

Discussion on the Policy Framework (PF) Opava 17 - 18 June 2010

Wednesday 16 June 2010

Petr Snejder welcomed all partners to Opava and introduced managing Authority representatives and the General Secretary of Opava City Council, added his warm welcome to us all. He explained that the City reborn after WWII, and underwent socialism

Doing best to make it nice and comfortable for citizens and visitors

Proud to partner in Repair

Learning from examples of solutions

Travel abroad to see how it is in Europe

Life is too short to face all the problems by oneself

In particular, the former military are to be dedicated to education in Opava, very important for the city cause of the added value

Also important to have a look at it with foreign eyes

Send regards to those who have not come yet

Enjoy your stay hope to meet you here once again

Have a nice stay

Mari-Anne Harstad acknowledged the welcome as REPAIR Lead partner and on behalf of all partners present.

Petr Snejder continued by outlining the programme of events for next couple of days and Mari-Anne suggested a slight change to events. She suggested moving the Steering Group discussion forward to just after lunch followed by a short break and then take the LAP/PRA Part A after that. This was agreed.

PS then provided a short history of Opava highlighting the reference to Peacocks in the brand and the legend accompanying this.

PS Situation in Opava

Explains Opava logo: peacock (pav in czech), modern legend about two men quarreling "about peacock" – (Opava in Czech)

Map and statistical data of Czech Silesia

Cooperation with Raciborz in Polish Silesia

Much damage seen in WWII

Opava today: many restoration works

Some see Opava as a residential town for Ostrava industries

High prices for residential real estate, low unemployment rates

Opava industries: food (sweets), paper and packaging, engineering (agri, some car and aircraft parts), pharmaceutical (Teva)

Projects, investment

Municipal house (courses, conferences, parties), former bank building, abandoned, muni invested 4MEUR.

City swimming pool (lido) 2MEUR, 30% state grant, popular

Current projects: House of Culture, and House of Arts 9 MEUR, co-fin by EU

Part of City development integrated plan

Need to improve road infrastructure, repulses investors. Now built till 2012 by the state

Rail not electrified and not fast

In this context, education is important for quality of life, hence project in the former military area. Discussions with Silesian Uni about collaboration, but option is to educate for local industries (on example of BTI in Karlskrona), and smth called 3rd age university for older citizens; there are more options being considered

PS explained that the venue for our meeting is a former Bank recently purchased by the city of Opava who have converted and restored the building to be a meeting house and exhibition space and Café for the public.

Education is very important in Opava, as a key quality of life measure, and this is why it is strongly desired that education should be a key element of the development of the Military Site.

PK observed that the road improvements under way between Opava and Ostrava airport would surely improve the offer for inward investment.

PK also asked why, with a large presence of the Silesian University, is another university required in Opava.

PS replied by saying that a second university is one option but an alternative is a more specialised institute such as seen in Karlskrona. There is also capacity for a Third Age University catering for the elderly. There is plenty of room for a campus development plus housing.

LUNCH BREAK

PS introduced and welcomed the arrival of Tereza Kuncova, National level for Managing Authority and contact point for URBACT Operational Programme. Teresa will join the meeting for the duration.

Steering Group Meeting

Apologies received from Liliann, Karlskrona due to an injury preventing her from travelling.

Charente also send their apologies for not attending, due to restrictive control at the council level, their travel plans were cancelled.

Thessaloniki was not present and sent no apology.

Florence, Rostock, Opava and Medway were present. MAH said she would speak with other partners during the next few working days.

Reprogramming of Project REPAIR is the first issue for discussion. MAH explained that each project is permitted two opportunities to reprogramme and outlined the main areas needing attention.

MAH continued by stating that all partners have NOT submitted and certified costs

ACTION: Each partner to inform MAH costs for certification and First Level Control

MAH explained that the Travel and Accommodation budget line would increase due to additional travel for experts.

ACTION: Partners to inform MAH of any changes of costs or planned expenditure that can be expected for inclusion in next claim.

MAH outlined the 3 key budget lines – Communication/dissemination, ULSG & MA

As an example MAH explained that Medway plans to spend all the budget by the end of the project.

Question from Rostock: Thomas will produce 1 x flyer about the topic promoting in addition he will prepare information panels promoting the military activity, relating to the subject of REPAIR for local promotion.

MAH confirmed this kind of information needed.

ACTION: Each partner to inform MAH expected expenditure in the Communications, ULSG, MA costs for certification and First Level Control

It was noted that the budget line for Managing Authority is a difficult one for partners, especially as some have less contact with their MA than others. More creativity is required in using this budget.

FLORENCE

Marco Toccafondi explained that Florence has had difficulty working with the Managing Authority in Italy. There is little interest in the URBACT Programme.

Marco suggested an expenditure under communications by providing a LINK to his municipality website. This was confirmed as acceptable, whereas development of websites is not eligible expenditure.

Local Support Group budget line has also been difficult to use, although he plans to hold a ULSG meeting formulated to attract attendees that will use the funds available.

MAH – Asked is the difficulty in identifying expenses due to meetings held during normal work time? Marco confirmed thi.

MAH explained that there are some solutions to this, providing that meeting minutes show the precise decision to make expenses.

MAH – will discuss with partners individually.

OPAVA

PS confirmed they have problem including the MA in meetings and have been successful in taking representatives to Medway, and other venues.

ULSG budget line will be used to visit another site of interest as soon as possible.

Communications and Dissemination – plans exist to produce flyers promoting the project and REPAIR involvement. Petr expects that interpretations will be provided.

Some of the Communications/Dissemination budget will be used for translation.

MAH explained that translation and websites are NOT eligible costs, except when used by ULSG.

PS referred to the repayments from earlier activity not yet received, therefore no further city budget will be placed at the disposal of REPAIR. But they will not use as much budget.

MAH – asked if communications/dissemination budget line is **expected to be used** by the end of 2010 or early part of 2011.

This clarification was picked up by Marco who also asked what is the formal end of project date.

Marco – asked about costs related to hosting next meeting.

MAH – confirmed that the event line will be transferred to the hosting city.

MAH – explained the concept of the Peer Review

MAH – asked about local events such as a meetings, exhibitions etc.

Marco – asked about what kind of events are expected. Discussion continued around this subject.

MAH – the location of the November PRA Work Group meeting will be decided tomorrow at the end of the PRA session.

MAH – asked if there is expected to be a promotional event focussed on the REPAIR project. She clarified the budget line.

MAH – will send some details to partners.

MAH - continued to explain the status of Phase 1 payments. Delays have occurred several months after claims were submitted when URBACT Secretariat say they have a query and in some cases new certification has to be prepared, well after the claim time.

As far as Phase 2 is concerned the same will happen. From 01 July a new claim certificate can be submitted and URBACT will be able to repay the claim.

Payments are likely to come close together. At the same time we will be preparing the claim for the next period in which all costs not previously claimed for the period 01 July 2009 – end of 2010 can be submitted, making a larger claim.

PS – asked for clarification about entering costs onto PRESSAGE. MAH confirmed that these costs could be entered at **any time** during the semester. She also confirmed that FL Certificates could be issued during the semester.

Rostock – has problems with costs certified during 2009. Thomas asked if it is necessary for claims to be certified in chronological order. MAH answered that this is not a problem. Simply let MAH know when the costs are entered so she can inform the Secretariat.

MAH – explained further that if costs are validated by LP but not certified this can be changed. To confirm that all 2009 costs are entered.

FLORENCE – has a problem with the approbation of the FLC. Awaiting for this approval soon but the body acts slowly and often sends docs several times.

