



## Work Group Report:

Former military heritage site re-uses and techniques, which secure the long-term preservation of the heritage and contribute to broader sustainable urban development



**R**EALISING THE **P**OTENTIAL  
OF **A**BANDONED MILITARY SITES  
AS AN **I**NTEGRAL PART OF  
SUSTAINABLE URBAN  
COMMUNITY **R**EGENERATION

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

repair 



## **Forward by Cllr Mrs Jane Chitty, Medway Council's Portfolio Holder for Strategic Growth and Economic Development**

---

As Medway Council's Portfolio Holder for Strategic Growth and Economic Development, I have been a Cabinet Member since 2002, and an elected Member since 1982. My portfolio responsibilities include planning, building and development control, economic development, social regeneration, tourism and events, European affairs and falls within the Thames Gateway area, one of the largest regeneration zones in Europe.

One of the challenges taken up by Medway Council, in common with EU partners, is to realise the excellent potential for former military sites to develop highly successful alternative uses, stimulating job creation, new economic activity and quality of life improvements.

Until now, former military land regeneration projects throughout Europe have been undertaken on an individual basis thanks to EU and national government funding. REPAIR project partners have come together to exchange experience on the conversion of former military sites to alternative uses. This presents an excellent opportunity to assist other EU regions facing similar challenges.

REPAIR partners chose to centre their exchange around four main pillars focusing the project activities into developing a framework to answer the major policy development challenge: **how the successful regeneration of former military sites can also act as catalyst for broader sustainable urban development.**

**The four Pillars are:**

- I. How to achieve the sustainable re-use of the built heritage and heritage sites, through maximising energy efficiency, the better management of waste production, energy consumption and greater use of renewable energies;
- II. How to develop alternative site uses and techniques, which best secure the long term preservation of the military heritage;
- III. How to maximise access to military sites by sustainable modes of transport, which minimise car use and decouple transport growth from local GDP growth;
- IV. How the socio-economic re-use of the sites can maximise local jobs for local people and therefore sustainable communities and greater social cohesion.

Partners came together in Medway, UK during May 2009 to debate the second pillar and common goal: **How can we develop alternative site uses and techniques, which both secure the long-term preservation of the military heritage and contribute to broader sustainable development of the surrounding urban areas?**

The very ethos of interregional co-operation, and of network projects, is making recommendations. Partners can reflect on their own experience, and conclude how they would do things differently if they were starting afresh; what advice they would offer regions in similar positions; what they do differently now compared to in the past, based on experience and development

In addition, a key role of a network is to assimilate experience. In mapping all the recommendations made by individual partners, key priority areas have emerged, which we present to you in this work group report.

I commend the work undertaken so far and look forward to seeing the future developments unfold.

---



## **REPAIR Working Group Pillar II “ Preservation”**

**Our Goal: How can we develop alternative site uses and techniques which both secure the long term preservation of the military heritage and contribute to broader sustainable development of the surrounding urban areas?**

### **Objectives:**

**To develop EU policy recommendations by:**

- 1) agreeing what factors would be critical to successfully achieving our goal;**
- 2) learning from one another’s experiences about what has helped and what has hindered success so that we identify best practice examples;**
- 3) To develop and test our policy recommendations on typical case studies;**
- 4) To use the above to help each working group member to develop their own practical action plans for local implementation;**
- 5) In addition to learn some practical tools and techniques to help us in our day-to-day work and to get to know one another better so that the group works as effectively as possible.**

Facilitators: Judy Oliver, Jacquie Stringer, Diana Haw, Nigel Wood, Jennie Peters

### **What would we like to achieve from these two days?**

Listen and Learn  
Look at how others do things  
Help my area to be a nicer place  
Learn from others  
See how other cities have developed their sites  
Share ideas  
Make comparisons  
Learn how to deliver this work in different ways  
Build knowledge for us and the rest of Europe  
Want to know more  
Get to know you all better  
Learn what has survived from ASCEND to help REPAIR project  
Learn a lot from others  
Ownership of best practice  
Take lessons back to Government  
Obtain ideas that can be applied  
Help make connections

Be able to extend these processes and disseminate to other cities  
Bring different specialisations and experts together  
Develop ideas we can share with others  
Exchange of experience and expertise

**Our Goal is to secure the military heritage and sustainable urban development**

**If we knew we are going to be really successful in achieving our goal, how will we know?**

Group A (Paulius, Andreas, Helena, Malcolm, Anton, Jiri, David, Fiona and John)

Project finished (phew!)  
All aspects of community will be proud and aware of the site's significance  
It will be a better place to live and work – investment in people not just buildings  
Material and immaterial – both  
Community will be able to physically gain access to site  
People will come – site will be appreciated  
Relevant to local people  
Local employment – tourism link  
Engagement – include voluntary sector who are often community members, e.g. park management in Dock area, School children, social housing in barracks (Malta)  
Funding will be balanced between local community and powerful potential investors

