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The proposed site is the historic urban landscape represented by the significant extent of modernist architecture buildings in the centre of Kaunas in Lithuania. It is a witness to the fundamental transformation in urban life during the 20th century and will contribute to the balance and credibility of the World Heritage List by the enhancement of the heritage of Modernism represented on it.

Lithuania, with four cultural heritage properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List, this time faced a unique social transformation, when local communities and local initiatives were most actively involved in the process of developing contemporary cultural heritage management and justifying values related to the modernist architecture of Kaunas.

Ongoing reflection on the 20th century architecture of Kaunas, its urban solutions and contemporary demands facilitated a thorough integration of issues related to sustainable development, the way of looking at an historic urban landscape, and awareness of the heritage management process. The close collaboration between the national and municipal governments, local and international experts, and other related stakeholders is particularly important and valuable.

This site expands the concept of Modernism beyond the International Style Modernism and is an outstanding example of the rapid creation of Lithuania’s temporary capital city in the given time period. The modernist architecture of Kaunas can become a treasured and internationally recognized landmark testifying to its exceptional significance – a legacy which continues to generate hope and optimism.

Simonas Kairys
Minister of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania

Kaunas today is a growing and contemporary city, with a uniqueness encoded in the city’s genes in the interwar years.

The period of Kaunas’ status as provisional Lithuanian capital might very well be called the city’s Golden Age. Indeed, it has been said that a modern Lithuanian nation emerged in Kaunas during those years. This strong foundation, which has survived various subsequent periods of history, is now the basis upon which a contemporary identity – that of a self-confident, progressive city – is emerging.

The legacy of the provisional capital continues to adorn Kaunas today, making its name known throughout the world. Thousands of buildings with their unique architecture and a broad network of streets and green spaces are complimented by a distinctive tradition of urban lifestyle. In today’s Kaunas, the optimism and intellectual traditions of the interwar years have merged with present-day modernity into one common whole.

The value of these attributes is being increasingly understood and treasured beyond just the city of Kaunas. Their significance was affirmed in 2015 after the award of the European Heritage Label to Kaunas’ modernist architecture of 1919–1939, which then inspired efforts to seek broader recognition of this phenomenon.

We, the leaders of this city, view the preservation of its unique heritage and its entrustment to future generations as our duty and commitment. This would not be possible without a strong team and the smooth collaboration between the local community, the central government, and the business community. In this regard, the support and recognition of relevant international institutions and organizations is particularly important.

We have included the preservation of the interwar heritage on our list of strategic priorities for the city as one our most important objectives. For the phenomenon of the provisional capital to live on not only in documents or within the walls of individual buildings, we must tell its story for all to hear – not just within our own communities, but to the entire world.

As we create our city’s new history, we must never forget its past.

Visvaldis Matijošaitis
Mayor of the City of Kaunas
1. A view of Modern Kaunas. Photo: Martynas Plėpis, 2020
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

State Party: Lithuania

State, Province or Region: Kaunas Region / Kaunas

Name of Property: Modernist Kaunas: Architecture of Optimism, 1919–1939

Geographical coordinates to the nearest second:
Latitude: N 54° 53' 49”;
Longitude: W 23° 55' 45”

Textual description of the boundary of the nominated property

Modernist Kaunas is situated in central Lithuania, at the confluence of two major rivers. The nominated property consists of two areas: Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis. Both areas possess several distinctive components in terms of historical significance, architecture, and urban planning. Naujamiestis consists of an administrative centre of the provisional capital (1.1), an upper and middle-class residential districts (1.2), and an industrial area (1.3), while Žaliakalnis, which was developed on the upper north-eastern territories, is divided into five sections: the Garden City residential area (2.1), the Kaukas residential area (2.2), the Perkūnas residential area (2.3), Ąžuolynas park with sports facilities (2.4), and the Research Laboratory (2.5).

A Buffer Zone covers the existing protected areas of the cultural heritage sites comprising the nominated property, while on the west side it covers the territory of a protected cultural heritage site of national significance: the Kaunas Historic Centre (National Register of Cultural Heritage No. 20171). On the east side, the buffer zone encompasses the area of the Kaunas University of Technology Campus (National Register of Cultural Heritage No. 33502) and the Kaunas Zoo (est. 1938). No buffer zone is designated on the south-east side because of distinctive natural and urban features which set a clear historic boundary: a deep valley with transportation (motor and railway) infrastructure.

Naujamiestis spans a territory of 226 hectares and Žaliakalnis has a total area of 243 hectares. The nominated property extends approximately 2.8 km from north to south and 3.4 km from east to west, covering a total area of 451.6 ha. The buffer zone extends approximately 3.4 km from north to south and 5.4 km from east to west, covering a total area of 407.4 ha. Total area covers 859 ha.

Maps of the nominated property, showing boundaries and buffer zone

Two maps show the position and the delimitation of the nominated property – Modernist Kaunas: Architecture of Optimism, 1919–1939 – and of the associated buffer zone: Fig. 2. Position of the nominated property and buffer zone. See p. 12–13
Fig. 3. Delimitation and zoning of the nominated property. See p. 14–15

Criteria under which property is nominated (ii, iv)
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief Synthesis

Modernist Kaunas is situated in central Lithuania, at the confluence of two major rivers, the Nemunas and the Neris. The area within the nominated property was planned in the mid-19th century and developed in 1919–1939 when, after the declaration of an independent Republic of Lithuania in 1918, Kaunas served as the provisional capital of the state. The status of provisional capital was crucial for the city’s unprecedented growth and architectural development. In less than twenty years, under the auspices of the new national government and civic initiative, Kaunas was transformed into a modern city based on the assimilation of modern urban planning and architecture with pre-existing natural, urban, and other local conditions. Architecture, specifically in the form of a local inflection of the international language of modernism, played a particularly important role in that transformation. Kaunas Modernism, therefore, bears exceptional testimony to an authentically multifaceted modernism born out of local political and cultural exigencies and an evolutionary urban modernisation responding to pre-existing human-made and natural features.

The nominated property comprises two areas: Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis. Naujamiestis (New Town), a generous grid planned in 1847, was attached to the eastern edge of the Old Town and extends eastwards along the valley of the Nemunas River. Naujamiestis was modernised and intensively developed in 1919–1939. Encircling Naujamiestis to the north and east is Žaliakalnis (Green Hill) – a distinctive natural plateau rising to an average of 35–40 metres. Žaliakalnis was developed as a garden suburb, the successful integration of a garden city residential suburb, the natural environment, and the assimilation of local and global architectural modernism in response to local conditions. The façades, streetscapes, and natural elements, combined with the pre-existing urban and geomorphological setting, create a unique sense of place exhibited through broad panoramas, open urban and natural spaces, and varied topography. Unlike many experiences of urban and architectural modernity, Kaunas reflects an evolutionary rather than revolutionary process of and response to modernisation in the early 20th century.

World Heritage criteria under which the property is proposed

Criterion (iii): Kaunas Modernism of 1919–1939 expands the concept of Modernism beyond the International Style by revealing a more diverse, complex fabric of numerous, often divergent, cultural, social, political, and artistic trends. Kaunas Modernism is an exceptional example of rethinking architecture as a process of social, political, and cultural modernisation in the 20th century. Kaunas Modernism provides arguments for the decentralisation of modernism not only in the geographical sense, but also in terms of stylistic expression. Outstanding value of the Kaunas cityscape is its architectural diversity, represented through the plurality of modern architectural ideas, from modernised Neo-Classicism to National Modernism, which co-existed throughout the interwar period of development by taking in the spirit of modernity. 220 structures and urban areas, constructed in the period of 1919–1939 within the Nominated Property, are listed on the National Register of Cultural Heritage. The buffer zone contains structures and groups of buildings dating back to the interwar period which strengthen the character of the nominated property.

Kaunas lost its status as Lithuania’s provisional capital in October 1939, and the sudden change in the city’s political status helped to preserve the physical attributes of the 1920s and 1930s. Under the Soviet rule, which lasted from 1944–1990, the physical state of interwar modernist buildings was not deliberately neglected, since the superior quality of the architecture was put to pragmatic use. Intermittent development of the area continued with the construction of many buildings that, although new, were compatible with the interwar period of development by being restrained in volume and form. Construction during this era did not alter the established street grid and squares, but it did see the addition of large modernist buildings. The growth of contemporary Kaunas and developmental pressures resulted in several large structures along Kauno and Žaliakalnio Prospektas and sparked numerous debates about the relationship between new commercial architecture and the historic surroundings. Any risk is mitigated by listing of all areas comprising the Nominated Property on the National Register of Cultural Heritage and preparing of adequate conservation and management plans.

Statement of integrity

Because the historically evolved areas of Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis have changed relatively little, Modernist Kaunas is truly a time capsule of the 1919–1939 period. The location and setting, form and design, material and substance as well as use and function of the Nominated Property all represent a historic modernist city of the interwar period that evolved harmoniously, integrating the natural and historic settings, producing a diverse legacy of architectural modernism. The area of Naujamiestis is home to the largest concentration of landmark modernist buildings that were part of the formation of a new administrative, cultural, and social core of the Lithuanian state in 1919–1939. Modernist residential areas of Naujamiestis constitute a superior architectural background for the landmark buildings, creating a harmonious cityscape. The urban structure of the Naujamiestis, embodying the architectural and urban nature of a modern city, is noted for the greatest diversity of stylistic forms, materials, and functions – a feature which is still evident in the city today.

The Žaliakalnis area with Ažubynas Park, designed in 1923 and gradually developed up to 1939, represents an outstanding example of the integration of urban and natural landscapes and the adoption of the contemporaneous garden city concept to local conditions. Although the plan was only partially implemented, the elements that were realised and which have survived to this day reflect the local interpretation of the most progressive garden city urban planning concepts of the time, adjusted with an intelligent approach to suit pre-existing natural, topographical, and human-made features. Another feature of Kaunas Modernism that has retained its authenticity is its historical, cultural and symbolic significance (intangible heritage). Today, the Nominated Property continues to see the highest concentration of active social, cultural, and economic activity, as well as the evolution of new traditions and initiatives inspired by the legacy of Kaunas Modernism.
Protection and management system

The Nominated Property covers a central part of the city Kaunas – a group of areas that are legally protected on the national and local level under the Law on the Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage, the Law on Protected Areas, the Law on Spatial Planning, the Law on Construction, the Law on Landscaping, and the Law on Environmental Protection. The property consists of seven protected zones: Naujamiestis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22148); Žaliakalnis 1, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 31280); Kaunas Ąžuolynas Park Complex (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 44581); the Kaunas Ąžuolynas Sports Complex (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 31618); the Research Laboratory complex (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 28567) and Christ’s Resurrection Church (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 16005). There are 408 listed cultural heritage properties and areas within the nominated property.

The cultural significance of the Nominated Property is integrated into the Kaunas City General Plan 2013–2023, as well as in subsequent preservation, regulation, and special plans on the national and local level. In 2015, the Kaunas City Municipal Heritage Restoration Programme was launched to provide financial support for the maintenance of cultural heritage and to improve the condition of modernist buildings in Kaunas. In 2017, the Kaunas City Municipality approved a Cultural Strategy for 2027 to establish an integrated approach toward the interwar period heritage, with a view to protecting this legacy and meeting the contemporary needs of the public. A management plan concept was formulated in 2020 to safeguard the preservation and proper management of the Nominated Property, Modernist Kaunas.

Name and contact information of official local institution/agency

Organization: Kaunas City Municipal Administration
Address: Laisvės al. 96, LT-44251 Kaunas
Tel: +370 614 79553
Email: saulius.rimas@kaunas.lt
Web address: http://www.kaunas.lt/
1. IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROPERTY
1. IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROPERTY

1.a. Country: Lithuania

1.b. State, Province or Region: Kaunas Region / Kaunas
1.c. Name of Property:
Modernist Kaunas: Architecture of Optimism, 1919–1939

1.d. Geographical coordinates to the nearest second:
Latitude: N 54° 53' 49”
Longitude: W 23° 55' 45”

1.e. Maps and plans, showing the boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone
Fig. 8. Delimitation of the nominated property and buffer zone, p. 26
Fig. 9. Delimitation of the nominated property and buffer zone on orthophoto base, p. 28
Fig. 10. Delimitation and zoning of the nominated property, p. 30
Fig. 16. A map of Kaunas showing the legacy of Kaunas fortress, p. 38
Fig. 17. A orthophoto map of Kaunas showing the legacy of Kaunas fortress, p. 39
Fig. 20. The topographic height map of central Kaunas, p. 42
Fig. 21. The map of the nominated property and the surroundings with landscape elements and vegetation, p. 44
Fig. 456. The flood hazard and risk map, p. 304
Fig. 457. The map of the listed cultural heritage sites and properties, p. 311
Fig. 458. The excerpt of the General Plan of Kaunas for the nominated property and its buffer zone, p. 318

1.f. Area of nominated property (ha.) and proposed buffer zone (ha.)
Area of nominated property: 451.6 ha
Buffer zone: 407.4 ha
Total: 859 ha
Map of the nominated property
Modernist Kaunas: Architecture of Optimism, 1919–1939

Geographical coordinates of the central point of the nominated property: N 54° 53' 49"; W 23° 55' 45"

Legend
- Nominated property
- Buffer zone
- Buildings in the nominated property constructed in 1919-1939

8. Delimitation of the nominated property and buffer zone
Map of the nominated property
The Modern City of Kaunas: Architecture of Optimism, 1919–1939

Legend
- Nominated property
- Buffer zone

9. Delimitation of the nominated property and buffer zone on orthophoto base

Map of the nominated property
The Modern City of Kaunas: Architecture of Optimism, 1919–1939

Legend
- Nominated property
- Buffer zone

9. Delimitation of the nominated property and buffer zone on orthophoto base
2. DESCRIPTION
2. a.1. Introduction: Architecture of optimism and emerging new capital cities in the early 20th century

Kaunas is an outstanding example of a modern city subject to rapid urbanisation and modernisation, encapsulated by diverse expressions of the values and aspirations associated with optimistic belief in an independent future. On 16 February 1918, the founders of the newly proclaimed independent Republic of Lithuania declared Vilnius their capital. However, by January 1919, geopolitical tensions and territorial conflicts forced Lithuania's government to quickly relocate to the country's second largest city, Kaunas. By 1920, with Vilnius under Polish military control, Kaunas assumed a unique status as a provisional capital, a designation that led to the city's radical transformation over the following two decades, from 1919 to 1939.

The rapid growth of cities, new forms of urban life and the emergence of the nation state are key facets of the modern world. The decades from 1890 until the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939 were a period of crucial importance for Central and Eastern Europe which emerged as a group of post-imperial nation states that acquired the name 'New Europe'. The profound impact on urban environments was profound. Towns were part of the history of modernist architecture and urban planning. Austria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania shared an imperial legacy inherited from the three great European empires (Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia) and most of them emerged as nation states from these former imperial entities. This region of Europe suffered widespread destruction during the First World War, but this global conflict did not end in Central and Eastern Europe in November 1918. It continued for years in regional struggles for national survival. Borders shifted, large groups of populations were exchanged, new countries emerged, and capitals were re-established. The modern era for this region was therefore full of promise, new perspectives and, vitally, optimism.

The history of Central and Eastern European cities with metropolitan aspirations is not only characteristic of the modern era, it is a part of the history of modernist architecture and urban planning. The impact on urban environments was profound. Towns which had previously been provincial centres became national or provincial capitals of independent states. Newly established governments felt the need to represent national power and legitimacy, both of which were demonstrated through architecture and urban form. Urban development was equated to nation building. In a post-imperial setting and in a region characterised by ethnic diversity, this could also mean the nationalization of urban space. Therefore, the shaping of the Eastern European metropolis can be understood as a process by which architecture followed ideology. It is striking just how much this process linked urban planning to far-reaching promises of an improved human condition and a prosperous national future.

The modern experience in Central and Eastern Europe can be characterised by demanding social and ethnic tensions, the strong role of the state, a search for radical urban planning solutions, and modernist movements. After gaining independence, nascent nation states were eager to show that they had better means to improve urban life than their imperial predecessors. Their legitimacy largely rested on their ability to meet the challenges of modernisation. In order to improve these new capitals, they keenly embraced the modern concept of town planning, then emerging in Western Europe and the United States. Western experts were involved in this process and Western capitals therefore often served as points of reference. In accordance with Western European models, capital city planning underlined technological and aesthetic modernity, urban intimacy, and historical continuity rather than uniformity and standardised patterns. The building of cultural and political institutions was intended to promote and consolidate a specific national identity. Architecture reveals how European architectural historicism informed new national styles. Capitals such as Warsaw, Kaunas, or Helsinki faced not only structural challenges, they were also central to national pursuits for legitimacy that demanded the construction of representative government buildings, national libraries, and theatres, as well as the implementation of solutions to persisting social problems. An important facet of modernisation in Eastern Europe, therefore, was its heavy reliance on and expression of state policies.

The outbreak of the Second World War brought this era to an abrupt end. Warfare, ethnic cleansing, the Holocaust, and totalitarian dictatorship reshaped the region in a multitude of ways that distinguished it irrevocably from the interwar period. After 1945, in much of Eastern Europe the national, cultural, and political pluralism of the interwar era was subsumed within the Soviet empire. In many former nation states, the process of urbanisation continued, but the age of capital planning and architectural optimism that characterised the interwar period was over.

Modernist Kaunas is situated in central Lithuania, at the confluence of two major rivers – the Nemunas and the Neris. The area within the nominated property was planned in the mid-19th century and largely developed from 1919–1939. After the declaration of an independent State of Lithuania in 1918, Kaunas served as the provisional capital of the state. The status of capital was crucial for the unprecedented development. In less than twenty years, Kaunas’ residents transformed the city into a modern capital. Architecture played a particularly important role in that transformation.

The property consists of two areas – Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis. Naujamiestis (New Town), a generous grid plan established in 1847, was attached to the eastern edge of the Old Town (developed in the 13th to 18th centuries) and extends eastwards along the Nemunas river valley. Encircling Naujamiestis to the north and east is Žaliakalnis (Green Hill) – a distinctive natural plateau rising to an average of 35-40 metres above the river valley. Žaliakalnis was developed as a garden city residential suburb in 1919–1939 according to the 1923 master plan of Kaunas, which enabled a seven-fold increase in area from 1919–1939 and accommodated a doubling of the city's population to 155,000 over the same period.

Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis collectively comprise the area of the nominated property, which in turn makes up a significant part of central Kaunas today. Both areas possess several distinctive components in terms of historical significance, architecture, and urban planning. Naujamiestis comprises the centre of the provisional capital (1.1), upper and middle-class residential districts (1.2). Žaliakalnis is divided into five sections: the Garden City area (2.1), the Kaukas residential area (2.2), the Perkūnas residential area (2.3), Ažuolynas park with sports facilities (2.4), and an area around the Research Laboratory (2.5), all of which bear testimony to the global proliferation of modern urban planning and architecture in the 1920s and 1930s and the exigencies of new urban experiences. The green areas underline the inspiration of the overall urban project and a concern for quality of life and the environment. Public parks, planted areas, and private gardens proliferated, with the slopes of the Nemunas valley forming an additional green belt surrounding Naujamiestis to the south west, creating a complete urban landscape that successfully integrates natural and humanmade features.

The most significant attributes of the city’s resulting urban form and associated architecture are defined by:

1. Evolutionary modernisation of the urban plan;
   (a) Integration and reuse of the 19th century heritage;
   (b) Integration with and assimilation of the natural environment;
   (c) Implementation of the garden city residential suburb
2. Optimistic construction of the capital city;
   (a) Administrative centre;
   (b) Social infrastructure;
   (c) Modern housing.
   (a) A National Style;
   (b) Modern Interpretation of Neo-Classical Architecture;
   (c) Local Interpretation of International Modernism.

These attributes are best preserved and exposed in the spatial plan of the Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis areas and in the public buildings, spaces, and residential buildings developed in 1919–1939.
2. a. 2.1. Evolutionary modernisation of the urban plan

Unlike many experiences of urban and architectural modernity, Kaunas reflects an evolutionary rather than revolutionary process of and response to modernisation and illustrates the modernist project locally adapted in the historic and natural setting. The modernisation of Kaunas’ urban layout in 1919–1939 proceeded not through dramatic urban reconstruction, but by a steady adaptation of the existing urban and natural landscapes that resulted into two distinctive areas – Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis with evident attributes of urban structure and urban morphology.

1a. Integration and modernisation of the 19th century urban heritage

The coexistence of new architecture alongside the legacy of 19th century construction is a characteristic feature that shaped the spatial evolution of Kaunas between the two world wars. After the government was hastily moved to Kaunas from Vilnius in 1919, most offices and residents occupied the existing Naujamiestis (New Town), a former administrative centre of the Kaunas Governorate of the Russian Empire, filling up its urban structure laid in the mid-19th century: an orthogonal street grid, three squares arranged in a chessboard pattern, a perimeter block development with two-storey structures, and an urban axis – an avenue called Laisvės Alėja. The modern, three- to five-storey multi-purpose buildings arcing along the streets of Naujamiestis helped shape a compact, multi-functional city core adapted to meet the essential needs of the provisional capital (fig. 15, 23, 24, 25).

A prominent attribute of interwar Kaunas’ development associated with modern urban planning was the designation of zones, driven by a combination of aesthetic and functional motives, contributing significantly to the formulation of Kaunas’ outstanding modern cityscape. In 1932, Kaunas was divided into five areas based on construction type: (1) zones designated for brick buildings (brick architecture not only helped protect against fires, it was also closely identified with modernity and prosperity); (2) zones designated for closed-plan construction (this type of zoning, where buildings were required to be built adjacent to one another in a continuous line, meant that the central area of the city, first and foremost Naujamiestis, developed with multi-storey structures following a strict regular perimeter block typology, designed in the 19th century); (3) zones designated for open-plan construction, where buildings were required to be sited away from property lines, helped to shape a garden type cityscape; (4) zones designated for tile roof structures were expected to improve the city’s aesthetic appearance (a special low pitched roof type, characteristic of the modern architecture of Kaunas was thus established), and (5) zones reserved for industrial development were designated along the Nemunas River, to the west of Kaunas, to avoid the flow of wastewater past the city. This approach to zoning was a progressive step in an effort to provide the local population with clean and hygienic living and environmental conditions in the city centre (fig. 13, 14).

The shape of the newly laid out Žaliakalnis district was determined by the remains of the 19th century Russian Imperial Kaunas military fortress. An important element of the new Master plan for Kaunas (1923) was the suggestion to use the former fortifications to create a green belt around the existing city territory. Though this concept was not fully implemented, a portion of the city’s perimeter continued to follow the former fortification lines for another decade and urban development continued primarily along the military roads of the central ring of fortifications. The situation was similar in the suburbs encircled by a second ring of fortifications. Former military roads, gunpowder magazines, forts, a radio station, batteries, defensive water trenches, and an artificially shaped terrain were all harmoniously incorporated into the landscape of a new Kaunas (fig. 16, 17).
16. A map of Kaunas showing the legacy of Kaunas fortress adapted to the expansion of the city.

17. A orthophoto map of Kaunas showing the legacy of Kaunas fortress adapted to the expansion of the city.
Another key attribute of modern Kaunas is its integration with its natural surroundings. Kaunas is established on two geomorphological landscapes: a valley-carved limnoglacial plane (Žaliakalnis, Upper Šančiai, Upper Petrašiūnai, Freda, Aleksotas, and Noreikiškės) and on the sandy ancient riverbeds etched out by the Nemunas and Neris Rivers (Central Kaunas, Old Town, Viljampolė, Lower Šančiai and Old Panemunė). A narrow transitional strip runs along the steep slopes created by the Nemunas and Neris riverbeds, etched by deep gullies reaching up and over the slopes (fig. 20). The most valuable segment of this terrain consists of oak forests (see chapter 2.a.3.2.4. The Ąžuolynas Park and Sports Complex) on the heights and pine groves on the Nemunas and Neris river loops, which were adapted for recreational purposes in the 1930s.

While the Old Town had developed on the relatively flat plain at the confluence of the Nemunas and Neris rivers, by the early 20th century the growing Kaunas absorbed the surrounding heights, thereby incorporating a vertical dimension into the overall urban composition. The city’s ample green surroundings were perceived and deliberately developed as a significant environmental component in this composition. This integration of natural landscapes elicited novel architectural responses on the slopes surrounding the city. A series of landmarks arrayed along the horizon crowned the city, reflecting the contemporaneous urban planning concept of Stadtkrone, popularised by the German architect, Bruno Taut, in his book Die Stadtkrone (1919) (fig. 18).

The significance of the natural slopes surrounding Naujamiestis and the Old Town in shaping the character of Modernist Kaunas was acknowledged in 1933 when the municipal government mandated the proper management of these slopes. This comprised protection of the terrain from slippage while permitting some construction. It was precisely this connection between this sloping terrain and the developing modern city in the interwar period that enriched modern Kaunas’ evolving cityscape with very specific features. Small streets on the slopes and clusters of residential buildings along the slopes continued to enrich the diversity of Kaunas’ urban spaces during the interwar period (fig. 19, 21).
Topographic height map
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20. The topographic height map of central Kaunas
2. DESCRIPTION

21. The map of the nominated property and the surroundings with landscape elements and vegetation.
The Žaliakalnis area is an outstanding example of the realisation of the garden city concept in several different forms. The garden city concept was discussed extensively in professional circles and in the national press throughout the 1920s. Kaunas’ first mayor, Jonas Vileišis, who served from 1921 to 1931, took considerable interest in new urban planning trends, visiting the International Garden Cities and Town Planning Association conference in London in 1922 and actively participating in city council debates about Kaunas’ development. In 1923, Antanas Jokimas, the city’s chief engineer, was appointed to represent Lithuania at the next conference of the association in Gothenburg. In late 1923, Marius Frandsen, an experienced Danish engineer and urban planner, was invited to draw up a new master plan of the city. Inspired by the opportunity to create an entirely new city, Frandsen, in collaboration with Jokimas, created a master plan that divided the city into functional zones with uniform buildings (factory districts, villas, and working-class housing). Each of these districts was to have its own hospitals, schools, places of worship, and areas allocated to housing, sport, and community activities. One of the most intriguing elements of Frandsen’s plan was the suggestion to use the fortifications of the former Kaunas fortress to create a green belt around the existing city territory (fig. 22).

Such an ambitious project would have required considerable funds and extensive reconfiguring of the existing urban structure. Only a small portion of the plan was ever implemented and can be seen in Žaliakalnis. Because the land there was owned by the city, there were few obstacles to creating a well-planned street grid. The planning and growth of Žaliakalnis was consequently supported by legislation and pioneering town-planning regulation. The conceptual and economic basis of the Garden City idea was implemented in full. For example, the idea of community-owned property championed by Ebenezer Howard in his original garden city concept was put into practice. Land plots in Žaliakalnis were allocated to residents on the basis of perpetual lease agreements and collected rents were paid to the Kaunas municipal government, which reserved the right to regulate the area’s development. (See chapter 2.a.3.2. The Žaliakalnis Area)
2. Description

2.2. Optimistic construction of the capital city

Kaunas served as Lithuania’s provisional capital city from 1919 to 1939. Programmatically, the modern capital was expected to be both the practical and the symbolic focus of national administration and, especially in nation states emerging from control by an external power, it was also expected to serve as the focus of efforts to promote a sense of national identity. With this transformation of the scale, structure, and location of government, came the development of Kaunas as a modern city.

Kaunas was planned to serve both national and local municipal needs. The city was designed to be functional but also to accommodate a large number of cultural and symbolic landmarks. New state administrative buildings, a national memorial centre, and new types of institutions were established and a modern system of health and social care emerged, accompanied by rapid growth in trade and industry and the creation of all sorts of residential spaces and improved infrastructure. All of these processes contributed to the creation – over a very brief period of time – of the provisional capital city’s new modern architectural image.

The status of provisional capital presented Kaunas with an opportunity to rapidly transform itself into a modern metropolis, at the same time, however, the impermanent nature of the city’s official status acted as a damper. Segments of the country’s elite felt that investing in construction in Kaunas would mean resigning themselves to the loss of the historical capital Vilnius. As the national government had resolved to invest in Kaunas only by the late 1920s, new Kaunas was built by the civic initiative of its new residents (with substantial financial help from émigré Lithuanians in the United States): entrepreneurs, intellectuals, and civil servants, all with family roots in the rural provinces, who had assumed the optimistic task of shaping a new nation. This civic initiative and local entrepreneurship inspired local interpretation of modernist architecture, which was very different in comparison to the state-imposed modernism, and constitutes an attribute of optimism in interwar Kaunas. The Republic of Lithuania recovered control of its historical capital Vilnius in 1939, but over the preceding twenty years, the nation’s collective consciousness had come to view Kaunas as a proper, and no longer provisional, capital city.
2.a. An administrative centre

The modern capital was, above all, the seat of government and a legitimation of its existence. On 2 January 1919, it was decided to temporarily transfer all Lithuanian government ministries from Vilnius to Kaunas, where facilities essential for the functioning of a capital city were limited. Ministries and government agencies occupied whatever available office space they could find (fig. 12).

As long as the hope of returning to the historical capital Vilnius lived on, maintenance of government buildings was limited to simple renovations. The hopes for a temporary stay in Kaunas began to fade in the late 1920s, evidenced by the subsequent private construction and extensive renovations on buildings designated for government institutions.

The first purposefully built administrative structures were the Bank of Lithuania (1925, see 1.1.2) and the Ministry of Justice (1925, see 1.1.3), which also housed the Lithuanian parliament. A characteristic type of hybrid administrative building shared by several institutions was developed in Kaunas due to the provisional nature of the capital and lack of funds. The Bank of Agriculture, completed in 1935, had two separate entrances and housed both the bank and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (see 11.0). A building shared by the State Security Department and the Kaunas County municipality government had two main façades with separate entrances (see 11.14). The central building of Kaunas University, built originally as a State Printing house in 1928, also housed the Ministry of Education (see 11.5). The State Savings Bank was supposed to also house the Lithuanian Department of Trade, the Bureau of Statistics, and several other national agencies (see 11.17).

In the 1930s, Naujamiestis saw the construction of modern administrative buildings for new state institutions and organisations that were supported by the state (fig. 27) as well as commercial headquarters.

The national narrative was promoted by a National Museum, a project launched in the first years of the establishment of the provisional capital, which included two separate War and Culture museums in one building (see 11.18). The adjacent Vienvybes (Unity) Square and garden with its monument to the Fallen for Lithuania’s Freedom became the principal venue for official national celebrations. In 1928, on the tenth anniversary of Lithuania’s declaration of independence, a sculpture entitled Lavė (Freedom) was unveiled near the War Museum, and soon after the modest temporary museum building was replaced by a new, modern, and majestic museum intended to bring new meaning to the narrative of Lithuanian statehood, the Wars of Independence, a unified Lithuanian state with jurisdiction over Vilnius and the Baltic Sea port city Klaipėda, and a national collection of art.

In the 1920s, modernised historical styles were considered most suitable for such stately buildings. In the 1930s, modern and functional modernism best expressed the aspirations and ambitions of a modern state. New national administrative and cultural buildings constructed for the purposes of the provisional capital in 1919–1939 constitute an important attribute of the optimistic construction of the new capital city.
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2b. Social infrastructure

Modernisation in Kaunas was the imperative of building a truly modern society. Modernist solutions were dictated by certain practical requirements and economic constraints. Improving the country’s educational system and providing it with a suitable architectural infrastructure were deemed critical to the modernisation programme of the new state. In addition to primary schools, six new Lithuanian-language secondary schools, six secondary schools for Jewish students, and several schools for Russian, Polish, and German-heritage children were built in Kaunas by the state and private organisations (see 1.1.20, 1.1.21, 1.2.12). The establishment in 1922 of the University of Lithuania was due solely to the city’s status as provisional capital (see 1.1.5, 1.1.6). Modernist architecture was promoted for these new educational institutions, marking a shift away from dark classrooms toward bright and spacious interiors commensurate with modern standards of comfort.

Similar approaches were applied to the nation’s fledgling systems of health care and social welfare. This new national infrastructure involved the active participation of non-governmental organisations and individuals. By 1938, Kaunas had twenty-three hospitals, twenty-seven outpatient care centres, thirteen chemistry laboratories, seven x-ray facilities, twenty-seven pharmacies, and construction had begun on a large clinic compound based on the winning entry in an international competition designed by French architects Urbain Cassan and Ellie Ouchanoff. Health and social insurance funds were also introduced by the government.

A campaign to better manage and increase recreational areas in Kaunas was closely associated with a modernist rhetoric of hygiene, fresh air, and sunlight. A modern sports compound including a stadium, basketball arena, and the Hall of Physical Culture was built in Ąžuolynas Park (see 2.4.2, 2.4.3, 2.4.4). Considerable attention was paid to green zones and the city’s recreational interaction with its rivers. Recreational use of riverbanks became extremely important in developing urban territories. Kaunas had twelve public beaches along its rivers and in pine forests and two beaches at Upper Panemunė became the core of a new resort area with modern sanatoriums and villas. With natural elements structured around the rivers and sloping hills playing a central role in the urban landscape, a close association between the modernising city and its natural surroundings was established that contributed significantly to the shape of the city’s physical character. The remaining modern buildings of the new social infrastructure are an important attribute of the optimistic state and civic initiative to create a modern social infrastructure and modern lifestyles.
2c. Residential buildings

The construction of modern housing became one of the most significant attributes of Kaunas Modernism – in terms of quality, quantity, and architectural diversity. Housing was in severely short supply in the rapidly growing provisional capital, so residential buildings became the most important element of the construction sector throughout the interwar period. Of the nearly 12,000 construction and renovation permits issued between 1918 and 1940, approximately 60% were for residential projects. In 1931, for example, plans called for the construction of 874 buildings with 2,389 flats. By 1934, construction had declined to just 291 buildings with 670 residential units due to an economic crisis. Individually constructed, privately-owned residential homes were the most prevalent building type in interwar Kaunas and, as such, heavily influenced the city’s character and shaped the local environment. These structures today most vividly embody the city’s modern character:

1. Single-family cottages or urban villas. With a few exceptions, private, single-family urban villas were developed further away from the city centre. From luxurious residences such as the villa of Prime Minister Juozas Tūbelis (see 2.2.3) to more modest but particularly functionalist residences (see 2.1.3), the villas were one- or two-storey residences of brick or wood, featuring a more freely designed volume and open plan structure (see 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.5, 2.1.6). The heart of the villa plan was the entrance hall, around which all other rooms were arranged. It was also characteristic to install a couple of small units for rent in the attic because of the housing shortage.

2. Small multi-family buildings for 2 to 4 families were an intermediate option between single-family homes and larger apartment buildings characteristic of Kaunas Modernism. The owner of a two- to three-storey building usually resided in one of its apartments, renting out the other units. This type of residential buildings can be found both in the city centre and on more remote urban streets (see 1.1.25, 1.1.27, 1.2.6, 1.2.10, 2.3.7, 2.4.1).

3. Three- to six-storey, large apartment houses were usually developed according to the urban pattern of regular blocks. In residential districts, modernist apartment houses, not large blocks of flats, predominated. The owner of a building resided in one of its apartments, renting out the other units. Usually two luxury apartments were built per storey with a main and service
entraneces. Interior layouts were repeated on each floor, with representative rooms facing the street and service areas and bedrooms at the rear. Apartments included small servant’s quar ters, expansive lounges, and dining rooms connected through sliding panel doors to a sitting room. Buyers of land in the city centre embraced innovation in architectural and construction technology and favoured high quality materials, bringing new, modern, and comfortable residential buildings to Naumiestis. (see 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 1.2.6, 1.2.8, 1.2.12, 1.2.4, 1.2.7, 1.2.8, 1.2.9, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8).