MAH – said it will be useful to enter as many costs as soon as possible for LP validation then FLC can certify. Marco confirmed that these costs should be entered in next few weeks.

ROSTOCK – do other partners have to spend money for FLC. MAH – yes, yes, yes.

This has been a problem for a number of the partners. Costs for FLC must be entered into Project Coordination. It is possible for some budget from STAFF COSTS to cover Project Coordination.

Thomas explained that he does not want to move budget lines because it is a large portion 10 – 15% of total can be eaten up.

THESSALONIKI

MAH – Provided an outline of what has been undertaken by Lead Partner in trying to resolve the problem of Thessaloniki commitment to the project. She explained that other URBACT projects in which Thessaloniki is involved is undertaken by another contracted consultant and there lies the problem.

MAH suggested that REPAIR could retain the city on the project paper but will remove the budget line from them and no further publicity will be provided to Thessaloniki.

2 options were suggested at the Malta Steering Group meeting:

1. To decommit Thessaloniki.
2. To

Discussion carried on among the partners and eventually the proposal was made to retain Thessaloniki in the project on paper but to redistribute their budget among partners.

Opava agreed

Rostock agreed

Florence agreed

Medway agreed

We will talk to other partners during next few days.

BUDGET

Mari-Anne continued by explaining the budgets and that for simplicity it was distributed fairly between all partners. There are four options to consider:

Option 1 - Modify all partner budgets equally

Option 2 - Modify Only Lead Partner Budget

Option 3 - Modify Lead Partner Budget to include their allocation of Common Cost €17,756.27 and rest of budget amongst all partners

Option 4 - Modify only those partners who wish to have more budget

MAH added a cautionary note that an increase in the budget lines will require a new letter of commitment from each partner and this may cause difficulty for some to obtain.

Opava could not think of an appropriate use for the increased budget for local use. However, PS thought that it would be better used to fund an additional activity such as an additional visit to a partner area. Peter added that he could go through the application for a letter of commitment and would not be achievable before the end of September. Choose Option 4

Rostock stated that Option 3 would be preferred as a new letter of commitment will not be a problem to obtain and they would like to use the €3000 to cover the costs of FLC.

Florence agreed with Opava proposal for another visit to an additional partner area, however Option 3 preferred.

MAH explained in more details some of the opportunities.
She asked whether the final event would be better formulated by maintaining the final event in Avrig but additionally a small event held in Brussels to meet with technicians etc.

Although Avrig will host the Final event it will in fact take place in Sibiu due to international flight connections and available accommodation. Perhaps we could transfer the budget over to the final conference to cover costs of greater involvement.

Finally, to coincide with the end of other URBACT thematic projects such as HERO

PS – counted 5 proposals

1. Cover partners needs
2. Add Visit to Brussels
3. Spend more time in Avrig area
4. Visit another partner area
5. ?

FINAL EVENT & BUDGETS

Activity 5.2 Total budget €27,610 has been allocated and the full composition is shown on slide 10.

MAH asked which partners are in favour of further investigation of further figures? All partners agreed to this proposal and to discuss it again tomorrow.

MAH - outlined further possibilities in connection with these costs.

REVISED BUDGET

Will be sent by email

REPROGRAMMING

Any increased budget will require a NEW letter of commitment. Once we have received your preferences, LP will write to URBACT for approval and Pressage will change.

FINAL EVENT & BUDGETS

Returning to the Final Event in Sibiu was originally planned for Mar/April 2011. We hope to confirm the date with Arnold soon, however we must consider local elections where applicable (Medway 06 May 2011) therefore the inability of politicians to participate due to PURDAH

OPAVA no elections at that time and intend to bring an elected member
ROSTOCK – no elections at that time and intend to bring an elected member
OPAVA – no elections at that time and intend to bring an elected member
MEDWAY - elections are expected in early May 2011

Marco agreed with all the suggested participants and added that the character of the event should be the maximum. Emphasising the relevance of Military Sites as a catalysts to broader sustainable development

ROSTOCK – asked what will be the focus of the conference be?

OPAVA – suggested that we should agree the content the final event. Should we invite EU representatives, local politicians, Managing Authorities, stakeholders, ULSG members etc.

FLORENCE – Agreed with Opava

MAH agree to clarify if costs for translation is eligible for this type of event.

MAH confirmed that the purpose of the Final Event are outlined in the Work Plan as the Formal Dissemination Event, therefore it should focus on the outputs of the project. This includes the broader dissemination of the project.

MAH reappraised the content of the conference and stated that it will be developed over time.

MAH – suggested that partners not present today will be invited to comment on the budget and content of the Final Event on day 2 17 June during a half hour slot to be allocated.

MAH Asked if there are further questions to be raised at present? None were raised!

Break

LOCAL ACTION PLANS

MAH explained to partners that Hen Gerritse, Thematic Expert and Peter Ros, New Dutch Waterline are at Katowice, on their way to Opava therefore she will make the first part of Hen's presentation. By the time we get to PART B tomorrow we will have had updates from a number of partners about their LAP and those who are attempting a PRA.

She outlined the work plan for today and tomorrow.

Part D

Make voting discussions and decide on venue for next meeting. The latter sessions of the day will be led by LP and LE looking at the Working Group reports and notes and look at Cross cutting themes.

Followed by a break and then a discussion to analyse what is missing.

LAP & PRA

Part A

Part B

Part C

Part D

An explanation of a Pilot Regeneration Action was given by MAH. The intention being to validate the PRA plans against the Local Action Plan. Also to give the 2 selected PRA sites the full attention of the partners and experts.

MAH explained that Hen is the TE with responsibility to develop the PRA and the methodology, which is to:

- Select PRA sites
- Action planning for PRA Sites

- Undertake desk research
- Draft proposals followed by a work group located in one of the 3 Pilot Regeneration Action sites.

Selection Criteria was agreed in Malta and a voting system has been established and was distributed to partners in advance of the meeting.

We will hear proposals from Avrig, RO; Florence, IT; Charente-Maritime, FR;

PRA Selection Criteria

Peter explained the principles of the voting method for PRA and the various headings He asked us to think about the headings before voting, to place votes in the relevant boxes using 1 as low score and 5 as the highest.

Weighting of the criteria allows 15% per Pillar and 40% for sections 5a – e.

MAH reconfirmed the point 5d is about funding. It is important to state if funding may be available and that the partner has identified that.

Q – PR asked what the outcome of the voting would be and what is the work plan for the PRA?

Today we will select the two sites and by July will make contact with partners to arrange a meeting with ULSG to develop the content of the PRA further to improve the offer and give considerations about further development and to subsidy engineering! The first meets will be scheduled in October and a WG will be held in November with draft discussion papers for the sites.

Thematic reports will be finalised and act as the basis of the funding application.

Meetings will be held with managing authorities are very important in this process. Note it could be that Objective 1 funds may already be allocated; therefore other options may be focussed accordingly.

The framework of the questionnaire is to set the agenda based on 6 or 7 questions.

Use Hens slide with details of the objectives of the Working Group Meetings etc.

Hen recapped some of the LAPs to date. What are the obstacles in the way of developing the project – regulations, finance, stakeholder support and priorities.

LAP presentations

Marco Toccafondi MT (Florence)

Florence LAP

Frm. State prison “Le Murate”
2 squares and a ped. Way
73 social dwellings
Social and commercial/handicraft spaces

Introduction of plan by pillar I-IV

MAH: how many jobs?

MT: 20-30.

VJ: are these jobs self-employed?

MT: yes

PS: Solar panels are not allowed on historic buildings also in Czech, but flat “film” is allowed in Prague

MT: cannot change roof in Florence. Using geo-thermal energy. Referring to Leopoldine convent Thermie A project

MAH: Are the LAPs validate by the LSGs in LSG meetings?

