction of urban regeneration programs and projects".*

*"As far as Medway is concerned involvement in Project REPAIR has highlighted a number of policy areas of key importance but we have realised that it is just as essential requirement to link the policy (EU, national, or Local) to the actions required. We now understand more clearly that by doing this we will find the key to opening the gates to funding. The general discussions in the REPAIR workgroups led to a much clearer understanding of the wider EU policies and how they are associated to funding programmes"*

### **2) QUOTE FROM AVRIG:**

*"The methodology chosen by REPAIR and the whole set of project activities have brought an added value in the way of understanding the importance of integrating it in the urban development of the abandoned military site. The building a Local Support Group at local level and its activities, which were influenced by the Repair framework, represented for us a new issue and also an opportunity of learning how to build together." "The most interesting idea taken into consideration by the Local Support Group referred to the creation of work places. In the present economic situation, a successful idea is the one presented by our partners in Karlskrona."*

### **3) QUOTE FROM KARLSKRONA:**

*"The main barrier to the project was the lack of willingness to participate in this kind of projects, especially from people who will have to take on additional tasks, on top of the ordinary ones."*

### **4) QUOTE FROM FLORENCE:**

*"The organisation around 4 conceptual pillars has been very interesting and useful, matching with the integrated approach that the Florence has chosen since years in urban regeneration programs. The structure of Local Action Plan and the need to formally constitute a Local Support Group helped very much to clarify the project and to work together with the stakeholders."*

*In terms of to what extent the REPAIR methodology lead to a broader urban development perspective:*

*“In the case of Le Murate certainly the revitalisation of the site has been a vector for the broader development of the district (and of the whole city in consideration of the historical value of the district). From a “black hole” closed that divided the district in two we have brought to the city social dwellings, two new urban squares, meeting points, restaurant, literary café, social and public spaces, improving the quality of life in the district and positively interacting with the architecture faculty.”*

##### **5) QUOTE FROM OPOVA:**

*(Regarding the ULSG).. “discussing the main idea of re-use and the following activities with public can bring the long-term sustainability of the idea and the project itself. Once the project gains support from public it is difficult for politicians to change it. This is the most interesting idea for us...”*

What worked the best in the REPAIR project were the PRAs, the thematic workshops and the mutual selection of REPAIR priorities. These elements can be regarded strong from the initial stage until the end of the project. The best practice exchange was one of the useful elements where Partners implemented some concepts developed by Florence, Karlskrona, Paola, New Dutch Waterline etc. Also in many cities such as Opava, Paola and Florence, the political support was continuously strong. For instance, in Opava, the strong support of local and managing authorities, the solid political link to regional authorities helped them to give more realistic and detailed input in into the project.

What worked less well was the collaboration with the managing authorities. For instance, during the 4 meetings of the LE to the 2 PRA sites it was only possible to meet the managing authorities very shortly twice. In Medway, it was said in the evaluation that the Managing Authority was uninterested in the project and unaware of the URBACT Programme. Also there were very few concrete cases describing how the REPAIR project was reflected in local policies, whether it had any value in terms of sustainable urban practices. In general visibility could have been increased by media coverage etc. Although there was press coverage on the regeneration activities the REPAIR project and the potential role for brownfield developments, especially concerning cultural/historical heritage could have been stronger.

## **7. WHAT ARE THE CONCRETE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPED BY PROJECT PARTNERS?**

Some of the most noteworthy concrete solutions developed during project duration responding to the exchange of experience and the URBACT methodological framework:

1) An evolving idea in Medway, which is linked with revitalising the community based on REPAIR outcome and learning is the adaptation of the Triple Helix to develop a Renewable Energy business in conjunction with Small and Medium Enterprises in the area; the University of Greenwich at Medway and Medway Council. This concept would lead to a new industry which would achieve new jobs and improved conditions for the local economy.

2) In Rostock the recreation of the environment of the Kröpeliner Tor (former city gate) – forms part of major restoration project to be finalised by 2012 strongly linked to local strategy and policy objectives. Shortage of sufficient public funding of this project was smartly addressed through involving volunteers to carry out a large share of the work to recreate the former city gate. The problem of scarce local public funds was addressed through successful efforts to secure support of local inhabitants for signposting etc.

3) One of the most important solutions of the Paola Local Action Plan was the way that all REPAIR priority areas (energy/waste, local jobs, preservation of cultural heritage and sustainable transport) was integrated which lead to spill-over effects and a framework ready to response to new ideas and needs. Also Paola based its LAP on clear strengths such as the excellence in sports and language education and clearly manages to combine commercial and cultural heritage.