4) Inexpensive wooden tenement houses that were con structed in parts of Kaunas not subject to brick development requirements were usually simple two-storey, corridor-system buildings with 4 to 8 flats and brick firewalls. Built at almost half the cost of brick buildings, this type of housing came to em body the Kaunas version of affordable housing. This type proliferated in Žaliakalnis, shaping an authentic character of mixed development comprising wooden and brick architecture. Several more ambitious initiatives to construct multi-unit so cial housing were undertaken in the late 1930s (see 2.2.4). An inter-agency commission on affordable housing construction, established within the Ministry of Interior in 1938, acknowledged that city workers needed sanitary housing at affordable prices. Discussions about new development models were purely theoretical, however, with an eye on future prospects for urban growth. Several housing co-operatives were established by employees (see 1.2.11, 2.3.8), however, this form of housing was rather rare in Kaunas. Stylistically, the 1920s saw a prevalence of traditional wood en architecture or variations of historicism. Modernism [combined with local features] became more prevalent in the 1930s. Brightness, cleanliness, and efficiency reflected international modernist concepts of new housing. Modernist housing ideas were promoted by the Bauhaus-trained Vladas Šypas in his 1933 publication Miesto gyvenamieji namai [Urban Residential Housing]. Yet, more traditional approaches to decoration are also evidenced by the practice of adorning only the principal façade of the house. The unique look of different neighbourhoods also depended on available construction materials. The decision to restrict construction in the city centre to brick buildings with tiled roofs resulted in the rapid disappearance of existing wooden buildings. These new types of houses came to define modern Kaunas’ standard for housing which endured until the outbreak of the Second World War. Residential districts with private villas, small multi-unit houses and large, luxury multi-apartment houses, became characteristic attributes of Kaunas Modernism.
MODERNIST KAUNAS: ARCHITECTURE OF OPTIMISM, 1919–1939

2. DESCRIPTION

3a. A National Style

The new nations that emerged from Europe’s post-imperial era after the First World War were among the first to experience and embrace modernism as the basis of a new national architecture. Yet, these nations faced the common dilemma of reconciling novel expressions of both architecture and national identity. This pursuit of a new architectural language made unique by its national context was the subject of intense debate within broader cultural and political circles. The creation of a unique national style based on folk art and historical references became a central component of Lithuanian architecture from 1918, in conditions that emphasised that Lithuania was not a new country but the restoration of historical statehood, the thriving medieval Grand Duchy of Lithuania which, together with the Kingdom of Poland, had been erased from the map of Europe in 1795. The shaping of Lithuania’s national identity was oriented towards a modern future, despite being based on the grandeur of a medieval aristocratic state and the heritage of a rural, ethnically Lithuanian culture (fig. 39). Already in the 19th century, national movements had reclaimed folk arts and crafts as a unique part of ‘nationalising’ local cultural heritage for the nations dreaming of becoming national states. The leading voices in the search for a Lithuanian national style in the early 1920s were folk art historians and enthusiasts who were convinced that the best foundation for a national style could be found in pure folk art based on rural culture. They emphasised the use of traditional ornamentation, first and foremost wood carving. An example of this approach is the Tulpė (Tulip) Cooperative building in Kaunas, completed in 1925 (fig. 41).

Indeed, a sketch of the building’s ornamented façade was published in 1925 in the Lietuvių statybos ir puošybos pavyzdžių albumas (Album of Lithuanian Construction and Ornamentation Examples), a publication which had mainstream aspirations. Baroque was also considered an important source of inspiration for the nascent Lithuanian national style for its association with the Catholic Church and the abundant Baroque architecture legacy in Vilnius (fig. 38). The adoption of Neo-Baroque as a national style in the early 1920s was folk art historians and enthusiasts who were convinced that the best foundation for a national style could be found in pure folk art based on rural culture. They emphasised the use of traditional ornamentation, first and foremost wood carving. An example of this approach is the Tulpė (Tulip) Cooperative building in Kaunas, completed in 1925 (fig. 41).

Despite political support, a significant number of architects and public figures viewed the creation of a national architecture with scepticism. Younger architects were convinced that the Lithuanian style should be defined by the present. However, proponents of the Lithuanian national approach criticised the International Style as being incapable of expressing the national spirit. In blending the cosmopolitan (style) with the vernacular (materials, methods, and ornamentation), Kaunas’ modern architecture reflected the reconciliation nationally of the progressive and the retrospective, the transnational and the native. This approach produced landmark buildings designed with modernist exteriors and interiors decorated in the national style (see 1.1.7, 1.1.12, 1.1.15, 1.1.9). In truth, the national style as a means of ideological inspiration remained relevant throughout the entire interwar period and was later promoted by the post-World War II Lithuanian diaspora throughout the world.
3b. Modern Interpretation of Neo-Classical Architecture

In the 1920s, and often also in the 1930s, the aesthetic expression of landmark sites in Kaunas was intrinsically linked to the interpretation of historical styles, mainly Neo-Classicism, which satisfied the demand for a certain monumentalism of public buildings. Traditional aesthetics were familiar and therefore less unsettling when discussion turned to representational needs (see 2.3.1). In the construction of the Bank of Lithuania and its residential building (see 1.1.2, 1.2.9, fig. 43) and the Ministry of Justice (see 1.1.3), modernised Neo-Classicism was intentionally deployed to declare the country’s new economic ambitions.

Most of the public buildings in Kaunas embraced an intermediate path between modernism and classical tradition. This understanding of aesthetics was aptly described by one of Kaunas’ most important and prolific architects, Vytautas Landsbergis, in his discussion in 1932 of ‘the classical rhythm of monumental construction in modern form’, which was considered both sufficiently modern and monumental (see 1.1.6, 1.1.10, 1.1.11, 1.1.14, 1.1.16, 1.3.5, 2.4.4). This approach was described in 1939 by art historian Mikalojus Vorobjovas, who observed that in Kaunas, ‘they have succeeded in inserting into an ultramodern, transatlantic liner style something resembling Doric columns or the rudiments of other historical styles.’ (see 2.3.3)

Toward the end of the 1930s, a significant influence from the Beaux-Arts architectural idiom began to emerge in public buildings of Kaunas. The latter confirmed that Lithuania, like other European countries at that time, was looking for stability. Affected by the economic crisis, which had generated anxiety and insecurity, together with rapidly mounting political tensions, Lithuanian architects and their clients turned to the solid and timeless neo-traditionalism with the growing use of artworks for the decoration of public buildings. The Lithuanian Officers’ Club (see 1.1.15, fig. 44) or the Chamber of Commerce, Industry, and Crafts (see 1.1.2, fig. 45) were presented as symbols of the vitality and wellness of the state. In both their composition and tectonics, these types of structures possess their own unique interplay of the modern and the classical. Indeed, the status of neo-traditionalism, referred to as ‘state modernism’, actually surged, as it did in many authoritarian European countries at the time. A notable example in Kaunas is the plan, launched in 1938, to build a Hall of State government complex in a classical spirit as the preferred architectural approach (fig. 42).
By the 1930s, the characteristic architecture of Kaunas Modernism was formed. Tradition and priorities of the state bureaucracy restrained the more avant-garde social and architectural experiments. What emerged instead was an intermediate path of restrained the more avant-garde social and architectural experiments. What emerged instead was an intermediate path of restraint deferred to the international architectural idiom of the 1930s.

Modernist Kaunas was fundamentally shaped by the overall process and urgency of the city’s status as a provisional capital and developed certain characteristic features:

1. Many modern works fitted harmoniously into the existing structure of the city and at the same time encouraged new directions of development.
2. Architecture avoided the radicalism of avant-garde or totalitarian ideology that advocated erasing or rebuilding pre-existing conditions.
3. Architectural language combined traditional symmetry of volumes with modernist elements.

The unique set of functional interactions and visual associations forms an essential layer of values and distinguishes Kaunas as a city that is simultaneously modern and sensitive to its existing historical and natural surroundings. It is here that a dialogue emerges between the existing city with its deep historical associations and the imperative to create a new capital city possessing a new urban infrastructure and capable of meeting the demands of a rapidly changing modern world. These processes highlight the optimistic mentality of a new and aspirational country and the ambitious expectations associated with the vision of a new and modern nation that was a testament to the resilience of local construction traditions in Kaunas architecture.

Conclusion

Modernist Kaunas was fundamentally shaped by the overall process and urgency of the city’s status as a provisional capital and developed certain characteristic features:

1. Many modern works fitted harmoniously into the existing structure of the city and at the same time encouraged new directions of development.
2. Architecture avoided the radicalism of avant-garde or totalitarian ideology that advocated erasing or rebuilding pre-existing conditions.
3. Architectural language combined traditional symmetry of volumes with modernist elements.

The unique set of functional interactions and visual associations forms an essential layer of values and distinguishes Kaunas as a city that is simultaneously modern and sensitive to its existing historical and natural surroundings. It is here that a dialogue emerges between the existing city with its deep historical associations and the imperative to create a new capital city possessing a new urban infrastructure and capable of meeting the demands of a rapidly changing modern world. These processes highlight the optimistic mentality of a new and aspirational country and the ambitious expectations associated with the vision of a new and modern nation that was a testament to the resilience of local construction traditions in Kaunas architecture.
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2.a.3. The Naujamiestis Area

Naujamiestis (New Town) is an outstanding example of the rapid urban transformation of Kaunas between 1919 and 1939, from a low-rise, extensively developed city quarter into a modern urban centre. The historical district of Kaunas known as Naujamiestis (listed 22149) covers an area of 226 hectares. The urban plan of Naujamiestis was laid in 1843–1847 on an empty area outside the historic city, after Kaunas was officially designated the administrative centre of a newly constituted Kaunas Governorate. Naujamiestis was constructed in adherence to a regular grid, covering an area twice the size of the Old Town. The plan possesses features typical of urban planning from the period: an orthogonal street grid, three squares arranged in a chessboard pattern, and a new urban axis – an avenue called Laisves Aleja (Freedom Boulevard). Newly created street blocks were divided into 411 plots (see fig. 432, 433). However, due to the specific nature of Kaunas’ terrain, the initial plan had to be adjusted and some of the blocks were not as regular as originally planned.

An important impetus for the growth of Naujamiestis was the construction of the Warsaw-St. Petersburg railway and a class II Kaunas railway station (1859–1862), next to which an industrial district began to develop. At this same time, a second urban development occurred between 1930 and 1940 (fig. 50). By 1940, the central areas of Naujamiestis were fully formed. The central portion of the area features a concentration of administrative offices and a network of symbolic spaces, organically intertwined with various types of residential buildings. An area of middle-class residential homes and urban villas was established along the peripheral structure of Naujamiestis, on the slopes of Žaliakalnis. As Naujamiestis reaches sloping terrain, the strict orthogonal street grid yields to more circuitous connecting roads linking the upper and lower terraces. The slopes have historically served as a clear natural boundary between Naujamiestis and other districts.

Naujamiestis remains symbolically and historically the city’s most important district. The cultural heritage value of Naujamiestis rests on its historic, urban, and architectural characteristics. The historical significance of Naujamiestis is based on the nucleus of a provisional capital city of a nascent nation state between 1919 and 1939, complete with symbolic public sites and the individuals who helped build the foundation of a new republic. Its urban structure is based on the multi-layered fabric shaped by historical processes: a regular geometric plan, regular squares, perimeter development with 3–5 storey structures and natural slopes defining the area’s boundary. The modern, multi-purpose buildings arising along the streets of Naujamiestis helped shape a compact multi-functional city core adapted to meet all the essential needs of the provisional capital: employment, commerce, education, health care, entertainment, a comfortable way of life, and, to some extent, recreation. The architectural value is shaped largely by Naujamiestis possessing the large number and density of interwar modernist structures in Kaunas. A total of 594 buildings from the 1919–1939 period survived throughout the area, all featuring the harmonious assimilation of modern aspirations and local references.

Naujamiestis consists of three different areas:
2.a.3.1. Central Naujamiestis. The city’s administrative and cultural centre developed between 1919 and 1939 based on the regular plan created in the 19th century.
2.a.3.2. Residential Naujamiestis. An upper and middle-class residential district developed between 1919 and 1939 around the base of the Naujamiestis slopes.
2.a.3.3. Industrial Naujamiestis. An industrial district developed in the southern area of Naujamiestis between the Nemunas River and the Kaunas railway station in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.
2.3.1. Central Naujamiestis

The street grid. Naujamiestis is shaped by an orthogonal grid consisting of streets running parallel to the Nemunas River and perpendicular intersecting streets connecting the river to the sloping high ground. The east-west streets parallel to the river are associated with a particular set of prevailing functions. In the interwar years, the riverbank road was an active zone of transportation and industry, including various types of industrial enterprises and a functioning port. A city core developed around a central axis, Laisvės Alėja, supplemented by two additional parallel routes: K. Donelaičio and Kęstučio Streets. Finally, stretching along the base of the slopes is V. Putvinskio Street, the actual boundary of Naujamiestis, beyond which the urban rhythm of the city centre gradually yields to the suburban Žaliakalnis. In contrast, perpendicular north-south streets (Maironio, S. Daukanto, A. Mickevičiaus and Gedimino) serve as important functional and visual connecting corridors, not only between the district’s principal avenues, but also linking the river with Žaliakalnis.

Laisvės Alėja. The most important axis for public life is Laisvės Alėja, its surrounding blocks, and three rectangular squares. Laisvės Alėja [Freedom Boulevard] was envisioned as the city’s principal avenue as early as the 1847 master plan. The 1620 m long boulevard-type street was set aside for transportation and pedestrians. Two rows of linden trees running down the middle of the avenue created a space for walking and recreation, a design which endured for the entire interwar period. In 1970, as transportation increased in the city, it was decided to convert Laisvės Alėja into an exclusively pedestrian zone based on designs proposed in 1982 by architects Alfredas Paulauskas and Vanda Paleckienė. The conversion created a unique pedestrian street (one of the longest in Europe) – a function the avenue continues to serve to this day. (fig. 52, 53, 449)

Independence Square. In 1895, a square (one of the three rectangular squares) established on the eastern end of the Laisvės Alėja axis became the site for one of the area’s most important landmarks: St. Michael the Archangel Orthodox Church, also known as the Garrison Church or the Soboras (listed 20904), constructed to serve the needs of the military fortress. For a considerable period, the church marked the symbolic midpoint between the railway station and the Old Town. Accordingly, the city’s most vital institutions were also established in the vicinity of the church, including the police, a hospital, and the main hotel. After the restoration of Lithuanian independence in 1918,
Map of the historical development of Central Naujamiestis

Historical development of the Central Naujamiestis

- Nominated property
- Subdivision of the nominated property
- Before the end of 18th c.
- 19 c. – Beginning of 20th c.
- 1919–1939
- 1945–1955
- 1956–1990
- > 1990
- Not identified

Projection: UTM34
Position reference system: LKS 1994 Lithuania TM
Scale: 1:5 000
Meters

Data: Kaunas City Municipality, 2020; SĮ Kauno Planas, 2020;
National/Real Estate Register, 2020
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the Kaunas military garrison took over jurisdiction of the church in 1919, and Lithuanian Military Academy and garrison commemorative celebrations were held in the square, which was named Independence Square. (fig. 60)

City Garden Square and its environment. Extensive development of Laisvės Alėja occurred also at the western end of this central axis, near the Old Town, where several regular blocks in brick were constructed in the early 20th century. After the restoration of Lithuanian independence in 1918, this section of the city faced development again. Older buildings along Laisvės Alėja and on surrounding streets were appropriated by the Ministry of Transportation, the District Court, the Aušra Boys' Gymnasium, postal and telephone exchanges, and other important institutions. Nearby, the Choral Synagogue, completed in 1872, remained open. The City Theatre was rebuilt and converted into the State Theatre (see 1.1.1) in 1923, and renovations were also completed on a second rectangular square surrounding the theatre, an area known as Miesto sodas [City Garden]. In 1925, the Jewish Bank and its arcade was opened nearby. Further away, the new Ministry of Justice building opened in 1929 (see 1.1.3). The development of City Garden Square was completed in 1939, with the construction of the Savings Bank building (see 1.1.7). In this section of Naujamiestis, the modern architecture and that of the Tsarist period are particularly well-balanced (fig. 53, 70).

**The intersection of Laisvės Alėja and S. Daukanto Street** is a significant area. Here, Laisvės Alėja visually connects via Daukanto Street with the geographic boundaries of Naujamiestis – the Nemunas River and the slopes of Žaliakalnis (fig. 58, 61). It was here that the city’s most prominent restaurant, Metropolis, opened during the Tsarist era and which not only retained its core function throughout the interwar period, but was augmented by the addition of the landmark Lietuva (Lithuania) Hotel in 1925 (see 1.1.4). Later, the Agriculture Bank opened nearby, as did the Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (see 1.1.10). The intersection thus became a locus of important political and public events, as well as a popular commercial centre. The five-storey commercial buildings Pienocentras and Pažanga (see 1.1.8, 1.1.9) ushered in a new architectural standard in Naujamiestis. These were landmark, premiere quality, multi-functional buildings for offices and flats. The new standard was met by several other buildings on neighbouring city blocks, including apartment buildings commissioned by wealthy owners (see 1.1.23, 1.1.24). The building was demolished in 2009 to make way for more commercially viable ventures. The largest and most modern cinema in interwar Kaunas, the Romuva (see 1.1.22), was completed on Laisvės Alėja in 1940.
Vienybės (Unity) Square. Daukanto Street links the river to the third Naujamiestis square, Vienybės (Unity) Square, which developed into the most important official representational centre of the Republic of Lithuania (fig. 63, 64). With its façade facing the square, the Vytautas the Great War Museum (see 1.1.11) embraces a small garden intended to celebrate the most prominent symbols of the Lithuanian nation’s struggle for freedom: the Freedom Statue, the Monument to the Fallen for Lithuanian Freedom, the Grave of the Unknown Soldier, and an Eternal Flame. Visually, the museum echoed the volumetric solidity of the headquarters of the Bank of Lithuania (see 1.1.2), located adjacent to the square.

In the interwar years, the square was slightly smaller than it is today, its size restrained by a Tsarist-era power plant and residential housing (fig. 62).

K. Donelaičio Street. Although Laisvės Alėja was and continued to serve as Kaunas’ principal representational street, during the interwar period it was rivalled by the parallel K. Donelaičio Street (fig. 48). Many buildings were proposed along this artery including the Ministry of Justice, the Bank of Lithuania, the Agriculture Bank (see 1.1.10), and the Chamber of Trade, Industry and Crafts (see 1.1.2), while existing structures housed important official institutions, such as the Cabinet of Ministers, the Ministry of Education, and Vytautas Magnus University (see 1.1.5). The street was surrounded by groups of modern architectural residential buildings. The segment from Gedimino Street to Vytauto Prospektas developed a particularly expressive architectural character. This perfectly preserved section of Naujamiestis represents the area’s multifaceted architecture, comprising a continuous streetscape combining Tsarist-era multi-storey brick administrative buildings as well as single-storey wooden residential architecture, conservative 1920s architectural trends, and bold and innovative examples of Kaunas Modernism. In the Soviet era, the area was enhanced by the harmonious incorporation of the late-modernist Kaunas Picture Gallery, designed by architects Liucija Gedgaudienė and Jonas Navakas in 1979.

Kęstučio and Miško Streets. On the other side of Laisvės Aleja, three city blocks between Kęstučio and Miško Streets were developed into a group of larger offices and institutions, including the Ministry of Agriculture complex occupying former fortress facilities, the Ministry of Defence, a prison, the newly constructed Vytautas Magnus University Medical Faculty (see 1.1.6), and insurance offices. The Chamber of Labour (see 1.1.6) was built further away. Apartment buildings were constructed on adjacent land.
Small residential dead-end streets (culs-de-sac) In the very heart of Naujamiestis, city blocks just a few steps away in either direction had an essentially different character, the method of modernisation characteristic of Naujamiestis: the reconstruction of interior common areas and courtyards. This approach was used to intensify development and to subdivide the large-scale blocks laid out in the mid-19th century. In pre-modernist Kaunas, these areas served as economic zones typically seen in extensively developed provincial towns subsisting on animal husbandry and agriculture. In the 1920s they were developed into dead-end streets (culs-de-sac), including M. Dobužinskio, Vaidilutės, Lydos, K. Donelaičio, Lydos and similar (fig. 66, 67, 68). The gradual development of such neighbourhoods while still retaining a relatively small scale of internal plots and structures reflects one of the core principles of evolutionary modernisation of central Kaunas: a transformation driven by the city’s status of provisional capital, in which a principle of consistent change governed the nature of new development. Many residential buildings combine the convenience of 20th century urban life with a quiet environment enjoyed within the interior spaces of each city block. This combination of quiet and convenience has remained a characteristic feature of the Central Naujamiestis district to this day.

Former Cemetery and Ramybės parkas (Tranquillity Park) The Kaunas City [Carmelite] Cemetery existed on the edge of the property since 1847 but was closed during the Soviet period in 1959 and reopened as Ramybės parkas (fig. 65, 235, 236). The cemetery was an important symbol of urban population diversity since its grounds were divided into three large sections: a southern area for Orthodox Christians, a middle (the largest) section for Catholics, and a northern area for Protestant Evangelical Germans, from which a small section was later separated to provide an area for Muslims. During the interwar years, the area’s cultural significance increased. Tatars built a Mosque in the Muslim section (see 1.1.19) and Germans opened a private school in their area. A private school was also opened in 1925 in the Orthodox section (see 1.1.21), followed by the consecration of the Annunciation Orthodox Church built there in 1935. In 1931, the Adam Mickiewicz Gymnasium for Polish-speaking students was opened nearby, on the opposite side of Vytauto Prospektas.
State of Authenticity and Integrity. During the Soviet period (1945–1990), Naujamiestis followed a path of moderate growth, broadly adhering to development principals established in the interwar years. Construction during this era did not alter the established street grid and squares, but it did see the addition of large structures that were not always compatible with their surroundings, including four multi-storey hotels (two were never completed), six design institutes of various types, four new museums, and one large shopping centre (fig. 69).

The Aušra Gymnasium was renovated in the 1970s, and the Jewish Bank arcade was replaced by the Zoological Museum (architect: Alfonas Keturiš). Adjacent to the museum, a series of existing three-storey brick structures was replaced by a multi-unit residential building in 1974 (architect: Ina Sprindienė). Despite these changes, surviving historical structures and City Garden Square still retain the area’s authentic character (fig. 70).

Unity Square underwent significant transformation. The square was expanded in the Soviet era with the alteration of the eastern portion in 1965 to accommodate the construction of two voluminous design institutes and the Hall of Political Education. The architecture of these new structures echoed interwar modernism, but another redesign of the square completed in 2020 has further altered this square, giving it a distinctly commercial feel (architects: 3deluxe and Giedraitis & architektai) (fig. 71).

After the restoration of Lithuanian independence to the present day (1990–2020), the surviving 348 buildings from 1919–1939 period are being adapted for rapidly changing public expectations, therefore a considerable amount of authentic physical details has been lost, including windows, internal and external doors, and building interiors.
1.1.1. The State Theatre (currently the Kaunas Musical Theatre)

Laušės al. 91, architects Ustinas Golinevičius (1891), Vladimiras Dubeneckis, Mykolas Songaila (1923), Vytautas Landsbergis (1931), listed

The old Kaunas City Theatre built in 1891 in City Garden was the first purpose-built theatre in Lithuania. After the declaration of independence in 1918 it was renamed the State Theatre and professional drama, opera, and ballet troupes were established. In 1920, the theatre became the epicentre of political events. On 15 May the first meeting of the Constituent Assembly was convened there, and Lithuania reaffirmed as an independent democratic republic. The theatre was renovated in 1922–1925 in a Neo-Baroque style and the auditorium was decorated with folk art motifs. The theatre's new architectural expression is representative of the national style that was popular at the time. Further renovations took place in 1929–1930 to improve the theatre's material conditions. New wings were added and the new rear façade was designed in a modernist style. The theatre was renovated again between 1980 and 1984, mainly focusing on the interior.

1.1.2. The Bank of Lithuania

Maironio g. 25, architect Mykolas Songaila, 1925–1928, listed

The construction of the Bank of Lithuania in Kaunas can be viewed as the hallmark of the effective transfer of Lithuania's capital to Kaunas. This landmark building of the first decade of independence was a clear statement of intent by the institution to remain in Kaunas for some time. Lithuania's new national currency, the litas, was developed in concert with the bank itself. An international design competition for the building was announced in 1925, but the winning proposal by a French architect was deemed too costly and complicated. The commission was entrusted to Professor Mykolas Songaila of the Lithuanian University. Location on the corner of two streets facing the existing older central bank and the Ministry of Finance was meant to emphasise the monumental stature of the future building. The three-storey structure comprises three separate wings concentrated around a two-storey transactions hall. Two wings are connected by a semi-circular corner section topped with a cupola and spindle.

The interior is furnished with imposing and luxurious materials. Ionic columns of natural Swedish marble adorn the lobby and anterooms, the lobby stairs are made from grey Swedish granite, and the anterooms are natural marble. The walls of the lobby and halls are decorated in black, yellow, and brown natural and artificial marble. A coffered ceiling with allegorical paintings, the main staircase, and a conference hall on the second floor are not only functional, but also representational. The Bank of Lithuania building retains many authentic furniture and interior finishing details designed specifically for the bank. The third storey included an ornate private apartment designed for then Prime Minister Augustinas Voldemaras.

The elements of Neo-Classical architecture, expensive finishing materials and works of art by the most famous Lithuanian artists of the time testify to the new nation's ambitions, its growing economic power, and confidence in the future. The building has retained its function and interior to the present day.
I.1.3. Ministry of Justice and the Seimas (Parliament)
[currently the Kaunas Philharmonic]

E. Ožeškienės g. 12, architect Edmundas Frykas, 1925–1929, listed 4047

As the dispute over the status of Vilnius as Lithuania’s capital dragged on, various official institutions began to gradually establish themselves in Kaunas. The construction of a large Ministry of Justice building began in 1925. An international architectural design competition for the ministry headquarters was won by a pair of young Finnish architects – Ragnar Ypyä and Antero Pernaja – but the commission was eventually given to Edmundas Frykas, then an architect with the Kaunas Municipal Construction Department. The architectural approach echoes the prevailing aesthetic concepts that were deferential to classical tradition and ornamentation: Corinthian colonnade shaping the contours of the street corner capped by an inscription in Latin proclaiming Justitia est fundamentum regnorum (Justice is the Foundation of the Realm). An effort was made to decorate the building’s interior in a national style. The lobby is particularly ornate, adorned with motifs of folk carvings and ornamentation resembling a traditional Lithuanian woven sash. The floor boasts floral designs and the top of the main staircase features the seal of the Columns of Gediminas, a symbol harking back to the era of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

The building was intended to house only the Ministry of Justice, but when construction was nearly complete it was decided that it should also accommodate the Lithuanian Seimas, or parliament, dissolved after a 1926 coup, if there was a need for it to meet. The first session of a new Seimas convened here on 1 September 1936 and the building was subsequently known as the Ministry of Justice and Seimas.

The building was nationalized by the occupying Soviet regime in 1940 and its spacious interior was subdivided for use by numerous different agencies. In 1961, the building was adapted to house the Kaunas Philharmonic, which continues to use the facility today. The building was restored in 2005–2008.

75. The Ministry of Justice, designed by Edmundas Frykas, 1929. Photo: Mejeris Smečechauskas, 1930s, ČDM.
76. The Kaunas Philharmonic. Photo: Martynas Plepys, 2020
77. The ground floor plan. Source: Archfondas
78. The Kaunas Philharmonic. Photo: Martynas Plepys, 2020
79. The Kaunas Philharmonic. Photo: Martynas Plepys, 2020
1.1.4. Hotel Lietuva (Lithuania)
S. Daukanto g. 21, architect Vladimiras Dubeneckis, 1925, listed 306/15
The relocation of the Lithuanian government from Vilnius to Kaunas was hampered by a housing shortage. In 1925, a new three-storey hotel was constructed adjacent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and was advertised as the most beautiful and modern in Kaunas. The building clearly conveys the architect’s desire to instil the hotel with a national style expressed through specific choices of ornamentation and Baroque forms. The floors of the ornate lobby feature tiled patterns resembling traditional Lithuanian woven textiles and the ceiling is embellished with plant ornamentation. The building was refurbished in 1986, enlarging the ground floor service entrance and renovating interior and exterior details. Despite the changes made to its interior, the building has preserved its historical image as a prewar hotel.

1.1.5. The State Printing House – Vytautas Magnus University Main Building
Gedimino g. 50, architects Heinrich Fischer (1923), Vytautas Landsbergis (1929), listed 376/25
The competition for the design of the State Printing House held in 1923 was the first international architecture competition organized in independent Lithuania. Of eleven submitted proposals, the jury chose one by the Brandenburg-based architect Heinrich Fischer, who professionally designed an industrial building compliant with the requirements for a printing house. and, according to the jury, presented a façade in a modernised German classical style which would enhance the city’s overall image. The three-storey printing house with four-storey corner towers occupied nearly an entire block and was an impressive building when completed in 1925. However, doubts were soon cast over the necessity of such large industrial premises. The construction was criticized as an irresponsible waste of public funds. In 1927, the building was transferred to the Lithuanian university, established in 1922. The young architect Vytautas Landsbergis was hired to adapt the premises for the main building of the university. Ministry of Education had also moved into the building. Today, the building houses the Kaunas University of Technology. The building’s history and architecture demonstrate how international know-how and foreign expertise were enlisted in the early years of the new state to accelerate the process of architectural modernization.
1.1.6. Vytautas Magnus University Faculty of Medicine building
A. Mickevičiaus g. 9, architect Vladimiras Dubeneckis, 1933, listed 1970

In 1930, the Lithuanian University was renamed Vytautas Magnus University in honour of Vytautas, the Grand Duke of Lithuania. A new Faculty of Medicine was designed in 1933, based on the faculty of medicine at the University of Brussels, which the project sponsors viewed as one of the best examples of such buildings in Europe at the time. The building is zoned functionally into administrative offices and instructional facilities, a connecting wing with class auditoriums, and a research wing. In terms of function, the complex was unquestionably contemporary, bringing working and educational conditions for medical students and professors closer to European standards. Yet, the symmetrical and monumental building's volume seeks a balance between modernity and classical tradition. The Medical Faculty became part of a group of buildings together with the State Insurance Agency Building built in 1932 (architect: Aleksandras Čiorekvičius, fig. 92, 93) and the National Health Insurance Fund building completed in 1935 (architect: Vytautas Landsbergis, fig. 34). These three visually linked institutions reflect the ambitions of a modernising capital city. Today the building belongs to the Medicine Academy of the Lithuanian University of Health Sciences.

88. The Vytautas Magnus University Faculty of Medicine, 1933. Private collection of Antanas Burikas
89. Ground floor plan for the Vytautas Magnus University Faculty of Medicine, 1933. Source: Žinios ir ūkis, 1933, no. 7
90. The main facade. Photo: Martynas Plepys, 2020
91. The rear facade. Photo: Martynas Plepys, 2020
92. The State Insurance Agency Building. A postcard, 1930s
93. The State Insurance Agency Building, detail. Photo: Martynas Plepys, 2020
In 1929, a decision was made to build a new Central Post Office as the nucleus and symbol of a modern system of communications. Completed in less than one year in 1930, the new building with its bold symmetrical façade and a flat roof joined the ranks of landmark structures in the city. It altered the face of Laisvės Aleja, standing out from the surrounding buildings and quickly becoming both a meeting place for the residents of Naujamiestis and an iconic landmark of modern Kaunas.

Despite its modernist architectural elements, the five-storied building conveys a spirit of classical solemnity and gravity. Architect Vizbaras presented his plan as an innovative interpretation of Lithuanian folk architecture. In his vision, the plan was meant to echo the layout of a typical Lithuanian rural cottage. The traditional village weaving patterns in the frieze and the ornamental flooring in the lobby and transactions hall of the Post Office’s interior represent the search for a modern national style.

The proposed décor’s ‘national interpretation’ encouraged visitors to the Central Post Office to enjoy the sight of familiar motifs from rural folk textiles in the interior designs, helping to foster pride in this expression of Lithuanian modernism. The exclusive use of local materials in the building’s construction, a detail often repeated in public announcements, helped foster confidence in the country’s growing economy.

The Central Post Office continued to perform its primary function throughout the 20th century, but the Soviet regime initially sought to minimise the building’s symbolic importance. Commemorative plaques with the names of sponsors and project founders on the building’s exterior and a list of construction team members hung inside the building were plastered over and a commemorative medallion was removed from the façade. After the restoration of Lithuanian independence in the late 20th century, efforts were made to restore the Post Office’s symbolic content. Restoration of the transactions hall interior finishing commenced in 1996.
1.1.8. The Pienocentras Headquarters Building

Laisvės al. 55, architects Vytautas Landsbergis, Karolis Reisonas, engineers Pranas Markūnas, Saliamonas Milis, 1931–1934, listed 19968

Established in 1927 as a cooperative union of Lithuanian dairy processors, Pienocentras soon became one of Lithuania’s largest industrial enterprises. The first five-storey building on Laisvės Aleja, the Pienocentras administrative headquarters fundamentally changed the character of the intersection of Laisvės Aleja and S. Daukanto Street. Compared to the surrounding low-rise structures, the new building looked like a skyscraper. The ground floor included a shop selling Pienocentras brand products and a milk bar. In the summer, the bar would open up to the outdoors, its street-side tables quickly becoming an important symbol of modern urban life in Kaunas. The bottom two storeys were also home to the famous Muralis Brothers hair salon, with modernist interiors designed by architect Arno Funkas. Pienocentras reserved the first and second storeys for its administrative offices and upper floors were allocated to spacious private apartments. The concrete framework of the building afforded a range of options for laying out interior spaces. The building’s corner composition featured simple but powerfully expressive architecture with convex windows. The ground floor was finished in luxurious polished black labradorite and expansive showcase windows with a continuous glazed canopy electrically illuminating the ground floor and streetscape. The Pienocentras headquarters design was awarded a bronze medal and diploma at an international exhibition in Paris in 1937. In the Soviet years, the building housed several higher education institutions and the popular Pienocentras Café opened there in 1982.
1.1.9. The Pažanga Headquarters Building

Laisvės al. 53, architect Feliksas Vizbaras, 1934, listed 1989

The Pažanga (Progress) company, established in 1928, was owned by the ruling Nationalist (Tautininkų) Party. The corporation’s name originated from the party’s earlier designation as the National Progress Party. Built in 1933–1934, the large five-storey edifice housed the party’s headquarters, editorial offices, and the Jaunoji Lietuva (Young Lithuania) national youth union. The second floor was home to the National Club, which ran a snack bar and restaurant. Patrons of the restaurant could use the elevator to the flat roof terrace. A modern shop run by the Parama cooperative, which supported national business, rented the ground floor. The deep basement, which extended under the entire yard, contained meeting rooms illuminated by skylights made of glass blocks. In search of the modern national style, the architect Vizbaras simulated Lithuanian folk-art wood carvings and national symbols in art-deco manner in the façade and interiors.
The Agriculture Bank, established in 1924, was the largest official credit institution for agriculture. Because the bank was built on the edge of Vienybės Square, its architect Reisonas took special note of a neighbouring symbolic building, the Vytautas the Great Museum. Reisonas sought to ensure that the bank would not obscure the museum, but rather serve as a suitable backdrop for it. The monumentality of the four-storey building was created through a rhythm of vertical and horizontal lines and opulent finishing materials, including granite stucco, polished granite cladding, and works of art. A large amount of reinforced concrete was used to construct the bank. The building also housed offices of the Foreign Ministry, accessed by a separate entrance and lift. The building’s architecture was modern yet rooted in Neo-Classical proportions, and reflects the monumentality that was popular for official buildings in the early 1930s.
1.1. The Vytautas the Great War Museum and M. K. Čiurlionis National Art Museum
K. Donelaičio g. 64, architects Vladimiras Dubeneckis, Karolis Reisonas, Kazimieras Krūčiukaitis, 1921–1936, listed 16946

The idea of constructing a national museum in Lithuania was conceived in the early 20th century, propelled by a wave of sweeping nationalism. After 1918, the concept for the national museum expanded in scope and came to be seen not only as a monument to statehood but also as the central repository of artefacts representing the collective national memory and an institution for the education and development of a modern society. Two competitions were held to select the best architectural design for the future museum, one in 1929 and another in 1930. The final competition was won by the most famous Lithuanian architects of the day, Vladimiras Dubeneckis and Karolis Reisonas. Interestingly, a 1936 law governing the Vytautas the Great Museum mandated the existence of two separate museums in one building: one for military history, the other for culture.

