

REPAIR PILLAR III WORKING GROUP – UTRECHT 24-25 SEPT 2009

Thurs 23rd

0900 Welcome from Peter, NDW

Ref to Berlin as exemplary on sustainable transport – ‘Zitadelle is the only military heritage site in Europe with its own metro station’.

0915 Medway recap on WG II

The first WG was in May in Medway. The reports are being finalised. Expect a good summary during October. Aim is to turn around the results of this WG in the same time frame. Pre Xmas expect to start work on the LAPs. How to make former military heritage sites accessible to the general public, how get the community involved. On sustainable transport – what to do as a collective group to influence Europe and bring lessons of Europe to our own areas.

0930 Views from Thematic Experts on getting the expected outcomes of the meeting *(not all remarks recorded)*

Paulius

Reports from the WGs should be short, max 15 pages, with presentations etc in annexes. Not too academic. He has little time to produce them. Need to agree format and structure. Want to have authentic information in the report – partners’ own inputs.

Proposed report structure :

Problems analysis

EU policy & programmes

Known experience eg other cities

Experiences of REPAIR partners

Conclusions of WG debates. Emerging policy recommendations.

Thematic action plans of REPAIR partners – progress report.

Hen

Highlighted issues of transferability of practice from one country to another.

Conditions to consider – funding, subsidies, regulations, politics, ownership, spatial structure... etc. Different situations – isolated vs embedded sites; state of development of the site/fortress itself – etc etc

What’s happening with the buddy system within the project ? Any scope for direct transferability ?

Possible to construct a matrix of ‘best practices’ vs interested partners.

Liz

Briefing from Paulius for this workshop was mainly from the perspective of site managers. Important not to lose sight of the broader regeneration agenda. The URBACT LAP arising from this project will not necessarily be just for a particular site. There is supposed to be consideration of the role of military heritage in sustainable development of the whole urban area.

Heritage sites have many possible re-uses but they often have problems of access in common (walls, moats, location separate from the main urban area etc...). Questions of access to sites by the local community (especially when the site has a community re-use eg housing) and connection of heritage sites to the town as a whole need to be considered – not just the transport of visitors to sites which are tourist attractions.

Much to learn from Utrecht and NDW but partners should expect to learn lots from other partners too.

Clarification on recommendations. There is a commitment in the project to make recommendations for EU level. The recommendations could be targeted either at the EU institutions (Commission, Parliament, Committee of the Regions etc) or at national urban ministers within the framework of their informal ministerial meetings. Could make links to the Leipzig Charter.

VJ circulated a 'fact sheet' to collect contextual information on transport policy and measures from each partner. The thematic experts saw a draft and made inputs but did not see the final version, the individual answers or a summary of the key findings. There is a need for a short written report from Vincent.

LM concern about getting adequate information on the national context in each partner's country. In the presentations the focus is very local, except maybe for mentions of the use of Structural Funds.

Explanation of the procedure for the parallel workshops after lunch. Each workshop was asked to identify & justify 3 'good practices' of interest to them (intention to use this to start on the 'buddy system'.) (The original plan was for these to be reported during dinner by the LE.)

The plan for Friday 24th – Opportunities to shape EU level recommendations. Reminder that Mark Degenkamp's presentation was expected to explain how European cities have been doing this for real through Eurocities network and say why it's important. 'If he doesn't explain this please ask him'. The experts would propose 3 recommendations for EU level for discussion by partners.

Have the partners who are not coming sent info to Vincent ??

No apparent link to Managing Authorities in the preparatory material. Does Utrecht have access to West Netherlands Operational programme ? Management of this programme is devolved to urban level so there should be lessons for other partners.

LM presentation on opportunities for making policy recommendations

One of the objectives for this meeting is to develop and agree policy recommendations relating to sustainable transport.

The terms of the project require us to come up with 2 recommendations specifically for the EU level. However, let's not forget that we have opportunities to make recommendations appropriate to other levels of govt also. So, starting from the bottom up :

(1) the local level

In line with the main objective of the URBACT programme – to improve the effectiveness of urban development policies by means of exchange and cooperation mainly between urban local authorities – we can come up with recommendations for our own organisations. You will know best which technical colleagues or local politicians to target and how to reach them.