5) In Florence, to tackle actors' request for different types of development goals, the city carried out a public stakeholder consultation which lead to a strong social objective with discounted social housing for people who normally cannot afford to live in this area of Florence. The former prison Le Murate has combined functions also include innovation incubators, temporary housing for political dissidents from other parts of hte

world and exhibition places for young artists. Also the House of City provides a link between two parts of the city that have been large disconnected for a long time.

## 8. AVAILABLE OUTPUTS

### 1) Baseline Study

([http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/outputs\\_media/Repair\\_Base\\_Line\\_Study\\_-\\_FINAL\\_211008.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/outputs_media/Repair_Base_Line_Study_-_FINAL_211008.pdf))

The Base Line Study presents an overview of the key drivers and trends prevailing in the EU together with policy development and in addition, highlights existing strategies to promote sustainable integrated urban development from each partner at National, Regional, City and Neighbourhood level. Profiles of each partner provide a clearer understanding of the particular circumstances in their area and the Synthesis illustrates the method used to reach the Four Pillars on which we base our research.

### 2) The Thematic Report on Pillar I on waste management and energy

How to achieve the sustainable re-use of the built heritage and heritage sites, through maximising energy efficiency, the better management of waste production, energy consumption and greater use of renewable energies. The venue for the REPAIR Working Group Pillar 1 meeting was the former military prison – Paola Corradino in Malta. The subject of Renewable Energy and Waste Management was the focus.

### 3) The Thematic Report on Pillar II on conservation of cultural/military heritage

([http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/WG\\_Pillar\\_II\\_Report\\_3\\_.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/WG_Pillar_II_Report_3_.pdf)):

How to develop alternative site uses and techniques, which best secure the long term preservation of the military heritage. The first of four working groups took place in Medway and focused on Preservation – the second of our Four Pillars. The theme of this Pillar is: “How to develop alternative site uses and techniques, which best secure the long term preservation of the military heritage?”

### 4) The Thematic Report on Pillar III on Sustainable Transport

([http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/Medway\\_Report\\_WG\\_Pillar\\_III\\_Transport\\_B.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/Medway_Report_WG_Pillar_III_Transport_B.pdf)):

How to maximise access to military sites by sustainable modes of transport, which minimise car use and decouple transport growth from local GDP growth Transport systems exist to provide social and economic connections, and people quickly take up the opportunities offered by increased mobility and accessibility.

### 5) The Thematic Report on Pillar IV on Local Jobs

([http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/WG4\\_report\\_v2.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/WG4_report_v2.pdf)):

How the socio-economic re-use of the sites can maximise local jobs for local people and therefore sustainable communities and greater social cohesion.

6) **A collection of good practices:** Medway: [Lower lines](#) | Medway: [Drill Hall Library](#) | Medway: [Fort Horsted](#) | Medway: [Historic Dockyard](#) | Medway: [Fort Amherst](#) | Rostock: [Rostock Heath](#) | Rostock : [City Wall](#) | Kaunas: [The Ninth Fort](#) | Karlskrona: [Telecom City \[video\]](#) | Karlskrona: [Bla Port](#) | Paola: [Corradino](#) | Paola: [Zejtun](#) | Paola: [Floriana Park and Ride](#) | New Dutch Waterline: [Utrecht bicycle paths and transport](#) | New Dutch Waterline: [Fort Vechten, multiple uses supporting skills and employment creation](#) | Opava: [Public transport marketing](#) | Avrig: [Energy Master Plan](#) | Florence: [Le Murate](#) | Florence: [The Leopoldine Monastery](#) | Charente: [Inter-urban mobility](#) | Charente: [Rochefort](#) |

### 7) Policy framework “Capitalising on military heritage: EU strategies and local tactics”

([http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/Policy\\_Framework\\_-\\_FINAL\\_220811\\_01.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/Policy_Framework_-_FINAL_220811_01.pdf)):

The Policy Framework constitutes the means by which partners explored the realm of policy pertaining to sustainable redevelopment of former military sites. During the exchanges undertaken in REPAIR an incremental growth in both knowledge of EU policy and was achieved. This knowledge was combined with

the understanding gained through discussion with like-minded colleagues from the partner locations and resulted in an increased understanding of policy at EU, national and local level and why it is important.