Group B (Liz, Martina, Claes-Ake, Kevin, Renald, Lenka, Irena, Angret, Philip)

The site will be useful to the community  
It will be used as a good example – others will recognise it and adopt our ideas  
Acceptability of the community  
Citizens become participants (ownership)  
Maximum transparency (Of process)  
Embedding on local level  
Funding secured will support other projects  
The creation of individual action plans  
We develop ourselves as a network  
Knowledge of all other projects here!  
Small, unexpected things will be picked up from other projects to use  
Recognition at Government level

Group C (Vince, Hen, Angret, Lillian, Christopher, Maria, Dominic, Martine)

It will be clear why the project is wanted  
The potential of the site will have been realised  
11 countries working together and learning from other EU countries  
Turn policy into local action plans – seek funding sources (£)  
Site to become known by local communities, mixed use, sign of positive recognition from further away  
Sustainability  
Good awareness of the site – civic pride, local people involved in planning and devising its use. – ‘stakeholders’  
Local policy is important, learn from other EU sites  
Increasing value in our heritage: get “buy in” from locals  
New use of sites  
‘Preservation through re-use’ at local and national level  
EU level – take our combined knowledge to policy level as a method for future site development  
Need for ongoing strategy  
Bottom up planning – ‘use stakeholders’ creativity’  
Active local involvement resulting in local action plans and local support group  
Full use not just historical heritage  
‘Alive and kicking’ – bring life into the site

#### Group D (Clem, Andrius, Mikael, Peter, Michel, Lucian, Arnold, Jose, Petr)

Opening ‘secret’ places  
People will like/value the project  
Place is ‘alive’  
Feedback is positive from people outside project including external experts  
It brings advantage to city/area as a whole  
Everyone has participated  
Sign of peace – no longer war  
Tourism (sustainable/manageable)  
Heritage is itself sustainable / clear ‘journey’ of human use over time  
Military sites make tangible contribution to local community  
Public/private partnership – improve economy  
Help develop businesses – people will invest in area  
Immediate local people are happy in vicinity  
Clear road map for how to do this – refined with experience  
We manage potential conflicts between EU, national and community, e.g. wetlands  
Budget would be same as if development had been in new site  
Improved quality of life – local people (jobs, educational – give a future to a place that was use-less)  
Sustainable entrepreneurs are in place to take the project forward – who understand area, ownership/enthusiastic about heritage – sustain it in the long term.

## **What Factors will be critical to our success?**

### Group A (Paulius, Andreas, Helena, Malcolm, Anton, Jiri, David, Fiona and John)

May involve compromise – regarding key critical issues  
Or must it be success to everyone  
National versus local needs  
Non-political – ownership by all  
Evidence – proof of benefits  
Awareness of why military fortification – for local or colonial heritage  
Social inclusion – functioning and creating for themselves a community asset, as well as preservation  
Time / age of site – recent experience regarding third parties' sites  
(Whose heritage?)  
Appropriate public function (planning hospital, school terms) – community consultation / research implementation  
Where appropriate creating local jobs (higher skilled)  
Local communities – often used to paternalistic input versus enterprise mindset, e.g. creative small business  
Broaden expectations of local communities to accept different jobs

### Group B (Liz, Martina, Claes-Ake, Kevin, Renald, Lenka, Irena, Angret, Philip)

What factors are critical to the success of the REPAIR Project?

Communication – sharing information  
Equality of commitment  
Time – meeting deadlines  
Willingness to share  
Co-production with local community and network  
Secured funding  
Strong leadership (lead partner)

### Group C (Vince, Hen, Angret, Lillian, Christopher, Maria, Dominic, Martine)

Have a long term vision  
Business Development Strategy  
Have inspirational champions  
At the beginning have local involvement  
Identify sources of funding – public/private partnership to achieve sustainability  
Fundraising – create a good story, e.g. significance of the site, its value and Unique Selling Point – not just for heritage  
Good communications and Marketing  
Balance of private and public interests  
Public – create conditions and plan for development then BRIDGE to the actual development  
Political support: local and national  
Establish a formal body as a keeper of the site overall – be selective about what you restore

Sustainable via mixed use to being different sources of revenue: short – longer term

Need an element of private money to help achieve sustainability

Group D (Clem, Andrius, Mikael, Peter, Michel, Lucian, Arnold, Jose, Petr)

Strong will

Continuity of people/ideas

Financing (Sustainable despite the economic crisis)

Master plan / strategy – respect for everyone

Exchange of experience – visible example to others – internal and external

Reliable partners

Understand context (including local political views of immediate neighbours)

Involve local people in the process

Fits with local strategy

Demonstrates plan of action to generate jobs and attract inward investment

Meets the needs of bigger local community (campsite)

Clear assessment of impact on utilities e.g. gas, electricity and water, and resources (IT), transport, tourism

With local neighbours, build in facilities, e.g. car parking

Thorough examination of safety measures for public use – removal of risks (balance safety and cultural heritage)

Tourism – assessment and plan (impact assessment)

Balance between nature, environment and heritage

Thorough knowledge - Government and local regarding regulations and permissions first, e.g. conservation policy and agree with authorities – what can you do? What can't you do?