The museum’s architecture combines a modern concept with classical tradition. The monumental building is arranged around two inner courtyards. The largest section, the southern part, houses the War Museum and its ceremonial hall. Although the overall composition aspires to symmetry, the façades of the War Museum and Museum of Culture differ. The War Museum was officially opened on 16 February 1936, on the eighteenth anniversary of Lithuania’s declaration of independence, and was intended to be the country’s principal institution of memory, performing the functions of both a history museum and a centre for official state celebrations. Arcades help to extend the main building of the War Museum, creating a half-open inner courtyard in front of the building’s western wall, connecting the museum with a bell tower whose decor is thematically linked to the memorial halls and the monuments erected in the museum’s garden. A dense complex of artwork commemorating the War of Independence and its heroes and victims was installed in the War Museum Garden and in the adjacent Vienybės Square. On the tenth anniversary of Lithuanian independence, a Freedom Monument was unveiled in the War Museum Garden, designed in 1928 by sculptor Juozas Zikaras and architect Vladimiras Dubeneckis.

The Museum of Culture opened its doors to the public exactly one year later, on 16 February 1937. The façade of the Museum of Culture is more dynamic, its main focus being a semi-circular central section encompassing an amphitheatre auditorium. The vertical division of the façade by narrow windows and interspersed pilasters capped with copper canopies is a nod to a crown image depicted in paintings by the national artistic genius Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis. High-quality and durable materials were used to finish the building. The exterior was covered in granite plaster and granite blocks were used in the plinth and exterior steps. The floor and interior staircases are finished in terrazzo tile and the exhibition halls in parquet flooring. The predominant white, grey, black, and dark wood colour scheme used for the museum’s interior is typical of ceremonial public buildings, creating a solemn and discrete background against which works of art or historic relics could be displayed. By 1936, the Vytautas the Great Museum had become an integral part of Kaunas’ cultural landscape.

The significance of the combined museums and their impact on the nation’s identity were well understood by the Soviet forces that occupied the country in the 1940s: the Vytautas the Great Museum and its grounds were subjected to significant alteration, but their primary function survived. The Museum of Culture, known today as the M. K. Čiurlionis National Art Museum, retained its original function throughout the Soviet period. In 1967, a new annex intended solely for the storage and exhibition of works by M. K. Čiurlionis was attached to the western side of the complex, connected to the main building via a glass-enclosed corridor (renovated in 2002). A library and archives were added in 2011. A renovation of the original museum structure was completed in 2016.
The founders of the newly independent Lithuania were in agreement on one point: Economic power was a vital guarantor of statehood. One of the symbols of the country’s expanding economy and trade was the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, an institution established in 1925 to coordinate and represent the interests of producers and tradesmen. Its symbolic importance was to remind citizens that a strong economy was the foundation of the country’s prosperity. The campaign inevitably led to an effort, beginning in 1931, to construct a modern, representative headquarters for the chamber.

The call for design proposals attracted twenty-nine submissions, a surprisingly large number given that the competition was restricted to Lithuanian architects. The project’s sponsors selected a design by Vytautas Landsbergis, whose proposal called for a classical tradition: a principal façade featuring pilasters and an arched entrance. Furniture, artwork, and interior details in the national style were meant to represent Lithuania’s economic potential and prowess, serving as a visual testament to the sources of this strength: the country’s territorial integrity, its demographic resources, social cohesion around national values, and the continued growth of its industrial, commercial, agricultural, and crafts sectors. The new chamber, with its convenient layout, superior materials, and decorative details was everything its sponsors had hoped for: a well-executed example of solemnity and landmark stature.

In 1944, Soviet authorities transferred the building to the jurisdiction of the Central State Library. The Kaunas Regional Library was opened at this location in 1950. The library continues to be the building’s principal occupant today, although a small section of the structure was allocated in the late-20th century to the newly established Kaunas Chamber of Commerce, Industry, and Crafts, the successor to the prewar institution.
1.1.13. The Chamber of Agriculture
K. Donelaičio g. 2, architect Karolis Reisonas, 1931

The Chamber of Agriculture was founded in 1924 as a semi-state, semi-public agency charged with promoting various agricultural issues, organizing educational programmes for farmers, establishing agriculture schools, and publishing materials on agricultural subjects. The three-storey office building was rounded and the lateral-eastern wall featured a setback configuration, with the façade shaped by a series of stepped-back planes. The corner of a residential building at No. 2 Parodos Street, located on the other side, was also rounded. Both structures shaped the space leading to the stairs accessing Paroda Hill, a former exhibition area. Today, this access is closed by a brick wall, but both buildings comprise an original, unified composition. In the Soviet period, the buildings housed offices of various institutions. The Lithuanian Chamber of Agriculture was re-established in 1991.

1.1.14. Kaunas County Municipality and State Security Department Building
Laisvės al. 14, architect Vytautas Landsbergis, structural engineers Anatolijus Rozenbliumas, Algirdas Šalkauskis, 1933, listed 1992

Located on a significant site at the intersection of central streets, this modern building helped shape the face of the new capital. The structure comprises two wings joined at a right angle, a composition determined by the building’s corner site and its intended use by two different institutions. The wing facing Laisvės Alėja was occupied by Kaunas county municipal offices and the police headquarters, while the structure fronting on Vytauto Prospekts was allocated to the State Security Department and criminal police, with holding cells in the basement. Narrow windows and dividing pilasters were intended to create a façade surface reminiscent of classical columns, lending the structure a sense of gravity and typical of other modern public buildings in Kaunas. The site was imbued with further solemnity by the use of centrally placed entrances adorned in black labradorite in each façade. Interior finishing and engineering details were also intended to emphasise the well-funded stature of the agencies within. Visitors are met by a set of revolving doors, a mosaic concrete staircase and decorated metal railings, columns, and half-columns. During the Soviet period, the building was occupied by the KGB.
Because military strength was viewed as one of the central guar- antors of sovereignty of the interwar Lithuanian state, officers en- joyed a prominent position in society. They sought to maintain and strengthen this position through active participation in the country’s political, public, and cultural life. Proponents of the new Officers’ Club resolved to create a symbolic space which would allow visitors to experience the grandeur of Lithuanian history, while at the same time promoting an optimistic vision of the country’s future.

The design for the new Kaunas Officers’ Club was put out to international competition in 1931 and some thirty architects and their teams submitted proposals. The winning submissions were viewed as valuable sources of ideas, but the final design was commissioned from the renowned Kaunas architect Vladimiras Dubeneckis, who died suddenly in the summer of 1932. The design was consequently entrusted to the young Italian-trained architect Stasys Kudokas. The designers sought to use only locally procured materials for construction and finishing. The only imported material was granite from Scandinavia. The club was officially opened on 23 April 1937 and immediately became one of the most lavish buildings in interwar Kaunas.

The interior finishing and decor were carefully chosen to honour the Lithuanian state and its founders and defenders. The designers closely adhered to the principle of incorporating both modern and historical elements. As was typical in the case of classical architecture, the building’s main façade emphasised a ceremonial piano nobile, with granite stairs leading to the main entrance. The coats of arms of Vilnius, Kaunas, and Klaipėda placed above the main entrance were meant to symbolise the country’s territorial integrity.

The building was divided into several functional zones. Crossing the spacious lobby with coatrooms on either side brought visitors to the entrance of the restaurant hall and symmetrically arranged staircases leading to the ceremonial first floor. Thematic halls were furnished on the first storey facing the street. Connecting the halls was an anteroom called the Hall of Dukes, adorned with images of Lithuania’s Grand Dukes, echoing the building’s overall symbolism and a nod to the portrait galleries of ancestors typically found in noble houses and estates. The medieval ambience of the thematic Hall of Grand Duke Vytautas, designed by Jonas Kovalskis, was intended to convey the grandeur of Lithuania’s history. The hall featured wooden paneling mimicking the gothic arcade motif and furniture made in a style found in medieval castles. Another thematic hall, the Presidential Lounge, designed by Stasys Kudokas, was incorporated in the overall building design to reflect the glory of the country’s history and its present-day achievements through an exemplary expression of national modernism. The historical rooms contrasted to the steel frame glazed conservatory that demonstrated amazing technological construction.

The new Officers’ Club instantly became a central part of public life in Kaunas. It was a meeting place for the officer corps and a venue for official state celebrations, receptions, and conferences. Soon after the occupation of Lithuania, the Soviet government adapted the Officers’ Club for the needs of its own military in 1941. In 1988, as the democratic reform movement began to take hold, the Lithuanian government allocated funds to preserve the existing building and, after officially resuming custodian-ship of the club in 2000, the Lithuanian military launched a faithful restoration project.
1.1.16. The Chamber of Labour
[currently the Kaunas Cultural Centre]
Vytauto pr. 79, architects Adolfo Lukošaitis, Antanas Novickis, 1939, listed 32465.
The Chamber of Labour was a state institution devoted to promoting the cultural, economic, and social needs of workers and civil servants. The chamber’s founding was inspired by a political decision to ban trade unions in 1935. Designed in 1938, the building housed the chamber’s administration, social welfare departments, editorial offices of the Darbas (Labour) newspaper, a library and a reading room, various cultural and sports clubs, a theatre, a private grammar school for the children of employees, and the School of Labour. It also had a canteen and a small hotel. The chamber’s location on Vytauto Prospektas attests to its institutional significance. The architecture of the four-storey administrative building with its austere exterior resembles a monolithic cube. A series of grey-brown plastered pilasters establish the texture of the two main façades. The most beautiful part of the building is a lobby with two wide parallel sets of stairs. During the Second World War, the building was occupied by the German Gestapo and in the Soviet years it was known as the Palace of Trade Unions. A stained-glass decoration by Bronius Grušas was installed in the lobby in the 1950s. The building has maintained its function to the present day and currently houses the Kaunas Cultural Centre.
1.1.17. The State Savings Bank
(currently the Kaunas City Municipal Building)
Laisvės at 96, architects Arnas Funkas, Adolfas Lukofaitis, Bronius Ežbergas, 1938–1940, listed II*
One of last public buildings constructed in the interwar period was the State Savings Bank. The building was also intended to house the Lithuanian Department of Trade, the Bureau of Statistics, and several other national agencies. The facility was designed to be ornate and was equipped with the latest technological advancements. A special commission had been sent abroad to visit similar buildings in other European countries. An international design competition for the building was announced in 1938 and received seventy-seven responses. A final design was crafted based on contributions by three proposals selected by the jury.

Vertically arranged pilasters lifted the building’s façade upward, prompting residents to dub the six-storey building a ‘Kaunas skyscraper’. The ground floor is finished in polished hexagonal granite panels, and the floors above are finished in grey granite plaster. The building’s structure rests on a metal frame and the roofs are flat except for the main hall roof, which has four glazed slopes on a metal frame. The glass ceiling is unique, with its black metal frame forming a geometric pattern. A pneumatic mail tube connected the building’s facilities. As was often seen in Kaunas modernism, ethnically themed ornamentation was also subtly incorporated into the building’s modern interior decor. The building was still under construction in June 1940, at the start of the first Soviet occupation, so the Savings Bank never assumed occupancy. During the Soviet period, the building was transferred to the Kaunas City Municipality, which remains the principal tenant today.
1.1.18. The Evangelical Reformed (Calvinist) Church
E. Ožeškienės g. 41, architect Karolis Reisonas, 1937–1947, listed 37687
The Kaunas Evangelical Reformed (Calvinist) Church is sited on a picturesque plot of land at the base of a hill. Architect Karolis Reisonas succeeded in fitting a large structure within a relatively small area, gracefully incorporating it into the surrounding Kaunas landscape. Narrow vertical windows and a setback tower not only exhibit the spirit typical of 1930s Kaunas architecture, but also visually amplify an impression of vigour in the relatively small volume of the church. Unfortunately, as in the case of Resurrection Church, final finishing and plastering for the building were still underway at the start of the Soviet occupation in 1940. When construction resumed after World War II, the structure served as a warehouse, a police cafeteria, and a sports hall. Numerous changes were made: the upper portion and church tower were removed, the flat roof was partially altered, windows were bricked shut, and the central entrance was redesigned. The church was returned to the parish in 1990 and faithfully restored according to Reisonas’ original designs.

1.1.19. Tatar Mosque
Totorių g. 6, architects Vaclovas Michnevičius, Adolfas Netykša, 1930–1933, listed 1151
The Kaunas Tatar Mosque is the only brick mosque in the three Baltic countries. It was built within the former Carmelite Cemetery on a one-hectare plot purchased from the Kaunas municipality in 1910 by the Tatar philanthropist Aleksandras Iljasevičius, who financed the building of a small wooden mosque and hall and set aside land for a Tatar cemetery (mizar). The Tatars originally arrived in Lithuania in 1400, during the reign of Grand Duke Vytautas. Their community in Kaunas decided to commemorate the 500th anniversary of Vytautas’ death by building a mosque in 1930. The Lithuanian government allocated half of the necessary funds. The small Oriental style mosque consists of a domed prayer hall, lobby, and a single minaret. A bas-relief plaque dedicated to Vytautas was attached to the wall of the minaret in 1930 but has not survived. The mosque continued to hold services until 1947, when it was closed by the Soviet regime and converted into a warehouse. The adjacent cemetery was removed. The mosque was returned to the Kaunas Muslim community in 1989 and a major renovation was completed in 2008.
1.1.20. The Kaunas Jewish Realschule  
[currently the Juozas Naujalis Music School]  
Kęstučio g. 85, architect Baruch Kling, 1931, listed 44854  
The Jüdische Realschule, or Jewish Realschule, was established in Kaunas in 1915 at the initiative of Chief Rabbi Rozenbach, who had served in the Imperial German army. The school’s construction was financed by Jewish American philanthropist Edward Chase. In addition to classrooms and a sports hall, the school also had a day-care facility, a library and reading room, and a medical office. When completed, it was the most modern Jewish secondary school in Lithuania. The three-storey building has a regular, symmetrical composition and consists of three separate areas: a main section with two entrances to the street, a staircase and main hall, and two side wings for classrooms. A central staircase leads out into the back courtyard. The street-facing façade is dominated by the large main hall windows, while the rear-facing façade has no windows at all to insulate classrooms against any noise from outside. The architecture of the large building is simple, with wide windows connected by horizontal lines and every element serving the structure’s principal function. A Jewish primary school was also completed in 1931 on land near the southern side of the grounds, helping to create a centre for Jewish education in Kaunas.

1.1.21. The Kaunas Russian Gymnasium  
[currently the Kaunas Pedagogical Qualification Centre]  
Vytisuo pr. 44, architect Aleksandras Gordevičius, 1925  
In 1940, Kaunas had six Lithuanian language secondary schools, six secondary schools for Jewish students, and several schools for Russian, Polish, and German heritage children. In 1925, the ‘Education is Light’ Russian Private Gymnasium was completed in the Orthodox section of the Kaunas City (Carmelite) Cemetery. The school with its romantically styled exterior was one of the most ornately decorated educational buildings constructed in Kaunas in the first decade of independence. The building’s design has a clear historicist feel, the school’s functional layout stands out for the use of unusually wide corridors designated as ‘recreational halls’ on both storeys.
1.1.22. The Romuva Cinema
Laisvės al. 54, architect Nikolajus Mačiulskis, 1940, listed 32115
The Romuva Cinema opened on 18 April 1940, just two months before Lithuania lost its independence. The modernist building stands on the city’s principal avenue, Laisvės Aleeja, but is situated at the far end of the plot, set back from the street, thereby creating a small passageway and space in front of the theatre entrance. The main façade was designed with a narrow glass tower at one corner, a feature which remains a widely recognizable symbol of Kaunas’ interwar architecture today. The art deco style façade was also meant to display a fresco, but it was never completed and was eventually replaced by a series of small windows. Screening hall ceilings were finished in special acoustic elements to improve sound quality, an innovation patented by Lithuanian engineers. Today, the Romuva is the only cinema in Kaunas of its era to have retained its principal function and exterior appearance. The building was reopened in 2020 after extensive restoration work.
1.1.23. Apartment Building of the Lapėnas family

Kęstučio g. 38, architect Feliksas Vizbaras, 1932, listed 32101

The largest apartment building in Kaunas was owned by the millionaire Jonas Lapėnas, the director of the Maistas (Food) company and a leader of the Nationalist Party. The building stands out with its functionalist architecture and luxurious finishing. The modern concrete and brick structure included every convenience: central heating and water, a sewage system, and two lifts. The ground floor had space set aside for shops and the rest of the building featured two apartments per floor, totaling eight luxurious five-room residences. The central core of the building consists of two staircases, a main and service access, and a lift. Superior finishing materials usually reserved for public buildings, such as granite plaster for the walls and polished brown granite doorways, created an impression of luxury. The geometry of the main façade is emphasised by bands of dark stucco, window trimmings, black window frames, and metal balcony railings. Two adjoining apartments on the first floor were rented by the Polish Embassy in 1938–1939. Various institutions occupied the building in the Soviet and post-Soviet years. The pitched roof was replaced with a flat one after a fire in 1960. In the 1970s, the lift at the back staircase was dismantled. Many of the original furnishings survive today, including the valuable interior of the lobby. In 2016, the house was thoroughly restored and is now rented for offices. The building exemplifies the rise of a national financial elite in interwar Kaunas and the priority given to investing in the construction of well-appointed, modernist residential buildings.

1.1.24. Apartment Building of the Chaimsonas family

Maironio g. 13, architect Vytautas Landsbergis, 1933, listed 1135

Residential buildings taller than three storeys began to appear in Kaunas only from the late-1920s. One of these was an apartment building commissioned by the co-owner of a bulk manufacturing warehouse, Mozė Chaimsonas. When completed, this structure, one of the tallest in Kaunas, marked the start of a new era in urban residential architecture. The building featured construction elements which were modern for their time, including concrete floors and metal-framed bay windows. The three lower storeys had two luxurious five- and six-room apartments per floor, while upper storeys were each laid out with four smaller units. The building’s owners, Mozė and Malka Chaimsonas, lived on the third floor, and another apartment was occupied by the famous artist at the time, Mstislav Dobuzhinsky. Apartments included small servant’s quarters, expansive lounges, and dining rooms connected through sliding panel doors to a sitting room. The flats were reduced in size during the Soviet period. The central core of the building consists of two staircases, a main and service access, and lifts which have since been removed.
The two-storey residential building owned by Aleksandra and Jurgis Iljinas is one of the most impressive examples of Kaunas modernism. The building is notable for its free and innovative window composition, including corner windows which serve to lighten the structure’s volume and the harmonious incorporation of curved glass and a famous porthole (circular window) demonstrate the window’s role as both a functional element and an active compositional method. The building includes three apartments, two on the ground floor for rent, and a particularly well-appointed Iljinas family residence on the first floor, complete with a rooftop terrace and a winter garden. The building’s interior designs and furnishings were all crafted by architect Arnas Funkas, incorporating modern solutions. The owners’ flat features an Oriental style alcove finished with a traditional mugumas, installed when the building was initially designed and is still present today. Other surviving elements in the building include a spiral wooden staircase, custom wooden doors with glass features and wooden siding, archways between rooms with wooden siding, and ceiling décor over the first-floor anteroom.
1.1.26. Apartment Building of Mozė Posvianskis and Hiršas Klisas
Vytauto pr. 58, architect Jokūbas Peras, 1928, listed 15920

The fluid form of this four-storey residential building on Vytauto Prospect incorporates styles seen in foreign architectural journals. The building’s façade and its ornamentation call to mind Dutch and German expressionist designs. The main façade element is an entryway with gothic arches, black columns with capitals adorned in stylized plant motifs, and a star-shaped vaulting canopy. The back side façade is dominated by glass-enclosed semi-cylindrical staircases adorned with galleries and a rectangular protrusion of the stairs. A functionalist style prevails throughout the façade.
11.27. Apartment Building of Taubė-Feibė Elšteinienė
L. Sapiegos g. 4, architects Leiba Žimanas and Izakas Trakmanas, 1935, listed 42757
As soon as this cuboid rational building was finished, the Kaunas municipality acknowledged it as having ‘the most beautiful residential façade’. According to the original design, the building was to have two storeys with a loggia, decorated by a sculpture. Later, a more rational design was chosen with a third storey and a column replacing the sculpture. The ground and second floors contained two compact three-room apartments, with the owner’s apartment on the first floor. Moze Elšteinė was the owner of a perfume and cosmetics shop on Laisvės Alėja. The building was nationalized during the Soviet period and housed the city’s Executive Committee.

11.28. Apartment Building of Elijošius Šneideris
Vaidulių g. 3, architect Stasys Kudokas, 1938, listed 42760
This multi-unit residential building was constructed along a small cul-de-sac on a city block between Kęstučio and Mūšų Streets. The four-storey building features a mansard roof, asymmetrical compositions and two displaced volumes. Its façades are dominated by horizontal rounded balconies. A bay window stairwell adorned with narrow windows and cornices features prominently in the façade. The building was designed to have eleven spacious, fully functional and comfortable apartments. The structure is well known in Kaunas today and is a treasured example of mature Kaunas modernism. Its original owners, Elijošius Šneideris, his wife Liuba, and their daughter Rūta, born in 1938, were deported by the Soviet authorities to the Tomsk Oblast in Western Siberia in 1941.
2. DESCRIPTION

1. A view of V. Putvinskio Street. Photo: Martynas Plepys, 2020
2.a.3.2. Residential Naujamiestis

Neighbourhoods with landmark apartment buildings and villas along the perimeter of Naujamiestis represent an important feature of the city's modern character: the urbanisation of the sloping terrain. Construction in these areas fully developed between 1923 and 1939, whereas during the Soviet period and in recent decades, this part of the city has seen only sporadic development. In most cases, there has been no essential alteration of the authentic interwar urban fabric, allowing this area to retain its integrity. And while the sloping terrain runs the entire length of the western edge of Naujamiestis, two representative residential development zones have emerged in this area over time. One is the V. Putvinskio Street area behind Vienybės Square (fig. 189, 191) and the other is at the convergence of Ramybės Park and Trakų and Būgos Street area (fig. 235, 237, 238).

Developments on the sloping topography have retained their authenticity and integrity. Small 2 to 3 storeys multi-unit (3 to 4 apartments) brick houses with low-pitched roofs are characteristic for the area (Aušros takas 8, 9, 16; Žemaičių Street 10, 11, 12, 16, 18) (fig. 191). On the slope’s upper terrace, the architectural development continues at Vaistinės skersgatvis, which also has a predominance of 1930s multi-unit, brick apartments. The view from Aušros takas provides an impressive profile of the landmark Resurrection Church (see 1.2.1). A particularly attractive landmark of this area is a funicular railway operating since 1931 (see 1.2.2).

State of Authenticity and Integrity. Several Soviet-era five-storey residential structures have been inserted along Trakų and V. Putvinskio Streets between interwar apartment buildings. A new large building of Vytautas Magnus University was opened on V. Putvinskio Street in 2016 (architect: Gražina Janulytė-Bementošienė). Yet, the entire district, shaped during the period between 1923 and 1939, has remained relatively unchanged, retaining both its authenticity and integrity as an open-air museum of interwar Kaunas modernist residential architecture.
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194. Map of 1.2. Residential Naujamiestis (Ramybės Park, Trakų and K. Būgos Street Area)
1.2.1. Christ’s Resurrection Church

Žemaičių g. 31A, architect Karolis Reisonas, 1933–2004, listed 16005

The idea of constructing a memorial church in Kaunas to symbolise the rebirth of the Lithuanian nation and to serve as a national expression of gratitude to God was conceived in 1922. The initiative was inspired by the practice of building votive churches, first seen in Austria and France in the late 19th century, and which became more widely accepted in the 20th century. The significance of the Lithuanian memorial temple was to be augmented by a national mausoleum in its crypt, where prominent citizens would be laid to rest, honouring their sacrifice to nation and country.

The competition to design the memorial Resurrection Church was launched in 1928, stipulating three principal requirements: The shrine had to be monumental in form; designs had to include space for a mausoleum; and the structure had to convey a Lithuanian spirit. Of fifteen entries the proposal by Latvian-born Kārlis Reisons, or Karolis Reisonas in the Lithuanian transcription, was chosen for the final design. Reisonas revised his plans, eventually receiving approval in 1933 for a design centred around clearly defined geometric forms. Resurrection Church was to stand high on the hill of Žaliakalnis as a prominent city landmark, clearly visible from central Kaunas. The Church’s distinct silhouette was created by a sixty-three-metre tall bell tower and a roof chapel.

By 1940 and the onset of the first Soviet occupation, work on the exterior plastering and tower stairs had yet to begin. In 1941, the Soviet regime nationalized the unfinished church. Under the subsequent Nazi occupation, the building served as a paper storage facility. After the war, in 1952, the building was converted into a Soviet military facility, popularly known as the Radio Factory. To set up production lines in the church, the building’s interior was horizontally divided with reinforced concrete beams. The aisles were split into three floors and the central nave into five. The terrace chapel, considered unnecessary for the factory’s purposes, was dismantled. The unplastered but nonetheless grand red-brick structure dominated the Kaunas skyline for fifty years, serving as a reminder of the incomplete construction of a national symbol and inspiring hopes for the restoration of independence. When the first signs of the impending collapse of the Soviet regime began to appear in 1988, there were growing calls to dismantle the factory and return the church to the faithful. Restoration was completed in 2004.
1.2.2. The Žaliakalnis Funicular Railway

Aušros g. 6, 1931, listed 16773

Kaunas’ two funicular railways are evidence of the city’s rapid growth and the consequent modernisation of its infrastructure. The first railway was completed in Žaliakalnis in 1931 and the second in Aleksotas in 1935. Such cable railways were a typical means of transportation used in hilly European cities. To promote and accelerate overall development in Žaliakalnis, city authorities approved the installation of a funicular to improve the connection between Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis in 1927. The Žaliakalnis funicular consists of an upper station (at Aušros Street 6), a passenger pavilion on V. Putvinskio Street, and a 142-metre track. The ride takes one minute and thirty-eight seconds. The funicular was designed and manufactured by the Leipzig-based engineering company Curt Rudolph Transportanlagen, with the electrical equipment supplied by the AEG corporation. The Lithuanian-American trading company Amlit manufactured the funicular rail cars in Kaunas. In 1937, engineer Napoleonas Dobkevičius designed new cars and a modern passenger station was built in 1935. In 1986, the funicular underwent comprehensive repairs and new platforms were installed at the upper station. The funicular was renovated again in 2003 and surviving original equipment was restored.
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203. A passenger pavilion on V. Putvinskio Street. Photo: Martynas Plepys, 2020

204. The upper station at Aušros Street. Photo: Martynas Plepys, 2020
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2. DESCRIPTION

V. Putvinskio Street retains the public face typical of Naujamiestis. On the northern side of the street, residential buildings serve as a key link between the city centre and Žaliakalnis: one side of each structure helping to shape a landmark street, and the other facing the lush greenery on the sloping terrain. Buildings owned by renowned Kaunas residents faced onto the Museum of Culture, while service entrances and courtyards were formed at the bottom of the Žaliakalnis slopes. Units in many of these buildings were rented out to foreign embassy staff. This street and its ensemble of modern residential buildings constructed between 1930 and 1936 have retained their integrity and illustrate the city’s diversity of modernist architecture. Today, the area is protected as a single collection of residential buildings (V. Putvinskio Street 52–72, listed 15922).

The remaining section of V. Putvinskio Street retains its historic character from the interwar period but also displays a broader temporal and functional range. Kaunas’ contrasting social and architectural conditions typically exhibited in the interwar period are evident in the variety of multi-storey modern buildings and surviving low-rise wooden structures.
1.2.3. Apartment Building of Algirdas Šliosoraitis
V. Putvinskio g. 32, architect Bronius Elsbergas, 1938, listed 44492
One of the largest and most modern apartment buildings on V. Putvinskio Street was built by Algirdas Šliosoraitis, a military officer and a leader of both the geležinis vilkas (Iron Wolf) paramilitary organization and the Skuba railway goods expedition company. The eastern side of the four-storey building was angled, while the street elevation features massive, rounded balconies conveying a sense of dynamic movement in the manner of the ‘transatlantic ocean liner’ style fashionable in the 1930s. The building originally had apartments of various sizes: large, luxurious units, as well as small one-room apartments with no kitchen. In 1938, the building was recognized by the Kaunas municipality as having the most beautiful brick residential building façade.

1.2.4. Apartment building of Kazimieras Škėma
V. Putvinskio g. 60, architects Klaudijus Duž-Dušauskas, Bronius Elsbergas, 1933, listed 34861
Five-storey buildings were a rarity in Kaunas. Indeed, city officials had even proposed a rule requiring new buildings to match the height of neighbouring structures. But a lawyer named Kazimieras Škėma, considered one of Kaunas’ wealthiest citizens in the interwar period, was able to obtain official permission to construct this particular building. The central accent in the building’s main asymmetrical façade is a massive four-storey set of bay windows which connect to balconies echoing the same rounded corners of the window bay. The ground floor features two complimentary entrances, one providing the main access into the building and another leading to an interior courtyard. Each floor had one five-room flat. Apartments in the building were rented by the Czechoslovak and Swedish legations between 1934 and 1939. A three-storey structure inside the main courtyard once served as the building’s support facility, and included garages, rooms for drivers, and a greenhouse.
1.2.5. The Apostolic Nunciature
[cURRENTLY THE KAUNAS ARTISTS’ HOUSE]
V. Putvinskio g. 56, architect Vytautas Landsbergis, 1930, LISTED 34955
This is the only building in Kaunas commissioned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs specifically for a foreign legation and was intended to house the Vatican’s diplomatic mission in 1930. The villa was set slightly back from the street on the slope of Žaliakalnis. Although building codes required structures on V. Putvinskio Street to form a continuous row of joined houses, an exception was made for the Nunciature. However, after diplomatic relations between Lithuania and the Vatican deteriorated, the Italian Rationalist style villa, complete with chancellery facilities, offices, living and dining rooms, a winter garden, bedrooms, chapel, and a reception area, was converted into a children’s hospital. After the Second World War, it housed a children’s nursery until 1971, when a local cultural office took over the building. In 1973, the building became known as Menininkų namai (Artists’ House). The structure was renovated in 1972 and again in 1979. A second storey was constructed over the building’s wing, a café and performance hall were installed on the ground floor. Stained glass art by V. Banys was installed in the building’s windows in 1980. The building continues to serve as the Kaunas Artists’ House today.

1.2.6. House with a studio of painter Antanas Žmuidzinavičius
[CREATIONS AND COLLECTIONS MUSEUM]
V. Putvinskio g. 64, architect Vytautas Landsbergis, 1928, LISTED 30426
The original design for this building was for a two-storey house, but a third storey with an apartment for rent and the artist’s studio was added. The Žmuidzinavičius family lived on the first floor, while the ground floor was let out. Marija Putvinskaitė-Žmuidzinavičienė’s dental surgery operated from the family’s apartment. The building has an irregular plan with two staircases. The window frames are divided by decorative wavy bars, an element favoured by architect Landsbergis in the late 1920s. The artist left his property to the state. After his death in 1966, a museum of his works and a collection was opened and a memorial apartment with a studio was opened to the public in 1967. Original furniture and a large amount of equipment have survived in the flat.
1.2.7. Apartment building of Jonas Vileišis
V. Putvinskio g. 68, architect Aleksandras Gordevičius, 1930, listed 34859
This building, once the property of Jonas Vileišis, a signatory to the 1918 Lithuanian Declaration of Independence, a Mayor of Kaunas in 1921–1931, and a member of the governing State Council, was leased in 1932 to the United States as a legation and consulate, while Vileišis himself took up residence in a separate home built on the same plot. The building’s façade is divided horizontally with rhythmically arranged bands of windows. This symmetry is disrupted by a rounded corner which links the flat plane of the main façade with a recessed portion. Both sections of the façade are compositionally interconnected by balconies echoing the curved corner motif of the main façade. The structure’s Streamline Moderne forms contrast starkly with the adjacent residential building owned by Antanas Gravrogkas. In the interwar years, the composition of the two structures and their uneven heights was criticized as detracting from the overall image of the street, but today they are a perfect example of the diversity of architecture of the interwar era.