An important point for all EU-funded projects like REPAIR – these projects should not be isolated from the main business of the partner organisations because the whole point of the exchange is to use the lessons learned from elsewhere to support local delivery.

(2) regional level

You may want to influence the policies of your elected regional govt if you have one, and/or the regional development agency, for eg to ensure that the special problems of accessibility and transport associated with military sites are highlighted in regional transport plans.

It's important to make a connection to the Operational Programmes of Structural Funds, most of which are managed at regional level – so you need to be targeting your Managing Authorities.

The European Commission would like to see urban measures in SFs being directly managed by cities – national govts have mostly not allowed for this in the 2007-13 programmes.

How involved were the REPAIR partners in programming ? And do you have any involvement now with your regional level Managing Authorities ?

How can you help to ensure that the available ERDF and ESF budgets in your regions are spent on improving transport connections to heritage sites ?

(3) National level

You probably need to be thinking about national urban policy and national transport strategies and targeting appropriate civil servants in national ministries. In the UK, at least, the situation for military heritage is complicated by the fact that we have a separate ministry dealing with cultural heritage (DCMS) and a govt agency – English

Heritage – responsible for heritage protection. How can we ensure that the special issues of access and transport relating to military sites don't fall through the net ?

(4) EU level

Our main focus. Here there's another complication in that our focus need to be on transport issues within urban areas but urban issues are not an EU competence. So in fact we need to distinguish between the activities of national ministers who come together at European level at least every 6 months in informal ministerial meetings (eg chance here to influence the Leipzig Charter which is an inter-governmental project – not EU) and the activities of the EU institutions – the Parliament, Council, Commission, COR, Economic & Social Committee. (ECOSOC)

Turning to the briefing note on European transport policy – we need to come up with 2 recommendations on urban mobility relevant for EU policy, and a few opportunities are flagged up

Just mention 3 :

(i) Transport in the EU Sustainable Development Strategy review – an ECOSOC Opinion is in preparation. Could find out who the rapporteur is and lobby for inclusion of some points – maybe on social inclusion and economic aspects.

(ii) Overall EU transport policy – a revised White Paper is in preparation. There has already been lots of consultation but there will be a high level stakeholder conference in late November. Could lobby eg to raise the profile of urban transport but unlikely to get specific mention of military heritage in here.

(iii) Best chance – Commission's Action Plan on Urban Mobility was due to be published yesterday. Need to check what it says – but in the meantime you can see there is a lobby for local authorities to be asked to prepare Sustainable Urban Transport Plans. What's your view on this ? Of maybe you like the ideas of Green Zones ? A bit like Home Zones – as proposed by the European Parliament.

It would be good to know whether REPAIR partners have been involved in discussions on EU policy for urban mobility eg via networks like Eurocities or POLIS – and whether military heritage ever gets mentioned.

Also, what use you are making of EU funds – not only Structural Funds but also the CIVITAS programme on clean urban transport. Are these funds being used to solve problems like neighbourhood severance associated with military sites ?

You might have recommendations on what CIVITAS can pay for.

So in trying to make recommendations for the EU level we may need to come back to the local level again and say something about the need for people working on military heritage in urban municipalities or other organisations to be informed about EU policy in their field and associated legislation and funding and to make sure that they maximise the available opportunities.

Discussion

Paulius – practices inform policy. What obstacles or shortcomings in policy ? Recommendations should be aimed at modifying policy so it is more supportive of taking actions on the ground. Making policy recommendations takes time. Meanwhile we need to get on with Local Action Plans. LAPs can be fitted into existing policy.

ASCEND included some policy recs which could be re-visited. There are also some in the baseline study.

Peter said ASCEND helped NDW to get started. What arrangements/political support works to get these sites regenerated eg NDW is successful because it is a national project with political support.

0950 State of play. Presentation of transport fact sheet - Vincent

Responses patchy. 7 of 11 returned. Need all for comparison. Some partners used an earlier version of the form. Has prepared a spreadsheet containing the answers to all the questions. General points in summary :

- no specific transport policy just relating to military sites
- common challenges – not much evidence
- getting technical specialists involved in REPAIR is important. In Medway much difficulty in getting people to give up their time

6 partners have a sustainable transport policy

main challenges range from dispersed population & poor access to public transport to difficult location of sites.