Compatibility between heritage and users of site

**These Critical Success Factors were examined and summarised as follows:**

**1. Strong leaders**

(Partnership Project Board involving community)

**2. Clear vision and strategy that is relevant to the area**

**3. Understand the context**

What national and local regulations and restrictions apply, what can the site be used/not used for?

**4. Involvement of the local people**

**5. Funding – Private/Public**

Sustainable funding which involves a mix of public and private contributors.

**6. Transparent open process, good communication**

Throughout the project to maximise the level of trust between all concerned.

**7. Political support - non-partisan - at EU, national and local levels**

**8. Investing in both the buildings and the people (including infrastructure)**

**9. Thorough impact assessment (safety and security, nature and environment, culture, conservation, transport and parking and tourism)**

**10. Something for everyone, demonstrable benefits for the local community and the economy**

**11. Professional and technical expertise**

We then heard presentations by each of the project teams represented. A group was designated to assess the project against the critical success factors in order to test the criteria and identify best practice examples.

### **Project Presentations**

#### **Rostock**

*What worked?*

New Inner City Development Framework and Action Plan

Historical Association with lots of actions and specific Wall Exhibition

Museum at City Wall got a maintained re-opened building and shows now a model of City defence system

New pedestrian area by City Wall opened in November 2008

Euro architects competition = new development at City Wall

*Problems encountered:*

Plan had been to celebrate architects competition – St. Petri Gate - will now be delayed so no chance for Repair to support this activity

Alternative uses?

*Action needed:*

Exhibition

Tourism product development, e.g. guided walks round City walls

Education and Product Development

New street to be developed ahead of arch

Competition

Soon housing complex development in front of City Wall

Improve public awareness

Finance / national / federal / local funds and private

#### **Charente-Maritime**

*Aim:*

To put in a network of fortresses and find a specific theme for each site.  
Budget is £1 million  
Funding since 1999 – Euro 1.6 million  
Imaginative Activity for children designed which links all 6 forts  
9 seasonal workers  
Euro 25,000 annual costs  
Many actors: Municipalities, tourism owners of forts

*Problems encountered:*

Waiting for political decision – funding solutions

**Kaunas – Re-development of Aerodrome, airfield and surrounding area**

*Problems encountered:*

Different opinions on how to use the site  
Lack of financing resources – depends on use  
Long last procedures for state owned land use  
Not enough political will  
Cultural heritage department restrictions  
Political leadership keeps changing

*Action needed:*

To find accepted and attractive way to develop to meet all parties  
Further development of science and technology  
Use EU structured funds for leisure park, recreation and sports  
Attracting private investors  
Changes in national legislation for state owned land use and cultural heritage restriction

**Opava – University buildings**

*What action is needed?*

Get relevant information from studies (to understand site)  
Make good decisions regarding re-use of site  
Create realistic plan of next steps  
Find good content  
Have realistic plan  
Find reliable partners

*Finances:*

55.5 million Euros needed to build university campus  
Will need to interest partners, universities etc to help

*Broader effects for City:*

Strong historical identity  
New life in site has positive influence on whole city

Respect history and the place  
Saved buildings for next generation  
Effective re-use of buildings – each building will have its own sense and be part of whole complex  
Will bring more inter-regional functions

*Policy Recommendations:*

Legislation should be less difficult (i.e. City Plan charges)  
It is more about changing people's minds

**New Dutch Waterline**

*Goals:*

Conservation/restoration of all forts on edge of City of Utrecht.  
New and modern use for every fort  
Open to the public  
Redevelopment process with as many (private) partners as possible  
Varied and socially relevant usages

*Challenges:*

Large technical and financial task for Utrecht  
Three have been renovated and developed (started in 1999)  
Survey of Fort de Gagel started  
Lunatter 1, 2, 3 and 4 are in different stages of development

*What problems have been encountered?*

Resistance of neighbours against redevelopment plan  
Funding solution to preserve liberation of both  
Funding solutions for restoration problems (respecting monument laws)  
Getting precise estimate of costs  
Funding subsidies and co-financing

*Action Needed:*

90% now in agreement – still have 10% against  
'Preservation by Development'

*Finance:*

Euros 2.5 million including subsidies national provincial  
Less than 25% paid by City of Utrecht