1.2.8. Apartment building of Antanas Gravrogkas
V. Putvinskio g. 70, architect Edmundas Frykas, 1932, listed 34860
This ornate building was owned by Antanas Gravrogkas – engineer, activist, Director of the Lithuanian narrow-gauge railway, and Mayor of Kaunas in 1932–1933. The two lower floors of the four-storey structure were constructed using bricks salvaged from demolished buildings from the former Kaunas fortress. The building’s façade is asymmetrical and adorned with columns which in places resemble castle towers or crowns. The eastern section features massive balconies decorated with Art-Nouveau style plant ornamentation. A high arched entrance is adorned with bronze bas-relief sculpture work by Juozas Zikaras, depicting a Horse Tamer, a Reaper, and a Harvest Gatherer. Among other structures on V. Putvinskio Street, the Gravrogkas building is distinct for its inclusion of historicist and art deco architectural details.
1.2.9. Apartment Building for Bank of Lithuania Employees
V. Putvinskio g. 38, architect Aleksandras Gordevičius, 1926, listed 20748
The residential building designed for employees of the Bank of Lithuania was one of the largest and most luxurious apartment buildings of the interwar period. The structure included not only residential units, but also a social hall and hotel-type rooms. The historicist style building was among the first projects constructed on what would later become a prestigious street in the interwar-era capital city. Built on a virtually empty plot of land surrounded by rustic wooden shacks, the structure became immediately memorable for its monumental architecture, more often seen in larger cities. Ornate finishings were incorporated not only on the building's representative street façade, but also in its interior courtyard, which boasted pilasters and capitals in the Corinthian Order. The building was constructed simultaneously with the Bank of Lithuania and intended to symbolise the institution's grandeur.
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236. Photo of the residents, late 1920s. Photo: LNM
The area between Ramybės Park (the former city cemetery) and Vaižganto Street on the high ground is shaped by an irregular network of streets adapting to the terrain. Trakų Street, branching off one end of Laisvės Aleja, is the axis for yet another authentic residential quarter. The former cemetery running along the street’s southern perimeter afforded residents with a tranquil green space, but it also pushed construction up and onto the slopes of Žaliakalnis. Ascending rather steep hillsides, sections of K. Būgos and Totorių Streets create unique connections of different development altitudes not seen elsewhere in Naujamiestis. Other perpendicular streets such as V. Mykolaičio- Putino, Baritonų, Dainos, Soprano, and Tenero also rise up and onto the hill. The entire area is made up of characteristic modern houses: two-storey urban villas or multi-family buildings or three-to six-storey apartment buildings (K. Būgos g. 3, 36, 66, Totorių g. 10, 11, 13, 14, Trakų g. 2, 3, 4, 8, 14, 23, 25, 37, Dainos g. 3, 4, 6, 8, 10), interspersed by the occasional larger structure, such as the Vincas Kudirka Primary School for Lithuanian-speaking children (see 1.2.12).
1.2.10. Apartments of Jonas Norkaitis and Stasys Stašys
V. Mykolis-Putno g. 6 and K. Būgos g. 41, architect Arnas Funkas, 1935
One of the most striking landmarks in this villa district are two attached houses, both constructed by wealthy government officials: Jonas Norkaitis, an economist, diplomat, and director of the Foreign Ministry’s Economic Department, and Stasys Stašys, the director of the government’s general audit department. The architecture is impacted by the rising terrain of the street and the adjacent curved intersection which the building echoes with its own rounded corner. While the structures conform to neighbouring buildings in volume, their façades incorporate a notable use of ornate Streamline Moderne geometry: Prominent moulding, rounded balconies and horizontal lines. Even the structure’s chimney includes ornamentation. Both buildings were very comfortably furnished. The Norkaitis building included two apartments with separate entrances. An underground garage was also part of the original design. The Stašys side of the structure had six apartments, one single-room flat with a bathroom in the attic, and a basement with a laundry room, garage, boiler room, kitchen, and bedrooms.
1.2.11. The Butas Housing Co-operative
Trakų g. 5, architect Jonas Kriščiukaitis, 1932, listed 42759
Housing cooperatives began to be established in Kaunas in the 1930s and usually were meant for members working in one particular profession. The senior staff of the Supreme Tribunal of Lithuania founded the Butas (Apartment) housing cooperative and built a five-storey modern residential building with nine identical apartments. Large five-room apartments were arranged in a rational layout, with clearly separated common, private, and service areas. There were also offices with separate bathrooms adjacent to hallways so that lawyers could receive clients without disturbing the privacy of their families. The reinforced concrete frame was designed by engineer Anatolijus Rozenbliumas and was then a relatively new approach in residential construction. A lift was installed next to the main and back staircases. The building’s exterior was simple and plain, and, characteristic of many of Kaunas’ aspiring modernist buildings, its low-pitched roof was concealed behind a high horizontal attic to create the image of a flat roof. The modernist façade was emphasised by streamlined bays with curved corner windows rising from the first floor, with attached balconies. The symmetrical main façade does not feature the decorative details characteristic of Kaunas, and the International Style approach makes the building unique in the context of early-1930s residential architecture in both its style and social aspects.

1.2.12. The Vincas Kudirka Primary School
Trakų g. 38, architects Feliksas Vizbaras, Antanas Jokimas, 1925–1929
The Vincas Kudirka Primary School was officially opened on 16 November 1929, commemorating the 30th anniversary of the death of Vincas Kudirka, a prominent leader in the Lithuanian national movement and the author of Lithuania’s national anthem. The building’s dedication was the first step in the city government’s plan to open a new school in every section of Kaunas. Construction on the school began in 1925 and was completed in two phases. It was one of the costliest primary schools built in Lithuania, an expense that received both public praise and criticism for wasting public funds. It is important to note that, at the time, most students in Kaunas still attended class in poorly adapted facilities with substandard hygienic conditions. The new school’s cost was not only driven up by the decorative historicist façade, but also by the installation of modern equipment and furnishings, including central heating and hot water, showers, and a large hall with adaptable partitions. The school was enlarged in 1965 and 1974 with the construction of new facilities.
2. Aerial view of Industrial Naujamiestis area on the Nemunas River embankment and Karaliaus Mindaugo Prospekto. Photo: Martynas Plipys, 2020
2.3.3. Industrial Naujamiestis

An industrial district in the southeast portion of Naujamiestis began to take shape in 1847. Since the 16th century, large parts of this district were the property of Holy Cross Church and the Order of Discalced Carmelites (listed 128). The village of Kaukakiemis developed around the church, near the intersection of old roads leading from Kaunas to Vilnius. As a result of an extensive Russification programme and policies promoting the Orthodox Church pursued in the 19th century by the Russian Imperial government, most Catholic monasteries and churches were closed, including Holy Cross Church and the Carmelite Order, and in 1845 all of their land holdings were appropriated by the state.

The Karmelitai (Carmelite) industrial zone. After the arrival of the railways and the construction of a railway station in 1859–1862, large factories began to appear in the area's southern part. The Vytauto Prospektas zone, framed by the modern Locarno Hotel (Vytauto Prospektas No. 2) (fig. 257) and a three-storey residential building on Vytauto Prospektas No. 49, designed by architect Vytautas Frandsen proposed moving the industrial zone to Lower Šančiai, but the idea was never implemented. Industrial enterprises remained in the Karmelitai zone of Naujamiestis even as their profile changed, developing new textiles and food processing operations, usually reconstructing existing large metal factories and repurposing their infrastructure (see Pienocentras industrial site and Kauno audiniai textiles factory). Production continued to be serviced by the existing railway and Nemunas river port (fig. 252, 253).

The Vytauto Prospektas zone. The growth of Naujamiestis was accelerated by the construction of the Warsaw-St. Petersburg railway line from 1859 to 1862. With the completion of the Kaunas railway station in 1862, a new street, Vytauto (previously Mikhail) Prospektas, was laid out to connect it to Naujamiestis, which soon became the main urban artery linking the railway station to the Old Town. Partially regular plots were laid out on both sides of Vytauto Prospektas, providing space for the construction of wooden structures (fig. 254, 255, 256).

Significant changes were introduced along Vytauto Prospektas in the interwar period. City blocks were made more uniform, side streets were widened, and perimeter block development was introduced. Vytauto Prospektas underwent a comprehensive reconstruction in 1930, including widening and paving. In addition, the grounds of the Military Hospital were modernised and expanded and a new modernist hospital was constructed on Vytauto Prospektas No. 49, designed by architect Vytautas Landsbergis in 1928 (listed 16663, fig. 259). It was not only architecturally modern with its horizontal windows and glass ceiling, but also technologically innovative, fitted with cutting-edge medical equipment.

New, multi-storey residential and public buildings of superior quality designed by renowned architects began to rise along the avenue (see 1.3.6, 1.3.7, and Apartment building at Karo Ligoninės Street No. 3, listed 10400). A city gateway emerged around the railway station, framed by the modern Locarno Hotel (Vytauto Prospektas No. 2) (fig. 257) and a three-storey residential building owned by businessmen Vołtas and Romas (Vytauto Prospektas No. 1, listed 44010).

Integrity and Authenticity. In the Soviet period, the area's functional continuity remained intact. Industrial activity continued in the Karmelitai industrial zone and various public services buildings (hotels, stores, and a cinema house) were opened in the Vytauto Prospektas district. Although larger residential buildings were added to the area during the Soviet period, in addition to a new middle school and the Baltija Hotel, most of the historical development here survives to this day. The perimeter development approach was also retained. Extensive reconstruction work was conducted in this area in 2007 converting industrial buildings into the large Akropolis shopping centre (architects: S. Jurevičius and A. Kančas). The retail centre occupied an entire block of the Karmelitai zone, contrasting with the overall urban fabric of Naujamiestis. While some industrial buildings and façades were preserved, the urban structure of Naujamiestis, and consequently its integrity, was disrupted. The former course of Gruvaldų Street was erased and the volume of a multi-level parking garage built on the southern end of the property overshadowed the Baroque Holy Cross Church and cut the city off from the river. The industrial area of Naujamiestis retained its essential character but lost a number of its historical structures. Despite such interventions, the interwar architecture continued to shape the area's local character. A unique feature of the development of the industrial section of Naujamiestis was its planned adaptation to the surrounding natural environment (the Žaliakalnis slopes, the Gristudio Creek rivulet, and the Nemunas riverbank) as well as the long-standing functional zoning.
256. Aerial view of Vytauto Prospektas. Photo: Martynas Plipys, 2020

257. A view of Vytauto Prospektas from the train station in the late 1930s. Hotel Locarno is seen on the right and Apartment Building of businessmen Volfas and Romas on the left. Photo: Private collection of Antanas Burkas

258. The Pienocentras central dairy complex in the Karmelitai industrial zone on the banks of the Nemunas river. Photo: Vytautas Augustinas, 1938, LNM

259. A new ENT Hospital hospital on 49 Vytauto Prospektas, designed by architect Vytautas Landsbergis in 1928. Photo: Private collection
Elsbergas softened the massive functionalist reinforced concrete building with red brick walls and triangular gables. The construction of the Central Dairy building began one year later, designed by the modernist architect Vytautas Landsbergis. This was Pienocentras' first large dairy, purchased from the Danish company Silkeborg. Landsbergis chose to modify the design: The sawtooth-shaped three-segment roof, which echoes the forms found in Elsbergas' building, dominates the silhouette of the white three-storey modernist factory. Images of this modern dairy were printed in many contemporary publications. A new egg warehouse was built next to the cold storage in 1938. Its architect, Jonas Kovalskis, followed in the footsteps of his predecessors by implementing a modified pitched roof in the design. The modern three-storey warehouse combined functionalist architecture with a red brick façade reminiscent of old Hanseatic League warehouses. The modern Sodyba (farmstead) juice factory, designed by Landsbergis and Algirdas Prapuolenis, was built in 1938, employing a poured concrete structure designed by engineer Anatolijus Rozenbliumas. Modern buildings designed by different architects used similar materials, red brick, and white plaster, a recurring gable motif, and a local interpretation of functionalism. The Pienocentras complex is an outstanding object of modernist industrial architecture. It was converted into residential housing in 2016 based on designs by Algimantas Kančas’ Studio.
1.3.2. The Stumbras spirits factory

K. Bügos g. 7

The Russian Empire imposed a state-owned monopoly of vodka production in 1894. Because Kaunas was the administrative centre of a governorate at the time, a red brick, historicist style, state-owned vodka warehouse complex was constructed near the railway station between 1904 and 1906. The facility was damaged during the First World War, but the independent Lithuanian government decided in 1923 to continue using the complex. The Stumbras spirits brand and factory was established, incorporating the city’s symbol, an aurochs. The large spirits factory spanned a 1.5-hectare territory. Modernisation undertaken in the Soviet period added new buildings to the complex, where spirits production continues to this day. The corporation has also opened the Stumbras Museum to showcase its history.

1.3.3. The Volfas Engelman Brewery

Kaunakiemio g. 2, architect Leonas Ritas

A beer brewery has operated near the former Beer Alley since the late 19th century. A brick and wooden industrial complex owned by Ferdinand Engelman was purchased in 1894 by the brewer Iseras Beras Volfas. In 1927, the owners established the I. B. Volfas-Engelman corporation, which became the largest beer producer in Kaunas and Lithuania. The factory’s owners were the first in interwar Kaunas to construct a group of six small houses (designed by Leonas Ritas, 1929) next to a brewery, which illustrates the idea of affordable housing based on relatively inexpensive homes complete with a plot of land for a garden. Two of the original houses survive today, at M. K. Čiurlionio Street Nos. 5 and 15. The brewery was nationalized during the Soviet period and the factory was taken over by the state, but its operations continued. Several historic buildings were demolished and large new structures arose. In 2011, the brewery restored its historic name Volfas-Engelman and a company museum-studio was opened. While its architecture may have changed, the facility symbolizes a continuity of operation on this area. In 2017, the former Brewery and Turbine Street was renamed I. B. Volfo ir F.Engelmano Street.
1.3.4. The Kauno Audiniai textiles factory
Karaliaus Mindaugo pr. 49, architect Nikolajus Mačiulskis
The origins of the German-born Tillmanns brothers metal factory reach back to 1867, with the start of wire and nail production on a site near the edge of Naujamiestis, on the corner of Gedimino and Grunvaldo Streets, using iron and cast iron brought to Kaunas by rail. As production increased, new buildings were added, so that by 1899 a two-storey brick metal works factory took shape along the perimeter of the street. In 1927, the Tillmanns family sold a portion of the buildings to the Latvian weaving factory Rīgas audums, whose owners modernised the facility in 1938. Designs by Nikolajus Mačiulskis, a young architect trained in Berlin, led to the addition of a third and fourth floor and the radical modernisation of the building’s façades. The previous red brick neo-gothic façades with arc windows were replaced by white plastered walls, horizontal bands, and a flat roof. This modernisation illustrates the changes which took place in Kaunas industry as political circumstances shifted and demonstrates the practice of sustainable re-use of existing industrial facilities. The architectural modernisation also clearly shows the importance that modern industrial firms in interwar Lithuania placed on the modern appearance of their production facilities, which were often displayed in advertising materials. The factory continued operating during the Soviet period and its architecture remained unchanged. After the closure of the factory, the building and its modernist façade were incorporated into the converted Akropolis shopping centre in 2007.

1.3.5. Lietūkis Headquarters
Vytauto pr. 43, architect Karolis Reisonas, 1930, listed 45896
The state-sponsored agricultural cooperative union Lietūkis began to rapidly expand its operations in 1926 and opened its head office in 1930. The four-storey building features a rational composition aspiring to create a conservative, landmark structure. The main façade is symmetrical, massive, and includes a restrained use of arc motif ornamentation. The ground floor was reserved for shops, while the first floor housed the administrative offices. Upper floors were used as apartments. The building’s construction on Vytauto Prospektas signalled the conversion of the street into one of the city’s most prestigious and representative avenues.
1.3.7. Apartment Building of Juozas Daugirdas
Vytauto pr. 30, architect Vladimiras Dubeneckis, 1930, listed 1934
The residential building stands out on Vytauto Prospėtas due to its modern appearance. In the 1920s, a Lithuanian-American textile company, Drobė, acquired the former Minerva metal factory, and Juozas Daugirdas, the director of the company, approached several architects to design a multi-unit residential building. A private miniature architectural competition was organized, eventually selecting the highly regarded Vladimiras Dubeneckis, the designer of a number of prestigious public buildings. The plan for the four-storey building is traditional and symmetrical. The ground floor houses shops, while the first, second, and third floors have two identical luxurious five-room apartments each. The main façade adopted a modernist approach, with two large bays intersected by ribbon windows. The building’s ornamentation did not, however, entirely escape using elements of a Lithuanian national style, including ‘folk tulips’ around the main entrance. The combination of modernism and a Lithuanian national style is an illustrative example of the national modernism characteristic of Kaunas architecture.

1.3.6. Apartment Building of Sara Malcienė
Vytauto pr. 27, architect Arnas Funkas, 1933
The residential building owned by Sara Malcienė is located in a characteristically modernist block of Vytauto Prospėtas developed with large modern buildings in the 1930s. The apartment building has a simple symmetrical composition and the floor plan is as clear and rational as the structure’s exterior. Two luxury apartments were installed on each floor. The style is one typically seen in the designs of Arnas Funkas, a graduate of the Berlin Technische Hochschule in Charlottenburg. Construction of apartment buildings on Vytauto Prospėtas signalled the conversion of the street into one of the city’s main avenues.
2. DESCRIPTION

286. Aerial view of Žaliakalnis. Photo: Martynas Plepy, 2020
The historic area of Kaunas known as Žaliakalnis (Green Hill) is made up of several protected zones and has a total area of 243 hectares. With its modern planning ideas, its integration of the natural landscape and military fortress heritage, its garden-type suburban development and the diversity of its modernist architectural structures, Žaliakalnis is an outstanding example of the rapid growth of modern residential Kaunas, the adaptation of the modern urban planning garden city concept to pre-existing suburban and natural features, and the local interpretation of modernist architecture – all of which reflects the active spirit of an era and the creation and accommodation of a new way of life.

Žaliakalnis was incorporated into the city of Kaunas in 1889. Prior to the First World War, this rural suburb was sparsely populated, since the demands of the Russian Imperial fortification system – forts, batteries, and an array of gunpowder magazines – prohibited any civilian construction. As a result, interwar urban planners and architects had few obstacles in their way as they set out to completely reimage the area unimpeded. In 1923–1939, Žaliakalnis became the city’s second most rapidly growing district, after Naujamiestis. Small plots with private homes and gardens emerged as the central urban element of the district.

The outstanding value of Žaliakalnis rests on its combination of natural, urban, historic, and architectural characteristics. The natural and urban value lies in the implementation on the site of a structure typical of a garden city, including even its economic basis. A series of concentric semi-circular streets and two axial avenues, an integrated landscaping system, and comfortable, small scale and efficient homes bear testimony to the garden city idea, popular in early 20th century Europe, which developed into suburban neighbourhoods. The area is known for a distinctive landscaping of residential gardens and planting of small orchards. The residences, which have retained their integrity within the area developed in 1923–1940, are an outstanding representation of the diversity of modern residential architecture of the 1920s and 1930s. Upper class neighbourhoods with multi-storey brick villas and comfortable small apartment buildings appeared alongside the garden city area of low-rise, inexpensive homes. One- to two-storey residential buildings, divided into 1–4 flats, are typical of this area. Stylistically, the 1920s saw a prevalence of traditional wooden architecture or variations of historicism. Kaunas’ characteristic modernism (combined with local features) became more prevalent in the 1930s.

The site’s historic significance derives from the contributions made by those who developed the area and lived there, including the author of the area’s urban plan. Renowned interwar Lithuanian architects designed homes in Žaliakalnis and later lived there, as well as their famous clients and other notable residents who were members of the country’s cultural, financial, political, and military elite. Sociological research (2002) has revealed that residents of Žaliakalnis are inclined to continue their traditional way of life (comfortable living conditions in individual or multi-unit apartment residences and the proximity to the city centre and the natural environment), which then becomes the most important motivating factor for preserving the area’s identity.

The area consists of five different sections:

2.1. The Garden City Area: A residential neighbourhood on a semi-hexagonal plan

2.2. The Kaukas Area: A residential neighbourhood divided into a grid of smaller side streets and a square, incorporating the former fortress esplanade

2.3. The Perkūnas Area: An upper-class residential area bordered by Perkūno Aleya and Vytautų Streets, including the Kaunas Radio Station and Vytautas Park

2.4. The Ažuolynas Park and Sports Complex: Ažuolynas Park, including the main sports complex and an adjacent area, Paroda Hill, which together form a natural environmental zone

2.5. The Research Laboratory Area: The site of the Ministry of Defence Research Laboratory buildings
2. DESCRIPTION

288. Žaliakalnis Area in the Master plan by Marius Frandsen and Antanas Jokimaitis, 1923. Drawing: LNM

289. Žaliakalnis Area in the Kaunas plan of 1935. Map: VDKM
290. Aerial view of the Garden City Area of Žaliakalnis. Photo: Martynas Plepy, 2020
2.4.1. The Garden City Area

The Garden City Area of Žaliakalnis (listed 22148) was developed between 1923 and 1939. The area covers 60.91 hectares. It is the most faithfully executed section of the original 1923 Frandsen and Jokimas plan. The Garden City Area is a perfect example of the adaptation of the garden city planning concept for new purposes often seen in early 20th century suburban architecture globally. Ebenezer Howard claimed that ‘town and country must be subdivided into 187 plots. A total of 285 wooden and 62 brick structures were constructed here.

The allocation of plots to residents in 1924 faithfully adopted the Garden City’s economic model, on the basis of perpetual lease agreements with the municipal authority. More than 300 plots were eventually created, divided into three different sizes: 1500 m², 600–750 m² and 550 m², the majority of which were rectangular in shape. Spacious plots were initially occupied by small, wooden, single-storey homes. Most plots had been developed by 1931, after which only the occasional new home was constructed. The area was categorized as an open development district in which buildings had to be constructed as free-standing structures set back from all property lines, thereby creating a low density of construction.

As streets were laid out between 1924 to 1925, planners envisioned abundant landscaping and the separation of pedestrians and transportation through the introduction of wide pavements. Twenty-five-meter-wide strips on both sides of K. Petrausko Street, Basanavičiaus Aleja, Vyūnuo Aleja and Gėlių Circle were declared zones limited exclusively to brick construction. Homes on both sides of K. Petrausko Street up to Tūšių and P. Vaičio Streets, and on the left side of Vyūnuo Aleja and Gėlių Circle were restricted only to new buildings with tile roofs, but this requirement was often ignored, with the usual justification being limited financial resources. Roofs were therefore commonly covered in tin and painted red to imitate the look of ceramic tiles.

Integrity and Authenticity

The urban approach developed on this part of Žaliakalnis by 1932 has largely retained its integrity by remaining relatively unchanged. The Soviet period witnessed some construction of new buildings that were incompatible with the context of the district, including several four and five-storey apartment buildings and three multi-storey dormitories. The section of M. Jankaus Street between J. Basanavičiaus Aleja and Radvilėnų Rūstas was removed in the 1960s. However, despite the new construction, the overall urban planning and low-rise type of development in the area remains authentic.

Residential architecture

Approximately 230 new homes (about 60% of all structures) were built between 1925 and 1931. The architecture of single-family homes was characterised by an adoption of various historic styles as well as the incorporation of traditional folk motifs in deference to the Lithuanian national style. The largest group of homes was constructed in wood, the traditional local material. New types of residential buildings constructed in 1932–1939 were driven by new modernist fashions. Two to three-storey wooden and brick homes with two to six small, rented flats became popular. As the economic situation improved, construction intensified in 1938–1939, increasing the density of the area. The area also began to see the construction of modernist single-family villas and cottages, and a modern gymnasium built in 1937 (Aukštoji Street 78). Residential architecture adhered to compact and functional plans, with asymmetrical, freely arranged volumes and modernist façades. The district was socio-economically diverse. Wooden homes financed from Kaunas municipal funds were rented to less well-to-do residents, while villas were constructed by public officials, lawyers, and artists.
2.1. The Garden City Area
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293. Map of 2.1. The Garden City Area
The homes in the Garden City Area can be divided into three types:

1. **Cottages.** Small, wooden, single-storey cottages of rectangular plan with a central gable and a mansard gable. These villas were usually divided into two small units. Because of the housing shortage, two more units were sometimes installed in the attic space. The homes were clad in wood and painted red. These cottages built in the 1920s represent the first decade of simple and inexpensive private housing development in Žaliakalnis. The most characteristic cottages are at Gelžių r. 1, Gelžių r. 9, Gelžių r. 23, Minties r. 13, Minties r. 19, Minties r. 23.

2. **Urban villas.** Private villas were intended for a single family, but because of the housing shortage often contained a couple of small units for rent in the attic. The villas were one- or two-storey residences of brick or wood, featuring a more flexible design, allowing the possibility of subdividing land plots (fig. 296).

3. **Small multi-family residential buildings** began to be built in this area in 1930. Constructed largely of brick or wood, these were two- to three-storey compact buildings made up of two to six apartments. Each floor typically had two apartments of different sizes. One floor, usually the first, was often reserved for a more well-appointed owner’s apartment. Over forty such residential buildings were designed for the Garden City area. Modernist homes were architecturally diverse, with asymmetrical plans and frequently arranged volumes, varied facades, and round-ed balconies and corners. Windows and entrances often featured decorative framing. The most characteristic buildings are the House of Teofilas Barisa (fig. 298), the House of Žaliakalnio Bankas (1930), and the House of Teofilas Barisa (fig. 297) which housed the Swiss Consulate (1936) at Vydūno Aleja 15 (fig. 297) and the House of Romanas Polovinskas which was rented for the Italian Embassy (1937) at Vydūno Aleja 13 (fig. 297). Other characteristic brick or wooden modernist houses built in the 1930s can be seen at Aukštaitės g. 74, Minties r. g. 13, Minties r. g. 19, Minties r. g. 31, K. Petrausko g. 27, P. Vačačio g. 19, Vydūno Aleja 51, Aukštaičių g. 74, Minties r. 13, Minties r. 19, Minties r. 23.

4. **Tenement houses.** Constructed as affordable housing by the Kaunas municipal government to alleviate the housing crisis, these wooden two-storey buildings had four to eight inexpensive rental units per building. Their exterior design was extremely simple and rational. Internally, a central staircase was flanked by flats on either side. About thirty such structures were completed in the whole of the area. The most characteristic buildings are at P. Vačačio g. 6.
2.1.1. Villa of architect Antanas Jokimas
Vydūno al. 17, engineer Jonas Andriūnas, 1925, listed 32102
The home built by architect Antanas Jokimas, who served as a city engineer at the time, is a good example of a variation on historical styles in search for a national style. Jokimas collaborated with Danish engineer Marius Frandsen on the 1923 Kaunas master plan. After obtaining a perpetual lease for this plot, Jokimas built his own wooden villa. The single-storey villa with a tin mansard roof follows a square plan with asymmetrical composition and has a main entrance topped with a Neo-Baroque pediment. The home's style reflects the contemporaneous search for a Lithuanian national style of architecture. A small flat for rent was installed in the attic. Half of the land was initially occupied by a garden.

Photo: Martynas Plepys, 2020
2.1.2. Villa of Adolfas Jančauskas

Minties Rato g. 51, technician Jonas Varneckis, 1935

The surveyor Adolfas Jančauskas received a building permit in 1935 to build a single-storey log house with a tiled roof. The building is set back from the street and the almost cuboid volume is clear. Unusually for wooden architecture, the house has corner windows, in deference to modernism, which, along with the sloping roof, is characteristic of Kaunas modernism. In 1938, the city acknowledged the house’s architectural quality, presenting it with a certificate of commendation, thereby exempting the owner from property tax for a year. After their three children were born, Jančauskas’ family decided to expand the house in 1957. The original tile roof was raised and a second timber frame storey was added.
2.1.3. Villa of Česlovas Pacevičius
Vydūno al. 59, architect Vsevolodas Kopylovas, 1934, listed 58372
This small villa owes its charm to its minimalist architecture. The small house with just three rooms gives the impression of being a geometrically perfect rectangle, achieved by using raised walls that hide the low-pitched roof which descends at the back. The house was designed by architect Kopylovas who was trained in Prague and brought modernist and cubist ideas to Lithuania. In 1935, the villa received an award for being the ‘most beautiful and comfortable brick house in Kaunas.’
318. Aerial view of Kaunas Area. Photo: Martynas Plepyš, 2020
2.4.2. The Kaukas Area

The northern portion of Žaliakalnis is known as the Kaukas Area and occupies 19.67 ha (listed 3286). To the south, its boundary forms the edge of Aboliškas Park. The Kaukas Area is notable for the uniform application of planning and development, the integration of former military fortifications, a harmonious assimilation of the natural landscape in an urban territory, and the local interpretation of modern architecture in the design of private residential buildings. It is an outstanding example of early 20th century suburban architecture.

The urban structure of the Kaukas Area was greatly influenced by the legacy of the former military fortifications. Aukštadvaris Street, for example, followed the course of a former road leading to a gunpowder magazine. Construction was prohibited near the magazine for safety reasons, thus the area had no civil development prior to 1920. The Kaukas Area took on its urban and landscaping structure between 1923 and 1940, with the creation of a garden-type residential neighbourhood with regular rectangular plots (fig. 294, 318, 320).

The fortifications were ingeniously incorporated into the modernisation of the Kaukas Area infrastructure, including the construction of several significant public amenities such as the Žaliakalnis Waterworks (see 2.2.2), the Kaukas Stairway (see 2.2.2), Kauko Aleja, and Petras Vileišis Square (listed 1072). Due to its proximity to the gunpowder magazine, an esplanade was created to provide a buffer of undeveloped space between the fortification and the nearest civilian buildings. In 1924, architect Felikas Vizbaras drafted a renovation plan adapting the gunpowder magazine mounds into an amphitheatre and the esplanade into a square for various types of official events and mass gatherings, such as Lithuanian National Song Festivals. In 1933, a housing commune of modern and inexpensive apartments was constructed on land separated from the square’s north-eastern corner.

Integrity and Authenticity: The Kaukas Area is now a fully developed district. Building volume, height, façade composition, and the totality of functional and decorative elements are the main factors determining the visual character of the Kaukas Area. Its residential function remains unchanged today. Its value rests in its surviving plot structure, building height, volume, and existing architectural forms and details. As an integral site developed between 1920 and 1940, it serves as an example of a middle-class garden suburb neighbourhood. The area’s authentic urban structure and architectural integrity remain largely intact.

The district has retained its predominant garden-type development, though changes during the Soviet period have resulted in the densification of the Kaukas Area. New brick buildings increased (59 new homes after 1940) and existing wooden buildings were bricked up. Visually, however, wooden architecture continues to predominate. The pattern of urban structures and architecture established up to 1940 continued to prevail until around 1960, with the construction of houses that, although new, were compatible with the interwar period of development by being restrained in volume and form. Villas in the spirit of interwar modernist forms continued to be built in the 1950s (Tulpių g. 1, 1952 (fig. 338), Kauko Aleja 20, 1956). This appropriation of volumes, layouts and even materials of interwar houses in the Soviet era is testament to the resilience of local construction traditions in Kaunas architecture.

A significant loss was the modification of the former home of architect Felikas Vizbaras into the Kaukas Restaurant [1981; architect Algimantas Spindys] and its later demolition (2012), which resulted in the removal of one of Žaliakalnis’ key landmarks. The partitioning of the former Tūbelis villa (see 2.2.3) plot and subsequent additional construction on the land has disrupted a garden-type development. The spatial integrity of Petras Vileišis Square was later diminished by the construction of the 13-storey Sports and Recreation Centre and hotel, and also by the creation of large sports venues.
2.2.1. The Žaliakalnis Waterworks

Aukštoji g. 43, architects Stasys Kudokas, Feliksas Bielinskis, engineer Steponas Kairys, 1930–1938, listed 28279

The Žaliakalnis waterworks was established in 1928 on the former training grounds of a military garrison. A former defensive mound of a gunpowder magazine was converted into a water reservoir with a capacity of 800 cubic meters. A modernist water pumping station was built here in 1930–1933, adorned with a tall granite wall and a fountain placed in a vaulted niche. In 1938, the reservoir was expanded and a new valve chamber installed. The reservoir’s reinforced concrete structure and double walls were designed to sustain immense water pressure. The modern exterior colonnade was functional rather than ornamental, providing a supporting structure for the wall. The valve chamber was adorned with a sculpture entitled *Water Bearer* (by Bronius Pundzius, 1939). A three-storey building for employees and several maintenance facilities was constructed at the same time.
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2.2.2. The Kaukas Stairway

Architect Stasys Kudokas, 1935–1936, listed 28279

The water pumping station was closely connected to the Kaukas Stairway – an imposing 100-metre long and 4-metre wide set of steps connecting upper Žaliakalnis to lower Naujamiestis. Originally, the site of the stairway was a natural gully draining water from the gunpowder magazine. In 1935–1936, the gully was replaced by an open water reservoir and a landscaped stairway designed by Stasys Kudokas, considered by many the most beautiful in Kaunas, with its wide, hewn granite steps and decorative greenery covering a stream which emerged at the foot of the staircase as a decorative fountain. In his project, Kudokas demonstrated a skilful implementation of modern landscape design. The waterworks and the Kaukas Stairway are outstanding examples of an artistic interpretation of functional requirements of the new modern city and their sensitive assimilation with the natural landscape. Kauko Aleja, the Kaukas Stairway, and the Žaliakalnis Waterworks form an integral architectural and functional ensemble designed to meet the needs of a modern society. The Kaukas Stairway was renovated faithfully to the original design in 2019.
Residential architecture. The land appropriated from the Kaunas fortress was used for newly laid out city blocks. 109 homes were built in this area between 1920 and 1940. The street grid for the area was approved in 1927 and land was allocated in small plots, some as rectangular areas, others in irregular configurations. Plots were leased, not sold, by the city to owners on the basis of perpetual lease agreements. The planning structure featured short, interconnected small streets and relatively small plots arranged in rows of two or three, due to the division of the grid. Buildings were arranged on plots following an irregular garden-type pattern. Development was fairly uniform with relatively few, if any, buildings contrasting in height or volume, comprising either cottages, villas, small multi-family homes, or tenement houses. The Kaunas City Construction Commission's only requirement was that houses be covered in tile or red-painted tin roofs. Because the area was considered a 'villa district', sidewalks and parkland were developed between 1936 and 1939.

Prior to 1940, the area was dominated by two-storey buildings, constructed equally in either brick or wood. Initially wood was common, but brick homes began to appear in 1930, and by 1940 the construction of wooden homes had ceased altogether. Interior yards usually had one- to two-storey compact brick or, less often, wooden service structures, such as storage buildings, garages, laundry rooms, quarters for servants or drivers. Most of the plots were closed off by low, openwork fences made from metal posts or wooden slats. Properties were usually landscaped with decorative plants and orchards, especially apple tree groves.

Private homes were built by teachers, lecturers, military officers, and physicians. Feliksas Vizbaras, chief architect of the Kaunas Municipal Construction Department, lived in this area at Kauko Aleja 2. However, the better-known architects and construction engineers of this period were less frequently employed here and most designs were prepared by construction engineers or technicians.

The homes in the Kaukas Area can be divided into four types:

1. Single-family cottages and urban villas. Villas were mostly single-storey with a gabled or mansard roof, built of wood or brick, rather simple and rational in appearance, and sometimes featured historical decoration. Due to the housing shortage, flats for rent were commonly installed in the attic. The most characteristic villas are at Kauko Aleja 7, Rūtų g. 3, Tulpių g. 21 (fig. 343, 345), and Tulpių g. 22 (fig. 344).

2. Small multi-family residential buildings began to appear around 1930. These houses were usually two storeys high and made of brick, and were built in modernist style and layouts. The owner usually lived in the larger apartment on the ground floor, renting the rest of the apartments above. The most characteristic houses are at Aguonų g. 4 (fig. 333, 334), Aguonų g. 5/Tulpių g. 25 (fig. 332), Aguonų g. 11, Kauko Aleja 11, Lelijų g. 5 (fig. 2.2.15), Lelijų g. 7 (fig. 341), Lelijų g. 9, Lelijų g. 18, Radastų g. 5 (fig. 2.2.22), Radastų g. 7 (fig. 2.2.23), Radastų g. 19 (fig. 2.2.24), Radastų g. 35 (fig. 2.2.25), and Tulpių g. 8.

3. Three to four-storey modernist apartment buildings were built near the Waterworks site and along the main K. Petrausko Street. The most characteristic houses are at K. Petrausko g. 38 (fig. 2.2.20), Lelijų g. 4 (fig. 340), P. Vileišio g. 2, 4, 6, Radastų g. 39 (fig. 337).