3 partners have a climate change strategy – Florence, Medway, Avrig (*& we now know that Karlskrona does too*) Varying degrees of success.

Discussion

Charente-Maritime is in charge of local transport for the whole Department. Michel is the transport director.

Mayor of Avrig has no difficulty getting people to respond to requests for info.

No response to Vincent from Rostock. Difficult situation – Andreas is working for a different department.

Importance of key individuals in getting things done.

Need to fill in the missing information. What link is there between local transport strategies and the national and EU levels ?

1015 Presentations from external NL experts

Martin Vastenhout – Mobility management at Fort Vechten

The Dutch state forestry service is currently responsible for the fort. As a state protected site the fort has strict conditions of use and fixed objectives. Since 1998 management has been through a public private partnership. A not for profit organisation with agreed goals, but there is a need for the fort to pay its way. Focus on attracting visitors for public and private events.(Many examples given.) There can be about 4000 visitors in a weekend for public events like ‘Designers in Wood’. Need for visitor management. Visitor management model described – separating visitors attending public events & private functions, focusing on the region, encouraging alternative means of transport.

To increase car access the managers pay local neighbours for the temporary use of fields as car parks. Have identified a need for 200 additional car park spaces. With this the fort could be opened up to 60-70,000 visitors a year – about 3 times the current number.

Innovation – a mobile visitors’ centre towed by Landrover,

Observations/questions:

Use of different EU funds – LEADER, RDP, SFs

No membership scheme for local people to allow informal access outside the public events ? How much are the entry charges ? Disabled access ?

City of Utrecht - Traffic & transport policy and sustainability – Ruud Diteweg

How urban development is connected to urban mobility measures (and some regional & national level links) and links to policy for the fortresses. Eg how to make the fortresses accessible by bike.

Note - this presentation stuck closely to the slides. A summary can be made using the powerpoint.

Utrecht is a typical cycling city. The city is in Utrecht Province. The NL state provides the transport planning framework but the region is responsible for bike policy.

City population is about 300,000 and growing. New development on the west side of the city will increase the population to about 350,000. (Province about 550,000.) Young city. Dynamic local economy with more than 205,000 jobs. Offices, services, university. Growing IT sector. Generates traffic, especially commuting in rush hours.

Main plan for the future – Planning 2020 for the Utrecht region – a package to keep the whole region accessible. *Key features – as on powerpoint slides.*

Growing distances as the city expands make it difficult to keep the modal share for bikes – is currently more than 30%. Various measures eg to stimulate use of electric bikes.

Such measures not only help to keep the city accessible. They are relevant for the air quality plan which will be adopted November 2009.

Examples of measures – on slides:

- the electric beer boat – freight delivery of beer etc to cafes by canal. – will be in operation in 2010. (Compare Berlin use of electric boat for visitors to nature sites.).
- Cargo hopper train. Heavy freight HGVs are banned from the city. Hard to find a solution for delivering goods to town centre shops.

Bike policy – additional details:

Need to build a physical network to persuade people to use bikes. The bike network has a 500m mesh.

Slides outline measures to make a fortress accessible by bike. Add eg separation of bikes and cars. Numerous traffic lights in Utrecht – with priority to bikes – are a disincentive to car use. Good, secure bike parking, especially at destinations.

Most visitors from outside the city come by train. The fortresses are far from the station. Currently stimulating bike rental at suburban stations using eg auto chip cards. Bike maps are especially needed by visitors + good info signs along the routes.

LM observations/questions

EU policy for urban mobility calls for city strategies which tackle both freight and passenger transport in an integrated way.

Does the city have strategies for climate protection/adaptation and noise ?

No delivery of freight by bike ? (eg grocery deliveries to customers ?)

Panel Discussion

Provincial policy to make the visitor centre at Fort Vechten accessible causes problems for the fortress – how to solve the parking problems.

Medway comment on the various different strategies there - air quality, noise pollution, community strategy etc, all with different timescales.