**Avrig**

*What problems were encountered?*

Legal situation unclear – who owned it?  
Lack of vision  
Hidden site – so no clear access  
No proper management of site after closure

*Action needed:*

Sorted out legal situation – signed by Ministry of Defence that it belongs to Avrig

Shaped and defined vision – discussed in local council

*Finance:*

Estimated Euro 15,750,000

Local and state budgets, Government and external funds, investors

*Possible uses:*

National Park

Museum

Conference Centre

Research Centre and Education

Biomass Power Station

*What policy changes would you recommend?*

Need to promote development of places to County Council and business community

Promote at national level – Ministries of Tourism, Culture

Participation at international projects in order to achieve the development strategy of the military site

**Karlskrona**

Transformation of Baroque water cistern

*What problems were encountered?*

Water supply

Authorities – previous projects failed – too costly and too severe impact on monument

Make it useful for longer periods of time (in cold climate)

Complex building – build on rock/ tunnels etc

*Action taken:*

Planned a transfer of property to family

Sought permit to change National Monument

Had to ensure antiquarian control

Add two modern wings to enable greater use

Water tank climate is ideal for art but not necessarily humans

Cafe

Blend of old/new

**Malta**

Re-use of Forts

*What problems were encountered?*

Maintenance deficiency – not maintained for many years  
Risks from Social and Collective Behaviour  
Insufficient conservation standards – now surmounted by a Restoration Club  
Degradation of maintaining building problems  
Development related  
Compromised Values: Full development permits  
Briefs and action plans for each main areas

*Actions Taken:*

Initial financial injection  
Planning Gain Fees  
Better feasibility projection  
Non-prescriptive Brief  
Less taxing contractual obligations  
Less stringent Lease Agreements  
Inclusive CMPs  
Greater restoration funding as a percentage of project  
Each fort has cost between Euro 300,000 – 4 million

*Recommended Policy Changes:*

Calibrate better restoration MS submissions and monitoring logs – post development  
Risks from social and collective behaviour – more stringent lease committees  
Non-prescriptive planning briefs and action plans with better planned feasibility on land use  
Contextual notions beyond planning and political will to back strategic development

**Medway – Chatham Dockyard**

*What worked?*

Local people came together alongside national experts  
Vision and commitment – to deliver a 'living museum'  
Chatham Historic Dockyard Trust was established

*What problems were encountered?*

Huge site  
State of repair  
£24 million was required at time of closure just to make the buildings watertight

*Action needed:*

A strategy of 'Regeneration through Re-Use' was developed  
Innovative uses needed  
Decontamination of land and buildings

Creation of mixed use community with homes and businesses

*Finances:*

£11 million lump sum investment was available

£3 million was needed just to repair the Ropery Building roof

*Recommended Policy Changes?*

Need clear exit strategy to secure Long Term preservation

Consultation and involvement from all stakeholders

Site and preservation techniques are sustainable

Strategy must be adopted by local groups and decision makers

Follow an agreed process – preservation from re-use

**What issues can prevent us being successful? What can we do to overcome these?**

The presentations demonstrated that there were some common problems which preservation projects tend to have to manage. These included:

- Local community opposition
- Partners not agreeing on usage/having different agendas
- Insufficient funding
- Restrictive regulations/laws locally and nationally
- Political changes
- Difficulty in attracting private sector investment
- Single use sites
- Restoration problems – due to complexity, state of poor repair of buildings
- Different directives from different government departments
- Lack of local involvement and ownership of project

Participants worked in small groups on the following problems:

**1. How can we overcome lack of community involvement and local opposition to Preservation Projects?**

- If you don't do this, it is an absolute deal-breaker
- Make it clear to people how they can get involved in the project e.g. publicity, communication, ask people what they want, make questions VERY practical

Show the opportunities not the problems, encourage bottom up communication.

- Public authorities can employ community activities
- Take account of WIDE DIFFERENCES in national culture

**2. How can we overcome the lack of alignment between Government departments?**

- Netherlands – Public Involvement
- France – Bottom up approach, public consultation