4. Tenement houses. Constructed as affordable housing by the Kaunas municipal government to alleviate the housing crisis, two-storey, four- to eight-apartment wooden tenement houses made up the great majority of development in the Kaukas Area. Two types of wooden houses were built: simple rational affordable housing (Aukštaičių g. 42, 50, 52) (fig. 2.2.8) and those where the owner lived in one of the apartments and rented the rest. These invariably had some distinguishing architectural embellishments. The most characteristic houses are at Aguonų g. 14, Žemuogių g. 2, Aukštaičių g. 36, Tulpių g. 17 (fig. 336, 339, 342, 346).
MODERNIST KAUNAS: ARCHITECTURE OF OPTIMISM, 1919–1939

2. DESCRIPTION

343. A wooden family villa on 21 Tulpių Street, designed by Juozas Indriūnas. Photo: Juozas Stanišauskas, 1930s, KAVB

344. A family villa on 22 Tulpių Street, designed by Stanislovas Radzevičius. Photo: 1950s, KTU ASI

342. A wooden house on 2 Žemuogių Street. Photo: Marija Drėmaitė, 2020

345. A wooden family villa on 21 Tulpių Street. Photo: archimede.lt, 2009

346. Apartment house on 17 Tulpių Street. Photo: Vaidas Petrulis, 2017

339. Aukštaičių Street. Photo: Juozas Stanišauskas, 1930s, KAVB

336. A wooden house on 36 Aukštaičių Street, designed by Antanas Novickis. Photo: Marija Drėmaitė, 2020

340. Apartment house on 4 Lelijų Street, designed by Aleksandras Goševičius. Photo: Gintaras Česonis, 2017

343. A wooden house on 2 Žemuogių Street. Photo: archimede.lt, 2009

337. Apartment house on 38 K. Petrasenko Street. Photo: Vaidas Petrulis, 2017

341. Apartment house on 7 Lelijų Street, designed by Aleksandras Goševičius. Photo: Gintaras Česonis, 2017

345. A wooden family villa on 21 Tulpių Street, designed by Juozas Indriūnas. Photo: Juozas Stanišauskas, 1930s, KAVB

338. A house on 1 Tulpių Street. Photo: Vaidas Petrulis, 2017

344. A family villa on 22 Tulpių Street, designed by Stanislovas Radzevičius. Photo: 1950s, KTU ASI
2.2.4. Affordable housing development

K. Petrausko g. 26, architect Stasys Kudokas, 1934
The construction of an affordable housing development in 1933 was a grand plan proposed by the Kaunas municipality to solve the problem of accommodation of the less affluent city residents. Architect Stasys Kudokas designed two identical V-shape buildings, but only one of them was constructed. The simple and modern design was driven by economy and utility.

The three-storey building was divided into sections, each designed to contain four one-room apartments with kitchens. The connecting section was designed to house communal areas and public facilities, including a gym and nursery. However, as construction neared completion in 1934, the city council changed its original plan and decided to use the building to house various health institutions and lease out other sections.
2. DESCRIPTION

351. Aerial view of Perkūnas Area. Photo: Martynas Plepys, 2020
2.4.3. The Perkūnas Area

The southern area of Žaliakalnis is called the Perkūnas Area and occupies a total of 57.81 ha (listed 30280). Its northern and eastern boundaries form the perimeter of Ažuolynas Park. Its south-eastern edge clings to the slope line, and its western edge follows the slope line between the lower Naujamiesis and upper Žaliakalnis terraces and forms the western boundary of building plots on the upper terrace. The Perkūnas Area is an authentic representation of Kaunas modernism and urban planning, represented by an exceptional collection of picturesque natural landscapes and modernist early 20th century residential villa architecture. The natural surroundings, the modernity and comfort of residential architecture here, the incorporation of the Kaunas fortress radio station, the garden-type development, and the district’s landmark status and panoramic vistas, have all helped to create this exceptional district and exemplify its enduring value – an area that embodies the nation’s pursuit of stability and modernisation.

The neighbourhood’s main section occupies a promontory surrounded by sloping terrain to the northwest, west, south, and east. In the 19th century, the military facilities here prevented any type of development. When the former military fort’s land management system was terminated in 1918 and the site was taken over by the newly independent Lithuanian government, the area began to be developed for housing. The Kaunas Radio Station (Vaižganto Street 13D, listed 42710), a fortified concrete building constructed at the Kaunas fortress in 1913–1915, was transferred to Lithuanian military control in 1919, and in 1923–1924, the facility was adapted for the Kaunas Radio Station. Its large plot remained unbuilt and influenced the shaping of a residential neighbourhood in the Perkūnas Area.

The area took shape in 1923–1940 as a prestigious residential villa community because of its proximity to Ažuolynas Park, convenient connection to the city centre, picturesque landscaping, expressively sloping terrain, and panoramic views of the city. The area also incorporated the 77-hectare Vytautas Park (listed 33823), established in 1871 on a naturally formed terrace and sloping terrain. Park landscaping, management, and building construction were overseen by the Kaunas Gardening Society, established in 1875, which then launched a campaign in 1899 to construct a new brick park pavilion, or kurhaus, which survives to this day (Perkūno Aleja 4B, listed 33847). Renovated in 1929 by architect Edmundas Frykas it housed a restaurant and a café. The wooden villa of the German Consul, one of the first new constructions in Kaunas in 1923 also took place in the park (Perkūno Aleja 4, listed 37504). The name of the hill and park was changed in 1919 in honour of the Lithuanian Grand Duke Vytautas, and the Kaunas municipal government took over responsibility for the

2.3. The Perkūnas Area

![Map of the Perkūnas Area](image-url)
The area retains its exclusively residential character. Neither the street grid nor the development density is intensive and the area still retains relatively large, undeveloped plots. After 1940, the existing social structure and community in the Perkūnas Area underwent profound decline as the district’s history mirrors that of Lithuania in general: marked by progress and optimism, but also great loss. Government officials, officers, and members of the academic and cultural elite rented apartments here or built their own modern houses. The area became home to public organizations (see 2.3.1). The largest number of homes here are modernist villas and small multi-family homes, for which this area is particularly well known, making it an outstanding example of authentic Kaunas modernism. Many of Lithuania’s renowned interwar architects, including Vytautas Landsbergis, Bronius Elsbergas, Stasys Kudokas, Feliksas Vizbaras, Edmundas Frykas, Nikolajus Mačiuliskis, Antanas Novickis, and Algirdas Škauskas designed homes here. The district’s aesthetic quality was also regulated by construction rules passed by the Kaunas municipal government at the time, designating the Žaliakalnis area as a zone of brick, but open-plan, development. This meant all new construction had to be brick and all existing wooden buildings were required to be renovated. Brick villas make up 91% of all construction, followed by wooden buildings at 4%, mixed wooden and brick structures at 1%, and brick and metal construction at 1%. A feature specific to the Perkūnas Area villas is the place, descent down the adjacent slope, it does not disrupt the balance of surrounding low-rise buildings. The property began to become more densely developed in recent decades, however, and this trend has had a negative impact on the area’s urban character and integrity.

The modern tradition did not go overlooked in the Soviet period. Cottages in the spirit of interwar modernism forms continued to be built in the 1950s (E. Fryko Street 1, 1955). The back of these new postwar villas was consistent with the interwar development. This appropriation and use of composition and even materials in the Soviet era is a testament to the resilience of local construction traditions in Kaunas architecture. Only several standard silicate-brick, large volume, 3-4 storey apartment buildings were constructed in the 1960s as a result of reckless mass apartment construction that disrupted the pre-existing urban fabric. After 1990, the newest apartment buildings arose on older plots, following the demolishing or reconstruction of previously existing cottages. Since 1990, the only public building constructed among surrounding residential homes is the Perkūno Namai Hotel (Perkūno Alėja 61, 1994). Built toward the back of its plot and descending down the adjacent slope, it does not disrupt the balance of surrounding low-rise buildings. The property began to become more densely developed in recent decades, however, and this trend has had a negative impact on the area’s urban character and integrity.
2.3.1. The Neo-Lithuania Student Fraternity Hall
Parodos g. 26, architect Edmundas Frykas, 1928

The buildings of the Neo-Lithuania student fraternity, established in 1922, are located on Vytautas Hill by the entrance to Vytautas Park. Construction began in 1923 as a dormitory and organizational centre for Neo-Lithuania, an association of students at Kaunas University supported by the Nationalist Party. The hall became the centre of the fraternity's activities. The irregular, V-shaped building included a dormitory for fraternity members, a reading room with an ample collection of books, meeting rooms for the fraternity's leadership, and a grand reception hall. The building was designed in the historicist style, with an elaborate façade adorned in Neo-Classical detail, topped with a small cupola. The hall included various types of activity rooms and its central hall was considered one of the best in the city in the interwar period. The facility itself was a prominent landmark building in Kaunas in the 1920s.

359. The Neo-Lithuania Student Fraternity Hall, 1930s. Private collection of Antanas Burkus

360. The ground floor plan. Source: Archfondas
Residential architecture. The homes in the Perkūnas Area can be divided into two types:

1. Single-family urban villas. The largest number of homes in the Perkūnas Area consists of villas built in the interwar period, for which this area is particularly renowned. These are single-family residences on small plots, featuring a prevalence of decorative landscaping and recreational functions. Exploiting the area’s panoramic views, some villas were designed to include observation decks facing Naujamiestis. Villas built in the 1930s were typically modernist: single-storey or two-storey, rectangular or assembled from several volumes, distinguished by a vertical staircase and verandas protruding at the sides or corners of the building. In keeping with rationalist and functionalist trends, sloping roofs were designed to have a minimal gradient and were often concealed behind parapets to make them appear flat and therefore modern. Some villas incorporated arched corner entrances (Vaižganto g. 3 (fig. 2.3.26)) topped by a porch roof or balcony. Residential architecture also includes entirely unique cottages, such as the home at E. Fryko g. 28 (fig. 2.3.2) and a home with a high-pitched roof (Perkūno Aleja 44 (fig. 364)). A wooden modernist single-storey villa can also be found in the area (Perkūno Aleja 35 (fig. 366)). And even distinctive elements of historicism can be found on a wooden plastered villa with decorative vases at Perkūno Aleja 11, built in 1927. The villas of the area exhibit harmonious designs, a proportional balance of detail, and incorporation into the surrounding environment.

2. Small multi-family residential buildings. There are fewer apartment buildings than villas in the Perkūnas Area. Wooden construction took place in the Perkūnas Area prior to 1930, after which the area was designated a brick development zone. The wooden homes built on spacious lots were one-storey structures with an attic or two-storey buildings. The façades on wooden buildings are usually simple, although there are also examples of the use of ornamental elements (Perkūno Aleja 10 (fig. 2.3.6)). The two-storey residences were divided into two to six rental flats. Multi-family houses were usually constructed by owner-occupiers, who rented out the additional flats. Floors usually featured the same layout of flats (Vaižganto g. 50 (fig. 2.3.36)). The brick structures were notably larger in volume, but they were not massive, and typically displayed modernist architectural forms (fig. 361, 362, 363, 365).

Several large apartment buildings and a cooperative housing complex were also constructed in the Perkūnas Area in the interwar period. Common features were their brick construction, plastered finish, rectangular plan, and 3–4 storey height. These apartment buildings were symmetrical, functional, and designed as a single volume. Interior layouts were usually simple and symmetrical, repeated on each floor, with representative rooms facing the street and service areas and bedrooms at the rear.
2.3.2. The villa of architect Stasys Kudokas

V. Mykolaicio-Putino g. 11, architect Stasys Kudokas, 1938, listed 1938

Stasys Kudokas was a famous architect and the only Lithuanian at the time with a doctorate in architecture, received in Milan. Kudokas chose a beautiful plot of land to build his villa, but because of its location on a steep slope, construction was particularly difficult. Due to the gradient, the floor of the house is on different levels and the building includes a number of mezzanines. The house has a rectangular plan with several loggias, galleries, and arcades. For his own family, Kudokas designed an apartment occupying several floors with a separate architect’s studio. There was also a separate three-room rental apartment on the west side. The flat roof used to accommodate a terrace and there was also a terrace on the southern side of the plot with a garden and a small fountain. Kudokas incorporated his personal architectural creed in the design of his house, adhering to a harmony of rationality and artistry. Kudokas fled his home in 1944 after the onset of the second Soviet occupation and continued his career abroad, in the United States. Four families were moved into the house in the Soviet period and a pitched roof was installed in 1980.
2.3.3. The villa of Juozas Papečkys
Vaižganto g. 23, Vytautas Landsbergis, 1935
This house, designed for State Council Member Lieutenant-Colonel Juozas Papečkys and his family, was built in a quiet and prestigious location. The building is emblematic of the style of prominent modernist architect Vytautas Landsbergis, who favoured the interplay of classical architecture and modernism, a functionality of layout, and interaction with the surrounding environment. The house has two main façades, both with very different tectonics. The north façade is functionalist and comprises two contrasting planes and a red brick tower, which quickly became a landmark on this street. The rectangular block is divided by two rows of ribbon windows. The garden façade is modest with classical proportions, yet its modernist façade is decorated with two vases. The ground floor used to have a five-room apartment organized around a spacious hallway. A solicitor’s office was added to the main entrance. A separate four-room apartment was built on the first floor. Landsbergis carefully considered every detail, from materials to the placement of furniture and even plants. The property’s owner was only able to enjoy his attractive and comfortable home for a short time before Soviet state security officers arrested and executed him in 1942.

2.3.4. The Eglutė villa
Vaižganto g. 25, architect Feliksas Vizbaras, 1929, listed 10728
This house once belonged to Petras Klimas, a signatory to the 1918 Act of Lithuanian Independence and one of the most famous Lithuanian diplomats of the interwar period. The villa was named after his daughter Eglė. The luxurious building resembles a modern castle because of its different shapes and volumes. The house stands on a small rise, its impressive height increased by narrow vertical windows and a high attic wall. The decoration on the attic wall resembles embrasures. The layout of the building is irregular with polygonal projections creating rooms of unusual shapes. Rooms are organized around a central hallway. The Klimas family never actually lived in the house because they were always abroad. A family relative, Juozas Tumas Vaižgantas – a renowned writer and priest – lived in the home. The villa was later rented by the Swedish Legation from 1937–1941. Under Soviet occupation, authorities expropriated the villa and housed seven families in it.
2.3.5. The villa of Pranas Lesauskis
Vaižganto g. 26, architect Stasys Kudokas, 1938
Colonel Pranas Lesauskis was a mathematician, an expert of scientific management, and the head of the Board of Munitions. Lesauskis was encouraged to move to Vaižganto Street by his brother-in-law, Petras Klimas, owner of the neighbouring Eglutė villa. The Lesauskis villa was designed by architect Stasys Kudokas, with whom Lesauskis had studied in Rome. The sloping site meant the villa had two storeys facing the street and three at the rear. The building is a combination of expressive contours, contrasting rectangles, and rounded forms. The hallway, dining room, and sitting room are connected by wide sliding partitions so that the size and privacy of each area can be adapted according to the needs of the residents. The house plan also clearly reveals that the family led an active public life. As one of independent Lithuania’s leading military officers and prominent public figures, Lesauskis was arrested by Soviet security forces in 1941 and subsequently deported to Siberia in 1942, where he was executed.

2.3.6. The villa of Juozas Tonkūnas – Japanese Consulate
Vaižganto g. 30, architect Juozas Milvydas, 1939, listed 32700
From the street, this characteristic villa appears to be a single-storey structure. Due to the steep slope behind it, however, the building actually has two floors on its western side, where balconies open up to panoramic views of the city below. This modest modernist villa was built for the Minister of Education, Juozas Tonkūnas and his family and was designed by his brother-in-law. In 1939–1940, the family rented the house to the Japanese Consulate, which played a vital role at the start of the Second World War. Japanese Consul Chiune Sugihara issued transit visas to Japan, helping to save over 6,000 Jewish refugees seeking to flee Lithuania and Poland. Today, the property is managed by the Sugihara Diplomats for Life Foundation and includes the Sugihara House Memorial Museum.
2.3.7. Apartment Building of Elena Barioniene and Petras Visockis
Sparni g. 2, architect Bronius Elsbergas, 1933
This modern three-storey building marked the beginning of the development of an area close to the Ažuolynas Park sports complex. Each floor contains one apartment. The contrasting composition of façades is emphasised through the use of white plaster and decorative red brick matching low-pitched roof tiles, as well as the interaction of horizontal bands between floors and the vertical elements of the staircases. The use of short double strips was a favourite decorative element in designs by the building’s architect. The rich combination of finishing materials and colours is characteristic of Kaunas modernism.

2.3.8. Cooperative homes for bank employees
Perkūno Aleja 52–64, architect Bronius Elsbergas, 1938
A development at Perkūno al. 52–64 is a unique example of co-operative construction. In 1938, seven bank officials took a loan together in order to construct their homes ‘under one roof’. Three identical single-storey block homes with attics were sited facing one another, with a small street laid out in the interior space between the houses. Each central section had three apartments.

All flats were the same size and rooms were arranged in a symmetrical mirror pattern. Four residential rooms and service areas were organized around a hallway. Another apartment was set up in the attic above the first floor of each building. Side wings included two flats, each with separate entrances from the interior service street. The grey brick façades are rational, modest, yet expressive.
Aerial view of the Ąžuolynas Park and Sports Complex. Photo: Martynas Plepys, 2020
2.4.4. The Ąžuolynas Park and Sports Complex

Ąžuolynas (Oak Grove) Park is a unique component of the city’s identity. It is the largest urban oak forest in Europe, with approximately 770 oak trees spanning an area of 84.42 ha (listed 17381). The park’s territory also includes Paroda (Exhibition) Hill, Adomas Mickevičius Valley, and Danų (Song) Valley. Ąžuolynas Park is also connected to the Zoological Garden, established in 1937 (included in the Buffer zone) and Vytautas Park (part of the Perkūnas Area). In the interwar period, Ąžuolynas Park was part of a green belt extending toward Aukštosios Panemunės forest, which was then considered a recreational zone. In 2006, Ąžuolynas Park was inscribed in the Lithuanian List of Cultural Heritage. Because the old growth oaks in the park are also home to the hermit beetle (Osmoderma eremita), Denodrocopos leucotos (grey-headed woodpecker), and other Kaunas streets. In the interwar years, the greenhouse complex was one of Kaunas’ best-known landmarks, welcoming more than 600 visitors per day. After the war, the greenhouse structures fell into disrepair.

Parada (Exhibition) Hill. The construction of Ąžuolynas Park between Parodos and K. Petrausko Streets, sometimes also known as Little Ąžuolynas, was known in the interwar period as Paroda (Exhibition) Hill or Exhibition Square because of the agricultural shows and industrial fairs held there. The square, established on an empty area once managed by the Kaunas fortress, began to be developed in 1922. Exhibitions were held here annually between 1922 and 1936. The fairs were organized by the Chamber of Agriculture. The main entrance to the area was on a rise at the intersection of Parodos and K. Petruasko Streets, with additional access in the lower area of the park, near the Chamber of Agriculture building completed in 1932. Forty-one pavilions operated during the first fairs – nearly all of them wooden and short-lived. These pavilions were designed by renowned architects and often with elements reflecting the Lithuanian national style.

394. Ortophoto map of the Ąžuolynas area

2.5. Sports Infrastructure

Sports and physical fitness were vital components of a modern interwar society. Physical education and the development of different fields of sport were encouraged on a national and community level as a hallmark of modernity, with official and public organizations playing an active role in this endeavour. The sports infrastructure in Ąžuolynas began to be developed in 1920. The Lithuanian diaspora in the United States had a significant impact on the development of
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395. Map of 2.4. Ažuolynas Park and Sports Complex
2.4.1. The house of Adelė and Paulius Galaunė

Vydūno al. 2, architect Arnas Funkas, 1932, listed 16670
At the start of Vydūno Alėja, set into the territory of Ąžuolynas, is a three-storey brick structure built in 1932 as the home of renowned museum director and cultural figure Paulius Galaunė. The house is a characteristic example of Kaunas modernism, with simple horizontal lines used to provide aesthetic ornamentation on the façade and an exterior dominated by rectangular forms. Apartments on each floor had five rooms, a kitchen, bath and toilet, connected by internal corridors. Service areas were set up in the basement and attic, which also included residential quarters for the building's caretaker, accessed via service stairs. Although the building was designed by Arnas Funkas, archives contain impressive sketches prepared by another architect, Vladimiras Dubeneckis. Currently, the memorial museum of Adelė and Paulius Galaunė (Galaunių Namai) operates in the house as a branch of the National M. K. Čiurlionis Museum of Art.

Authenticity and Integrity

In 1935, the municipal government approved a plan for Ąžuolynas, setting aside five hectares of land in the southern part of the area for sports fields, paths, flowerbeds, an orchestra pavilion, a restaurant, and other features in the rest of the park. The final plan for the area's management was never implemented before 1940, but many of the proposed solutions were later taken into consideration when the park was renovated under the Soviet regime, thereby retaining its original intention and authenticity. While the Ažuolynas area was never opened for private construction projects, development of public facilities did occur there. In 1977–1987, a new Kaunas Regional Public Library arose on Paroda Hill, designed by architect Boleslovas Zabulionis. The Ąžuolynas territory was declared a protected area in 1958 and was declared a republic-level natural landmark in 1986.
2.4.2. The Kaunas Stadium
Sporto g. 6, listed 36/19

The initiative to construct a national stadium in Kaunas has its roots in the early days of Lithuania’s independence, when the Kaunas City Executive Board leased an area of land in Āžuolynas to the Lithuanian Physical Education Union, which was then asked to establish athletic fields on the plot for various branches of sport. A football field, running track, and small viewing stand began operating here in 1922, followed by the opening of the first tennis courts in independent Lithuania. The stadium was reconstructed to designs by Vytautas Landsbergis and Feliksas Bielinskis and completed in 1936. The stadium was completed with a gate, ticket booths, and tower shaped flagpoles designed by Feliksas Bielinskis, giving the entire complex a sense of dynamism, vigour, and iconic significance. The stadium had a main viewing section with capacity for 3,000 fans and additional seating for 1,000 more guests in a covered viewing area, as well as a main tennis court with 1,200 seats and additional capacity for 500 more fans in a standing section. The stadium was demolished in the Soviet era and replaced by the Darius and Girėnas Stadium, designed in 1978 by architects Algimantas Alekna and Jonas Putna. A major reconstruction of the stadium began in 2019.

2.4.3. The Sports Hall (Basketball Arena)
Perkūno al. 5, engineer Anatolijus Rozentblumas, 1939, listed 15971

The Kaunas Sports Hall was the first in Europe to be built specifically for basketball. The game became particularly popular after Lithuania won the European basketball championship in 1937. In 1939, Kaunas received a proposal to host the Third European Men’s Basketball Championship. In response to the proposal, the Basketball Arena was commissioned for construction in Ėžuolynas Park, based on a design by Anatolijus Rozentblumas, the country’s most famous construction engineer at the time. In order to create as much space as possible, a vaulted system consisting of four riveted arches resting on reinforced concrete foundations was chosen as the basis for the building. The triangular-profile skylights fitted into the roof structure between the arches provided excellent daytime illumination. The arena, measuring 62.8 by 61 metres and 15.2 metres high, could accommodate 11,000 visitors (with 3,500 seats). The basketball court was considered the best in Europe, but not everyone liked the building’s austere, even utilitarian exterior, feeling it lacked sufficient ornamentation. Symbolically, the Lithuanian men’s basketball team won the European Championship for the second time in the Kaunas Sports Hall in 1939. The hall was renovated several times in the Soviet period and hosted basketball, volleyball, and boxing matches. In 1998, a major reconstruction was carried out after which the hall became a modern sports building meeting the requirements of international athletic competitions. Another renovation of the hall was carried out in 2019–2020.
2.4.4. The Hall of Physical Education
[currently the Lithuanian Sports University]
Sporto g. 6, architect Vytautas Landsbergis, 1934, listed I49
A watershed moment in sports and athletic infrastructure in Kaunas came in 1932 with the adoption of the Law on Physical Education. Organizing and supporting sports became a national priority and newly established physical education centres began to oversee the activities of existing sports organizations and clubs. The new national mandate granted to the Hall of Physical Education prompted a campaign to construct a proper headquarters. There was unanimous agreement regarding the site of the new sports centre. The hall was to be located next to the city’s existing stadium and the design entrusted to modernist architect Vytautas Landsbergis. The greater portion of the cross-shaped building was occupied by the main hall, covered by a vaulted, reinforced concrete ceiling with glass windows, an element that remains the building’s most prominent feature today. Two smaller sports halls formed annexes on either side of the main structure.

The central building has a symmetrical volume and adheres to an Italian Rationalist style. Vytautas Landsbergis’ own words best describe the hall’s architectural approach: ‘In the design of this building, we sought to combine two forms in one building: linking the classical era, represented by Greece, the pioneer of physical culture, to our own times. The buildings of both halls have been designed in the classical spirit, modernising only the essentials, as required by today’s architecture. At the same time, we sought to design the building in a completely modern way.’

The interior featured one of the most modern construction solutions: a semi-cylindrical athletic hall with a reinforced concrete frame ceiling and overhead lighting engineering by Solomonas Milis, using the Kreuzekrost construction invented and patented in 1928 by engineer Stefan Szego.

In the Soviet period, the building housed the Institute of Physical Education. A swimming pool, designed by Jonas Putna to adhere to the overall architectural character, was added in 1958, and in 1967 a third storey was built above both sides of the main arena. A wing of classrooms and laboratories was constructed behind the swimming pool building in 1983–1985, designed by architect J. Černius. The development of this building follows a protracted evolutionary process spanning different political eras.
Aerial view of the Research Laboratory Complex and the buildings of the Kaunas University of Technology built in the 1960s. Photo: Martynas Plepys, 2020
2.a.4.5. The Research Laboratory Area

The former Lithuanian Defence Ministry’s Armaments Board Research Laboratory Complex (listed 28567) occupies a 20.9-hectare territory on the edge of Ažuolynas and is one of the most authentic examples of Kaunas interwar architecture and modern aspirations. The laboratory was the most modern facility of its kind in the three Baltic countries, a reputation earned not only because of its technical equipment but also in recognition of its stylistic and functionalist architecture. The building’s unique ribbon and corner windows, flat roof, unadorned façade, and white colour all combine to create the building’s unique appearance, a monolith, and corner windows, flat roof, unadorned façade, and white colour all combine to create the building's unique appearance, a monolith.

The organization of the Armaments Council Research Laboratory was entrusted to the engineer Juozas Vėbra, who had received his doctorate in chemistry from the University of Toulouse. Vėbra was then sent on a series of exploratory visits to eight laboratories in Germany, Belgium, France, Spain, and Switzerland to learn about the latest research innovations. The design competition for the new facility was won by Vytautas Landsbergis, a graduate of the Higher Architectural School in Rome. Anatolijus Rozenblumas, an engineer trained in Germany, and corner windows, flat roof, unadorned façade, and white colour all combine to create the building's unique appearance, a monolith, was invited to oversee the new building’s engineering requirements. Thus, the new facility was created by young local specialists whose knowledge was based on the extensive experience of the most up to date technologies from across Europe.

A remote area on the perimeter of Žaliakalnis was chosen for the site along Vyškino Aleja, near the northern edge of the city boundaries at the time, in an area once part of the former Kaunas fortifications complex. The location was determined by the impossibility of siting such a facility in the city centre and the impracticality of locating it in a provincial area given the need for specialists to live in the city. Construction work was awarded to Lithuanian contractors and most construction materials were locally sourced. Laboratory equipment, however, was imported from various different countries. Tiles and ceramic pipes for ventilation channels were ordered from Czechoslovakia and laboratory tables with lava rock surfaces were brought in from Iceland. Special door locks and fittings were produced in France by Mason Pichet, a combustion gas generator was built in Berlin by Bamag Megnin, and electrical equipment was purchased from AEG. The facility’s main equipment was produced in France and Germany. The cost of construction and all equipment reached approximately 10 million Lithuanian litas, representing one of the largest government investments ever made in a new facility in interwar Kaunas.

Service buildings were constructed simultaneously with the main laboratory building, converting former fortress bunkers into warehouses, marking the integration and adaptive reuse of historical structures in pursuit of the nation’s modern agenda. By 1940, the complex included as many as twelve different types and sizes of structures. Today, surviving buildings include the main laboratory and three other facilities: the former administration office and telephone station and security guard’s quarters, industrial workshops which once housed metal and wood processing units, and a glassblowing laboratory where local workers were trained by Czechoslovakian master craftsmen to produce glass containers needed for chemical tests. This particular building is notable for the intense play of façade planes characteristic of architectural designs by Bronius Elsbergas. A long, utilitarian glassblowing laboratory which once housed metal and wood processing units, and a glassblowing laboratory where local workers were trained by Czechoslovakian master craftsmen to produce glass containers needed for chemical tests. This particular building is notable for the intense play of façade planes characteristic of architectural designs by Bronius Elsbergas. A long, utilitarian glassblowing laboratory. The laboratory was the most modern facility of its kind in the three Baltic countries, a reputation earned not only because of its technical equipment but also in recognition of its stylistic and functionalist architecture. The building’s unique ribbon and corner windows, flat roof, unadorned façade, and white colour all combine to create the building's unique appearance, a monolith.

A remote area on the perimeter of Žaliakalnis was chosen for the site along Vyškino Aleja, near the northern edge of the city boundaries at the time, in an area once part of the former Kaunas fortifications complex. The location was determined by the impossibility of siting such a facility in the city centre and the impracticality of locating it in a provincial area given the need for specialists to live in the city. Construction work was awarded to Lithuanian contractors and most construction materials were locally sourced. Laboratory equipment, however, was imported from various different countries. Tiles and ceramic pipes for ventilation channels were ordered from Czechoslovakia and laboratory tables with lava rock surfaces were brought in from Iceland. Special door locks and fittings were produced in France by Mason Pichet, a combustion gas generator was built in Berlin by Bamag Megnin, and electrical equipment was purchased from AEG. The facility’s main equipment was produced in France and Germany. The cost of construction and all equipment reached approximately 10 million Lithuanian litas, representing one of the largest government investments ever made in a new facility in interwar Kaunas. Service buildings were constructed simultaneously with the main laboratory building, converting former fortress bunkers into warehouses, marking the integration and adaptive reuse of historical structures in pursuit of the nation’s modern agenda. By 1940, the complex included as many as twelve different types and sizes of structures. Today, surviving buildings include the main laboratory and three other facilities: the former administration office and telephone station and security guard’s quarters, industrial workshops which once housed metal and wood processing units, and a glassblowing laboratory where local workers were trained by Czechoslovakian master craftsmen to produce glass containers needed for chemical tests. This particular building is notable for the intense play of façade planes characteristic of architectural designs by Bronius Elsbergas. A long, utilitarian glassblowing laboratory. The laboratory was the most modern facility of its kind in the three Baltic countries, a reputation earned not only because of its technical equipment but also in recognition of its stylistic and functionalist architecture. The building’s unique ribbon and corner windows, flat roof, unadorned façade, and white colour all combine to create the building's unique appearance, a monolith.

A remote area on the perimeter of Žaliakalnis was chosen for the site along Vyškino Aleja, near the northern edge of the city boundaries at the time, in an area once part of the former Kaunas fortifications complex. The location was determined by the impossibility of siting such a facility in the city centre and the impracticality of locating it in a provincial area given the need for specialists to live in the city. Construction work was awarded to Lithuanian contractors and most construction materials were locally sourced. Laboratory equipment, however, was imported from various different countries. Tiles and ceramic pipes for ventilation channels were ordered from Czechoslovakia and laboratory tables with lava rock surfaces were brought in from Iceland. Special door locks and fittings were produced in France by Mason Pichet, a combustion gas generator was built in Berlin by Bamag Megnin, and electrical equipment was purchased from AEG. The facility’s main equipment was produced in France and Germany. The cost of construction and all equipment reached approximately 10 million Lithuanian litas, representing one of the largest government investments ever made in a new facility in interwar Kaunas. Service buildings were constructed simultaneously with the main laboratory building, converting former fortress bunkers into warehouses, marking the integration and adaptive reuse of historical structures in pursuit of the nation’s modern agenda. By 1940, the complex included as many as twelve different types and sizes of structures. Today, surviving buildings include the main laboratory and three other facilities: the former administration office and telephone station and security guard’s quarters, industrial workshops which once housed metal and wood processing units, and a glassblowing laboratory where local workers were trained by Czechoslovakian master craftsmen to produce glass containers needed for chemical tests. This particular building is notable for the intense play of façade planes characteristic of architectural designs by Bronius Elsbergas. A long, utilitarian glassblowing laboratory. The laboratory was the most modern facility of its kind in the three Baltic countries, a reputation earned not only because of its technical equipment but also in recognition of its stylistic and functionalist architecture. The building’s unique ribbon and corner windows, flat roof, unadorned façade, and white colour all combine to create the building's unique appearance, a monolith.

A remote area on the perimeter of Žaliakalnis was chosen for the site along Vyškino Aleja, near the northern edge of the city boundaries at the time, in an area once part of the former Kaunas fortifications complex. The location was determined by the impossibility of siting such a facility in the city centre and the impracticality of locating it in a provincial area given the need for specialists to live in the city. Construction work was awarded to Lithuanian contractors and most construction materials were locally sourced. Laboratory equipment, however, was imported from various different countries. Tiles and ceramic pipes for ventilation channels were ordered from Czechoslovakia and laboratory tables with lava rock surfaces were brought in from Iceland. Special door locks and fittings were produced in France by Mason Pichet, a combustion gas generator was built in Berlin by Bamag Megnin, and electrical equipment was purchased from AEG. The facility’s main equipment was produced in France and Germany. The cost of construction and all equipment reached approximately 10 million Lithuanian litas, representing one of the largest government investments ever made in a new facility in interwar Kaunas. Service buildings were constructed simultaneously with the main laboratory building, converting former fortress bunkers into warehouses, marking the integration and adaptive reuse of historical structures in pursuit of the nation’s modern agenda. By 1940, the complex included as many as twelve different types and sizes of structures. Today, surviving buildings include the main laboratory and three other facilities: the former administration office and telephone station and security guard’s quarters, industrial workshops which once housed metal and wood processing units, and a glassblowing laboratory where local workers were trained by Czechoslovakian master craftsmen to produce glass containers needed for chemical tests. This particular building is notable for the intense play of façade planes characteristic of architectural designs by Bronius Elsbergas. A long, utilitarian glassblowing laboratory. The laboratory was the most modern facility of its kind in the three Baltic countries, a reputation earned not only because of its technical equipment but also in recognition of its stylistic and functionalist architecture. The building’s unique ribbon and corner windows, flat roof, unadorned façade, and white colour all combine to create the building's unique appearance, a monolith.
2.5.1. Research Laboratory Building (currently the Chemistry Faculty of the Kaunas University of Technology)
Radvilėnų pl. 19, architect Vytautas Landsbergis, engineer Anatolijus Rzenzibumas, 1933–1935, listed 1950
This structure features a monolithic concrete frame, a construction solution considered progressive at the time. All load-bearing structures (columns, beams, and floor) are concrete. The building’s frame structure permitted an open plan, allowing for a free arrangement of partitions and openings and the incorporation of continuous ribbon windows. Transparent bands of glass, a flat roof, and subtle proportions lend the building a sense of lightness and elegance, organically linking it to the natural environment and concealing its military purpose.

The Research Laboratory’s work was terminated during the first Soviet occupation and the site was transferred to the Technology Faculty of Kaunas University. In the spring of 1943, the university was closed by the occupying Nazi regime and some of the facilities were used to establish a Peat Cultivation Institute. As the Nazi army withdrew from Lithuania in the summer of 1944, it dismantled and carried off some of the laboratory’s equipment. After the war, the Technology Faculty of the restructured Kaunas Polytechnical Institute resumed its work and was renamed the Chemical Technology Faculty in 1947.