MT: yes

MAH: what is next in LSG?

MT: plan to hold the final plenary session of the LSG, to finalize roles in the project, and also discuss further projects in the area, residential and other initiatives in progress. At least 1 such session.

MAH: clarify – will LSG be focusing on other related initiatives, or on LAP?

MT: more on LAP, but also on future

MAH: pillar IV seems to be complete, What about other pillars, will they be completed by the end of REPAIR?

MAH: please remind on final result on Pillar I

MT: minimizing waste production on the building site, use of materials, adaptation of the dwellings to lowest national restrictions.

MAH: how is this monitored, if it is achieved? Are there targets in municipality?

MT: There are monitoring sub-offices almost in every department, such as air pollution and other.

MAH: Which partners would you be interested to exchange?

MT: Opava and NHW

PK: Malta prison?

MT: yes, of course.

FLORENCE - LAP

Marco outlined the developments at Le Murate in Florence to date.

Pillar 1

He explained the problem, purpose, time scale and tools involved. Law 179/1992 covering building for social housing. He went on to explain the different bodies involved in the process and that costs and finances are covered.

Pillar II

Historical buildings protected by law and have regulations prohibiting the use of certain materials and insisting on using other specific materials.

What was achieved? Minimizing waste production and reuse of the waste material and adjustment of standards of buildings to the minimum standards.

Pillar III

Consider how to maximise transport to the military sites. The site is located between 2 streets with high volumes of traffic. It has been decided to control traffic by taking it out of the area.

Pillar IV

Is about how to maximise local jobs. Although there is not in a situation of high unemployment in this part of Firenze the site wants to encourage employment in tourism and Artistic handy crafts in the area and decided to focus on developing this possibility. Consequently, the economic development office has been deeply involved in working with this project, creating 20 – 30 new self employed jobs.

Q – Opava referred to the fact that Solar Voltaic cells are not allowed in this type of building, however he proposed the possibility of using a PVC Foils. A useful tool for flat roofs but not so good for historic Gable roofs.

Q – Has the information presented today been validated by the LSG? Yes. Q - What will be undertaken next? A plenary session of the ULSG is planned to summarize progress and recognise the part played by partners.

Q – Is the LAP is more focussed on what has been finished. Pillar IV seems to be completed as jobs have been created? Where does the work stand at present? All completed.

Q – What was the achievement of Pillar I.

Q – MAH are you interested in sharing your experience or learning from other partners in the peer review? Oh yes we feel we can learn from Opava, NDW and Malta.

Any other questions? None raised.

ROSTOCK - LAP

Rostock there has been a number of changes recently due to finances. Tomas explained by use of a MAP the remains of the City walls. He then identified the decision made to reconstruct the entrance to the site. It was not an attractive entrance. There is one area under reconstruction Cannon Hill which is probably going to be the last part of the reconstruction. There are many interpretation panels in the area but some of these are more design than information. Recent meetings with the urban dept of regeneration and the museum led to the decision to develop a totally new information desk for both visitors and residents. It should be barrier free if possible but problems with this have been recognised.

Early June a meeting of LSG and municipal dept of heritage, dept. green spaces, NGO, Rostock Company of Urban Regeneration, and local museum that is close to fortifications, and it was decided to make a total new information desk for tourists – “barrier free”. It will help attract tourists and inhabitants to the wall. A tour of the former and existing fortification around the city centre is being developed.

PS: are delays of new reconstruction due to lack of funding

TW: money to regeneration is given by fed government, and the city council decides what to do with it. City wall used to be top priority, but it changed to school of arts and media. Another problem is 20% decrease in 2010 from 2009 level and in 2011 50% decrease of fed funds from 2009 level.

PS: when you are preparing documentation, is it public?

TW: yes, but the City is making a decision. School is run by NGOs, and they may have a higher profile than “municipal” projects – among the politicians who make decisions. And school also needs reconstruction, built in sozialismus.

PS: so what is going to happen?

TW: next year when it is clear how much money is available the politicians of the city will make the decision

PS: In Opava, we make plans too in administration. And then we try to find money in EU, state or local. So, give us the money and we can start tomorrow.

TW: we are prepared, too, the proposals are ready, we could start many projects. But the future is uncertain

MT: What is Rostock strategy with military sites?

TW: mostly recreational, to have the sites for public use

VJ: budget. You said there were reductions. The prop is 20% local, 30% land, 50% fed.

MAH: What buddies?

TW: Rostock Heath could be interesting for Avrig.

This sounds like an attractive prospect and Rostock has to adjust its offer to be more attractive to visitors.

Q – PS. Is the reason for reconstruction down to lack of funds. Tomas explained that every year the city receives funds for maintenance and improvements from Federal Government.

Q- PS. Are you preparing the project for commencement when ready? The problem is that politicians seem to want to help NGO and residents in preference to Local Authority. The grant has been reduced 20% on last year and it has been proposed that it will be 50% reduced on last year. Therefore the pot is smaller.

Q- MT. Does your city have a vocational designation? Yes it is recreation and there is a plan for that.

Q – MAH. What partners would you be interested to sharing experience with? Yes with Avrig to share experience of Rostock Heath.

Thursday 17 June 2010

Vincent gave a brief presentation to partners reviewing the original objectives of the Policy Framework and set the task for the next hour or so to review and agree the content of Work Group reports produced as a result of the four pillar working groups.

Paulius spoke briefly about the work ahead and how during the meeting we will achieve the targets setting out the following objectives:
Validate Work Group content; Agree cross cutting issues; Agree recommendations and agree on Good Practice Examples.

Printed papers were provided to all partners with details of the Work Group reports and summary of findings.

PILLAR WORK GROUPS

Led by Paulius Kulikauskas to obtain validation of the Work Group reports produced as a result of the Four Pillar meetings. Include conclusion of WG reports, discussion of crosscutting themes, finalising the recommendations & Good Practice Examples.

Discussion and validation of policy and cases by pillar, the following points were noted:

Pillar I – Policy

Discussion on policy and what if any should be added or removed

Clem challenge directive on the energy performance of buildings, in that it excludes historical buildings.

PK – do we want to keep thematic strategy concerning waste?

MB - re comment on waste – we should keep even on the Operational Programmes for every country, even though we didn't touch upon it so much I think we should keep it to ensure a holistic approach.

VJ – a sensible way to approach it so keep it in

MB – opportunities for partners then to refer to it later.

CS – apologies for not being at the last meeting but there appears to be a knowledge gap concerning how to adapt FMHS to sustainable renovation techniques we should

therefore be advocating steps to rectify this. We need people with the skills in terms of sustainable development, very little in terms of how it applies to FMHS.

MB – it's an issues arising out of RES and EE and salvaging materials

CS we don't have the business or university expertise to deal with this issue

MB – we need to offer training to address this subject.

CS – link to the work at Paola with them being PRA to further progress this agenda.

VJ – English Heritage are beginning to train people for skills in this field

MB – training now being delivered in UK – MB will send the link.

Pillar I - Cases

PK slide 8 – Waste Malta projects done with EU money

NDW with two climates (one for bats and another for humans)

Vechten with canals

MB – suggest a different methodology diverse choice from examples, cant we have an example from every city and you stamp it by city by city pillar by pillar and what type of good practice it is. Instead of wasting that knowledge lets use it all

PK – question of how we define the criteria and the cases supporting them

MH – include all cases in WG and when it comes to PF select the recommendations and GPE using more clearly defined criteria, which will be more useful to target audience.