NL has more than 20 years experience of making plans for traffic and transport. It is only recently that EC has made additional rules on air quality. In last 2-3 years every

big city in EU has been working on air quality policy documents. Utrecht has integrated the traffic and transport plan into the air quality plan. For better air quality you need lots of transport measures. But some are short term, others long term.

Need to bring together top down and bottom up approaches.

Malta needs to find a policy which no-one disagrees with. There are conflicts about land use, especially competition for space. Eg for car parking – surroundings are all protected for nature or archaeology. REPAIR project could make a recommendation about mediation.

Choosing to develop large scale activity means that cars are increasingly expected – can't ignore this even if the place is very 'sustainable'.

EIA obligation is a legal requirement. (Development plans have to have environmental impact assessment.)

In NL conflict is part of the rationale for a partnership approach to preparation of the sustainable transport plan.

For REPAIR Fort Vechten is a good example of 'clashes between pillars'. Preservation, access, economic use. An NGO is expected to maintain the buildings and to keep the site open for public access. Parking is essential if the fort is to generate the income level needed to meet the costs

Issue about public procurement when establishing management of Fort Vechten – short term tender for a price vs long term preservation etc goals for the fortress. The users have only a 2 year lease. This is 'an unfair formula'.

Fort Vechten is a successful case but one big problem remains. What happens to the fort if this isn't sorted ?

[Walking tour]

13.15 Parallel working groups to report partners' own experiences

Liz – Medway, Florence

Medway (Vincent)

Pop 252,000. Historic town on main road from Europe. Incorporation – combination of 5 smaller towns into one UA with all responsibilities of a city authority. Stroud, Rochester, Chatham, Gillingham and smaller villages. Set within wider growth area – Thames gateway. Major redevelopment area, especially within Chatham and Rochester waterfront. 85m Euro spent on remediation work of riverside – polluted brownfield site. Medway had to get outside funding – via Thames Gateway from central govt. Now need to use the land. Need 5 years while the land settles. Now planning to use.

Diversity – largest urban area in SE outside London. Multicultural.

Politics – brief points on local govt in UK. People don't always know which council functions are statutory and which voluntary.

181,000 voters. Elections every 4 years. 55 councillors in 22 wards. Conservative majority. Lab 10, Lib 8 Indep 3.

Challenges – legal requirement to produce a Local Transport Plan. Plan 3 is in prep. Plans 1 and 2 were about delivering transport. LTP 3 will be influenced by EU legislation.

- (1) demand for transport is increasing – can't meet it due to space and finance
- (2) Regulations (not covered in this presentation)
- (3) Funding – the biggest problem. Can only raise money from council tax. Medway has lowest in the country so there is a cap on central govt extras. (?)
- (4) Attitude (of drivers ?)

Some things have worked.

- Buses – some investment in new buses and services. Operators have decided profitable routes and fares. People notice improvements – the new buses are appreciated.
- Bus lanes – but impossible to administer properly because there is so much redevelopment going on
- Have tried car-sharing schemes, but very small
- Medway Mobility – weekly bus service for disabled, frail elderly – 'on demand'.
- Tax-free cycle scheme for Medway employees but very small scale
- Small projects on behavioural change
- Cycle routes – but small compared with elsewhere in Europe
- Traffic management – introduction of Medway tunnel has diverted traffic to avoid the town centre and increased the access for buses
- urban traffic management system – cameras identify vehicle registrations etc

What now ?

LTP3 – production of a LTP is a legal requirement for every local authority outside London. Local Transport Act 2000, amended 2008. Long term transport strategy plus short term implementation plans. DOT asks all LAs to consider contribution to national goals. Latest plan must reflect EU goals too. Supporting economic growth, climate protection, equal opps, safety, health, quality of life... This is the first time the Medway towns have been confronted by these goals. The transport team have started genuine consultation with local people. Need to change attitudes and find funding. A good LTP is a good basis for seeking funding.

Medway wants a new river crossing – a bridge. Need to decide where.

Waterways – we don't use the river at all. It was used in the past. Not now.

LM Observations

Much of the basic material about the local authority (eg pop, political control) should have been in the baseline study, so maybe no need to repeat it.