- Medway – Cohesive Governance – Trust principle
  - Romania – Integrated Administration
  - Czech Republic – Integrated Administration and local governance
- 3. Lack of Strong Leadership – Partners do not agree on usage**
- A strong leader is willing to make themselves vulnerable
  - An agreement to be drawn up between local, regional, national and international levels
  - Work from bottom up – ‘grass roots’ consultation upwards
  - Appoint a ‘champion’ or ‘champions’ who is/are very knowledgeable, but exist outside the ‘official’ system e.g. Sir Terry Farrell for Medway
  - Strong creative consultation with the community means they won’t put up with weak leadership
- 4. How can we overcome major restoration challenges?**
- Obtain information/expertise to identify problems
  - Develop scenarios of solutions – economic, technological, historical, value added questions
  - Best solution – experts, historians, politicians, administration needed
  - Implement best solution – finance, money (new local tax, local lottery, investor, developer)
  - How much money saved? Maintenance?
- 5. How can we overcome the problem of changing political leadership – short period in office – lack of continuity? How can you ensure your project is sustainable?**
- Make long term contracts (with user)
  - Involve all political parties during the project
  - Influence new politicians before the election – (invite them)
  - Look for lobbyist in your area.
- 6. How can we overcome lack of finance, inaccurate cost estimates which result in us not having sufficient funds?**
- Heritage experts tend not to have business planning expertise – need a multi-disciplinary team to ensure all costs and perspectives are considered
  - Spatial planning and business plan
  - Clear investment plan – intelligence, combination of public/private partnership, capacity building leading to appropriate for model or network
  - It can help to organise the project in small steps which can be dealt with independently of one another
- 7. How to avoid failure to attract private sector involvement and investment**
- Private sector companies invest where project is assured. They don’t want to be ‘guinea pigs’

- The size of the company has to be linked to the size of the project (e.g. tiny, small etc.)
- Private sector does not want 'any strings attached' where government or local authority has control.
- Often Government regulations and processes can be very off-putting for businesses – need to build in more incentives into the system to encourage them to get involved

### **8. How can we overcome obstructive local planning processes and regulations?**

- Make the whole process transparent to the public
  - (work with local authorities to) Simplify planning processes as much as possible in terms of timescales and bureaucracy
- Involve all stakeholders from early stages to avoid surprises later!!!

Action: Those present were invited to think further about these issues and be prepared to add any further ideas on Day Two.

### **Summary of day**

Surprised at the method of working, had to adjust – also language barrier

Inspiring to meet colleagues

Methodology worked very well

Inspiring to get overview

Projects differ, but managed to relate

Successful

Inspirational – new from old

Thought provoking – laboratory of minds

Preparation is everything!

Europeans become complicit and together despite the complexity of it all

Nice to see how involved people are in the projects with military sites

I have seen other views for clear visions

Boring – not at all! Amazing to hear, because I know nothing about the subject. Inspiring and I want to know more!

Informative – give final opinions tomorrow. Can we find a common denominator?

Very interesting and happy to be here

Surprised about the discipline to use powerpoint and other networks – well guided through the operation of the day

Inspiring

Good communications using interesting methods to give the best results for all of us

A pleasure to exchange and use a lot of togetherness

I would appreciate working groups and also papers

Happy we are not the only ones in Europe having problems!

I loved the way it was organised. Appreciate that it was very original and successful

Will reserve judgment until tomorrow

Openness = good communication = possibility of resolving the problem

Your operation showed that we have results which everyone can see

Your team has been very professional and efficient today

I like the way you force us to be clear

Worried – because I am in a slightly different situation to all of you because I have to do the final reports tomorrow!

Only the second time to follow projects, so for me very informative and thought provoking – gives good oversight

Nice to meet a group of people with different sides on the problems and ideas were similar. Thank you and your team for the guidance

We started with rain and wind and now we have sunshine. Let's hope this is symbolic

## **Appendix 1**

Based on the Project Presentations:

### **What examples of good practice exist?**

#### **1. Opava – Early stages of project**

Criteria	Yes	Evidence
1. Strong leaders	?	Was there a strong leader? Who adopted the idea?
2. Clear Vision	Yes	Vision seems to have been developed with support of studies – needs focus, specialisation on sectors/champion
3. Understand Context	Yes	Old buildings will surround new which will secure awareness
4. Involve local people	?	Was the plan made by involving stakeholders?
5. Funding	?	Estimates of funding needed but process for gaining funding not evident
6. Transparent Process	?	More evidence needed
7. Political Support	?	More evidence needed
8. Investing in buildings and people	Yes	
9. Impact Assessment	Some	
10. Demonstrable benefits for community	Yes	The planned university complex will provide facilities for all – what's in it for the inhabitants of Opava?
11. Professional and technical expertise	Yes	More evidence needed

#### **2. Charente Maritime – principal focus on history and preservation issues**

Criteria	Yes	Evidence
1. Strong leaders	?	Management (political?)
2. Clear Vision	Yes	More evidence needed
3. Understand Context	Yes	Context is strong. More evidence needed
4. Involve local people	Yes	More evidence needed

5. Funding	Yes	More evidence needed
6. Transparent Process	?	Not clear what processes were used
7. Political Support	Yes	There was political support
8. Investing in buildings and people	Yes	More evidence needed
9. Impact Assessment	?	Not clear
10. Demonstrable benefits for community	Yes	Mixed use – hotel, sailing school, . Brouage and Chateau D'Oleron national wetland to be protected Promotion of Game to families visiting
11. Professional and technical expertise	?	More evidence needed