AK – link to energy producer or EE how can the partners add something to the project, we could take into consideration what is going on at the site and also at the community level. The visits in Malta not directly linked to the situation of the FMHS

MB – the diversity fo the problem as explained

AK – we need to have examples for managing energy and waste in FMHS and also for the broader agenda, this will be useful to partners.

AK -If you are now making a policy you need to make a frame we need to

VJ -Two types of recommendation one for FMHS and another where we address the community / wider area

AK - It needs to fit the frame for the area or else it will not be useful.

MB – EU directive it is top down the directive does not differentiate whether it is a FMHS it is what it is and cities have to respond to that. I can't see what difference there is. If we are doing a policy for the military buildings

PK – should we note another issue, the directive defined principles, which should be applied to every situation.

Pk – slide 12 lets look at this as a structural thing, is it acceptable we look at PR on two levels

CS – yes on the basis that there are more specific recommendations within each type.

PR – how do we address the issues of knowledge gap and investment in skills and training and business development, research and development?

Debate on the construction of the policy that will be useful to the city level, AK – there is one middle level of the municipality with their own policies and framework

CS – yes and the planning policy – do they make it easy or do they make it difficult to use RES and EE in the FMHS Q is how do we make it the easiest option to enable action at the local level. And the local policy (whoever is responsible for overseeing the local development) or the regional/national (operational planning) these policies are necessary to make this happen at each level.

MB – ultimately you do what u want on or off site, you have a directive so use must abide by it even by planning terms. If you are not RES or EE then you swill not get ERDF funding.

CS – different in convergence zones so leverage in Malta is stronger than the UK for example.

Pillar III - Slide 13>

CS – asked if some validation on the effectiveness of the transport policy presented by Charente was available?

PK – no statistics were provided.

PR – add one case study about transferier (public transport hubs) but also to add transferier (interface land) for public spaces for people to go into the parklands.

Two partners present accepted this suggestion.

R – two issues came up from workshop last week 1. when it come to objects like FMHS you should arrange it like with the municipality but if its comes by bigger area e.g. a fort placed on regional road you should involved bigger regional policy – question of scale.

2 placing a tax for ever KM made – road pricing for cars not bicycles (public transport not private)

CS / VJ - Clarification of 'robust' a communication strategy as a pre-requisite.

Pillar IV - Slide 17 >

PR – how do they involve ESF, previously we spent millions on this.

PK – EU 2020 is not finished, but regional policy is now included for every pillar because this is important EU wide.

CS – it is described within the second point on slide 17.

CS – query where does G sit in that

PK – EU SDS = Gothenburg EU202 – Lisbon

PR – different sort of people / skills & integration projects, long-term unemployed people, young offenders 14-18.

CS – we are missing a trick by saying triple helix creates not just employment but high value employment where people can earn more money.

VJ – plus every high value job brings a low value job generates the low value employment.

Friday 18 June 2010

PILLAR WORK GROUPS continued

Lead by PK continuation of the validation concerning the WG reports produced as a result of the four Pillar meetings.

Recap over working plan for the day to include conclusion of WG reports, Discussion concerning crosscutting themes, finalising the recommendations & GPE and a final review session.

Discussion and validation of policy and cases by pillar continued, the following points were noted:

Pillar IV - Slide 20>

Continued discussion and validation of policy and cases

The following discussion points were noted:

AK – requested a recap on the 'Tripe Helix' approach

PK – explanation on how the business university and local authority work together to benefit all.

MB – Regeneration is a bit wide

CS – the article does say bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore, and this is a clear steer in the article relevant to the Repair and Ascend project. Without that article in the treaty this project would probably not be eligible.

Pillar II – Slide 23>

Discussion and validation of policy and cases

The following discussion points were noted:

AL – we had a debate about volunteers and their impact on the site, there was a lot of projects with volunteers and we should notice it in our records.

PK – this is a cross cutting issue and not pillar specific.

AL – influence on local jobs, it is so important because we have difference in the project.

MB – NGO make it more sustainable

The point was noted and marked for inclusion into the cross cutting themes. It was clarified that the contribution of volunteers needs to be recognised in the whole process of re-using/regenerating sites and that this is important reflection of community engagement.

CROSS CUTTING ISSUES – Slide 24>

Lead Expert presentation of initial proposals about how to link the additional themes arising from WG discussions.

Discussion on these cross cutting issues, the following points were noted:

CS – not just maintaining but ‘building’

Agreed that achieving and maintaining would be more appropriate.

MB – a case of slimming them down and fine-tuning.

Selecting Uses - Agreed to change the wording to include ‘...economic when selecting new uses’ and deleting the last few words that did not add any value.

MH – all cases can be used to validate the theme and an example of how this has been done well and another to demonstrate where one or more pillars was not considered and so these examples will thereby illustrate the point being made in the cross cutting issue.

MB/ CS – make it explicit about recognising the intrinsic relationship on planning matters

Economic Sustainability - Fitting into existing spatial models

MH – crucial to keep as it can act as a catalyst for local authorities and FMHS owners to create plans that cover all pillars and integrates them into wider strategic spatial plans.

CS – that this theme supports that local authority aims to increase jobs by allowing employment space to be reserved

We need to mention fitting the sustainable regeneration of site into existing spatial framework.

MH – third theme to say ‘operators of FMHS to integrate the sustainable regeneration of their sites are into existing spatial frameworks.

MB – support this in that directive does not make any distinction from the FMHS and so, there are obligations for each site to adhere to EU regulations.

Policy

MB – following the characteristics of the areas

Value of the land more recently

AK – comment on the Avrig site not more than 1% have been on the site but they were touched by it, there is nothing is left but the spirit of the previous military use.

MB – question is for communities is what is classed as heritage, is it 500yrs, sooner or earlier.

It was agreed to add sites and land previously owned by the military.

MAH Stepped out for 5 mins.

POLICY RECOMMENDATION AND GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLES

PK led the discussion concerning policy recommendations and supporting good practice examples by pillar based on his Presentation.

Questions and discussion points are noted as:

The objective being that partners agree the substance of the recommendations to be made and what the supporting GPE could be.

These were edited and are represented on the slides (attached).

Pillar I – slide 32>

Elaboration of the GPE to include Malta solar scheme and the lessons they learnt about being flexible and that it therefore an example of how to and how not to design a policy.

Elaboration of the GPE to include the Avrig energy plan because it is in the design stage and it will therefore include or support this recommendation (Paulius to research the Avrig energy plan to see how this recommendation is demonstrated within the energy plan – if it is not then there is work to be done. This will be an interesting topic at the final event will be under scrutiny) this case also brings into the light the recommendation with a specific focus on FMHS.

Pillar II – Slide 34>

Elaboration of the Utrecht example to detail the links with national, regional and local transport policies

Addition to consider including a parkland example from Malta.

Pillar IV – Slide 46>

Elaboration of the GPE of Telecom city, in that it created local jobs but clarification is required if these and existing local jobs are made accessible by local people.

Elaboration of the Avrig example in that where the intention is to attract inward investment (for example the hotel and hospitality trade) that provision is being made locally arranged by the council to have training space and supportive services to enable local people to access these new employment opportunities.

Elaboration of the business incubator in cultural technology in Le Murate, Florence.

We finished the discussion on PILLAR IV concluded the work on this theme.

AK – asked for explanation of the Triple Helix. PK made the explanation of Engles theory of everything working in cycles LA/UNI/BUS.

Pillar II – Slide 38>

Debate on whether to include specific terminology and whether this will assist or limit the impact on sites situated in urban, rural or brownfield designated sites. Reworking of the recommendations made as a result of the WG in Medway.

TW – maybe there is a need but it seems too theoretical and not sure how useful it is.