No detail on the various schemes & projects - eg are they all initiatives of Medway Council ? any ERDF funding ?

Any use of EU tools eg does Medway participate in European Mobility Week and./or the Car Free Day ?

City car clubs ? Green Travel Plans ? (*There are ERDF funded projects in SE on Green Travel Plans.*)

No mention of transport issues relating specifically to the regeneration of the military heritage sites, notably Chatham Docks. Eg during the project meeting in Chatham partners observed obvious lack of public transport, walking and cycling routes between Chatham Docks and the nearest town centre, railway station etc. Need for pedestrian routes and foot ferries to connect to the main waterfront regeneration site etc.

Walking doesn't feature in Medway transport planning ?

Florence

Case of the former state penitentiary which is being transformed (*or already completed ?*) to provide about 80 social housing units

Possibility to regenerate several old military sites – the city now doesn't know what to do with these complexes.

Transport in Italy – regional and local levels operate within state guidelines. PIT – the main regional planning Act – makes some direct reference to historic areas in cities. There is no regional cycle network but a very good regional rail network. The Act provides only general principles for the other transport modes. The province (between region and city) also has some role.

Florence has 2 urban bus companies ('societies') and a tramway society which includes external partners.

The main planning act for the city is the structural plan – for the metropolitan area of about 1m pop. Plans include the General Urban Traffic Plan and Bicycle Trails Plan. Main pillar is integration of rail, bus, tram, bike vs cars.

There are lots of ways to access the historic centre without using private cars, but public transport does not work very well. – a vicious circle. Hard to break the circle. There is still excess car use.

Fortress example – post war expo site now owned by the city council. It has maximum accessibility via all modes and is very near the central station.

All except one of the old military sites are in the city centre and on public transport routes. There are 13 sites. All but 2 are the property of the state. One has been sold to private developers but without city council involvement – the inhabitants protested against the development and blocked the process.

The prison has been owned by the city since 1990. Redevelopment for dwellings, new urban squares and commercial spaces. Tricky demolition. The new restored complex – ground floor is social/communal uses and the upper floors social housing. Design includes maximum permeability of the ground floor – for social spaces. Accessibility is nearly maximum. Bus, electric bus, bikes, 3 public car parks close by for 1000 cars - this was up front in the project.

Mobility is generally good in Florence. The weakest point is participation of citizens who no longer trust the city council or local public transport. It is difficult to involve them in projects.

When the city starts to consider the military sites as a system mobility will not be the biggest problem. At present there are different projects and there is no one single project (or overall vision/strategy) for all the sites.

Good practices/lessons identified by this group

Note – Participants wrote on post-its and there was afterwards a summary on a flip chart sheet – maybe you have this ?

General points made in plenary discussion

Critical importance of location of the sites.

Typical challenges include lack of existing infrastructure, parking, ownership of the sites (and sometimes even ownership of the roads/access).

Good practice points include:

- Multimodality – as used in Utrecht and Charente Maritime. Up to 6 modes of access to one place. Also door to door solutions – multimodality in one trip (ie using several different modes to reach a site – but within an overall integrated transport system which facilitates use of different means of transport).
- Communicate/market the solutions to users – to raise awareness of alternatives to private cars. Target both citizens and the existing users of the military sites (and of other tourism destinations).
- Promote the use of electric forms of transport.
- Use a combination of policy tools (sticks & carrots) – as illustrated in Utrecht.

- Use of the Dutch forts as part of a park and ride system.

Friday 24th at Fort de Gagel

Programme changed to insert report of progress on Local Action Plan in Utrecht at start of the day (Anton)

NDW is 85km long and 2.5km wide. National policy for the waterline is 'maintenance through redevelopment'. It must pay its own way for structural maintenance etc. Available national money is channelled through regional (provincial) policy.

NDW has 8 fortresses close to Utrecht, each with its own reconstruction plan. Together they are looking for 'a new destination'. Four have already been redeveloped. The forts are close to the city edge (because of urban expansion).

Local Policy Plan 1997 'from secret to public domain'. The city council bought the forts and called for an action plan for the redevelopment of each fortress covering restoration, increased access, a social action plan etc. Many stakeholders are involved – eg different government level, ministries.