In the Soviet era, the Research Laboratory became part of the Kaunas Polytechnic Institute’s Department of Chemistry, and construction of a new campus for the Institute adjacent to the former laboratory began in 1964. The architect of the campus, Vytautas Dičius, was inspired by the legacy of inter-war Kaunas modernism. Given the specific function of Research Laboratory, one which was useful and deemed necessary by all governments managing the site, the laboratory has retained much of its authenticity and functionality, externally and internally. Preservation efforts have also contributed to this end. The building was designated an architectural landmark in 1973, and in 2015 the site was granted the European Heritage Label by the European Commission. The building remains part of the Kaunas University of Technology campus today. In 2019, the Getty Foundation ‘Keeping It Modern’ programme awarded a grant to support the drafting of a conservation management plan for the laboratory.
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241. The Research Laboratory Building. Photo: Martynas Plepy, 2019
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243. The ground floor plan of the Research Laboratory. Source: Archfondas
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245. The front facade of the Research Laboratory. Photo: Martynas Plepy, 2019
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2.b. History and development

2.b.1. Growth in Kaunas prior to 1843

The city of Kaunas emerged in a unique location at the confluence of the Nemunas and Neris Rivers. Archaeological findings from the 10th century demonstrate that the area’s inhabitants made their living from commerce. As a town of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the name Kaunas is first mentioned in historical records in 1361, in Wigand von Marburg’s Chronica nova Prutenica (New Prussian Chronicle), which also mentions a castle located at the river confluence. In 1408, Grand Duke Vytautas granted Kaunas the right to establish and govern their city on the basis of the Magdeburg rights of town privileges. A community of free, economically independent merchants and craftsmen soon emerged in Kaunas. The city had a strategic and convenient location giving it access to both water and land navigation routes, and sat at the head of a Hanseatic trading road linking Gdańsk (Danzig), Toruń (Tornau), Elbląg (Elbing), Königsberg, Bremen, and Hamburg. After it was granted municipal privileges, Kaunas emerged as an important commercial centre engaged in business between eastern and western Europe. By the 15th century, Kaunas had become one of Lithuania’s largest cities and by the early 16th century it was home to 3,000 inhabitants. The main trade artery was the Nemunas River. In 1539, Kaunas was included in Canta Marina, a map of northern Europe drawn by Olaus Magnus. After a fire in 1537, Kaunas was surveyed and began to be developed along a rectangular grid plan, based on the Silesian module (42 metres). The core of the city plan was a rectangular square (126 by 210 metres) from which straight streets extended off each corner, with rectangular town blocks planned for the areas between the streets. A site for the town hall was chosen based on the size of the square, deriving the building’s length, width, and height proportions. Construction on the town hall began in 1542. This was the first example of regular town planning in Lithuania. The latter half of the 16th century and the early 17th century were a time of economic prosperity in Kaunas. The city grew and had functioning ports on both the Nemunas and the Neris. New Catholic churches and monasteries were constructed. The latter half of the 16th century and the early 17th century were a time of economic prosperity in Kaunas. The city grew and had functioning ports on both the Nemunas and the Neris. New Catholic churches and monasteries were constructed. The city’s merchants travelled to Kaunas, became citizens of the new city, and continued to develop their trade there. After it was granted municipal privileges, Kaunas emerged as an important commercial centre engaged in business between eastern and western Europe. By the 15th century, Kaunas had become one of Lithuania’s largest cities and by the early 16th century it was home to 3,000 inhabitants. The main trade artery was the Nemunas River. In 1539, Kaunas was included in Canta Marina, a map of northern Europe drawn by Olaus Magnus. After a fire in 1537, Kaunas was surveyed and began to be developed along a rectangular grid plan, based on the Silesian module (42 metres). The core of the city plan was a rectangular square (126 by 210 metres) from which straight streets extended off each corner, with rectangular town blocks planned for the areas between the streets. A site for the town hall was chosen based on the size of the square, deriving the building’s length, width, and height proportions. Construction on the town hall began in 1542. This was the first example of regular town planning in Lithuania. The latter half of the 16th century and the early 17th century were a time of economic prosperity in Kaunas. The city grew and had functioning ports on both the Nemunas and the Neris. New Catholic churches and monasteries were constructed. The latter half of the 16th century and the early 17th century were a time of economic prosperity in Kaunas. The city grew and had functioning ports on both the Nemunas and the Neris. New Catholic churches and monasteries were constructed. The latter half of the 16th century and the early 17th century were a time of economic prosperity in Kaunas. The city grew and had functioning ports on both the Nemunas and the Neris. New Catholic churches and monasteries were constructed. The latter half of the 16th century and the early 17th century were a time of economic prosperity in Kaunas. The city grew and had functioning ports on both the Nemunas and the Neris. New Catholic churches and monasteries were constructed. The latter half of the 16th century and the early 17th century were a time of economic prosperity in Kaunas. The city grew and had functioning ports on both the Nemunas and the Neris. New Catholic churches and monasteries were constructed. The latter half of the 16th century and the early 17th century were a time of economic prosperity in Kaunas. The city grew and had functioning ports on both the Nemunas and the Neris. New Catholic churches and monasteries were constructed.
2. DESCRIPTION

2.b.2. Kaunas as a Governorate centre and military garrison city, 1843–1918

In 1843, Kaunas became the administrative centre of the newly constituted Kaunas Governorate, part of the Northwestern Krai of the Russian Empire. The Tsar’s administration sought to establish an exemplary government centre in Kaunas, based on a grandiose ‘New Plan’ for the city. This was the first draft plan for Kaunas on this scale and constituted an ambitious urban implementation scheme. The plan was comparable, in part, to urban restructuring efforts undertaken in the mid-19th century in several European cities, including Paris, Vienna, and Kraków. A generous geometric street grid was adapted for the newly planned centre of Kaunas between sloping terrain on one side and by the Nemunas River on the other. The planning principles underpinning Kaunas’ New Town had come to Russia from France. The new Kaunas plan, occupying the territory of Naujamiestis, was approved by Tsar Nicholas I in 1847 (fig. 432). Naujamiestis was twice the size of its original core, and its plan was successfully implemented partly because the area to the east of Kaunas’ historic Old Town was virtually empty at the time.

A plan for the reinforcement of the Nemunas and Neris riverbanks was approved in 1851, which led to the paving of the virtually empty at the time. The planning principles underpinning Kaunas’ New Town had come to Russia from France. The new Kaunas plan, occupying the territory of Naujamiestis, was approved by Tsar Nicholas I in 1847 (fig. 432). Naujamiestis was twice the size of its original core, and its plan was successfully implemented partly because the area to the east of Kaunas’ historic Old Town was virtually empty at the time.

A plan for the reinforcement of the Nemunas and Neris riverbanks was approved in 1851, which led to the paving of the city. While the classification of Kaunas as a Governorate administrative centre in 1843 had accelerated the city’s growth, the rules imposed on the Kaunas fortress and its open and undeveloped expanse restrained that development. Military facilities – nine forts, nine batteries, and other fortifications – were arranged in a ring around Kaunas, limiting its territorial growth and increasing the density of development in the city centre (fig. 434). Administrative buildings were constructed in Naujamiestis and military garrisons in Upper Šančiai and Panemunė. The fortifications altered the city’s landscape, terrain, and urban structure and shaped the further development of Kaunas’ architecture and urban planning by limiting building heights to two storeys. During the years between 1843 and 1897, the population of Kaunas increased six-fold (from 14,000 to 86,000, of which 10,000 served in the Russian military), and the number of buildings increased in all parts of the city. By 1844, Kaunas had a population of 96,000 with four forms of property ownership: assets owned by religious communities; state-owned sites; public buildings (owned by associations, city and community facilities); and privately-owned structures (fig. 435).

Although the city only served as a fortress centre until 1915, the ring of fortifications, centrally-arranged defensive mounds, military garrisons and, in particular, the network of military roads constructed during this period had a considerable effect on the specific direction of subsequent city development and changes made to the street grid in the 20th century. Despite the presence of the fortress infrastructure, Kaunas was conquered by German forces during the First World War with barely a shot fired. The occupation lasted from 1915 to the summer of 1919. During this period, the city was home to the Ober Ost administration, a territorial unit established in 1915 in the German-controlled areas of the Eastern Front. Based on a plan drafted by the German engineer L. Weiss in 1917, Kaunas was to be radically restructured, forced into a geometric pattern developed with little regard for the actual lay of the land. Implementation of the plan was never even started. After Germany’s capitulation, the administration was abandoned in the summer of 1918 and the last German soldiers left Kaunas one year later, in 1919.
MODERNIST KAUNAS: ARCHITECTURE OF OPTIMISM, 1919–1939

2. DESCRIPTION

434. The plan of Kaunas Fortress at the beginning of the 20th century (prior to 1912). Source: The Atlas of Kaunas Fortress

435. The plan of Kaunas in 1914, LNM
2.3. Creating a Lithuanian capital, 1919–1939

After the Council of Lithuania proclaimed the country’s independence on 16 February 1918 with its capital in Vilnius and began to re-establish the foundations of statehood after 123 years of Russian occupation, the circumstances of history were to have profound significance for the city of Kaunas. The proclamation of Lithuanian independence was met almost immediately by an invasion of various warring parties. The territory of the new nation was one of the principal theatres of conflict during the Polish-Soviet War of 1919–1920, during which much of the country was occupied and reoccupied by the Red Army, Polish regular and irregular forces, and various Lithuanian units (both Bolshevik and anti-Soviet). Lithuania became functionally independent in July 1920 upon the withdrawal of Bolshevik regiments from Vilnius. But within months, an invasion of Polish forces overpowered the nascent Republic of Lithuania and occupied the southwestern third of its territory, comprising its historical core. The Lithuanian government was thus compelled by military force to retreat from Vilnius, the nation’s ancient cultural centre and newly established political capital and hastily establish a provisional government in Kaunas, the second largest city, some one hundred kilometers to the west. Acknowledging these historical events is crucial to understanding the role of culture – and architecture, in particular – in creating a national self-image at a time when the very existence of the new republic was in peril.

From early 1919 to October 1939, Kaunas served as Lithuania’s provisional capital and its principal city. The First President of Lithuania was elected in Kaunas on 4 April 1919. The Lithuanian Constituent Assembly, elected through universal elections in 1920, reaffirmed Lithuania’s independence in a proclamation adopted on 15 May 1920 and declared the Lithuanian state a democratic republic. It was hoped that the move to Kaunas would be only a temporary measure, but it lasted more than two decades. Surprisingly, Kaunas’ status as provisional capital was never codified in any Lithuanian legislation adopted in the interwar period. On the contrary, Vilnius’ status as the historical capital of Lithuania was based on the Act of Independence proclaimed on 6 February 1918 and the basic law of the newly restored Lithuanian state – its Constitution. The Constitutions of 1928 and 1938 proclaimed that ‘The capital of Lithuania is Vilnius. The capital may only be transferred to another location by specific law’; like that as it may, Kaunas was the only active provisional capital in the world at the time, and the opportunities arising from such a status were exploited to the fullest there.

Kaunas became a provisional capital under very dramatic circumstances. The city was poverty-stricken and in ruins. It lacked the essentials taken for granted in modern cities, such as proper water supply and sewage systems and other conveniences. As a wave of new residents flooded into the city, the issue of housing became acute. There was a chronic shortage of apartments, buildings for state institutions, and facilities for the university – everything that Lithuania’s neighbouring countries already enjoyed. Living in such an atmosphere of impermanence in that first year as a provisional capital, neither the state nor the city of Kaunas and its residents had the capacity for substantial investment in urban development. After diplomatic efforts in 1920 failed to recover Vilnius, hopes for a temporary stay in Kaunas began to fade, as evidenced by the subsequent private construction and extensive renovations on buildings designated for government institutions. Most offices and residents still occupied Tsarist-era buildings, which were expanded and increased in height (fig. 12). Private multi-storey houses began to be built along regular streets of Naujamiestis (fig. 42).

From September 30, 1921 to July 2, 1931 Kaunas was developed under the governance of Mayor (burmistras) Jonas Vileišis (1872–1942), a signatory of the 1918 Act of Lithuanian independence, the first representative of Lithuania in the United States of America in 1919–1920, a member of parliament; and a member of the second and fourth cabinets under Prime Minister Mykolas, Sleževičius, whose governance coincided with the rapid relocation of government to Kaunas. In this context, Vileišis had to develop Kaunas not only as a modern city but as a provisional capital as well. During this period, the Kaunas city area was expanded from 18 to 40 square kilometres; more than 2,500 new buildings were built; three reinforced concrete bridges over the Nemunas and the Neris (Aleksotas, Vilijampole, and Panemune) were constructed; main streets were paved; a modern public bus transport system was introduced; new squares and parks were planned; city sanitation was installed (including the establishment of a water supply and sewerage); the foundations of a social security system were laid; three new modern primary schools were built; and the Vincas Kudirka Public Library was established on Laisvės Aleja (fig. 437, 438, 439, 440). Vileišis also introduced Kaunas to the international arena, establishing contacts with the municipalities of many foreign capitals as an organiser and chairman of the Lithuanian Cities Union in 1924–1932. Jonas Vileišis took considerable interest in new urban planning trends, visiting the International Garden Cities and Town-Planning Association conference in London in 1922 and actively participating in city council debates about Kaunas’ development. In late 1922, the city council established a special committee for the city’s future development and gave four engineers (Feiškas Viliausas, Jonas Krauzauskas, Aleksandras Čiorevičius, and Adolf Kellermüller) one week to prepare draft plans of their individual visions. A Danish engineer, Marius Frandsen, was invited to review the proposed plans. After analysing the submitted proposals, Frandsen was invited to develop a new one of his own. The decision to entrust the city plan to Frandsen may have been
influenced by information about his experience, which comprised twenty-five years working in urban planning, authorship of plans for several Danish cities, and the development of a draft plan for Copenhagen. Historical records also mention discussions about city planning concepts with the renowned British garden-city proponent, architect Ebenezer Howard.

In collaboration with the Kaunas city engineer Antanas Viliūnas, Frandsen created a Kaunas master plan with functional zoning (factory districts, villas, working class housing) and uniform buildings. However, because of the draft nature of the plan and the lack of state funds at the beginning of the 1920s, the process of constructing the capital was left mostly in the hands of private initiatives, which often were not available. Yet, the impact of Frandsen’s concept could be seen in later plans for individual sections of the city.

The status of provisional capital presented provincial Kaunas with an opportunity to rapidly transform itself into a modern metropolis. Yet, the impermanent nature of that city’s official status acted as a damper, inhibiting forward progress. Segments of the country’s elite felt that investing in construction in Kaunas would mean resigning themselves to the loss of Vilnius. As long as the hope of returning to the historical capital Vilnius lived on, maintenance of government buildings was limited to simple renovations. The centres of actual power—such as the Office of the President, the Cabinet of Ministers, and parliament—remained housed in nineteenth-century Russian imperial buildings. The Frandsen Plan of 1923 sought to develop a new city centre in Zalasalas, with a ceremonial park and government buildings, however, a lack of public funds and a lingering sense of ‘impermanence’ prevented the project’s implementation or at least postponed plans for an unspecified length of time. Efforts by Lithuanian parliamentarians did, however, result in the construction of the Hall of Justice, the first purpose of which was to serve as a meeting place for the parliament (see 1.1.3). Only in 1938, after receiving a Polish ultimatum and establishing formal diplomatic relations with Poland, the Lithuanian government realised that Vilnius might never become the capital of Lithuania and announced an international architectural competition for a new Presidential Palace and a National Hall of State in Kaunas (the project was never implemented) (fig. 42).

The shift in political power that occurred in 1926 made the President Lithuania’s most powerful political institution. After a coup d’état on 17 December 1920, Antanas Smetona succeeded Kazys Grinius as President in an act meant to convey a sense of legitimacy. Democratic principles were soon abandoned, however, and President Smetona assumed the role of a unifying power. Although the national government had resolved to invest in Kaunas by the 1930s and proceeded with the construction of nationally significant sites there, façades and interior decor designs had tell-tale signs of provisional solutions and references to the acute question of Lithuania’s territorial integrity. The deliberate official display of the coats of arms of Lithuania’s three main cities—Vilnius, Kaunas and Klaipėda—was more an expression of hope than reality. In the period between 1918 and 1940, there was never a moment when all three cities were simultaneously under Lithuanian jurisdiction. One of the essential features of Kaunas’ transformation was the gradual conversion of the structure of a Russian imperial town into a modern, contemporary city. A similar drive to throw off imperial legacies and establish unique identities was evident in many other capital cities during this period and throughout the 20th century.

While the government hesitated, Kaunas was built by its new residents: intellectuals, businesspeople, and civil servants—all with family roots in the rural provinces—who had assumed the task of shaping a new nation. Although Kaunas was the capital of an ethnically based nation-state with nearly 60% of its residents identifying as ethnic Lithuanians, the city also retained its multiracial identity, which is clearly reflected in its architecture. In 1937, the city’s population was 61% Lithuanian, 25.5% Jewish, 3.9% Polish, 3.3% German and 3.3% Russian, with all of its communities
actively participating in diverse ethnic, professional, creative, and other civic societies and organisations. The active participation of these communities was evident in the city's temples and religious buildings, educational institutions, and banks [see xxx]. Institutions serving the needs of ethnic minorities were not constructed as separate, compact architectural complexes, but rather coexisted with others in both the city centre and around its periphery. The denser concentration of Jewish educational and social welfare institutions around the Old Town was a factor of the greater number of Jews living in this particular area of the city.

Over time and as the population grew, the city's spirit changed along with its architectural image. A considerable impact on cultural life in Kaunas came with the opening of the University of Lithuania in 1922, which symbolically replaced the loss of Vilnius University (est. 1579). The student population became an increasing and visible part of urban society. Foreign diplomats posted to Kaunas also became involved in the city's cultural life. The French Embassy, the Lithuanian-Italian and Lithuanian-British societies, as well as other diplomatic missions in Kaunas organized lectures, exhibitions, and concerts, showcasing Lithuanian and foreign speakers and artists. A symbolic date inaugurating a new Kaunas narrative occurred in 1930, when the Lithuanian government sent out notices to postal agencies around the world that correspondence addressed to Kaunas the Tsarist-era rendition of the city's name, rather than Kaunas, would no longer be delivered. In the 1930s, the nation's collective consciousness had come to view Kaunas as a proper, and no longer provisional, capital city.

The years between 1930 and 1939 saw many improvements in urban essentials under mayors Antanas Gravrogkas (1932–1933) and Antanas Merkys (1933–1939). Heading the Construction Department from 1930 to 1937, architect Karolis Reisonas prioritized the technical maintenance of existing urban spaces and territories. In the early 1930s, a qualitative improvement in urban planning in Kaunas became evident and bureaucracy had been replaced more rapidly, water and sanitation lines continued to be installed, new government and public buildings were constructed in Naujamiestis, and the housing crisis had begun to ease, albeit rather slowly (fig. 442).

Table 2.1. Construction in Kaunas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Residential buildings</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>non-residential buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bricks</td>
<td></td>
<td>wooden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918–1921</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3705</td>
<td>5001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rapid suburban growth led to a second expansion of the city limits in 1931. The area of the city now reached 3,982 hectares (fig. 443). The city council also adopted several important regulations, such as the mandatory order in 1932 that finally initiated the city’s zoning into so-called open and closed construction areas and also brick and tiled-roof districts (fig. 13). Zones reserved for industrial development were designated along the Nemunas River, to the west of Kaunas, to avoid the flow of wastewater past the city (fig. 14). The growth of enterprises outside the industrial zones was restricted. This approach to zoning was a progressive step in an effort to provide the local population with clean and hygienic living and environmental conditions in the city centre. Zoning principles, driven by a combination of aesthetic and functional motives, contributed significantly to the formulation of Kaunas’ outstanding modern cityscape. At the beginning of 1930s, the city gradually took the physical form of a new capital.

The beginnings of a surge in urban planning occurred around 1937, when articles on urban planning began to appear with greater frequency in the local and national press. The subject was principally explored by younger authors, including foreign-trained architects such as Jonas Kovalskis, Jurgis Getneris, Algirdas Mošinskis, economist Albertas Tarulis, and others. The term urbanism began to appear in the press in 1935 and 1936, though it had been initially introduced into regular usage in the Lithuanian language in 1933 by Antanas Novickis who, as the country’s senior construction inspector from 1930 to 1940, initiated the adoption of fundamental urban planning documents in Lithuania’s cities.

In 1937, the Kaunas Municipal Construction Department began drafting a new plan for the city which anticipated a future population of 250,000. The plan was placed under the control of architect Jonas Kovalskis, who had recently completed his studies at the École nationale supérieure des Beaux Arts. Processes taking place on a national scale were important harbingers of imminent change. In 1939, the Law on City Land Management was adopted, permitting partial land expropriation and territorial planning reorganisation. That same year, a National Construction Committee was established to resolve the main urban planning issues facing the country and to regulate urban expansion.
Of no less importance were processes taking place in the municipal sector. In March 1939, Kovalskis was appointed to head the new Planning Department. Known for his holistic approach to planning, Kovalskis not only had a clear vision for the city plan, but also proposed measures to implement it. He considered the low density of urban residents to be one of the city's greatest problems and sought to curb Kaunas' chaotic expansion into its surrounding environs, and at the same time advocated for the incorporation into the city limits of as many suburbs as possible in an effort to regulate their development. Democratic principles were also advanced as part of the process. A questionnaire was published in the press offering residents the opportunity to share their own visions of the best way to develop their city, their preferred types and height of construction in the city's districts, ideas for establishing recreational zones, and even their views on the configuration of land allocation (fig. 445). Kaunas' senior engineer, Juzas Dra galus, who served in 1940, also advocated for a swift reorganisation of the city.

Kaunas' population grew from 90,000 in 1919 to 154,000 in 1939. On a percentage basis, this was the fastest rate of urban population growth in Eastern Europe recorded in the 1930s, though it was also rather slow in commencing. It was equally impressive in terms of urbanisation and manifestation of self-awareness. Profound social change followed, with existing, outdated, or redundant identities being replaced by new modern ones. On a daily basis, the rather colourless mass of provincial arrivals flowing into Kaunas, raised by families of nearly identical social status and economic and cultural experience, came to display increasingly diverse forms of outward appearances. What was important was that the modern milieu of the provisional capital was not some copy of the peripheral world, but a contemporaneous relocation and adaptation. Kaunas not only acquired a new material appearance, it also saw the emergence of a new civil society and traditions. Within twenty years, in a city that in 1918 could not boast a single sports team or proper hotel, people in Kaunas could now enjoy an annual offering of 150 stage plays, 117 opera and ballet performances, thirteen symphony concerts, and thirty teams playing basketball in a modern sports arena.

In the 1920s, some referred to Kaunas as 'a most provisional capital', but by the 1930s the city's progress was universally acknowledged and revered and its efforts to become a modern city truly worthy of the title 'capital' were seen as justified. By the mid-1920s, the Lithuanian Foreign Ministry was inviting foreign diplomatic missions not only to find suitable leased facilities in Kaunas, but to begin acquiring land for the construction of diplomatic offices. Such proposals may not initially have been taken very seriously given the potential financial losses that would result from a move from Kaunas to Vilnius, but by the late-1930s the idea was being given earnest consideration. A British diplomat described the changing public mood in 1931 thus: 'Given how rapidly Kaunas is developing and how much money is being allocated to residential construction, one might conclude that Lithuania is no longer seriously considering the possibility of recovering Vilnius, or of Vilnius ever again serving as Lithuania's capital.' It can be noted that, more than it was planned, Kaunas had been developed by civic initiative and local entrepreneurship, which inspired local interpretation of modernist architecture.

The opening of the most interesting and modern public buildings in Kaunas coincided with the twentieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence in 1938. However, the year was not an entirely joyous one. Pressed by a new Polish ultimatum, Lithuania established formal diplomatic ties with Warsaw in March 1938. The public perceived this step by the Lithuanian government as the abandonment of Vilnius, Lithuania's historical capital. One year later, in March 1939, Lithuania lost Klaipeda to Nazi Germany. On 10 October 1939, in the early days of World War II, Lithuania finally regained control of Vilnius after signing a mutual assistance treaty with the Soviet Union (fig. 444). According to provisions outlined in the treaty, Lithuania would acquire about one fifth of the Vilnius region, including Lithuania's historical capital, Vilnius, and in exchange would allow five Soviet military bases with 20,000 troops to be established across Lithuania. In essence, the treaty with Lithuania was very similar to agreements which the Soviet Union had signed with Estonia on September 28, and with Latvia on October 5. However, the treaty opened the door for the first Soviet occupation of Lithuania in June 1940.

The return of Vilnius was a huge shock to Lithuanian society. Euphoria was followed by the realisation of a dilemma: What was to be done now that the city had been recovered? The question became even more complicated once it was realised that Vilnius, without which Lithuania had existed for twenty years, was a completely foreign city. The Lithuanian army marched into Vilnius on 28 October 1939. Antanas Merkys, who served as Mayor of Kaunas, was appointed the government's representative in Vilnius and the Vilnius District. Although slogans such as 'No rest without Vilnius' had resonated for twenty years in Lithuania, no one in Kaunas was in a hurry to move.

After Lithuania recovered control of Vilnius, Kaunas continued to be viewed as a 'second capital' and an important hub of transportation and industry. And while many institutions opened branch offices in Vilnius, all official bodies, including the Office of the President, the Cabinet, parliament, ministries, and the university, remained in Kaunas. What's more, independence anniversary celebrations on 16 February 1940 were held in Kaunas. The solemn return of the President to Vilnius was planned for June or July 1940. However, President Merkys was never to set foot in the historical capital. The onset of the Soviet occupation of Lithuania on 15 June 1940 brought an end to efforts to consolidate Vilnius as the capital of the Republic of Lithuania.
Lithuania was occupied by Nazi Germany from June 1941 to July 1944. Kaunas served as the administrative centre and headquarters for the German General Commissariat and the administrative centre of the Nazi-established Lithuanian Generalbezirk in the Baltic Ostland. The Kaunas ghetto was established in Vilijampolė in July 1941 and 30,000 Jews were soon confined there. The ghetto was liquidated in July 1944. Of Kaunas’ 37,000-strong Jewish community, less than 3,000 survived the Holocaust. Kaunas also witnessed efforts to save Jews. Over several weeks in the summer of 1940, from mid-July to early August, two diplomats posted in Kaunas, Jan Zwartendijk, Consul for the Netherlands and Chiune (Sampo) Sugihara, Consul for Japan, issued more than 2,400 visas to war refugees who had fled to Lithuania from Nazi-occupied territories in Europe. With these visas, refugees could continue traveling via Japan to the Dutch-controlled colonies of Curaçao and Suriname. After losing a portion of its inhabitants during the first Soviet occupation, Kaunas continued to see its population decline under the Nazis. At the same time, war meant only fragmented new construction in the city, with most activity directed toward renovations and the installation of shelters. Despite the first Soviet and subsequent Nazi occupation of Lithuania, urban development processes initiated by Kaunas’ planning division were continued under its new director, Algirdas Prapuolenis, who oversaw the approval of the first draft city plan in 1942. In March 1943, the city fully incorporated all of its principal suburbs and their surrounding land, consisting of 134 of the city’s current 168 square kilometre territory, the largest single expansion of Kaunas’ city limits in its history.
The second Soviet occupation began in the summer of 1944 with the return of the Soviet army and ended only on 11 March 1990 with the proclaimed restoration of Lithuanian independence. The last Soviet troops left the country in 1993.

In July 1944, Soviet armed forces were able to occupy Kaunas without firing a single shot. As it retreated, however, the Nazi army destroyed numerous important facilities and infrastructure sites in Kaunas, including the railway tunnel and station, the Vytautas Magnus University, the J. Damijonaitis Primary School, the Physics and Chemistry Institute, the Kleboniškis power station, and the Petras Vileišis Bridge in the Nemunas River, helping to control flooding and generate inexpensive electrical power.

The death of Joseph Stalin in 1953 and the introduction of the conditional political liberation that followed changed the course of history. Reforms instituted in construction and architecture by Nikita Khrushchev beginning in 1954 introduced a focus on efficiency, design standardisation, and the industrialisation of construction. Aesthetic choices returned to a functional approach.

Continuity in planning Kaunas was maintained at the end of the Second World War for some time under Feliksas Bielinskis who, as the city’s new senior engineer from the start of the second Soviet occupation of Lithuania in 1944 until 1946, implemented many of his predecessor’s ideas. Having lost nearly half of its population during the Second World War, the change in Kaunas’ character continued during the tenor of the postwar Stalinist years (1945–1956). Prewar architects who had remained in Soviet-controlled Kaunas were forced to adapt to Stalinist architecture.

Communist power affected architecture and architects not only ideologically but also socially, since it eradicated the private companies, forcing all professionals to be employed by state-run design and planning institutions. Efforts to create a new identity for Kaunas began very soon after the war. The former provisional capital was gradually transformed into a Soviet industrial hub. Industrial enterprises were enlarged and specialized. As production grew, so too did the need for residential housing. An illustrative example was the development from 1950 to 1955 of a residential complex for the Peršale factory. The district’s regular development continued to adhere to principles shaped in the interwar years (fig. 69, 448).

The death of Joseph Stalin in 1953 and the introduction of the conditional political liberation that followed changed the course of history. Reforms instituted in construction and architecture by Nikita Khrushchev beginning in 1954 introduced a focus on efficiency, design standardisation, and the industrialisation of construction. Aesthetic choices returned to a functional approach. State design institutes concentrated in Kaunas were instructed to plan for a large expansion of the city. It was envisioned that the city would be divided into functional zones where the concentration of industrial enterprises would be accompanied by districts of mass-constructed, prefabricated residential buildings. Kaunas grew rapidly, from a population of 232,000 in the 1960s to 323,000 in the 1970s, and 430,000 by the 1980s.

While industrial enterprises established in the immediate postwar period were developed without altering the urban fabric created in the interwar years, by 1960 this changed with the formation of new, massive industrial hubs in new areas surrounding the city. Territorial and industrial growth was solidified by the completion in 1959 of the Kaunas hydroelectric plant on the Nemunas River, helping to control flooding and generate inexpensive electrical power.

This period also saw the development of large, specialised, single-function city zones: student campuses, the growth of a complex of clinics and the Medical Institute, and a campus of professional schools in the Framones (Industrial) Prospektas zone. Plans for the reconstruction of the Old Town as a distinct urban functional zone were drafted in 1961, and in 1969 the Old Town was declared a republic-level historic urban monument. A further urban renewal plan was created for the Old Town in 1977.

The strict focus on industrialisation and construction efficiency produced monotony and standardisation in architecture and urban planning, eventually sparking debate about the importance of maintaining the character of local architecture. The 1970 general plan for Kaunas overseen by architect Petras Janušas and the detailed 1977 planning guidelines for the city centre by architect Algirdas Steponavičius et al sought to emphasise the uniqueness of the central portion of the city and impart the area with greater significance by establishing a pedestrian boulevard.
The city's interwar architecture began to be viewed as an important part of Kaunas' identity. Indeed, for local architects the interwar legacy became a source of inspiration. As they developed what is today Viėnybės Square (named for Julius Janonis in the Soviet period, fig. 452, 453), architects emphasised the spatial dialogue between three towers: the War Museum bell tower, the Soviet period, fig. 452, 453), architects emphasised the spatial dialogue between three towers: the War Museum bell tower, the Kaunas Polytechnic Institute, the successor to the Architecture Department of Vytautas Magnus University, retained several interwar architects and engineers as lecturers, including Aldoša Lukosaitaitė, Jokūbas P. Pernis, Anatolijus Rozentubins, and Pranas Merkinas. Renovated interwar Lithuanian modernists also participated in architectural processes in Kaunas, including architect Steponas Stulginskis, who returned to Lithuania in 1955 from exile in Siberia, and Vytautas Landsbergis-Zemkalnis, who repatriated to Lithuania from exile in Australia in 1959. Both continued their professional activities at different design institutes and ensured the transfer and continuity of interwar traditions which contributed to Lithuania's nickname as the 'Soviet West'.

Under Soviet rule, the physical state of interwar modernist buildings was not deliberately neglected, since the superlative quality of interwar architecture was put to pragmatic use. Kaunas' most important interwar buildings retained their authenticity. The Vytautas the Great Museum continued to perform its prewar function and, after enduring the war and the immediate postwar years, was renamed the State History Museum in 1956. The Kaunas Officers' Club became the Soviet Army Officers' Club, and the Bank of Lithuania, one of the most prominent landmark buildings of its time, continued to serve as a financial institution throughout the period until the present day. The Central Post Office also continued to serve its main function. While they may have lost some of their symbolically significant décor, these buildings essentially retained their principal function, albeit with some slight alterations, allowing them to retain a generally authentic physical appearance internally and externally. However, the unfinished Christ’s Resurrection Church suffered damage after it was adapted into a radio parts factory. The greatest transformation in terms of authenticity occurred in residential housing. Although there was little evident change to building exteriors, Soviet policies of nationalization of private property, denser tenancy (with more families moved into single-family or larger apartments), and the change in social makeup (deportees returning from Siberia were prevented from restoring their previous property rights) led to alterations of authentic interiors and communal spaces. Conversely, nationalization policies notwithstanding, some of the former owners of houses and apartments (or at least families with memories of the interwar period) continued to occupy their previous homes. Thus, even after the Soviet regime had nationalized real estate and immovable property, the architecture and the people residing within these buildings continued to act as silent symbols of a once independent country.

Although, in the early postwar years, the Soviets had condemned interwar Kaunas modernist architecture as bourgeois and formalistic, by the later Soviet period, local cultural activists had assumed considerably more decision-making power and succeeded as early as 1972 in securing official local landmark status for fifteen exceptionally significant interwar sites: the Vytautas the Great Museum, the Central Post Office, the Chamber of Commerce, Industry, and Crafts, the former Bank of Lithuania building, the former Bank of Agriculture, the Savings Bank, the Hall of Physical Education, the Research Laboratory, the Kaunas mosque, and the Šančiai Secondary School, as well as for residential buildings at Maironio g. 13, Vytauto pr. 30, Perkūno Aleja 12, and V. Mykolaičio-Putino g. 11. Such official recognition was testament to these buildings acquiring a cultural significance and value beyond their material function. It should be noted, however, that these acts of official recognition were associated with a rather narrow segment of the country's intellectual and professional architectural circles. An important breakthrough in the assessment and preservation of the interwar modernist architecture and interiors came with the establishment of the memorial real estate and immovable property, the architecture and the people residing within these buildings continued to act as silent symbols of a once independent country.
2.5. Contemporary Kaunas, 1990–2020

On 11 March 1990, Lithuania asserted its independence from the Soviet Union and proclaimed the restoration of a democratic political system and private property rights. But the period of change which followed was a particularly complicated time for both Kaunas and Lithuania as a whole. As early as 1991, with the rise of the Lithuanian national rebirth, many cultural treasures became the focus of gradual recovery. Previous names and titles were restored to streets, squares, and museums. Independence-era monuments were rebuilt. The Catholic Church regained control over the symbolic Christ’s Resurrection Church and immediately began its restoration. Museums were opened in the former homes of prominent citizens of interwar Kaunas, including the Liudas Truikiš and Marijona Rakauskaitė Memorial Home and Museum (E. Fryko Street 14); the Adelė and Petras Galaunė Memorial Home and Museum (Vydūno Alėja 2), honouring a prominent prewar museum director; and a memorial museum in the home of sculptor Juozas Zikaras (J. Zikaro Street 3). The sense of euphoria felt in the early 1990s became intertwined with the complex economic realities of life after the collapse of the Soviet Union’s industrial system. The process of restoring nationalized property to former owners led to a rise in tensions among city residents. As the economic crisis deepened, the population of Kaunas steadily declined, from 430,000 in 1991 to 360,000 in 2005. By 2018, Kaunas was home to 288,000 inhabitants.

In 2004, Lithuania became a member of both the European Union and NATO, events that provided a sense of stability and stimulated the first construction boom, which lasted until the global economic crisis of 2008. Kaunas began to see the appearance of new shopping centres and office buildings featuring a new commercial aesthetic, as well as industrial enterprises adapting to changed market conditions. Residential neighbourhoods were designed for development in different areas of Kaunas and the city’s universities began construction on new academic facilities. The new Žalgiris Arena on Nemunas Island opened in 2011, becoming a prominent architectural landmark representing 21st century Kaunas.