PF REVIEW

Vincent re set the question, “Have we addressed the original objectives set out in the work plan?”

Partners agreed that the Good Practice Examples proposed and selected by the partnership do demonstrate successful regeneration of former military sites and that the objectives set within the sites are being achieved.

Concerning proposals to advance sustainable policy it was felt that the discussion was comprehensive and the resulting recommendations reflect this.

Highlighting that cities are successfully re-using military sites has been done and complimented by the fact that this is a multi-speed project with partner sites began long before the start of the Repair project and others that are beginning just now and where the project has helped to progress the issue in partner cities.

Are we all happy that key objectives have been met? Partners agreed they are happy with the work undertaken.

Next steps on completing PF

More information from PK

Partners to send full good practice example information to Paulius for collation and insertion into the appropriate places within the PF.

PK to liaise with each partner to obtain the good practice information – full information required to LP and succinct summary drawn up by PK.

Publication options

Hefty booklet to include everything and then an executive summary

MB – stylish to have it on digital book main content on that and limited edition printed form then glossy executive summary.

TW – not such a big book as Ascend, web or CD electronic information and a smaller publication.

MB – CD website and booklet.

MT – CD and executive summary printed.

Discussion concluded.

MAH Thanked Opava for impeccable organisation thanks also to partners for patience and contributions.

Notes Take by Paulius Kulikauskas

June 16, 11.00

Welcome

Petr Snejdar PS

Organisational things later

Introduce guests

Secretary General of Opava, welcome speech – NAME?

City reborn after WWII, and underwent socialism

Doing best to make it nice and comfortable for citizens and visitors

Proud to partner in Repair

Learning from examples of solutions

Travel abroad to see how it is in Europe

Life is too short to face all the problems by oneself

In particular, the former military are to be dedicated to education in Opava, very important for the city cause of the added value

Also important to have a look at it with foreign eyes

Send regards to those who have not come yet

Enjoy your stay, hope to meet you here once again

Have a nice stay

Mari-Anne Harstad MAH Thanks for welcome

PS Some informations

Political directors are not here cause Mayor was elected to parliament

Presents the programme day by day

Day 1 Swap SC and PRA Part A to allow for Hen's arrival - Agreed

Management authority: regional – present, central – arrives from Prague in AM

Day 2 No changes

Day 3 No changes; Sightseeing – optional parts according to weather conditions

Discuss departures later

No comments

PS Situation in Opava

Explains Opava logo: peacock (pav in czech), modern legend about two men quarreling "about peacock" – (Opava in Czech)

Map and stat. data of Czech Silesia

Cooperation with Raciborz in Polish Silesia

Damage WWII

Opava today: many restoration works

Some see as residential town for Ostrava industries

High prices for residential real estate, low unemployment rates

Opava industries: food (sweets), paper and packaging, engineering (agri, some car and aircraft parts), pharma (Teva)

Projects, investment

Municipal house (courses, conferences, parties), former bank building, abandoned, muni invested 4MEUR.

City swimming pool (lido) 2MEUR, 30% state grant, popular

Current projects: House of Culture, and House of Arts 9 MEUR, co-fin by EU

Part of City development integrated plan

Need to improve road infrastructure, repulses investors. Now built till 2012 by the state

Rail not electrified and not fast

In this context, education is important for quality of life, hence project in the former military area. Discussions with Silesian Uni about collaboration, but option is to educate for local industries (on example of BTI in Karlskrona), and smth called 3rd age university for older citizens; there are more options being considered

12.00 LUNCH

13.00 SC meeting (notes by Vincent Jasper)

15.00 Break

15.30

MAH – intro to next two days.

Part A for PRA: methodology

Part B: LAP updates

Part C: Presentations from aspiring PRA partners (5 partners, 2 slots)

Part D:

Part A PRA (Hen's Presentation)

Benefits

Methodology:

- Selection criteria
- Scoring and voting

LAP presentations

Marco Toccafondi MT (Florence)

Florence LAP

Frm. State prison "Le Murate"
2 squares and a ped. Way
73 social dwellings
Social and commercial/handicraft spaces

Introduction of plan by pillar I-IV

MAH: how many jobs?

MT: 20-30.

VJ: are these jobs self-employed?

MT: yes

PS: Solar panels are not allowed on historic buildings also in Czech, but flat "film" is allowed in Prague

MT: cannot change roof in Florence. Using geo-thermal energy. Referring to Leopoldine convent Thermie A project

MAH: Are the LAPs validate by the LSGs in LSG meetings?

MT: yes

MAH: what is next in LSG?

MT: plan to hold the final plenary session of the LSG, to finalize roles in the project, and also discuss further projects in the area, residential and other initiatives in progress. At least 1 such session.

MAH: clarify – will LSG be focusing on other related initiatives, or on LAP?

MT: more on LAP, but also on future

MAH: pillar IV seems to be complete, What about other pillars, will they be completed by the end of REPAIR?

MAH: please remind on final result on Pillar I

MT: minimizing waste production on the building site, use of materials, adaptation of the dwellings to lowest national restrictions.

MAH: how is this monitored, if it is achieved? Are there targets in municipality?

MT: There are monitoring sub-offices almost in every department, such as air pollution and other.

MAH: Which partners would you be interested to exchange?

MT: Opava and NHW

PK: Malta prison?

MT: yes, of course.

Thomas Werner TW
Rostock LAP

Wanted to start from reconstruction of the part of city wall close to Kroepeliner Tor. Don't know when it will start, TW thinks it may be delayed for several years.

Another area under reconstruction is in the North West at Cannon Hill, perhaps one of the last reconstructions.

Many information panels were installed to inform, but not all very visible, sometimes more design than information.

Early June a meeting of LSG and municipal dept of heritage, dept. green spaces, NGO, Rostock Company of Urban Regeneration, and local museum that is close to fortifications, and it was decided to make a total new information desk for tourists – "barrier free". It will help attract tourists and inhabitants to the wall. A tour of the former and existing fortification around the city centre is being developed.

PS: are delays of new reconstruction due to lack of funding
TW: money to regeneration is given by fed gov, and the city council decides what to do with it. City wall used to be top priority, but it changed to school of arts and media. Another problem is 20% decrease in 2010 from 2009 level and in 2011 50% decrease of fed funds from 2009 level.
PS: when you are preparing documentation, is it public?
TW: yes, but the City is making a decision. School is run by NGOs, and they may have a higher profile than "municipal" projects – among the politicians who make decisions. And school also needs reconstruction, built in sozialismus.
PS: so what is going to happen
TW: next year when it is clear how much money is available the politicians of the city will make the decision
PS: In Opava, we make plans too in administration. And then we try o find money in EU, state or local. So, give us the money and we can start tomorrow.
TW: we are prepared, too. The proposals are ready, we could start many projects. But the future.
MT: What is Rostock strategy with military sites?
TW: mostly recreational, to have the sites for public use
VJ: budget. You said there were reductions. The prop is 20% local, 30% land, 50% fed.
MAH: What buddies?
TW: Rostock Heath could be interesting for Avrig.

MAH, Medway
LAP

Recap problem and challenge

Context:

Thames Gateway

Medway Renaissance

SCS

Master Plan for Chattenden/Lodge Hill – a lot of different issues, not jus new social housing

Eco-Region

Other strategies

LDF

Community infrastructure Plan

LTP3

Economic Development and Social regeneration Strategies

World Heritage ambition & Great Line City Park

River officers

Economic and skills plan

Medway energy plan

Target outcome of LAP: develop new policy of sustainable community

Local dissemination activities – spring 2011

Local strategic partnership

PS: any idea how to use the river?