*** Not clear whether there is a NL national ministry or agency dealing with built heritage in general – not just with the Forts. (ie equivalent of DCMS & English heritage)*

In Spring 2009 there was a study on the future use of Fort de Gagel. The intermediate report in July 2009 resulted in options for redevelopment. There are limitations on development around the fort. Much is green recreation space. There will be no urban expansion north of the ring road on the edge of Utrecht. There is scope to have a large green recreation area with the forts within it. So there will be an integrated plan for the whole area – green space + forts – a green lung for the city. However, the 4 lane ring road is a big barrier. This will get worse because the road is due to be widened. The city council is negotiating with regional and national authorities. When the road is widened they must build bridges and tunnels to overcome severance. There has been an ideas competition for the road crossing.

City of Utrecht would like Fort de Gagel to be a gateway from the city to the nature park – pulling in people from Overvecht – a deprived area on the other side of the ring road. This is one of 40 most deprived/problem areas in NL. Major investment is expected. The high rise apartment buildings will be demolished and replaced by low level dwellings. Social problems also need to be dealt with. Eg Dutch language teaching is obligatory for migrants joining their families here. Dutch classes are a condition of receiving benefits and important to increase the chances of getting work.

Options for redevelopment include an info centre, café, bike & canoe rental, quiet study centre, sustainable SMEs..... Residents objected to some other scenarios eg a proposal for a music venue. The info centre might cover environment, urban

agriculture, heritage. There is a need for commercial uses to make it viable. Existing tenants include a management consultant who wants to change to a 'self-reflection company'.

The number of options was narrowed from 8 or 9 to 3, then one. The green/sustainability option was chosen. A key feature of this is urban agriculture along permaculture principles. They want the local community to get involved in growing food close to the city. They want a national pilot scheme with experimental gardens in Overvecht. The city has applied to national government for support of the 1st plan. An answer is expected in 2-3 weeks.

*** What happened ??*

Current tenants in Overvecht will be temporarily displaced during the redevelopment. Hope this will be complete by 2012.

The Local Action Plan refers to the 4 pillars of REPAIR.

Energy – the managers of the fort will try to develop insulation etc (using sustainable construction approaches). The urban agriculture pilot will have a positive impact upon the whole energy situation in Utrecht.

Preservation – tenants of the fort will finance preservation of the site. This is a National Monument. Proven techniques will be used for work on heritage buildings.

Transport – they will maximise access by sustainable modes. Must overcome the road barrier. The plan is to put the road in a tunnel. The start of the tunnel will be about 100m to the west of the fort (not too close). There will be a ground level crossing, including an aqueduct, for public access, so people can walk, cycle or canoe. It will be necessary to restore and reactivate at least one lock. Trying to educate national govt etc so that they will allow an aqueduct to connect to the moat of the fort.

Jobs – there will be jobs in construction during the regeneration and some local jobs in the final uses.

Redevelopment of the NDW is currently popular with politicians. Showcasing. Millions of Euros are available for the redevelopment of Overvecht. Anton is cooperating with the development project to bring the two together – ie redevelopment of the deprived urban area + the green lung based around the forts.

Under the Crisis Act to be adopted by the NL government to deal with the financial crisis, the regions will invest in large infrastructure projects to boost the economy. Much lobbying is going on to take advantage of this and turn it to the advantage of the NDW project. Anton lobbies the Aldermen of the City of Utrecht. Peter takes care of lobbying strategy directed towards NL ministers. (Peter is responsible for all 50 forts and the landscape between.)

Also using the international opportunities and lessons from practice elsewhere.

Lessons from this workshop

Integration of the local redevelopment of the heritage site(s) with the local urban context.

Creative links between social regeneration and the NDW agenda. (described as 'piggy-backing')

Green landscape + heritage solution.

Use of water transport for both freight and people.

Clever use of lobbying – taking advantage of current mainstream initiatives and the political context.

Use of lessons from elsewhere eg Belgium, Paris.

The URBACT funding is being used to subsidise the local action plan activity.