The construction of very large office facilities along Karaliaus Mindaugo Prospektas caused damage to numerous historically significant interwar architectural landmarks. The reconstruction of Vienybės Square, uniquely seen as an important and valued part of the city’s identity, is an important part of this experience, Kaunas can be undeniably appreciated as a world-renowned city for which modernism, and in particular a uniquely local interpretation of modernism, is an important part of its contemporary and future identity.

The phenomenon of interwar Kaunas architecture has also gradually found resonance in an international context. In 2015, the European Heritage Label was awarded to 1919–1939 Kaunas, testifying to the phenomenon of the city’s status as Lithuania’s provisional capital as a critical, if fleeting, period of optimism in early 20th century Europe. In 2015, the Kaunas municipal government launched a heritage management programme which has already financially supported the restoration and management of 46 interwar buildings.

In 2017, Kaunas won the title European Cultural Capital for 2022. A programme entitled ‘Modemism for the Future’ will feature prominently in cultural events scheduled for that year. The programme has encouraged the rapid growth and mobilisation of the local heritage management community, the development of various different new cultural and public engagement initiatives, and the emergence in the public sphere of a multitude of events and social media projects dedicated to modernism, representing a broad range of social groups and areas of interest. In light of this experience, Kaunas can be undeniably appreciated as a world-renowned city for which modernism, and in particular a uniquely local interpretation of modernism, is an important part of its contemporary and future identity.

The growth of contemporary Kaunas and the approaches taken in the construction of different buildings sparked numerous debates about the relationship between new architecture and the historic surroundings and about the ethical and aesthetic aspects of construction and the commercialisation of architecture. To this day, opinion remains divided concerning the utility of the Akropolis complex of disregarding the urban scale of Naujamiestis, and does little to truly take advantage of the river’s potential.

The interplay of nature and architecture may be restored to the list of architectural priorities in the future by such planned projects as Moikalo sala [Science Island, designed by the Spanish and Australian firm SMAR Architecture Studio] and the M. K. Čiurlionis Concert Hall [designed by the Lithuanian firm Paleko architektų studija]. Both designs were selected through international competitions.

Kaunas’ interwar urban and architectural experience is increasingly seen as an important and valued part of the city’s identity. Since the restoration of independence, several particularly significant interwar architectural landmarks have been the focus of meticulous restoration work, including the Bank of Lithuania, the Lithuanian Officers’ Club, and the Vytautas the Great Museum. The phenomenon of interwar Kaunas architecture has also gradually found resonance in an international context. In 2015, the European Heritage Label was awarded to 1919–1939 Kaunas, testifying to the phenomenon of the city’s status as Lithuania’s provisional capital as a critical, if fleeting, period of optimism in early 20th century Europe. In 2015, the Kaunas municipal government launched a heritage management programme which has already financially supported the restoration and management of 46 interwar buildings.
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3. JUSTIFICATION FOR INSCRIPTION
3.1a. Brief Synthesis

Modernist Kaunas is situated in central Lithuania, at the confluence of the Nemunas and the Neris rivers. The area within the nominated property was planned in the mid-19th century and developed in 1919–1939 when, after the declaration of an independent Republic of Lithuania in 1918, Kaunas served as the provisional capital of the state. The status of provisional capital was crucial for the city’s unprecedented growth and architectural development. In less than twenty years, under the auspices of the new national government and civic initiative, Kaunas was transformed into a modern city based on the assimilation of modern urban planning and architecture with pre-existing natural, urban, and other local conditions. Architecture, specifically in the form of a local inflection of the international language of modernism, played a particularly important role in that transformation. Kaunas Modernism, therefore, bears exceptional testimony to an authentically multifaceted modernism born out of local political and cultural exigencies and an evolutionary urban modernisation responding to pre-existing humanmade and natural features.

The nominated property comprises two areas: Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis. Naujamiestis (New Town), a generous grid planned in 1847, was attached to the eastern edge of the Old Town and extends eastwards along the valley of the Nemunas River. Naujamiestis was modernised and intensively developed in 1919–1939. Encircling Naujamiestis to the north and east is Žaliakalnis (Green Hill) – a distinctive natural plateau rising to an average of 35–40 metres. Žaliakalnis was developed as a garden city residential suburb in 1919–1939 according to a 1923 master plan of Kaunas, which enabled a seven-fold increase in area and accommodating a doubling of the city’s population to 155,000 over the same period.

The most significant attributes of the city’s resulting urban form and associated architecture are defined by the inherent optimism and civic initiative behind the creation of the new modern city as a provisional capital with inherited geographical and urban morphological distinctiveness. A rich architectural heritage of emerging modernism overlaid on the 19th century urban grid and a new garden suburb create a unique ensemble of two complimentary urban landscapes. The sensitive adaptation of the pre-existing 19th-century urban grid, implementation of a garden city residential suburb, the successful integration of the natural environment, and the assimilation of local and global interpretations of architectural modernism gave birth to Kaunas Modernism, that reflects an evolutionary rather than revolutionary process of response to modernisation in the early 20th century Europe.

Kaunas’ modern urban and architectural attributes bear exceptional testimony to the dynamic interpretation of the interwar architectural legacy that, in each new generation, has inspired new architecture. During the subsequent years of Soviet occupation (1945–1990), Kaunas’ unique interwar spirit endured through different forms of spatial resistance. The city was developed as an industrial hub with residential districts outside the limits of the former capital. The legacy of modernist interwar architecture was maintained in the construction of single-family residences and even in some direct copies of interwar buildings. Kaunas interwar modernism inspired generations of Soviet Lithuanian architects and their colleagues in the Lithuanian diaspora in the United States, Canada, Australia, Great Britain, and South America throughout the 20th century. After the restoration of Lithuania’s independence in 1990, the legacy of Kaunas Modernism caused it to become the subject of increasing recognition publicly and professionally, evidenced by growth in the number of tours, articles, books, exhibitions, and internet websites. In 2015, the European Commission awarded the European Heritage Label to ‘Kaunas of 1919–1939’ and that same year Kaunas received the status of UNESCO City of Design. In 2017, Kaunas was inscribed on the UNESCO State Parties’ Tentative List, and in 2022 Kaunas will be the European Capital of Culture, with the city’s modernist architecture expected to play an important role as part of the ‘Modernism for the Future’ programme. The heritage of modernism has the core attribute of the city’s identity nationally and internationally.

3.1b. World Heritage criteria under which the property is proposed

Modernist Kaunas is an outstanding example of the rapid transformation of an existing urban environment into a modern national capital in the early 20th century. The site is proposed for inscription under the following criteria:

Criterion (i): to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning and landscape design.

Kaunas Modernism of 1919–1939, expands the concept of Modernism beyond the International Style by revealing a more diverse, complex fabric of numerous, often divergent, cultural, social, political, and artistic trends. Kaunas Modernism is an exceptional example of rethinking architecture as a process of social, political, and cultural modernisation in the 20th century. Kaunas Modernism provides arguments for the decentralisation of modernism not only in the geographical sense, but also in terms of stylistic expression. Outstanding value of the Kaunas cityscape is its architectural diversity, represented through the plurality of modern architectural ideas, from modernised Neo-Classicism to National Modernism, which co-existed throughout the world in the first half of the 20th century. By integrating and locally interpreting the principles of the Modern Movement, Kaunas Modernism displays a bold plurality of modern architectural expression in response to local needs and conditions.

Kaunas Modernism presents well-preserved 1500 buildings, groups of buildings and sites constructed in 1919–1939 in the nominated area. The diversity of Kaunas’ urban fabric calls into question the creation of a modern society with the doctrine of exclusively avant-garde modernism. Unlike most new cities and other well-known modernist sites established in the early 20th century, Kaunas was created by local architects. This shows that locally conceived ideas were just as important for the perception and representation of the phenomenon of modern architecture as the ideas promoted by renowned schools of architecture and the work of celebrated international architects. Kaunas experienced the intense and varied influence of styles prevailing in modernist architecture, manifesting in the solutions developed by Lithuanian designers who obtained their professional training in various different countries. This is evidenced by the spread of modernist influences and cultural exchanges which shaped the diversity of Kaunas Modernism in the first half of the 20th century.

The creation of a qualitatively new urban environment using the language of architectural modernism met the city’s aspirations to distance itself from the old imperial legacy and build an optimistic future. At the same time, the creation of the national capital produced favourable conditions for embracing the political, social, and cultural modernisation of urban life in the 20th century. Kaunas was transformed from a provincial town into the capital of a newly independent country, which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history.

Criterion (ii): to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape, which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history.

Modernist Kaunas is an outstanding example of a historic city subject to rapid urbanisation and modernisation, encapsulated by diverse expressions of the values and aspirations associated with optimistic belief in an independent future amid the turbulence of the early 20th century, when national borders were changing fast. The creation of a modern capital city of an emerging nation state is an outstanding testament to people’s faith in the future and their ability to be creative under difficult political and economic conditions. The gradual and sustainable modernisation of Kaunas, carried out through civic initiatives with respect to the urban context and natural environment, produced an outstanding urban landscape and modern architectural language serving the needs of both local and national capital functions, structures, and building typologies that reflected the modernisation of urban life in the 20th century.

The architectural and urban transformation of Kaunas demonstrates a flash of optimism amid the turbulence of the early 20th century, which represents an unprecedented growth of nation states and national capitals. These new countries shared an optimistic vision of a more promising future – one based on hopes of self-determination, democracy, social equality, physical and social mobility, intellectual and technological progress, and the comforts promised by modern urbanisation. Within this context, Kaunas represents the case of the provisional capital of the newly formed Lithuanian state and is an exceptional testament to the historical and urban processes of the early 20th century.

Modernist Kaunas is an important place where it is possible to tell the story of the political transformations of the first half of the 20th century during which complicated political circumstances produced a cultural breakthrough which gave birth to a modern urban landscape. The status of provisional capital was crucial aspect in the extraordinary speed and scale of transformation in Kaunas. Over twenty years, the city experienced rapid territorial and demographic change. The city’s area increased seven-fold and twelve thousand construction permits were issued. Markedly tangible progress was achieved with relatively meagre resources. The scale of the transformation is evident in the surviving authentic, clearly identifiable architectural setting – a vital piece of the city’s character. In Kaunas, the status of provisional capital backdrop has significant meaning because, the construction boom began not with official buildings, but with civic initiatives in the creation of residential housing and infrastructure. Thus, the processes of social mobility, political, but also as a civic initiative. Such historical circumstances essentially determined the local architectural and urban character.
Modernist Kaunas reflects political and civic visions for building a modern country and society, which were implemented through structural reforms in the political, social, economic, urban, and architectural realms. The city’s new urban layer, created between 1919 and 1939, established Kaunas as one of the most outstanding examples of the process of creating a modern capital with appropriating its natural and urban heritage. Kaunas’ urban and architectural transformation is an example of a city developing through adaptation to the condition of its landscape in an effort to harmonize the natural and urban surroundings. An exceptional cityscape spatial structure emerged on the terraces of the Nemunas and Neris slopes, revealing a multifaceted panorama with its functional and visual connections and volumetric components of modernism and garden city concept, which prevailed throughout the property.

3.1.c. Statement of integrity

Modernist Kaunas consists of Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis, two adjacent districts that have been preserved in adequate size in almost unchanged historical form and design. The significant architectural structures and the original urban layout, including the characteristic sloping natural and manmade terrain, public spaces and historic parks, have been retained in their entirety. Of 6000 surviving buildings constructed in Kaunas in 1919–1939, the greatest concentration of significant modernist structures is located in Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis with 1500 buildings of representative administrative, public, industrial, and residential functions testifying to the speed and diversity of development undertaken in the spirit of modernity. 220 structures and urban areas, constructed in the period of 1919–1939 within the Nominated Property, are listed on the National Register of Cultural Heritage. The buffer zone contains structures and groups of buildings dating back to the interwar period which strengthen the character of the nominated property.

Kaunas lost its status as Lithuania’s provisional capital in October 1939, and the sudden change in the city’s political status helped to preserve the physical attributes of the 1920s and 1930s. The nominated property was little affected during the Second World War. Under the Soviet rule, which lasted from 1944–1990, the physical state of interwar modernist buildings was not deliberately neglected, since the superior quality of the architecture was put to pragmatic use. Intermittent development of the area continued with the construction of many buildings that, although new, were compatible with interwar period of development by being restrained in volume and form. During the period of 1945–1965, development of the area continued the interwar modernist architectural tradition.

Naujamiestis followed a path of moderate growth, broadly adhering to development principals established in the interwar period. An illustrative example was the development from 1950 to 1955 of a residential complex for the Providence factory. The district’s regular development continued to adhere to principles shaped in the interwar years. Construction during this era did not alter the established street grid and squares, but it did see the addition of large modernist buildings. Vienybių aikštė (Unity Square) underwent significant transformation in 1965 to accommodate the construction of two voluminous design institutes that echoed architecture of interwar modernism. Although, in the early post-war years, the Soviets had condemned interwar Kaunas modernist architecture as bourgeois and formalistic, by the later Soviet period, local cultural activists had assumed considerably more decision-making power and succeeded as early as 1972 in securing official local landmark status for fifteen Kaunas Modernism buildings. Such official recognition was testament to these buildings acquiring a cultural significance and value beyond their material function. The detailed 1977 planning guidelines for the city centre by architect Aloyzas Steponavičius sought to emphasise the uniqueness of the Central Naujamiestis and impart the area with greater significance by establishing a pedestrian boulevard along Laisves Aleja in 1982. The Residential Naujamiestis area, shaped during the periods between 1923 and 1939, has remained relatively unchanged, retaining its integrity. Žaliakalnis area, developed between 1920 and 1940, retained its garden-type urban structure intact, though changes during the Soviet period have resulted in the densification and several new small streets were laid out around 1958. The pattern of urban structure and architecture established up to 1940 continued to prevail until around 1960, with the construction of many buildings that, although new, were compatible with interwar period of development by being restrained in volume and form. This appropriation and use of composition and even materials in the Soviet era is testament to the resilience of local construction traditions in Kaunas architecture. The Soviet period witnessed some construction of new buildings, including four- and five-storey apartment buildings. However, despite the new construction, the overall urban planning and low-rise type of development in the area retained its integrity.

The growth of contemporary Kaunas and developmental pressures resulted in several large structures. Extensive reconstruction work was conducted in the Industrial Naujamiestis area in 2007, converting industrial buildings into the large Akropolis shopping centre. The industrial area of Naujamiestis retained its essential character of stylistic forms, materials, and functions – a feature which is still evident in the city today. Most of the key public buildings have survived unchanged and their adaptation to new technological demands has nevertheless allowed for the preservation of their character and structure (The Bank of Lithuania, The Central Post Office, The Vytautas the Great National Museum, The Lithuanian Officers Club).

The Žaliakalnis area with Ažuolynas Park, designed in 1923 and gradually developed up to 1939, represents an outstanding example of the integration of urban and natural landscapes and the adoption of the contemporaneous garden city concept to local conditions. Although the plan was only partially implemented, the elements that were realised and which have survived to this day reflect local interpretation of the most progressive garden city urban planning concepts of the time, adjusted with an intelligent approach to suit pre-existing natural, topographical and humanmade features. The success of this design can be read in its survival throughout the Soviet era, when comparatively few changes were made and those that occurred, were based on the precedents of interwar architectural modernism and respected the formal and aesthetic continuity. This surviving section of Žaliakalnis is therefore a significant element of the original urban planning concept.

Panoramas, open spaces, topography, and urban planning elements such as large blocks of the 19th century urban grid filled with modernist architecture, the garden city district planned in 1923, and elements of Soviet-era architecture integrated into the historic urban structure, represent the development of the modern cityscape. Many buildings, open spaces and streetscapes also form part of a network of important points of orientation in the city, with the original views and routes. The strong sense of place is created not only by building façades and spaces, but also by surviving original small environmental features, original materials and building details, such as interiors and custom-designed wooden doors and metalwork including gates and balconies, a large proportion of which have remained intact.

Another feature of Kaunas Modernism that has retained its authenticity is its historical, cultural and symbolic significance (intangible heritage). Exterior and interior details, and physical structures such as monuments and memorials, which bore symbolic witness to the independent Lithuanian state, were destroyed during the Soviet period. After the restoration of Lithuania’s independence in 1990, many elements of symbolic significance were restored (including the interiors of the Officers’ Club and the Kaunas Central Post Office); the restoration work was completed on the Rasos Cemetery, and the Freedom Statue ([B 454]), a monument to Vytautas the Great, and the entire ensemble of the War Museum garden. This restoration was done after Lithuania became independent and so possesses the same spirit as that which gave rise to the original process which continues to this day. The addition of large modernist buildings added to the character of today’s Kaunas. The continued restoration and in many cases original function of these authentic elements is their public appreciation, resulting in their continued restoration and in many cases original function throughout the second half of the 20th century and to this day, when they are now afforded local or national protection.

3.1.d. Statement of authenticity

Because the historically evolved areas of Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis have changed relatively little, the Modernist Kaunas is truly a time capsule of the 1919–1939 period. The location and setting, form and design, material and substance as well as use and function of the Nominated Property all represent a historic modernist city of the interwar period that evolved harmoniously, integrating natural and historic settings, producing a diverse legacy of architectural modernism. The area of Naujamiestis is home to the largest concentration of landmark modernist buildings that were part of the formation of a new administrative, cultural, and social core of the Lithuanian state in 1919–1939. Modernist residential areas of Naujamiestis constitute a superior architectural background for the landmark buildings, creating a harmonious cityscape. There was an evident continuity of prewar modernist structures such as monuments and memorials, which bore symbolic witness to the independent Lithuanian state, were destroyed during the Soviet period. After the restoration of Lithuania’s independence in 1990, many elements of symbolic significance were restored (including the interiors of the Officers’ Club and the Kaunas Central Post Office); the restoration work was completed on the Rasos Cemetery, and the Freedom Statue ([B 454]), a monument to Vytautas the Great, and the entire ensemble of the War Museum garden. This restoration was done after Lithuania became independent and so possesses the same spirit as that which gave rise to the original process which continues to this day. The addition of large modernist buildings added to the character of today’s Kaunas. The continued restoration and in many cases original function of these authentic elements is their public appreciation, resulting in their continued restoration and in many cases original function throughout the second half of the 20th century and to this day, when they are now afforded local or national protection.
Today, the nominated area (particularly Naujamiestis) continues to see the highest concentration of active social, cultural, and economic activity, as well as the evolution of new traditions and initiatives inspired by the legacy of Kaunas Modernism. Over three decades, from 1990 to 2020, a new generation of urban dwellers has emerged in Kaunas, inspired in large part by the symbolic buildings and spaces of interwar Kaunas. Many continue to identify themselves with these tangible and intangible attributes, which bear witness to the former national capital's cultural and intellectual dynamism and optimism.

3.1. Protection and management system

The Nominated Property covers a central part of Kaunas – a group of areas that are legally protected on the national and local level under the Law on the Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage, the Law on Protected Areas, the Law on Spatial Planning, the Law on Construction, the Law on Landscaping, and the Law on Environmental Protection. The property consists of seven protected zones: Naujamiestis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of Cultural Heritage No 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of Cultural Heritage No 22148); Žaliakalnis-i, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of Cultural Heritage No 32880); Kaunas Ažuolynas Park Complex (National Register of Cultural Heritage No 44581); Kaunas Ažuolynas Sports Complex (National Register of Cultural Heritage No 31618); the Research Laboratory Complex (National Register of Cultural Heritage No. 44581); the Kaunas Ąžuolynas Sports Complex (National Register of Cultural Heritage No. 44581); and the Kaunas Ąžuolynas Sports Complex (National Register of Cultural Heritage No. 44581).

The management of the Nominated Property is based on the existing management system. An inter-institutional Executive Committee is set up to ensure the good management and to address strategic issues related to management of the Nominated Property on the State level. The Site Manager is appointed, and the Site Management Unit is set up for the management and coordination of the conservation and development of the Nominated Property at the local (municipal) level. The Advisory Board is established to consult and provide guidance towards the management of the Nominated Property both to the Executive Committee and the Site Management Unit. To achieve the balance between the protection of OUV and the pursuit of sustainable development goals, the participation of partners, stakeholders, and local communities in managing the property is foreseen. The systematic assessment and effective monitoring through continuity in data collection of the agreed indicators is planned.

3.2. Comparative Analysis

The cultural legacy of Modernism is a widely acknowledged phenomenon, which is revealed through abundant testimonies of human civilization. However, given the fact that modernist urban development in the 20th century went on at an unprecedented pace, and created a huge architectural legacy, it is clear that particular attention should be paid to unique urban landscapes which have witnessed a fundamental transformation in urban life in the 20th century. Since the launching of the Global Strategy for a credible, representative and balanced World Heritage list (1994) new categories for World Heritage sites have been promoted. To fill the gaps of cultural heritage identified in 2004, 20th-century properties were inscribed, but this latter category remains under-represented.

Of 46 properties inscribed as part of the 20th-century heritage on the UNESCO World Heritage List in 2020, 17 properties are listed for their outstanding contributions to the development of modern urban areas and cities. New modern capital cities are represented by Brasilia (1987), the White City of Tel-Aviv – the Modern Movement (2003), Rabat, Modern Capital and Historic City: a Shared Heritage (2012), and Asmara, a Modernist African City (2017). The dynamic construction and modernisation of European capital cities in the interwar period is not represented in this context. Modernist Kaunas demonstrates an outstanding example of a new European provisional capital city, which has witnessed an optimistic and fundamental transformation of urban life in the 20th century.

While the number of 20th-century sites on the WH list has increased, it should be noted that properties, already inscribed on the List, illustrate classical icons of Modern Movement and International Modernism: Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar and Dessau (Germany, 1996, i, iv, vi); V-Tower House in Alfeld (Germany, 2011, i, vii); Van Nelle Factory in Rotterdam (1997, i, iv, vi); the Tugendhat Villa in Brno (Czech Republic, 2019, i, iii, vi); Berlin Modernism Housing Estates (Germany, 2008, ii, iv, vi); Centennial Hall in Wroclaw (Poland, 2008, i, ii, vi); Tugendhat House in Alfeld (Germany, 2011, i, ii, vi); Van Nelle Factory in Rotterdam (2005, i, iv); and works by recognized masters of the Modern Movements (including Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Walter Gropius, Frank Lloyd Wright, and Le Corbusier). However, the multifaceted heritage of modernist architecture is not sufficiently represented. A few examples only the diversity of modernism, including Victorian Gothic and Art Deco Ensembles in Mumbai (India, 2018, i, iv); Asmara, a Modernist African City (Eritrea, 2017, i, iv); and Paris Modern (France, 2013, i, iv, vi) are currently inscribed on the WH list. Modernist Kaunas fills the gap by representing plurality of modernism that characterizes the global early 20th century.
Lithuania emerged to face the challenges of building a new country in a period framed by wars – two world conflicts of foreign origin (WWI and WWII), and two waged for its own national survival (the Wars of Independence from 1919 to 1920 and the anti-Soviet armed resistance from 1944 to 1945). One of these challenges was to leave the traditions and habits which had emerged with urban life, which became a fundamental aspect for the young Lithuanian state. At the start of the republic in the 1920s, the absolute majority of the population lived in the country’s provinces in villages and on farmsteads (with only 17.7 percent living in cities in 1923, and growing to 23 percent in 1939), while most of the small Lithuanian towns were shetels, home to the local Jewish population and communities of Poles, Russians or Germans. Because the urban network of cities and towns in Lithuania was already formed in the 16th and 17th centuries, there was no need to build new towns; rather modernising the existing ones. The number of medium sized towns with a population of 5,000 to 10,000 increased from 9 in 1923 to 19 in 1939. After the declaration of independence of Lithuania in 1918, Vilnius, the largest city within Lithuania’s historical borders, was annexed by Poland following a military campaign in 1920. The country’s sole seaport, Memel, severed from Germany after World War I, aspired to the status of a free city, and only later became Klaipėda, Lithuania’s gateway to the Baltic sea, after a valiant Lithuanian military escapade in 1923. Following the cession of German at heart, however, and was unsuited to serve as a symbol of Lithuanian urbanisation. Rapidly modernising Šiauliai in the northwestern part of Lithuania (31,500 residents in 1939), could not equal the tempo of the provisional capital. In intervall Lithuania, Kaunas became the fastest growing and largest city, which stood out in the context of Lithuanian urbanisation.

In 1932 ten cities in Lithuania received the status of the first class. Kaunas significantly surpassed the others in terms of size, population (155,000 in 1939), scale of new construction (12,000 construction permits in 1918–1940) and concentration of modern developments. In Kaunas, the first master plan of the city was prepared (1923), the construction of sewerage (1924) and water supply (1927) system was started, modernisation of public transport and paving of streets was introduced; and zones of brick con

3.2.3. The Modernist Kaunas in the Regional Context

The decades from the early 20th century until the beginning of World War II are a period of crucial importance for the East Central Europe region that emerged as a number of post-imperial nation states following the Treaty of Versailles and acquired a title of New Europe in the interwar period (1918–1939). Despite Europe’s tense political situations and economic difficulties, an ambitious modernisation plans were undertaken in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (renamed Kingdom of Yugoslavia in 1929), Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania during the interwar period. During that period, the building of a modern Central and Eastern Europe was undertaken for the first time, carving a space for the region among the most developed countries which made up civilizational centre of the world.

The primary cities of the new states that received the status of capitals faced not only infrastructural challenges. New states had to prove their legitimacy, including the construction of representative government buildings, national libraries; and attract, as well as solutions to social problems that persisted in the region. In accordance with European models, planning the capital city underlined technological modernity, aesthetic dimensions, urban intimacy, and historical and organic continuity rather than regularity and ready-made patterns. The architectural styles show how European architectural historicism changed into a national style at the turn of the century. The shaping of the East Central European metropolises can be understood as a process in which architecture followed ideology, a process that to a striking degree linked urban planning to far-reaching premises of an improved human condition and a prosperous national future. Modernisation and Europeanisation meant the creation of an urban citizenry and civic society with outwardly recognisable expressions of urban culture. In 1919–1939 Kaunas served as a provisional capital of Lithuania. Here, Kaunas was in line with similar cities that have become (and remained) capitals of their respective countries. In this regard, Kaunas should be compared to the Central and Eastern European cities Riga, Tallinn, Helsinki and Warsaw, that developed rapidly as capital cities in the interwar period [and not earlier], and other primary cities of the region Brno, Krakow, Ljubljana and Zagreb, that have a rich legacy of modernist architecture built on historic urban layers. The primary cities of the new states that received the status of capitals faced not only infrastructural challenges. New states had to prove their legitimacy, including the construction of representative government buildings, national libraries; and attract, as well as solutions to social problems that persisted in the region. In accordance with European models, planning the capital city underlined technological modernity, aesthetic dimensions, urban intimacy, and historical and organic continuity rather than regularity and ready-made patterns. The architectural styles show how European architectural historicism changed into a national style at the turn of the century. The shaping of the East Central European metropolises can be understood as a process in which architecture followed ideology, a process that to a striking degree linked urban planning to far-reaching premises of an improved human condition and a prosperous national future. Modernisation and Europeanisation meant the creation of an urban citizenry and civic society with outwardly recognisable expressions of urban culture. In 1919–1939 Kaunas served as a provisional capital of Lithuania. Here, Kaunas was in line with similar cities that have become (and remained) capitals of their respective countries. In this regard, Kaunas should be compared to the Central and Eastern European cities Riga, Tallinn, Helsinki and Warsaw, that developed rapidly as capital cities in the interwar period [and not earlier], and other primary cities of the region Brno, Krakow, Ljubljana and Zagreb, that have a rich legacy of modernist architecture built on historic urban layers.

Conclusion

The historic importance of Kaunas as de facto capital (1919–1939) of the First Republic of Lithuania (1918–1940) is evident not only in its urban, architectural, environmental legacy but also in historical, political, and social intangible heritage associated with the optimistic nation building. At the national level. Kaunas is an outstanding example of modern urbanisation both in terms of quality and quantity. At the national level. Kaunas has become an example for other Lithuanian cities to modernise.

Current Capitals

The Baltic States

Three independent Baltic republics – Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania – emerged on the Baltic Sea Northwest coast after the collapse of Russian Empire in 1918. Rather similar in size and modern aspirations, they were often called the Baltic Sisters in the interwar period. The Baltic States faced similar tasks and some of these were solved in a similar manner, others quite different. Tallinn, Riga and Kaunas were all former provincial towns and lacked the infrastructure required of capital cities. It was not until the 1930s that large-scale government buildings were built. In the first decade of independence, the important manifestations of modernisation in architecture were of a social and technical nature, and assumed a traditional form, and by the 1930s slowly melded into the modernist architecture. In the Baltic States, there was a tendency for Luxuriant and highly decorative modernism, usually associated with Art Deco. As noted by prof. Mart Kalm, the less decorative version of modernism is usually referred to as functionalism. Functionalism’s emphasised modernity satisfied many important aims for the young Baltic States. The innovative new language of form helped to emphasise the differences between them and the burden of Baltic German and Russian history, and to present themselves as modern European nations. The joint Baltic Pavilion for the 1937 World Fair in Paris, designed by the Estonian architect Alexander Nümburg, who won an architectural competition, was an especially good opportunity to prove the latter. The Baltic States also experienced coups d’état and authoritarian regimes in the interwar period. Led by Antanas Smėtona, Lithuania became authoritarian in 1926, while in Estonia and Latvia, the coups that brought Konstantin Päts and Kārlis Ulmanis to power took place in 1934. Even though in the European context these regimes were quite mild in the limitations they imposed on democracy, the task of architecture changed especially in Estonia and Latvia, where it needed to demonstrate the might of the nation, and neoclassicism with a blend of national motifs was perfectly suited to this.

The capital modernism created and asserted in Kaunas was outstanding solution articulated in the new Baltic republics. Like the others, it responded to local needs and specific conditions. The material and historical circumstances prevailing in Tallinn and Riga dictated different responses to contemporary challenges; though in each instance, modern architecture played a decisive role in configuring the respective nation’s self-image and promoting its identity internationally.

Riga (Latvia)

Of the three capitals, Riga was the only true metropolis in this Baltic region. Founded in 1209, Riga’s centuries as a principal Hansa trading centre and its continuing role through the nineteenth century as a major Russian imperial port allowed for the growth of a powerful and wealthy middle class made up of successful merchants and practitioners of the liberal professions. To fulfill the needs of the burgeoning metropolis, the city councillors opened up major tracts for residential development during the first decade of the twentieth century. The result of this development was the most extensive Jugendstil quarter (800 buildings), subsequently listed as the UNESCO World heritage site (Historic Centre of Riga, 1997, i, iv). The economic and social optimism that Jugendstil represented, especially in the stylish apartment buildings, came to an abrupt end with the start of World War I. In the interwar period Riga continued to grow as a capital of the independent Latvia from 180,000 residents in 1920 to ca. 370,000 in 1940. In 1923, the Office for New Development of Riga was founded, which shows high ambition of building a modern metropolis. The academic approach of local urban planner Arnolda Laizere, a professor at Latvian University, resulted in the project for development of Riga for the next fifty years foreseeing the population of 1.5 million, and the master plan drafted in 1924. Riga’s planners favoured the garden city model. However, Laizere believed that the city must develop as a single organism and developed Riga extensively, creating new local centres, broad highways, and a new city centre on the opposite bank of Daugava River. This large-scale project was rather different from the cozy plan of small Kaunas, but it similarly lacked economic and government support, and therefore was revised in the 1930s. In the authoritarian period the most ambitious urban planning developments affected the historic centre Riga.

In the new private and public buildings Riga’s modernist architects often employed decorative motives borrowed from the local Jugendstil, from Viennese Secessionism and Expressionism, or from a characteristic Latvian blend of Art Deco and functionalism. However, modernism did not make a substantial layer of administrative, cultural and residential architecture in the central part of the city as was seen in much smaller Kaunas.

Tallinn (Estonia)

Tallinn, first mentioned in 1219, became a capital of the newly created Estonia in February 1918. In 1917 the population was almost 160,000. The population decreased by about a third due to the WW I and the events concerning with it. There were 145,000 inhabitants in Tallinn in 1939. Rapid expansion, however, was not connected to the urban planning. Differently from Kaunas, which had a strong master plan, Tallinn, which had an urban plan competition in 1912, resulting in an ambitious Finnish architect Eiel Saarinen’s plan for Greater Tallinn, did not develop the similar one during interwar period, and therefore developed without
Helsinki (Finland)

The transformation of Helsinki, a former provincial capital city, a large port and a military fortress of Russian Empire into the Finnish capital city unfolded rather peacefully. From the proclamation of independence in 1917 until the end of the 1930s, Helsinki developed the image of a European capital in which the idea of national identity corresponded with the ideas of statehood. Helsinki was mainly built in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The city’s current historical centre and imperial legacy without iconoclasticism witnessed in the Balkans or in Poland, and adapted it to the use of the Finnish capital with the central Senate Square and its surroundings built in the 19th century Neo-Classical architecture. Helsinki contained the Government Palace, the main building of the University of Helsinki and the National Library of Finland. A statue of the tar Alexander II (1844) still stands in the middle of the Senate Square. In contrast to modern, green and cosmopolitan Helsinki, the large-scale centre of Helsinki retains the Neo-Classical grandeur.

The number of residents in Helsinki grew from 152,000 in 1920 to 252,000 in 1940. The imposing master plan for greater Helsinki was already drafted in 1915 by Eiel Saarinen, but this utopian project never left the drafting table. The expectations for the capital of an independent state were high, and in 1918 the Saarinen’s plan was redesigned together with city architect Bertel Jung presenting monumental regular blocks along the Royal Avenue, whereas Olavo Kaila designed a futuristic plan in 1927.

In contrast to Kaunas, where the national style was created based on the ethnic legacy, in Helsinki, from the 1920s on, Nordic classicism became one of the widely admired representations of modern urbanity. Finland is known worldwide for its regional approach to international modernism and the architectural heritage of Alvar Aalto (considered for the UNESCO World Heritage List). However, despite the singular modernist masterpieces and landmark buildings, the city of Helsinki does not make an integral collection of urban plan and modern buildings purposely constructed for the administration of the new capital and has very different attributes in comparison to Kaunas.

Warsaw (Poland)

Warsaw’s urban extension quadrupled between 1916 and 1939, which exceeds the developments of any other Central European city of this size. While the populations of Prague, Berlin, or Budapest grew only slightly, the number of inhabitants almost doubled in Warsaw as a capital of the independent Poland from some 700,000 after the Russian retreat in 1915 to around 1,300,000 and 1,900,000 within the metropolitan area in 1939. The scale of urban transformation of Warsaw required different responses when compared to Kaunas, and resulted in the use of state-of-the-art planning instruments like zoning and green belts for tackling basic challenges like the largely unorganized urban sprawl. It also included innovative solutions like the Supernebelnick superdistricts, self-contained residential districts intended to help decentralize administration, commercial activity, and traffic. The grandest of tourist monuments, the colossal Orthodox Cathedral (1911), was demolished by the Polish government in the 1920s as a national act of post-imperial liberation. Warsaw substantially improved mass transit service, street paving, telephones, fire protection, sanitation, hospitals, other public health facilities and welfare. The city also contributed to cultural development by extending public schooling and libraries, as well as subsidizing theatres, opening a National Museum and setting up a zoo. With all this investment and development, Warsaw became a central position in Polish life, as well as Kaunas did in Lithuania.