VJ: The river officers group works on this although the Medway River is not used very much. Could be used much more for transport and leisure pursuits. In 25 years

after dock closure the river has silted up. So, some groups want to prevent development and retain biosphere.

PS: How do you balance these two opposite interests?

MAH: there is a huge framework for debate where the city tries to play a role of a catalyst. Many consultations are going on at present It really grows up and starts joining up now.

VJ: that's why the interest in REPAIR grows.

PK: buddy up?

MAH: econ and triple helix. With Karlskrona on Telecom City concept, would like to do is with LSG to revitalize may be visit. Avrig energy plan. Transport –

17 June 09.00

MAH introducing day's programme

Remaining LAPs

PRA presentations

Discussion and voting

Hen Gerritse

Introducing PRA as practical implementation of exchange and discussions

Peer review process is important

Introducing Process between now and April next year

Repeat PRA, benefits and methodology

Access mainstream ERDF funding

based on baseline and PF

Linked to Ascend

Methodology: action planning, expert visits, meeting with MA and LSG

One more WG session in one of selected PRA sites

Now, carry on with LAP presentations

Arnold G Klingeis, Avrig

LAP

Part of local development strategy

Linked to energy masterplan and communication strategy

5 actions have been considered and confirm

Public tender for biomass CHP has been announced

Public-public partnership for nature park

Museum, in some way inspired by Kaunas

Research centre, very important, as we saw in Telecom City in Karlskrona, also as a public partnership, with public or private university

Conference center as a job creation venture

Much money is needed for these 5 projects. The city does not have it. So, Avrig needs a marketing plan to raise funding.

So, the first to happen is the CHP. Planted elephant grass as a test for biomass production.

There will be more initiatives under these headlines

The plan for the final event is to host a part of it in Sibiu, and then set up a tent on the actual site as we all saw in Medway

HG: Questions?

VJ: What plants have been tried?

AK: testing 4 types of elephant grass to see which one is most productive in the area

HG: how is the conference centre linked with military site?

AK: through tourism tourists will come, stay, experience the site, the wildlife nature park, the mountains. The military site will work as attraction to tourists.

Timescale for implementation: 7-12 years.

Short term: CHP and studies for other components

Research centre linked to energy policy ref. to Karskrona, and to biodiversity of the ... mountains.

Two pillars for Avrig economy: energy and tourism

HG: next pres. Opava

PS.

Thoughts around 4 pillars

Education in the former military site

Reflects experience of the REPAIR working group meetings

Brings new ideas

Idea framework has been set up, will be worked out in more detailed plans

Pillars 2 and 3 have been finished, all pillars will be agreed by LSG until end of 2010.

We start from Thesis, describing how to put theoretic considerations into practice

Good practice examples

Proposed solutions incl cost estimates

Expected Impact of Opava development

Conclusions

Pillar by pillar

(tb included from presentation)

I,

II,

III,

Cannot avoid the cars completely, so military sites used as park and connect to public transport

IV

Probably will not make a lot of new jobs directly, rather some multiplier effect, increase purchasing power, etc

Thoughts to be put on paper in greater detail

HG: Questions

Tereza: any expectations on how many jobs?

PS: no

PK: any new SMEs?

PS: an option to include business incubator, probably on another site

VJ: are there industries that would like to relocate into the site for any reason?

PS: perhaps from outside, on a new faculty of the Silesian Uni. Shpu;d be new.

MAH: Any R energy examples in Opava?

PS: No resources for RE in Opava, just biomass

HG: decentralized power plants?

PS: an option LAP just a framework of ideas Many possibilities will be included

HG: are you thinking of specific theme in education, such as Avrig on renewable energy?

PS: several options – a new faculty, or a cluster with industrial firms like in Karlskrona, or wellness as a theme

VJ: Geothermal?

PS: too long payback

NHW

PGM Ros

In Utrecht, De Gagel LAP was presented, as it was finished then already.

Now, NHW activities by pillar

De Gagel as information transferium pillar 2

Pillar 1 Energy – new research for opportunities in NHW

Pillar 4 – inclusion of employment projects

Pillar 3 – big changes:

Ring road of Utrecht, 1,5 BEUR, lots of coordination with the NHW forts

How to get money from infrastructure investments?

Coordinated transport and local development effort and the social issues?

PK: what's transferium

PR: connection point with parking, public transport etc.

Malta

Malcom Borg

Made up of two plans stitched up: repair and SPUR.

(insert presentation)

LAP in 6 sections

3 processes of elaboration of LAP

6 actions

4 SPUR projects

Horisontal initiatives

George Cilia

Hutment renewal

(insert presentation)

PR: will old hangars be tained:
GC: 4 in a block

PK: is there demand for industrial space?
GC: partly for removal of small industries and workshops from residential areas,
partly incubator, in various industries, eg. electronics "Spectra", fully flexible worktime

PR: new design - what inspiration?
GC: possibility for solar cells on the roof; possibility to connect multiple spaces
MB: day care centre was planned in old reservoir of Victorian period, very interesting
design, reusing the water feature inside new building

Kaunas
Andrius Baranauskas

General intro historic aerodrome
(insert presentation)

Pillar presentation

MAH: has there been identified any funding possibilities?
AB: Norwegian mechanism for wooden buildings was applied for, but did not succeed
May be in next period

BREAK 1105 – 1125
HG
Peer review
(see flipchart)

HG: Any budget?
MAH: only in ULSG and MA parts, eg Medway job pillar ULSG may go to Karlskrona

HG: send me the proposals, and with LP we'll discuss budget
MAH: Hen needs to get material as he will write the peer review report by the end of
the year

HG: close this part, now beauty contest (PRA selection)

PS explains the rules, and do the Charente presentation
PR: what's next?

HG: explains PRA process
PR: what will the partners who do not have PRA do?

Benefit from results of meetings with MA, gain methodology developed for PRA, and
follow up

VJ: presentation of Charente-Maritime PRA application
Mostly tourism-oriented
(insert presentation)
Questions will be answered after phoning them
Lunch at 13.00
13.45
PRA Florence

MT

(insert presentation)

New phase of Le Murate prison regeneration, 2,5 MEURO already available out of 10 MEURO total cost Time schedule: completion 2013

Questions:

AK: how many square meters to be recovered?

Claudio Fantoni: 34 for new housing units

MB: how to adapt prison to housing, difficulties architecturally?

CF: we have great architects in Italy (all laugh)

HG: any PPP

CF: no, just public, private just rent

MAH: was funding sought for the whole project?

MT: thematic applications, eg. housing was applied for in several places, including Le Murate. 2nd phase commercial, incubator have yet to be submitted to ERDF

Avrig

AK

(insert presentation)

Questions:

AB: is the municipality owning the land

AK: yes, we cannot influence national laws on eg. VAT to give investors other benefits than land

VJ: Medway tried to support businesses in different ways

MB: is it good the authority to hold shares in private business

AK: that's normal

MAH: maybe you can have a municipal company?

AK: we already have such companies, (gives examples). They belong to the council but management is independent

VJ: Are board members from the council?

AK: yes, but they are not bound to vote directed by the City council in the company board

VJ: feedback from Charente

Q: what level of political and community support?

A: C_M tourism office is very supportive. Small boat owners are very enthusiastic to get more work. Site owners are very supportive and involved

Q: possibilities for funding? Are they identified?

A: No, options have not been explored, they so far focused on communication

Q: what about profit?

A: shared between C_M and operators

Q: alternative energy on the boats – what ideas?

A: One of the boats runs on electric motor from solar panel on the boat. Want to multiply this

Q: any spinoff foreseen?

A: education on sustainable transportation + history of military heritage; helps to reach large groups of young people (?)