Process lessons from the formulation of the NDW/Utrecht LAP

Involvement of a wide range of stakeholders. Make a wide inventory at the beginning of the process and involve them from the start. Communicate with them eg have a newsletter.

Development of the options process started with the 'expert' stakeholders who worked on a task given to them by the municipality – clear requirements.

Be very specific about the assignments give to the ULSG by the local authority. What is your responsibility and what can you deliver ?

Effective negotiation between local, regional and national authorities on the highway issues.

Establishment of a cross-departmental project team inside the municipality. Utrecht has a task group which meets monthly. Anton has hierarchy above but a personal direct line to the relevant alderman.

Discussion *(not a complete record)*

Medway asked could more be done about jobs. How to raise the profile of social cohesion. What about upskilling of locals during the regeneration – possible apprenticeships with contractors, tourism training, placements ?

Urban mobility in EU policies – presentation by Mark Degenkamp

Mark is the representative from Utrecht on the Eurocities Mobility Forum. The forum is a way to share knowledge and try to influence EU policy. A tight connection to the European Commission for local politicians.

EU transport policy

2 main parts – the White Paper on transport & the TEN-T policy. *Summary of the main points is on the slides*

4 main topics in the White Paper. Item 3 – placing users at the heart of transport policy – this was not in the policy before. It is relevant for the local level. Covers things like safety, what do the users pay, are they involved in planning and the effects of traffic on local life.

At the start of the White Paper revision process in 2009 there was a public consultation – EC asked some questions on what should be part of the revised White Paper. Main points of *Eurocities response – on the slide*. Increasing urban population and volume of transport through cities means cities should have an important place in transport policy. Up to now policy has been mainly on eg the main highways. Need to increase the urban profile. The EU must recognise the role of city government, especially in influencing citizens to use public transport etc. Cities have a role in policy implementation. Shift to more sustainable modes is still top issue. Get car users to use public transport or walk/cycle. With the remaining necessary car travel make it as clean as possible. Lots of talk about electric cars. They are the solution for the environment but not necessarily ideal for ‘accessibility’. Eurocities also wants more focus on safety and more emphasis on freight logistics at local level.

Cities want to integrate accessibility with other things, especially climate change.

Transport doesn’t end at the edge of the city or region, so we need governmental integration too.

TEN-T – this includes waterways and short sea shipping. Much is about freight, and for passengers high speed trains. Long distance rather than commuting. Not important for accessibility to a site like Fort de Gevel – is about passing cities rather than going into them. But thanks to Eurocities connections into cities are now being included in the TEN-T policy.

Local mobility – Ref to the 2007 Green Paper on Urban Mobility and Expected Action Plan. Still not there – political reasons for the delay. The Green paper was just to open the debate

What Eurocities wants to see in the Action Plan : *see the slides*

Wants the EC to encourage cities to develop an Urban Mobility Plan. The EC could link this to EU funding. If a city has no urban mobility plan then no funding for mobility projects. Unlikely that the EC Action Plan will be this heavy. But expect to see some statement to the effect that a city’s chances to get big EU money will be

increased if they have a mobility plan in place and can show how a particular project will contribute to delivery of the plan. There will be initiatives on green propulsion. Want to overcome barriers eg to the establishment of low emission zones.

All Member States have their own schemes and own car registration systems. They are not connected. It is hard to enforce rules for foreign vehicles. The EU can play a role on standards and cross border enforcement.

Eurocities also asked the EU for a large campaign to influence travel behaviour. More could be done with initiatives like the Car Free Day.

The European Parliament have produced their own Action Plan - see slide

They call for eg more R&D, better planning and scheduling of transport to improve integration of travel modes, incentives for use of sustainable mobility and treatment of urban transport as an 'industry' in Lisbon strategy and EU Recovery Plan.

The EU sets the framework and can help by providing funding for more sustainable transport projects. The principle of subsidiarity is always important. The EU doesn't decide what we must do in cities but should help us as much as possible.

Link with REPAIR

The EU has no specific policy on transport aspects of redeveloping abandoned military sites. The key document will be the Action Plan on urban Mobility. The White Paper is at too high a level. Things you can use in REPAIR will be in the Action Plan – this is the only 'local level' plan and the key focus is on an integrated approach – what REPAIR is looking for too.