### **3. The New Dutch Waterline – well established project**

Criteria	Yes	Evidence
1. Strong leaders	?	Local government gave strict guidelines
2. Clear Vision	Yes	Access to the public – multi-use facilities, café, campsite, campus
3. Understand Context	Yes	Designed for use by public – walkers and cyclists
4. Involve local people	Yes	Resistance at first from local community – still some opposition – new jobs created for local people
5. Funding	Yes	EU funding, public (national and provincial and city) and private and others
6. Transparent Process	Yes	Monthly meetings held Long term building and planning process
7. Political Support	Yes	Local government – City of Utrecht Government helped
8. Investing in buildings and people	?	Consideration given to all forts and their uses – more evidence needed. Rent is coming in. Investment in people needs to be clearer
9. Impact Assessment	Yes	Still in negotiations keeping the forts authentic. Hibernating bats to be re-housed. Open all year Still to persuade neighbours over negative aspects e.g. parking.
10. Demonstrable benefits for community	Yes	Multi-facility used for learning, housing, business units Some neighbours don't feel involved
11. Professional and technical expertise	Yes	Consulted with professional departments. Bat Conservation Group

#### 4. Medway Chatham Historic Dockyard

Criteria	Yes	Evidence
1. Strong leaders	?	Led by local government groups
2. Clear Vision	Yes	\Very clear objectives. Sustainable preservation. Is vision of the local Dockyard Trust now owned more widely?
3. Understand Context	?	Following an agreed process
4. Involve local people	Yes	Historic Dockyard Trust. Involvement from all local stakeholders. Stressed as important but no explanation of how this has been done up to now
5. Funding	Yes	National funding made available. Strategy of long term preservation and a project of such ambition needs continual funding. Shortfall mentioned – how was this overcome?
6. Transparent Process	?	No real evidence
7. Political Support	Yes	National and local level – providing funding
8. Investing in buildings and people	Yes	Living Museum – creating new jobs and housing
9. Impact Assessment	?	Preservation Through Re-use. Decontamination was a major priority.
10. Demonstrable benefits for community	Yes	New jobs – Housing. Museum, tourism, restaurants, hotel. Everyone is benefitting,
11. Professional and technical expertise	Yes	Expertise sought at all stages of project. Experienced and professional

#### 5. Avrig – Secret military area

Criteria	Yes	Evidence
1. Strong leaders	Yes	Able to influence and persuade local focus groups to agree proposals – broader ownership not clear
2. Clear Vision	Yes	Personal visioning of Mayor – still has to be developed
3. Understand Context	?	Not clear
4. Involve local people	Yes	Referendum held – debate.
5. Funding	?	Variety of public and private sources of funds
6. Transparent	?	No evidence given

Process		
7. Political Support	?	Mayor at local level – also willing to secure county level buy-in
8. Investing in buildings and people	?	Retaining building use where possible
9. Impact Assessment	?	No evidence
10. Demonstrable benefits for community	?	To supply local energy source – international conference centre, parkland/nature, education, tourism
11. Professional and technical expertise	Yes	Have worked with professional departments e.g. self-sufficiency – bringing in outside expertise?

**6. Kaunas – early stage of project to preserve former military airport**  
**Feasibility studies have identified a range of possible options. –**  
**Numerous problems over lack of agreement between partners about**  
**usage, political instability, legal restrictions, no clear leadership,**  
**Sustainability?**

Criteria	Yes	Evidence
1. Strong leaders	?	Evidence needed – who are the leaders?
2. Clear Vision	?	Reasons not clear. Plan is quite vague
3. Understand Context	Yes	Feasibility studies – 3 alternatives
4. Involve local people	?	Not much evidence of involvement
5. Funding	?	More infrastructure money needed – attracting public and private funds
6. Transparent Process	?	Statement but needs to get message across more clearly – is the project wanted by local people? No evidence given.
7. Political Support	?	Not enough strong political will to help overcome problems – good awareness of problems which lack of political stability cause. Started by local council.
8. Investing in buildings and people	?	People and science park. Tourism.
9. Impact Assessment	?	Feasibility studies – no ecological expertise yet?
10. Demonstrable benefits for	?	Not clear as yet – tourism, sports activity – depends on agreed use.

community		
11. Professional and technical expertise	?	Professional architect employed to do the job. More expertise will be needed.