Q: who is operating at the moment?

A: a public agency, C_M tourism office. Costs are low, as this puts together existing facilities into a low cost package, but costs will increase with growth

Q: consolidation of all 3 tours?

A: possible, but 2 touristic, 1 educational, o target separate markets

Q: profits?

A: yes

Paola, Corradino correctional facility
Malcolm Borg

Q: none

Voting

Voting results announced

16:00 discussion of peer review

HG: How is Malta going to work on PRA? Using agora?

Based on peer review choices?

MB: (brainstorming) maybe visits, through internet portals

Charente not present

Further work plan.

Note taken by by Paulius Kulikauskas (PK)

June 16, 11.00

Welcome

Petr Snejdar PS

Organisational things later

Introduce guests

Secretary General of Opava, welcome speech – NAME?

City reborn after WWII, and underwent socialism

Doing best to make it nice and comfortable for citizens and visitors

Proud to partner in Repair

Learning from examples of solutions

Travel abroad to see how it is in Europe

Life is too short to face all the problems by oneself

In particular, the former military are to be dedicated to education in

Opava, very important for the city cause of the added value

Also important to have a look at it with foreign eyes

Send regards to those who have not come yet

Enjoy your stay, hope to meet you here once again

Have a nice stay

Mari-Anne Harstad MAH Thanks for welcome

PS Some informations

Political directors are not here cause Mayor was elected to parliament

Presents the programme day by day

Day 1 Swap SC and PRA Part A to allow for Hen's arrival - Agreed

Management authority: regional – present, central – arrives from Prague in AM

Day 2 No changes

Day 3 No changes; Sightseeing – optional parts according to weather conditions

Discuss departures later

No comments

PS Situation in Opava

Explains Opava logo: peacock (pav in czech), modern legend about two men quarreling "about peacock" – (O pava in Czech)

Map and stat. data of Czech Silesia

Cooperation with Raciborz in Polish Silesia

Damage WWII

Opava today: many restoration works

Some see as residential town for Ostrava industries

High prices for residential real estate, low unemployment rates

Opava industries: food (sweets), paper and packaging, engineering (agri, some car and aircraft parts), pharma (Teva)

Projects, investment

Municipal house (courses, conferences, parties), former bank building, abandoned, muni invested 4MEUR.

City swimming pool (lido) 2MEUR, 30% state grant, popular

Current projects: House of Culture, and House of Arts 9 MEUR, co-fin by EU

Part of City development integrated plan

Need to improve road infrastructure, repulses investors. Now built till 2012 by the state

Rail not electrified and not fast

In this context, education is important for quality of life, hence project in the former military area. Discussions with Silesian Uni about collaboration, but option is to educate for local industries (on example of BTI in Karlskrona), and smth called 3rd age university for older citizens; there are more options being considered

12.00 LUNCH

13.00 SC meeting (notes by Vincent Jasper)

15.00 Break

15.30

MAH – intro to next two days.

Part A for PRA: methodology

Part B: LAP updates

Part C: Presentations from aspiring PRA partners (5 partners, 2 slots)

Part D:

Part A PRA (Hen's Presentation)

Benefits

Methodology:

- Selection criteria
- Scoring and voting

LAP presentations

Marco Toccafondi MT (Florence)

Florence LAP

Frm. State prison "Le Murate"

2 squares and a ped. Way

73 social dwellings

Social and commercial/handicraft spaces

Introduction of plan by pillar I-IV

MAH: how many jobs?

MT: 20-30.

VJ: are these jobs self-employed?

MT: yes

PS: Solar panels are not allowed on historic buildings also in Czech, but flat "film" is allowed in Prague

MT: cannot change roof in Florence. Using geo-thermal energy. Referring to Leopoldine convent Thermie A project

MAH: Are the LAPs validate by the LSGs in LSG meetings?

MT: yes

MAH: what is next in LSG?

MT: plan to hold the final plenary session of the LSG, to finalize roles in the project, and also discuss further projects in the area, residential and other initiatives in progress. At least 1 such session.

MAH: clarify – will LSG be focusing on other related initiatives, or on LAP?

MT: more on LAP, but also on future

MAH: pillar IV seems to be complete, What about other pillars, will they be completed by the end of REPAIR?

MAH: please remind on final result on Pillar I

MT: minimizing waste production on the building site, use of materials, adaptation of the dwellings to lowest national restrictions.

MAH: how is this monitored, if it is achieved? Are there targets in municipality?

MT. There are monitoring sub-offices almost in every department, such as air pollution and other.

MAH: Which partners would you be interested to exchange?

MT: Opava and NHW

PK: Malta prison?

MT: yes, of course.

Thomas Werner TW

Rostock LAP

Wanted to start from reconstruction of the part of city wall close to Kroepeliner Tor. Don't know when it will start, TW thinks it may be delayed for several years.

Another area under reconstruction is in the North West at Cannon Hill, perhaps one of the last reconstructions.

Many information panels were installed to inform, but not all very visible, sometimes more design than information.

Early June a meeting of LSG and municipal dept of heritage, dept. green spaces, NGO, Rostock Company of Urban Regeneration, and local museum that is close to fortifications, and it was decided to make a total new information desk for tourists – "barrier free". It will help attract tourists and inhabitants to the wall. A tour of the former and existing fortification around the city centre is being developed.

PS: are delays of new reconstruction due to lack of funding

TW: money to regeneration is given by fed gov, and the city council decides what to do with it. City wall used to be top priority, but it changed to school of arts and media. Another problem is 20% decrease in 2010 from 2009 level and in 2011 50% decrease of fed funds from 2009 level.

PS: when you are preparing documentation, is it public?

TW: yes, but the City is making a decision. School is run by NGOs, and they may have a higher profile than "municipal" projects – among the politicians who make decisions. And school also needs reconstruction, built in sozialismus.

PS: so what is going to happen

TW: next year when it is clear how much money is available the politicians of the city will make the decision

PS: In Opava, we make plans too in administration. And then we try to find money in EU, state or local. So, give us the money and we can start tomorrow.

TW: we are prepared, too. The proposals are ready, we could start many projects. But the future.

MT: What is Rostock strategy with military sites?

TW: mostly recreational, to have the sites for public use

VJ: budget. You said there were reductions. The prop is 20% local, 30% land, 50% fed.

MAH: What buddies?

TW: Rostock Heath could be interesting for Avrig.

MAH, Medway

LAP

Recap problem and challenge

Context:

Thames Gateway

Medway Renaissance

SCS

Master Plan for Chattenden/Lodge Hill – a lot of different issues, not just new social housing

Eco-Region

Other strategies

LDF

Community infrastructure Plan

LTP3

Economic Development and Social regeneration Strategies

World Heritage ambition & Great Line City Park

River officers

Economic and skills plan

Medway energy plan

Target outcome of LAP: develop new policy of sustainable community

Local dissemination activities – spring 2011

Local strategic partnership

PS: any idea how to use the river?

VJ: The river officers group works on this although the Medway River is not used very much. Could be used much more for transport and leisure pursuits. In 25 years after dock closure the river has silted up. So, some groups want to prevent development and retain biosphere.

PS: How do you balance these two opposite interests?

MAH: there is a huge framework for debate where the city tries to play a role of a catalyst. Many consultations are going on at present It really grows up and starts joining up now.

VJ: that's why the interest in REPAIR grows.

PK: buddy up?