### **8) Policy Recommendations**

([http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/outputs\\_media/EU\\_Recommendations\\_FINAL.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/outputs_media/EU_Recommendations_FINAL.pdf)):

In the course of their work the REPAIR partners identified both supportive EU measures and some policy gaps and barriers to effective local action. They are now in a position to suggest some adjustments to the 'EU toolkit'. In making these recommendations it is the collective aim of partners' to achieve much broader recognition of the scope to re-use abandoned military sites – and heritage assets more generally – to achieve sustainable urban development. Some modest changes at EU level could help to provide cities with a more consistent and supportive context for local efforts, in turn enabling them to play their part in delivery of the ambitious goals set out in EU2020.

### **9) Synthesis of Local Action Plans:**

#### **10) Local Action Plan Avrig**

([http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/LAP\\_Avrig\\_01.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/LAP_Avrig_01.pdf))

#### **11) Local Action Plan Florence**

[http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/LAP\\_Avrig\\_01.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/LAP_Avrig_01.pdf))

#### **12) Local Action Plan Malta**

#### **13) Local Action Plan Opava**

#### **14) Local Action Plan New Dutch Waterline**

#### **15) Local Action Plan Karlskrona**

[http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/REPAIR\\_LAP\\_Karlskrona\\_for\\_publication\\_FINAL\\_02.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/REPAIR_LAP_Karlskrona_for_publication_FINAL_02.pdf))

#### **16) Local Action Plan Kaunas**

[http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/Kaunas\\_REPAIR\\_LAP\\_FINAL.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/Kaunas_REPAIR_LAP_FINAL.pdf))

#### **17) Local Action Plan Rostock**

([http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/Kaunas\\_REPAIR\\_LAP\\_FINAL.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/Kaunas_REPAIR_LAP_FINAL.pdf))

#### **18) Local Action Plan Medway**

([http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/REPAIR\\_LAP\\_Medway\\_080611\\_02.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/REPAIR_LAP_Medway_080611_02.pdf))

#### **19) PRA Thematic Report Paola**

[http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/Paola\\_URBACT\\_REPAIR\\_Thematic\\_Report\\_PRA\\_Paola\\_REVISED\\_260511.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/Paola_URBACT_REPAIR_Thematic_Report_PRA_Paola_REVISED_260511.pdf))

The Thematic Reports represents one of the final phases of the REPAIR project. It presents all the previous PRA steps, i.e. LAP analysis, PRA site visits with consultations with Managing authorities, PRA project managers, relevant local authorities and members of the ULSG and strategic advice. The Thematic Report aims at providing all the PRA components in a structured order to allow PRA site to increase access to EU funding programmes, to have LAP and local activities better anchored in regional urban development strategies and to ensure a bottom-up approach in all stages of the project development.

#### **20) PRA Thematic Report Florence**

[http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/1\\_URBACT\\_REPAIR\\_Thematic\\_Report\\_PRA\\_Florence\\_10\\_May\\_2011revised\\_260511vj.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/1_URBACT_REPAIR_Thematic_Report_PRA_Florence_10_May_2011revised_260511vj.pdf))

#### **21) Pilot Regeneration Actions Funding Annex**

#### **22) Final conference report**

([http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/REPAIR\\_Final\\_Conference\\_Report.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/REPAIR_Final_Conference_Report.pdf)): The Final Dissemination Event was held in Avrig and Sibiu, Romania. The event was organized over two days in mid June 2011.

**23) REPAIR hand-outs**

[http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/Repair\\_Handout\\_-\\_271108.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/Repair_Handout_-_271108.pdf)

A brochure, poster and project card were created to increase the media outreach and visibility.

**24: Article by Paulius Kulikauskas, “More People in Prison”**

([http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents\\_media/House\\_of\\_the\\_City\\_combined\\_01.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/REPAIR/documents_media/House_of_the_City_combined_01.pdf))

URBACT II

**URBACT** is a European exchange and learning programme promoting sustainable urban development.

It enables cities to work together to develop solutions to major urban challenges, reaffirming the key role they play in facing increasingly complex societal challenges. It helps them to develop pragmatic solutions that are new and sustainable, and that integrate economic, social and environmental dimensions. It enables cities to share good practices and lessons learned with all professionals involved in urban policy throughout Europe. URBACT is 255 cities, 29 countries, and 5,000 active participants

[www.urbact.eu/project](http://www.urbact.eu/project)