**7. Karlskrona – Preservation of water cistern originally built by military. Good use of technical expertise, architects, engineers etc, Tourism and café local use bringing jobs and building back into use. Impact assessment, energy use, leadership/political support/local community involvement unclear**

Criteria	Yes	Evidence
1. Strong leaders	Yes	Private owners interested to force the idea through
2. Clear Vision	Yes	Master Plan but why are public authorities involved?
3. Understand Context	Yes	Military built water tower – to be used as museum/art gallery –clear city plan
4. Involve local people	?	Not evidenced at consultation and planning stage
5. Funding	Yes	All private funding – 100%
6. Transparent Process	?	Debate amongst officials – process not clear
7. Political Support	?	No division evidenced but process and support unclear
8. Investing in buildings and people	Yes	Complex construction of building renovated and adapted for people
9. Impact Assessment	?	Not clear
10. Demonstrable benefits for community	Yes	Tourist attraction and café benefits people and economy
11. Professional and technical expertise	?	Technical challenges re. construction of walls etc met by expertise and climate control

## 8. Malta

Criteria	Yes	Evidence
1. Strong leaders	Yes	Non-private NGO actively involved – national government decision. Support of the Mayor
2. Clear Vision	Yes	Every fort has a plan – know what to do with site
3. Understand Context	Yes	Different examples – know site well. Clear description of buildings – clear idea of project

		aims
4. Involve local people	Yes	Event =- more subjects involved
5. Funding	Yes	Public – might be a problem – slower process – no partnerships. Private investment needed – lack of financial injections
6. Transparent Process	?	No evidence
7. Political Support	Yes	At all levels – national/local/NGO. Government had clear vision. Land could be rented
8. Investing in buildings and people	Yes	Examples – social housing positive action – analysis of building preservation – maintenance deficiency
9. Impact Assessment	Yes	Thought about everything – clear ideas about future development in detail
10. Demonstrable benefits for community	Yes	Different examples of re-use – several types for different people (cultural, social, housing)
11. Professional and technical expertise	Yes	Know a lot about technicalities of the site and how to work with it.

## 9. Rostock – City development

Criteria	Yes	Evidence
1. Strong leaders	Yes	Strong plan from government – new Inner City Development Plan. Former NGO members actively participate in project activities Not clear that this initiative has strong political backing
2. Clear Vision	Yes	Spatial Planning. New Comprehensive Plan. Military Heritage pre-conditions. Development Framework Plan is very clear. Is there a clear over-riding vision? Cross ministerial need
3. Understand Context	Yes	Using old city wall in new development. Harmonised action plan based on history and geography. Understand all the connections between history and modern day and all relationships
4. Involve local people	Yes	Disabled people involved. Spatial development combined with community development – co-operation with community. City wall housing project involved local people – engagement of local association. Interesting architectural competition. Guided tours, volunteers involved.

5. Funding	Yes	Public and private – strong public finance input from a variety of sources – need to get better private sector input
6. Transparent Process	?	Need to improve public awareness
7. Political Support	?	Not presented – has project transcended politics? Not strong in a changing world
8. Investing in buildings and people	Yes	Job opportunities for local people for City Wall housing development. Investing more in buildings than people
9. Impact Assessment	?	Analysis of housing needs carried out led to social housing provision
10. Demonstrable benefits for community	Yes	Tangible benefits to broader community and economy not immediately clear
11. Professional and technical expertise	Yes	Input from cultural and heritage bodies but needs broader range of expertise

## **Day Two**

### **What we want from today?**

Co-ordinate our thoughts and develop plan  
Convert ideas into sustainable regeneration  
How to overcome problems  
Link between preservation/conservation and sustainable urban regeneration  
Results we can take home to use  
Common vision of policy  
Recommendations for Baltic League Museum  
Conclude ideas – best practice  
Best practice examples  
Ideas to adopt  
What do to on the ground?  
Break down high level policy for local level  
How all this transmits to local level  
Where it will go next?  
What routes to take?  
Practical recommendation – influence EU  
Recommendations which help projects to be sustainable?  
Results – first step to working well together to develop all our sites  
Results! Results! Practical Plans!

### **What can we do to overcome problems?**

Participants reviewed the groups work which was carried out at the end of Day One and added additional ideas which were incorporated into the notes.

### **Developing Local Action Plans - Managing a Successful Transition**

Participants were invited to work in their project groups to refine their Local Action Plans in view of the lessons which had been shared during the previous twenty-four hours.

The Facilitating Team offered participants a framework for thinking about the transition which they are managing based on the work of William Bridges. A useful metaphor can be the Israelites moving from Egypt to the Promised Land i.e. from an abandoned military site to a thriving new community facility which contributes to sustainable urban development. Participants were invited to consider the following questions:

1. What do we do now which we can build on? (and what do we need to do to achieve this?)

2. What do we need to end? (and what do we need to do to achieve this?)
3. What new things do we need to introduce? (and what do we need to do to achieve this?)

Example presented by The Dutch Waterline Project

### **Developing EU Policy Recommendations**

Participants were invited to use the same methodology in developing EU [policy recommendations in respect of the REPAIR Programme.