MAH: econ and triple helix. With Karlskrona on Telecom City concept, would like to do is with LSG to revitalize may be visit. Avrig energy plan. Transport –

17 June 09.00

MAH introducing day's programme

Remaining Local Action Plan

Pilot Regeneration Action presentations

Discussion and voting

Hen Gerritse

Introducing PRA as practical implementation of exchange and discussions

Peer review process is important

Introducing Process between now and April next year

Repeat PRA, benefits and methodology
Access mainstream ERDF funding
based on baseline and PF
Linked to Ascend
Methodology: action planning, expert visits, meeting with MA and LSG
One more WG session in one of selected PRA sites

LOCAL ACTION PLANS CONTINUED

Now, carry on with LAP presentations

Arnold G Klingeis, Avrig

LAP

Part of local development strategy
Linked to energy master plan and communication strategy
5 actions have been considered and confirm

Public tender for biomass CHP has been announced
Public-public partnership for Nature Park
Museum, in some way inspired by Kaunas
Research centre, very important, as we saw in Telecom City in Karlskrona,
also as a public partnership, with public or private university
Conference center as a job creation venture

Much money is needed for these 5 projects. The city does not have it. So,
Avrig needs a marketing plan to raise funding.

So, the first to happen is the CHP. Planted elephant grass as a test for
biomass production.

There will be more initiatives under these headlines

The plan for the final event is to host a part of it in Sibiu, and then set up
a tent on the actual site as we all saw in Medway

HG: Questions?

VJ: the plants?

AK: testing 4 types of elephant grass to see which one is most productive
in the area

HG: how is the conference centre linked with military site?

AK: through tourism tourists will come, stay, experience the site, the
wildlife nature park, the mountains. The military site will work as
attraction to tourists.

Timescale for implementation: 7-12 years.

Short term: CHP and studies for other components

Research centre linked to energy policy ref. to Karskrona, and to
biodiversity of the ... mountains.

Two pillars for Avrig economy: energy and tourism

HG: next pres. Opava
PS.

Thoughts around 4 pillars
Education in the former military site
Reflects experience of the REPAIR working group meetings
Brings new ideas
Idea framework has been set up, will be worked out in more detailed plans
Pillars 2 and 3 have been finished, all pillars will be agreed by LSG until end of 2010.

We start from Thesis, describing how to put theoretic considerations into practice
Good practice examples
Proposed solutions included cost estimates
Expected Impact of Opava development
Conclusions

Pillar by pillar
(To be included from presentation)

I,

II,

III,

Cannot avoid the cars completely, so military sites used as park and connect to public transport

IV

Probably will not make a lot of new jobs directly, rather some multiplier effect, increase purchasing power, etc

Thoughts to be put on paper in greater detail

HG: Questions

Teresa: any expectations on how many jobs?

PS: no

PK: any new SMEs?

PS: an option to include business incubator, probably on another site

VJ: are there industries that would like to relocate into the site for any reason?

PS: Perhaps - from outside Opava, on a new faculty of the Silesian Uni.

MAH: Any Renewable energy examples in Opava?

PS: No resources for RE in Opava, just biomass

HG: decentralized power plants?

PS: an option LAP just a framework of ideas Many possibilities will be included

HG: are you thinking of specific theme in education, such as Avrig on renewable energy?

PS: several options – a new faculty, or a cluster with industrial firms like in Karlskrona, or wellness as a theme

VJ: Geothermal?

PS: too long payback

NHW

PGM Ros

In Utrecht, De Gagel LAP was presented, as it was finished then already.

Now, NHW activities by pillar

De Gagel as information transferium pillar 2

Pillar 1 Energy – new research for opportunities in NHW

Pillar 4 – inclusion of employment projects

Pillar 3 – big changes:

Ring road of Utrecht, 1,5 BEUR, lots of coordination with the NHW forts

How to get money from infrastructure investments?

Coordinated transport and local development effort and the social issues?

PK: what's transferium

PR: connection point with parking, public transport etc.

Malta

Malcom Borg

Made up of two plans stitched together: repair and SPUR.

(insert presentation)

LAP in 6 sections

3 processes of elaboration of LAP

6 actions

4 SPUR projects

Horizontal initiatives

George Cilia

Hutment renewal

(insert presentation)

PR: will old hangars be retained:

GC: 4 in a block

PK: is there demand for industrial space?

GC: partly for removal of small industries and workshops from residential areas, partly incubator, in various industries, eg. electronics "Spectra", fully flexible worktime

PR: new design - what inspiration?

GC: possibility for solar cells on the roof; possibility to connect multiple spaces

MB: day care centre was planned in old reservoir of Victorian period, very interesting design, reusing the water feature inside new building

Kaunas

Andrius Baranauskas

General intro historic aerodrome

(insert presentation)

Pillar presentation

MAH: has there been identified any funding possibilities?

AB: Norwegian mechanism for wooden buildings was applied for, but did not succeed May be in next period

BREAK 1105 – 1125

HG

Peer review

(see flipchart)

HG: Any budget?

MAH: only in ULSG and MA parts, eg Medway job pillar ULSG may go to Karlskrona

HG: send me the proposals, and with LP we'll discuss budget

MAH: Hen needs to get material as he will write the peer review report by the end of the year

HG: close this part, now beauty contest (PRA selection)

PS explains the rules, and do the Charente presentation

PR: what's next?

HG: explains PRA process

PR: what will the partners who do not have PRA do?

Benefit from results of meetings with MA, gain methodology developed for PRA, and follow up

VJ: presentation of Charente-Maritime PRA application

Mostly tourism-oriented

(insert presentation)

Questions will be answered after phoning them

Lunch at 13.00

13.45

PRA Florence

MT

(insert presentation)

New phase of Le Murate prison regeneration, 2,5 MEURO already available out of 10 MEURO total cost Time schedule: completion 2013

Questions:

AK: how many square meters to be recovered?

Claudio Fantoni: 34 for new housing units

MB: how to adapt prison to housing, difficulties architecturally?

CF: we have great architects in Italy (all laugh)

HG: any PPP

CF: no, just public, private just rent

MAH: was funding sought for the whole project?

MT: thematic applications, eg. housing was applied for in several places, including Le Murate. 2nd phase commercial, incubator have yet to be submitted to ERDF

Avrig

AK

(insert presentation)

Questions:

AB: Does the municipality own the land?

AK: yes, we cannot influence national laws on eg. VAT to give investors other benefits than land

VJ: Medway tried to support businesses in different ways

MB: is it good the authority to hold shares in private business

AK: that's normal

MAH: maybe you can have a municipal company?

AK: we already have such companies, (gives examples). They belong to the council but management is independent

VJ: Are board members from the council?

AK: yes, but they are not bound to vote directed by the City council in the company board

VJ: feedback from Charente

Q: what level of political and community support?

A: C_M tourism office is very supportive. Small boat owners are very enthusiastic to get more work. Site owners are very supportive and involved

Q: possibilities for funding? Are they identified?

A: No, options have not been explored; they so far focused on communication

Q: what about profit?

A: shared between C_M and operators

Q: alternative energy on the boats – what ideas?

A: One of the boats runs on electric motor from solar panel on the boat and we want to add to this

Q: any spin off foreseen?

A: education on sustainable transportation + history of military heritage; helps to reach large groups of young people (?)

Q: who is operating at the moment?

A: a public agency, C_M tourism office. Costs are low, as this puts together existing facilities into a low cost package, but costs will increase with growth

Q: consolidation of all 3 tours?

A: possible, but 2 touristic, 1 educational, o target separate markets

Q: profits?

A: yes

Paola, Corradino correctional facility
Malcolm Borg

Q: none

Voting

Voting results announced

16:00 discussion of peer review

HG: How is Malta going to work on PRA? Using agora?

Based on peer review choices?

MB: (brainstorming) maybe visits, through internet portals

Charente not present

Further work plan.