What's missing from EU urban mobility policy ? Links to places outside the city will not be covered in the urban mobility action plan. No rural/urban connection. Some cities have large rural areas within their admin boundaries.

*** to influence this partners would have to lobby national ministers for urban policy & spatial planning in the context of the Territorial Agenda*

Partners could also focus on mobility outside rush hours, recreational mobility etc

Could make recommendations for city-regional level eg REPAIR partners could suggest that the EC should encourage cities to address the level of the city region when preparing their local urban mobility plans.

Questions/discussion points

City of Utrecht already has a local plan for sustainable mobility

Lots of EU funding is available for R&D and soft measures but not for local infrastructure

European Parliament supports the continuation of the CIVITAS programme. There may be opportunities to influence future calls. The cargo hopper and electric boat operating in Utrecht are co-financed by CIVITAS.

Recommend all REPAIR partner local authorities to join the Civitas Forum Network.

Round table – reactions from the partners

Malta – Already has an integrated approach to regeneration. Sustainable mobility is part of the context. No one system fits all situations. Ours is an industrial town – we have to consider freight also.

Avrig – the military site was hidden and had zero access. Need to clear vegetation from usable rail and road links but we are not the owner.

Utrecht/NDW – thinking of accessibility to 8 forts – the 2 important things are the integrated approach and multimodality

Florence – the historic military sites already have maximum accessibility but the city lacks a general plan for renovation of these sites – in this plan accessibility will not be the main issue. Rather ownership and working with private developers.

Rostock – has had an urban mobility plan for 15 years. In urban areas there is high use of public transport, a new tram etc Rostock doesn't have problems of accessibility to the military sites. Rather the problem is to attract uses to sites and also improve shorter routes for pedestrians and cyclists.

Medway – how to implement a strategy in Medway taking what has been learned in REPAIR and translate to practical actions. (1) creating linkages – multimodality + links to strategies for noise and health. (2) using innovative solutions – intend to bid into CIVITAS and try things like the freight hopper and beer boat. (3) consultation – need to involve citizens, link with the political agenda and get the Managing Authority on board.

Opava – the main goal is to work with citizens. Second objective is to improve transport in the city centre. All of this will influence our military site. Teach citizens to use alternative modes of transport and offer them integrated alternatives to car use. Integrate all governmental levels – citizens, city, region, state.

Charente-Maritime – there are no main routes linking city transport with the military site which is in marshland. Must develop hubs to link the fort with the main transport systems.

Lessons/summary points

Best situation for dealing with transport/access issue in the regeneration of the military sites is for the local authority to have an overall strategy for sustainable mobility into which these sites fit.

Paulius identifies 2 groups of issues – intermodality + communication.

LM observation – during the discussion no partners mentioned:

- market tools – eg charging and ticketing on public transport
- safety issues or quality and reliability of public transport services
- use of Structural Funds to solve problems of mobility and access
- use of Green Travel Plans at the sites
- role of public procurement

Progress on Local Action Plans

Rostock – uncertainties on responsibilities

Charente-Maritime – an inventory is done. Now considering different options for tourist transport. Next step – will finalise various proposals and submit ideas to each site and put to the local authority for approval by November 2009. There is a local support group for implementation.

Opava – Has written a Pillar II LAP but not yet agreed with the ULSG. Now writing Pillar III mini LAP and will complete after this meeting and report October.

Medway has concepts and ideas for Pillars II and III. Hope to draft for Pillars I and IV by December. Local support group meetings are planned for November. Will look at drafts over Xmas. Probably there will be an explanatory paper before then.

Avrig has an Action Plan focusing on right of accessibility via a privately owned road. Will focus also on putting a railway back into service, then cycle routes. They have clear points in mind.

Florence – is at the last stage in LAP preparation. Must settle on the new functions to be in the renovated spaces of the prison. Have submitted a bid for Competitiveness funding (ERDF). For other sites the target is to develop a programme to cover all such sites which will then be submitted to the city council.

Malta – they have the background sorted and have worked through the REPAIR pillars. There will be 2 ERDF funding calls from the Operational Programme soon and they intend to bid into it.