1. What do we do now which we can build on? E.g. international co-operation, determination to convert a place associated with war to one associated with peace and community spirit.
2. What do we need to end? E.g. Bureaucratic, lengthy planning processes, lack of joined-up thinking across government departments/ministries.
3. What new things do we need to do? E.g. wider community participation.

With this as background, participants were invited to first think in pairs and then in groups about the following questions:

What policy changes will you recommend specifically?

### **Summary of Working Group Recommendations and agreement on good practice examples**

*Recommendations:*

1. Clear EU Policy

Establish clear EU policy regarding military heritage as a means of sustainable urban development

This policy to be implemented in member states to ensure EU, national, regional and community level systems of administration, planning etc. In support of this. Ensure continuity of initiatives throughout political change  
Resources made available for other purposes should incorporate heritage as a cross-cutting issue

Council ministers – set of agreed principles what is sustained development?

European funding will be available direct to local authorities

Filling the 'gap' in policy when neither urban or rural policies apply – which charter applies, if at all ('one size fits all doesn't apply')

Sustainable partnership across cutting at all levels

At EU level: convincing arguments – more recognition that in economic development more heritage recognition is included

All EU members – informed 6 monthly meeting. Council recommendation regarding planning on cultural heritage

Code of Ethics: Overriding coordinated process to ensure all partners are involved from the start (community – professional – local Government funder)  
Because the military doesn't fit well with urban/rural heritage. The new development should be the overriding process, in which military/heritage fits  
Existing policies – make it happen  
Integration of neighbours – more programmes to enable co-operation (with cross border)

## 2. Programme Methodology

Inter-department committee (Central Government) re. Ministry heritage re-use: lack of holistic view – implications of proposed site: resources, skills (silo counter approach)  
Simplify planning process – with focus and deadlines  
Jargon busting policy needed  
Standards imposed top down need greater consideration of impact at local level  
Onus on leadership – local authorities to take on outside expertise to make it happen practically, e.g. Working Group which is inter-disciplinary to define the vision and implement so make this a pre-policy requisite to the site

## 3. Local Action Plan Level

Marketing: to keep continuity of idea – stakeholders: community, brings partners, political support. Co-ownership of ideas  
Identify volunteers at start of project  
Need Clarity on what is an Action Plan  
Take bigger goals into 'mini action plans' – steps to bigger goal  
Community development engagement belongs to integrated sustainable development  
Local level – policy communicated to local people – target to different population segments, e.g. OP, young families, students and adjust communication methods 'what's in it for me?'

# **REPAIR URBACT NETWORK – FIRST WORKSHOP**

## **POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING**

### **1 POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

1.1 To make community involvement a pre-requisite of planning processes and development briefs. To ensure it is an integral part of sustainable development

1.2 The need for a strategic co-ordination committee, which features inter-departmental representation from government departments – this will ensure a more holistic approach to site regeneration, which is able to combine physical, social and economic regeneration priorities.

1.3 The need for a historical site degradation impact assessment in order to determine the true capital renovation costs and the true revenue costs of ongoing maintenance.

1.4 At EU level the need for a Council of Ministers recommendation, which presents a series of core principles on sustainable development, which are applicable in policy terms across all areas of competence.

1.5 Establish a clear EU policy regarding the special case of military heritage site regeneration as a means of sustainable urban development.

1.6 Advocating a combined site master plan and business plan in order to measure more accurately the potential for the site to generate employment successfully.

### **2. PROGRAMME GUIDANCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 The need for a project delivery working group which is inter-disciplinary and which combines expertise in planning, social regeneration, sustainable development, business development, finance etc. This should be made a programme pre-requisite.

2.2 The need to integrate approaches in policy terms to economic regeneration and cultural heritage conservation.

2.3 The need for closer cross-border co-operation between partner areas to address military site regeneration.

2.4 Simply the project delivery process – focus on clear deadlines.

2.5 Jargon busting policy needed in order to break down inter-disciplinary communication barriers as well as barriers between different levels of governance.

2.6 The need to achieve clarity as to the role of a Local Action Plan.

2.7 The drawing up of a new model planning process, which ensures that the business and commercial planning dimension is fully integrated.

### **3. PROJECT DELIVERY PLAN GUIDANCE**

3.1 Community consultation methods employed need to be centered on the specific nature of the group of residents being consulted – different population segments, OP, young families, students etc. Develop specific model guidelines on community consultation that should be adhered to.

3.2 Establish a code of ethics in terms of project delivery plans, which ensure that all key partners are engaged and involved from the start (community, professionals, local government, funding agents etc)/

3.3 Organisational development needs for local authorities and local regeneration practitioners – specialist staff often take a one-sided approach, which does not take into account the broader strategic approach. There is a need to adopt a more holistic view of the regeneration process that respects the need to combine expertise.