In contrast to evolutionary modernisation of Kaunas, modernist urban planners of Warsaw produced a number of conceptual projects, of which Warszawa Funkcjonálná (Functional Warsaw), written by prominent Polish modernist architects Jan Chmielowski and Szymon Syrýns in 1934, is known best. Warszawa Funkcjonálná was a concept of the rational development of the urban region from natural landscape features to a unique location at the intersection of transcontinental routes. It is clearly a different approach than in Kaunas to overcome the process of catching up with the West and reversing the situation with a radical vision.

Warsaw was severely damaged during the WWII. Although the beautiful pre-war residential suburbs of Zoliborz and Saska Kepa have survived, the central part of the city does not any more present the integrity of the interwar modernist capital city. Although Kaunas and Warsaw share the label and experience of modern capitals combining urban form and architecture, further comparisons are less discernible. Warsaw’s scale and singular vision based on a strong adherence to the ideas of modernism emanating from Western Europe, and specifically Warszawa Funkcjonálná project, bear no comparison to Kaunas. The radical modernist urbanism of Warsaw inspired and enabled different urban and architectural responses, unlike in Kaunas where a city size, economic considerations and the status of provisional capital constrained the planners and architects. The loss of integrity of Warsaw’s remarkable modernist foundations therefore strengthens the outstanding universal value of Kaunas’ similar experiences, which share the same level of authenticity yet have retained their integrity.

Regional Capital

Brno (Czech Republic)

Around 1900 Brno, which until 1918 consisted in administrative terms only of the central city area, had a predominantly German-speaking population. In 1919, after World War I, two neighbouring towns, Královo Pole and Husovice, and 21 other municipalities were annexed to create a Greater Brno, a second largest city of Czechoslovakia. This was done to dilute the German-speaking majority of close to 55,000 by the addition of the Slavic communities of the city’s neighbouring. Greater Brno was almost seven times larger, with a population of about 222,000 – before that Brno had about 150,000 inhabitants. Since 1921 Brno became the capital of the Land of Moravia before that it was the capital of the Moravian State. Seven years later, Brno became the capital of the Land of Moravia-Silesia. Brno is best known for its singular architectural marvels. Mies van der Rohe’s Villa Tugendhat of 1930, a UNESCO listed property (Tugendhat villa in Brno, Czechia, 2001, ii), but beyond Tugendhat, Brno is home to numerous modernist buildings, many by local architects, all dating from the period of frenetic growth between the two world wars. When the city’s take on clean, functionalist design, touched nearly every aspect of life here. In this regard, Brno, an economically prosperous regional capital and a functionalist city with a favour of International Style and radical modernism, demonstrates a distinct contrast to Kaunas. Brno’s singular vision based on a strong adherence to the ideas of functionalism bear no comparison to Kaunas with its greater architectural and functional diversity, the aspirations of creating national modernism, and constructing national landmarks.

Primary Cities

Kraków (Poland)

During the 19th century, the urban development of a historic city of Kraków was week and limited. Austrian authorities decided to turn the city into a military fortress in 1850, as Russian authorities turned Kaunas into military fortress in 1879. Due to its military function, the heavily fortified city of Kraków occupied only a very small area of about 5.77 square kilometres until 1910 and had almost 100,000 citizens, and was for many years the most densely populated city in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Before the outbreak of the WWII Kraków saw the beginning of its urban transformation – a plan of Greater Kraków, based on a garden city concept (master plan competition, 1910). However, in the 1920s the full completion of the vision, which was influenced by the garden city movement, was in many ways prevented by the new economic conditions. As a combination of an evolutionary planning process and modern architecture reflecting local conditions and constraints, Kraków’s comparisons with Kaunas are noteworthy.

As a second largest city in Poland, Kraków was supposed to contain new metropolitan buildings and functions: a National Museum, a Monument to Freedom, and a National Pantheon in the Renaissance Wawel Castle courtyard. Based on its rich history as a royal capital [Historic Centre of Kraków is a UNESCO World Heritage site (1978, ii)], Kraków’s new architecture was closely connected to historicist tradition. Until 1939 the population of Kraków grew steadily reaching 257,000 just before the outbreak of WWII. City expansion produced strong pressure for new housing architecture. As a result, pre WWII concepts of the garden city filled with villas were realized only at a small scale in few garden districts. The majority of the city’s housing architecture was developed according to the urban pattern of regular blocks filled with tenement housing. As in Kaunas, just before the WWII Kraków’s architecture faced rapid development marked by the new economic conditions, and was already dominated by a younger generation of designers, many of them from Jewish families and society; which at that time represented almost 25 percent of the city’s population.
The garden city development ideas, assimilation of the international and the traditional/national in both planning and architecture are features of Kaunas that are characteristic to the interwar period and manifest through historic features, natural landscapes, and nationalistic agendas in a relatively small temporal window through the 1920s and 1930s. The principal distinction between Kaunas and Kraków resides in their respective political contexts, as Kraków demonstrates many similar characteristics, except for the capital city status, political dimension and the predominant layer of modernist architecture in the city centre.

Lviv (Ukraine)

Modern Lviv (known in history also as Lwów, Lwów, Lemberg) is a city in contemporary Ukraine. The Historic Centre of Lviv was inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage list in 1998 as an outstanding example of the fusion of the architectural and artistic traditions of eastern Europe with those of Italy and Germany (ii, iv, v). During the interwar period, Lviv belonged to the Republic of Poland, and was the third most populous city (with 293,400 residents in 1921 and 340,000 in 1939), a seat of the Lwów Voivodeship [region], and an important centre of new architecture in the region. The planning development of Lviv had its roots in Austrian period. Garden city concept as a Greater Lviv master plan was proposed by Ignacy Drexler in 1920, who authored a book on garden cities in 1912. Many modern works fit harmoniously into the existing structure of the city and architecture avoided the radicalism of avant-garde or totalitarian ideas of holistically rebuilding or destroying what was already there. New forms and technologies were used in a way which would enable architectural modernity, but also avoid being directed against tradition of the city.

To understand the distinction between Kaunas and Lviv resides in their respective national territories during the interwar period. Kaunas, for instance, is a new capital city for the newly independent Lithuania, created from scratch as a modernist monument being constructed in neighbouring nations. Kaunas was designated new capital of their respective newly defined nation states following the collapse of the old order after the First World War. For Turkey, Ankara’s rise was caused by the collapse of the Ottoman Empire at the end of World War I and the decision by Mustafa Kemal (Ataturk) to relocate the capital from Istanbul to Ankara during the War of Independence (1919–1923). When the Turkish Republic was formally established in 1923, the formerly small town of Ankara located more centrally in the country especially compared with Istanbul became the capital of the new Republic. As with Kaunas, not only was the new capital city appended to a historic town, the principles of the new state were founded on the historic precedents of nationalism and a shared sense of cultural identity, as well as the modern principles of the enlightenment, including democracy and rationality. In both cities, these political agendas found expression in the urban form and architecture that followed.

The swift realisation of a new capital in Ankara, as in Kaunas, required foreign experts, both in planning and in architecture. For Ankara, the equivalent to Kaunas’ Marius Frandsen from Denmark, was Hermann Jansen from Germany, who won an international competition launched by the new Turkish government for the plan of the capital. Jansen would also have had direct knowledge of Kaunas’ development, as he was elected as juror on some of the design competitions for buildings in Kaunas and tutored young Lithuanian architects in his studio in Berlin. Jansen’s ideas for Ankara bear important comparison to Kaunas in the way they respected and combined the pre-existing historical and geomorphological features with the aspirations of a modern metropolitan city embodied by the principles of the modern state. The observance of local conditions and context, notably the existing historic settlement and the natural landscape created a modern capital city that, in both examples, was very much of its place.

Jansen, like Frandsen, also adopted the modern principal of urban zoning, which, like in Kaunas, was the first time it had been implemented within its national context. Another feature of urban planning that found favour with the new Republican government’s belief in the inviolable bond between the city and the countryside was the Garden City, the ideas of which found fertile ground in both Kaunas and Ankara. The urban planning of both cities shares the same strong adherence to and respect of landscape as an underlying principle for creating a healthy and happy capital that serves as a model for the entire country. Kaunas inherited the master plan of the century that was manifested in large scale urban planning and modern architecture motivated by an aspirational cultural and political agenda under the aegis of modernity.

Ankara (Turkey)

Few cities bear such close political and symbolic comparison to Kaunas as the modern Turkish capital of Ankara. Both cities were designated new capitals of their respective newly defined nation states following the collapse of the old order after the First World War. For Turkey, Ankara’s rise was caused by the collapse of the Ottoman Empire at the end of World War and the decision by Mustafa Kemal (Ataturk) to relocate the capital from Istanbul to Ankara during the War of Independence (1919–1923). When the Turkish Republic was formally established in 1923, the newly small town of Ankara located more centrally in the country especially compared with Istanbul became the capital of the new Republic. As with Kaunas, not only was the new capital city appended to a historic town, the principles of the new state were founded on the historic precedents of nationalism and a shared sense of cultural identity, as well as the modern principles of the enlightenment, including democracy and rationality. In both cities, these political agendas found expression in the urban form and architecture that followed.

3.2.4. The Modernist Kaunas in the Global Context

Current Capitals

The following list contains cities that, like Kaunas, were capitals of their respective national territories during the interwar period but which have retained this status to the present day. Some of these include cities that, like Kaunas, were designated capital city for the first time during the interwar period, while others may have a longer history in this primary role. What they nearly all reveal, however, is the shared experience of receiving substantial investment in capital planning in the 19th- and early 20th centuries that was manifested in large scale urban planning and modern architecture motivated by an aspirational cultural and political agenda under the aegis of modernity.

MODERNIST KAUNAS: ARCHITECTURE OF OPTIMISM, 1919–1939

Jansen, like Frandsen, also adopted the modern principal of urban zoning, which, like in Kaunas, was the first time it had been implemented within its national context. Another feature of urban planning that found favour with the new Republican government’s belief in the inviolable bond between the city and the countryside was the Garden City, the ideas of which found fertile ground in both Kaunas and Ankara. The urban planning of both cities shares the same strong adherence to and respect of landscape as an underlying principle for creating a healthy and happy capital that serves as a model for the entire country. Kaunas inherited the master plan of the century that was manifested in large scale urban planning and modern architecture motivated by an aspirational cultural and political agenda under the aegis of modernity. Few cities bear such close political and symbolic comparison to Kaunas as the modern Turkish capital of Ankara. Both cities were designated new capitals of their respective newly defined nation states following the collapse of the old order after the First World War. For Turkey, Ankara’s rise was caused by the collapse of the Ottoman Empire at the end of the war and the decision by Mustafa Kemal (Ataturk) to relocate the capital from Istanbul to Ankara during the War of Independence (1919–1923). When the Turkish Republic was formally established in 1923, the formerly small town of Ankara located more centrally in the country especially compared with Istanbul became the capital of the new Republic. As with Kaunas, not only was the new capital city appended to a historic town, the principles of the new state were founded on the historic precedents of nationalism and a shared sense of cultural identity, as well as the modern principles of the enlightenment, including democracy and rationality. In both cities, these political agendas found expression in the urban form and architecture that followed. The swift realisation of a new capital in Ankara, as in Kaunas, required foreign experts, both in planning and in architecture. For Ankara, the equivalent to Kaunas’ Marius Frandsen from Denmark, was Hermann Jansen from Germany, who won an international competition launched by the new Turkish government for the plan of the capital. Jansen would also have had direct knowledge of Kaunas’ development, as he was elected as juror on some of the design competitions for buildings in Kaunas and tutored young Lithuanian architects in his studio in Berlin. Jansen’s ideas for Ankara bear important comparison to Kaunas in the way they respected and combined the pre-existing historical and geomorphological features with the aspirations of a modern metropolitan city embodied by the principles of the modern state. The observance of local conditions and context, notably the existing historic settlement and the natural landscape created a modern capital city that, in both examples, was very much of its place.

Jansen, like Frandsen, also adopted the modern principal of urban zoning, which, like in Kaunas, was the first time it had been implemented within its national context. Another feature of urban planning that found favour with the new Republican government’s belief in the inviolable bond between the city and the countryside was the Garden City, the ideas of which found fertile ground in both Kaunas and Ankara. The urban planning of both cities shares the same strong adherence to and respect of landscape as an underlying principle for creating a healthy and happy capital that serves as a model for the entire country. Kaunas inherited the master plan of the century that was manifested in large scale urban planning and modern architecture motivated by an aspirational cultural and political agenda under the aegis of modernity.
Jansen’s proposals for sports facilities including a hippodrome and stadion bear very close resemblance to similar proposals and facilities in Kaunas Žalaiskis district. His proposals for urban and suburban housing set amongst green areas and with their own gardens, where it was expected people would cultivate their own fruits and vegetables, also bear close comparison to the principles underlying Kaunas’ housing in Žalaiskis. Finally, Anchra shares with Anchra a strong architectural language based on modernism, which has continued to play an important role in the identity of the city and the country it represents as being modern, progressive and optimistic.

The assimilation of the modern and the local in both planning and architecture are features of Anchra that bear exceptionable authenticity to the post-imperial age and close comparison to Anchra, manifest through historic features, natural landscapes, and nationalist agendas in a relatively small temporal window through the 1920s and 1930s. However where Kaunas and Anchra are incomparable today is in the respective integrity of both cities’ modern heritage from the interwar era. The subsequent development of Anchra throughout the second half of the 20th century have neglected the principles underlining Jansen’s plans and those of Kernal’s government, and in so doing have erased or removed many of its vital attributes. The natural landscape, private gardens, public spaces, and water features have to a large extent been lost under multiple layers of urban development that have expanded and densified the city to accommodate the 5.5 million people that live there today. The loss of integrity of Anchra’s remarkable modernist foundations therefore strengthens the outstanding universal value of Anchra’s similar experiences, which share the same level of authenticity yet have retained their integrity.

Asmara (Enteprise)
Asmara, the capital of independent Enteprise, was also the capital of the Italian colony of Anchra, established in 1889 and ending in the defeat of Italy during the Second World War in 1941. In the context of UNESCO World Heritage, Anchra — A Modernist African City, is one of few modernist cities on the List and to date is the only modernist site in Africa. As a combination of an evolutionary planning process and modern architecture reflecting local conditions and constraints, Anchra’s comparisons with Kaunas are noteworthy and instructive.

Notwithstanding the fact that Anchra was a colonial capital, representing as much as was possible under very particu- lar circumstances, Italian colonial ambitions and consequently, the urban planning process, the urban and residential subjects, as function as a capital city serving the needs of a comparatively new admin- istration bears some comparisons with Kaunas. The original vil- lage of Arbate Anchra cannot be compared with the Old Town of Kaunas in scale or structure, but, importantly, both existing settlements do share the same role in determining where and how their respective modern extensions developed, especially in terms of urban layout. For Anchra, this was the creation of a formal urban grid around the Main Market that physically con- nected the Enteprise settlement with the nascent Italian settle- ment from the end of the 19th century. For Kaunas it was a similar orthogonal grid, albeit on a much larger scale, in the mid-19th century.

Perhaps more insightfully in terms of comparison, both cities’ subsequent suburban developments had to contend with and negotiate the complex amalgamation of the original settlement, a more recent urban grid, and, most significantly, the natural land- scape and topographical features. For Anchra, this can be seen in Odoardo Cavagnari’s urban plan of 1913 which envisioned sub- urbs carefully laid out around the urban core and in response to topographical conditions. It also adopted contemporaneous planning principles, such as the picturesque landscapes rem- iniscient Howard’s Garden City concept, realised in Žalaiskis. Although these were not always realised in Anchra (such as the circular layout of Maa Chihot), other examples that were de- signed included Forto, Haaz Haar or Gheza Banda. Sited on raised terrain to the southeast of the city centre, Gheza Banda is linked to it by some sensitively planned roads and public spaces, nota- bly Maa Jah Jah fountain. Anchra’s equivalent to Kaunas’ Kaukas Strandway connecting upper Žalaiskis to lower Naujamiestis. This designed response to the city’s geomorphology is a characteris- tic shared by both cities.

Both urban centres are situated in a river valley (albeit Anchra’s Maa Beles is only seasonal) surrounded by low-lying hills and pla- teaux that have been subsequently populated by urban parks or suburbs. Although the evolutionary development of Anchra’s modern architectural development was realised over a different length of time compared with Kaunas (Kaunas from 1840–1930) and Anchra 1895–1938), they nevertheless both reveal a progressive approach that laid the foundation of subsequent and characteris- tic modern architectural development that in both cases was concentrated in the 1920s and 1930s.

The modernist architecture of Anchra and Kaunas both strong- ly reflect their shared experiences during the interwar period and their sense of place. Neither city supports the master narra- tive of Western European modernism or the singular notion of a Modern Movement, but rather demonstrates the more complex reality of an architecture that aspires to be modern while simulta- neously reflecting prevailing financial, material and professional constraints and, perhaps most significantly, political evengies.

Although Anchra’s urban planning of the 1920s and 1930s was politically antiethic, their practical needs and functions never- theless bear comparison architecturally. Underwritten by consid- erable state budgets, both necessitated the realisation and projec- tion of a new and viable metropolitan entity worthy of its status. This entails the design and construction of buildings required to perform this function, from public offices accommodating new institutions to suburban housing to accommodate the inhabitants of a new society. In both cities, this required the design and con- struction of a diverse and comprehensive range of typologies, including infrastructure and open spaces, cinemas, shops, banks, religious structures, public and private offices, industrial facilities, and residences.

A final comparison worthy of note can be found in the ma- terial and aesthetic qualities of the modern architecture of both cities. In both cases the local context is clearly expressed in the use of materials, construction techniques and certain decorative features, despite the divergent political conditions that fuelled their architecture. For Anchra, although modernism used import- ed materials and foreign expertise in engineering and architec- ture, the ubiquitous use of local stone and in particular the nota- ble layering of different types of stone attest to the reliance on local labour and skills, as well as the projection of local culture. The best example in Anchra of the assimilation of foreign and local materials and techniques is St Mary’s Orthodox Cathedral, constructed in 1938 for the exclusive use by Enteprise Orthodox Christians.

The principal distinction between Kaunas and Anchra resides in their respective political contexts, the former being independ- ent, optimistic and progressive, and the latter being colonial, oppressive and regressive. However, Anchra does bear impor- tant comparison with some of Anchra’s key attributes that have already been recognised by UNESCO as possessing outstand- ing universal value, notably the evolutionary planning process and diverse modern architecture possessing important local characteristics.

Addis Ababa (Ethiopia)
Addis Ababa became capital of Ethiopia in 1889 under Emperor Menelik II. On 5th May 1936, it also became the capital of Italian East Africa, following Italy’s invasion of Ethiopia in late 1935. Colonial power and authority were transferred from Anchra, in neighbouring Enteprise, to the new heart of a larger and more con- solidated imperial realm. Although this expanded colonial context bears no compari- son to Kaunas, Italy’s use of modern city planning and architec- ture to strengthen their political position and legitimacy in the 1930s does warrant acknowledgment in this context. Unlike Kaunas, Addis Ababa is a young city. In 1936, Italy swiftly set about imposing grand modernist plans for their new capital, even com- monist. The use of stained glass in modern buildings, especially to convey folk tales or carry symbolic meaning, is one fascinating as- pect of comparison with Kaunas.

Addis Ababa’s modernist buildings in the post-war era reflect the assimilation of modernism and the optimism of independ- ence in Africa during that period, which Kaunas had experienced before the war. In both cases, the city’s architecture bears test- imony to the expression of these cultural and political ideals in concrete form, demonstrating modernism’s adaptability and plurality in different global contexts and in response to similar political aspirations.

Brasilia (Brazil)
Described by UNESCO as a ‘definitive example of 20th century modernist urban planning’, Brasilia was ground-breaking for not only being the first modernist site on the World Heritage List in 1987, but also the first modernist plan. Designed by local architects and internationally celebrated modernists, Lucio Costa’s cruciform urban plan [the ‘Plano Piloto’] and Oscar Niemeyer’s modernist
architecture provided a new functional, administrative and deliberately modernist home for Brazil's capital city. Although Kaunas and Brasilia share the label and experience of modern capitals combining urban form and architecture, further comparisons are less discernable. Brasilia's scale and singular vision based on a strong adherence to the ideas of modernism emanating from Western Europe, and specifically Le Corbusier, bear no comparison to Kaunas. The tabula rasa nature of Brasilia's site inspired and enabled very different urban and architectural responses over a longer period of time, unlike in Kaunas where a pre-existing ancient city and a more recent urban grid inspired and to some extent constrained the response by planners and architects in a comparatively short temporal window during the interwar period. The former sought to create a complete modernist composition described by UNESCO as 'a singular artistic achievement' and was largely successful in doing so because of the uniformity of its central concept, whereas the latter had to contend with extensive pre-existing natural and human-made conditions and consequently reflects a much more cumulative, diverse and plural response to the requirements of a capital.

Another factor determining these two different outcomes was the provisional and contingent nature of Kaunas, compared with the ambition and permanence of Brasilia. The resulting scale and scope of the planning and architecture is incomparable. Although Kaunas has grand public buildings possessing monumental pretensions based on strong geometry, grandiosity, and monumentality, these cannot be compared with Niemeyer’s singular architectural compositions. However, an important factor that should be taken into account when comparing or contrasting the scale and scope of these two capital planning projects is their respective eras. Kaunas’ development before the Second World War in the 1930s and into the 1950s represents an important and formative phase of early modernism, which is arguably more instructive in terms of understanding global modernism than the realisation of Costa and Niemeyer’s Brasilia in the late 1950s, which had the advantage not only of being completed after the destruction and turmoil of the Second World War, but also after a further three decades of maturation, development and was largely successful in doing so because of the uniformity of its central concept, whereas the latter had to contend with extensive pre-existing natural and human-made conditions and consequently reflects a much more cumulative, diverse and plural response to the requirements of a capital.

One of the enduring legacies left to the modernist projects is the urban planning response was determined by the natural landscape. Kaunas’ location at the confluence of the Nemunas and Neris Rivers, the subsequent development of Naujamiestis on the valley floor and the surrounding hills of Upper Šančiai, Panemune, Alekšotas and Žaliakalnis bear testimony to the relationship between urban and natural landscapes, but unlike Canberra’s singular, integrated and coherent urban plan, Kaunas was evolutionary, cumulative and incremental. Regardless, the plans of both cities did successfully integrate the natural landscape and architectural features to create a complex urban structure, notable vistas and important landmarks.

Canberra’s plan was subject to an international competition which received 137 entries, the winning submission being by Chicago-based landscape architect, Walter Burley Griffin. Like Frandsen’s plan for Žaliakalnis, Griffin’s was heavily influenced by the contemporaneous Garden City movement and shared the concentric form that in Canberra were a series of interconnected octagonal hubs and in Žaliakalnis was originally a pentagon with two interior concentric ring roads (Celu[flower] and Minties [ideal] Circles). With the Aøjubynas portion remaining as natural woodland, only half was completed and remains a semi-hexagon divided into over 300 plots.

While the status of capital and the landscape elements of the plan are comparable to Kaunas, they bear little comparison in terms of architecture or the speed and aspiration of their development. The realisation of Griffin’s plan was hampered by both World Wars and the intervening Great Depression and not considered complete until the second half of the 20th century. Consequently, the general architectural character does not reflect a particular epoch and cannot be said to be modernist.

Edinburgh (Old and New Towns, Scotland)

The chief comparison between Kaunas and the World Heritage Site of Edinburgh lies in the two cities’ respective statues as capitals whose urban development is based on the implementation of new urban planning principles as a modern extension to a pre-existing historic old town. In Kaunas, the old town dates from the 16th century, compared with Edinburgh’s from the 15th century, while their respective new towns date from the 16th and 18th centuries respectively. In both examples the old and new towns possess similar characteristics of a heavily fortified historic settlement and neo-classically-styled new town. The outstanding way in which Edinburgh’s old and new towns are so successfully juxtaposed, especially in exploiting the local geomorphology, contrasts with Kaunas’ Old Town and Naujamiestis (New Town) district, which bear no such relationship. However, where this kind of quality in planning can be observed in Kaunas is in the juxtaposition of the 19th and 20th century plans of Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis respectively. Kaunas and Edinburgh therefore both bear testimony to the successful urban planning inspired by the natural landscape, which in both cities also incorporates private and public open spaces, green areas and panoramic views of the skyline and individual architectural features and monuments.

Both cities developed an evolutionary planning process that incorporated successive waves of urban expansion and architectural responses. Edinburgh’s world-renowned neoclassical architecture that furnishes the New Town largely from the 19th century bears no comparison to Kaunas’ modern architectural language a century later. However, both could be said to be similarly unified architectural responses to their respective substantial investments in city development.

New Delhi (India)

Besides their status as national capitals, Kaunas and Delhi share one important attribute in their implementation of an imperial plan appended to an existing historical settlement. The layout of Naujamiestis (New Town) attached to Kaunas Old Town under the Russian Empire can be likened to the plan for New Delhi attached to the ancient city under the British Empire. However, the symbolism is markedly distinct, with Sir Edwin Lutyens’ plan for New Delhi drafted in 1913 creating the jewel in the crown of the British Empire. The scale, scope and monumentality of the architecture are therefore incomparable. Lutyens was an advocate of the Garden City movement and had the opportunity to implement these ideas in the layout of Hampstead Garden Suburb in London. Furthermore, the attributes for which Kaunas justifies outstanding universal value, lie in the combination of the planning of Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis, and the modern architecture during the interwar period. Although New Delhi was constructed throughout this period and its architecture did seek to incorporate local Indian motifs, styles, materials, and techniques, it can neither be said to be modern nor representative of the same socio-political conditions that motivated Kaunas’ development as a provincial capital. In New Delhi, Lutyens’ architecture represented a strain of progressive English neo-classicism mixed with local traditions and the need for monumentality that were at odds with the neutrality, progression and social agenda of modernism that made it so appealing to cities like Kaunas.

It may be coincidental that New Delhi shared with Kaunas’ Naujamiestis a site characterised by its valley context between the old city, a major river system and beneath a ridge of natural landscape, which in New Delhi was called the Ridge and, like Kaunas’ Ajuodynas district, has been preserved as an urban park.

Pretoria (South Africa)

The capital of South Africa boasts a comparatively strong urban form based on a rectilinear grid (on an east-west orientation) with a prolific use of public squares and open spaces, similar to Kaunas’ Naujamiestis district, while the suburban developments reflect the Garden City principles found in Žaliakalnis. The distinction between city and suburb, is similar to that found in Kaunas and in many African capitals, including neighbouring Zimbabwe (Harare) and Kenya (Nairobi), which were all developed around the same time. Where Kaunas and Pretoria are markedly divergent is in their respective architectural character. The formality and traditional grandeur of Pretoria’s neoclassical public and commercial buildings contrasts with Kaunas’ distinctive modernist aesthetic.

Rabat (Morocco)

Rabat is a complex historic urban environment inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List that could be compared to Kaunas for its evolutionary planning approach, which in this case was masterminded by Henri Prost, who also worked in the French colonial cities of Casablanca, Fès, Marrakech and Meknès. As a national capital, Prost spent eight years on his plan from 1914–1922, concluding a year before Frandsen was commissioned to draft his plan for Kaunas. Žaliakalnis. Both plans employed functional zoning, and, like Frandsen, Prost was hoping to have a working with an existing and well-established urban settlement. For Frandsen this was the 19th century large-scale orthogonal grid of Naujamiestis (New Town), but a closer comparison might be made between Naujamiestis and Kaunas Old Town because Prost’s Ville Nouvelle (New Town) was appended to the large and ancient Medina extending southwards from the sea. Both Naujamiestis and Frandsen’s Žaliakalnis share similar characteristics to Prost’s Ville Nouvelle, especially in the landscaped parkland, provision of public spaces, and the consideration of monumental vistas and panoramas creating and focusing on prominent sites and architectural landmarks.

Rabat’s architectural character is diverse, which, unlike Kaunas, is more a consequence of the wider temporal and stylistic range over the early 20th century (Neo-Moorish, neo-vernacular, neo-Classicism and Art Nouveau) compared with Kaunas, where plurality occurred within a smaller temporal frame and largely within the modernist idiom. Therefore, Rabat, while possessing outstanding examples of urban planning and architecture that combined traditional and modern attributes, cannot be said to share Kaunas’ modernist character and sense of optimism that were so much a part of the cultural identity of the place during the interwar period.
The extent of Tirana’s incompleteness undermines its authenticity. As with Kaunas and other modern cities from the interwar era, Tirana’s modern development was forestalled by the war era, leaving the city largely unfinished. Although war-era plans were prepared before 1929, as with Kaunas, Tirana’s planning process was therefore protracted, albeit over a much shorter period, and evolved rather than revolutionising the existing context. The second plan, in 1926, was drafted by foreign experts: Ernst Fraencker, Castellani, and G. Weiss. In 1927 another plan by Brusini was more comprehensive than the first and was followed in 1928 by a fourth plan, this time by W. Köhler, which set the tone for a final plan in 1929 based around a monumental 4.5km axial thoroughfare linking the old and new cities, in the same vein as Kaunas’ Laisvės Aleya (Freedom Boulevard) linking the Old Town with Naujamiestis.

Throughout the 1930s, extensive public works programmes were initiated to furnish Tirana with a modern infrastructure and new public buildings. A complex of government ministries and the presidential palace were designed by Brusini, who also designed notable buildings in Tripoli (The Castle and the Headquarters of the Cassa di Risparmio). After Albania’s annexation in 1939, the responsibility for Tirana’s urban development fell to the Florentine architect, Gherardo Bosio, who had been appointed head of the newly established Central Office for Building and Town Planning. Bosio had only recently planned the historic Ethiopian city of Gondar and had contributed to the plan for Addis Ababa. His scheme for Tirana in 1939 continued the evolution of the earlier plans, based on a concentric formation around an axial cruciform centre. The modern application of functional planning appended to an existing historic city and the assimilation of local traditions with modernist architecture in the process of creating a new capital during the interwar period. Although the respective political conditions in Tripoli and Kaunas are strongly divergent – one being a capital of a colonised state and the other being a temporary capital of a newly independent state – they share similar attributes pertaining to their planning process and modern architecture.

Tripoli’s modern urban expansions began after Italy’s occupation of Libya in 1911. The first technical surveys by Italian cartographers and engineers were published in 1912, laying the groundwork for the first urban plan in 1914. As occurred in the development of Kaunas’ Naujamiestis district in the mid-19th century, the urban development of Tripoli in the early 20th century had to accommodate and respond to a pre-existing historic port city (on a river and a sea respectively), and defensive fortifications. The natural conditions of the surrounding and relatively flat desert landscape in Libya contrast starkly with Kaunas’ wooded hinterland and geomorphology, and consequently play an important role in determining the form and layout of the urban plan. In Tripoli, the Italians were much less constrained by pre-existing natural conditions surrounding the existing historic city and the subsequent layout does not reflect the natural landscape as it does so distinctly in Kaunas.

The plan for Tripoli was masterminded by the Italian engineer, Guido Ferrazza, who can be likened to Kaunas’ planner, Marius Frandsen. Both were outsiders charged with envisioning a future capital based on strong historical context. Ferrazza drafted a master plan for Tripoli between 1931 and 1935, but unlike Frandsen, he was also responsible for designing many key public buildings. The stripped classical language that Ferrazza used in Tripoli and other Italian colonial towns and cities, including Asmara, Harare and Mogadishu can be likened to the Italian brand of modernism. Rationalism. While the pure geometric volumes and unadorned facades of modernist architecture in Tripoli cannot be compared to Kaunas’ local modernist dialect, there are individual examples where the Italianate response to modernism found expression, not least through the works of Lithuanian architects trained in Italy at the same time. The best example is the Officer’s Club designed initially by the young Italian-trained architect Stasys Kudokas, which bears a strong resemblance to the volumetric and proportional composition of contemporaneous structures in Tripoli and other Italian colonies. More generally, comparisons can be made with Kaunas in the way that Italian architects in Tripoli interpreted local architectural and other kinds of cultural traditions based on the city’s Islamic and also Classical past, in their construction of a modern urban landscape.

While the interwar attributes of Tripoli do bear comparison with Kaunas, the subsequent experiences under the newly independent state – first under a monarchy and then the Libyan Arab Republic – have undermined the integrity of the urban plan and the architectural elements, many of which were either demolished or altered in part because of their colonial association. This highlights another important distinction between both cities in their respective recollection of the interwar period. The optimism inherent in Kaunas’ modern architecture cannot be compared to Tripoli’s colonial era, which carries very different connotations.

Modern Capitals

The following list contains cities that, like Kaunas, were designated capital in the modern era, but have since lost this status. Driven by regional, national and global politics, these former modern capital cities shared very similar experiences to Kaunas in terms of ambitious planning and modern architecture. In particular, the two cities of Changchun and, especially, Nanjing, were designated capitals in the interwar period and perhaps bear the closest comparison to Kaunas for the socio-political conditions they share and how these conditions were reflected in the creation of consciously modern capitals.

Changchun (formerly Hsinking, China)

Although the 20th century bore witness to a proliferation of new capital cities in the wake of the late- and post-colonial era, the investment in massive urban plans, often appended to pre-existing settlements in the manner of Kaunas was comparatively rare. In most cases, newly designated capitals were either entirely new (e.g. Brasilia or Canberra) or existing primary cities were adapted to assume the role. One somewhat exceptional case that can be compared to Kaunas is for its contemporaneous designation as a capital; its ambitious urban planning, and the pluralist nature of its modern architecture is Changchun, formerly known as Hsinking (New Capital), capital of the Japanese puppet state of Manchukuo from 1932–1945.

At the start of the 20th century, Changchun was a small, comparatively isolated and ancient Chinese settlement in the northeastern province of Jilin, bordering North Korea. Following the construction of the Trans-Siberian Railway by Tsarist Russia from the 1890s and Russia’s subsequent defeat to Japan in 1905, Changchun found itself at the juncture of Japan’s South Manchuria Railway Company (SMR) and Russia’s Chinese Eastern Railway (CER). Both empires had developed small railway settlements outside the Chinese city to administer their respective operations, but it was in 1931, when Japan orchestrated a terrorist incident on the railway outside the ancient capital of Shenyang (The Mukden Incident), that Changchun’s fortunes changed. In early 1932, after Japan had annexed northeast China and established the new state of Manchukuo, Changchun was declared the capital and renamed Hsinking (New Capital).

Hsinking was planned to be a huge modern capital with an urban planning area covering 200 square km including the old town and eventually accommodating a population of one million. The form of the plan combined the grid and radial system, more in the tradition of the Beaux-Arts than the Garden City movement, though it did incorporate expansive areas of parkland. One French writer visiting Hsinking in 1938 compared the city to Casablanca, which he claimed, ‘showed the power of our construction work just as Hsinking indicates the same in the Orient’ ([Contemporary Manchuria, Volume II, Number 3, May 1938, p. 124]).

As with Kaunas, Hsinking was functionally zoned and although appended to the original settlement the old town was not incorporated into the concept or layout of the new plan. The speed with which Hsinking was laid out and constructed also bears comparison with Kaunas, albeit not on the same scale. The huge investment in construction was largely confined to the 1930s and, like Kaunas, the architectural character of Hsinking reflected an aspiration for the modern that was diverse as well as deliberately and expeditiously incorporating local cultural characteristics. Framed as ultra-modernism, to distinguish it from western precedents, ‘Japan’s modernism in Manchukuo often adopted local features, especially in public buildings, which drew heavily from Mongolian and Manchurian fortifications and monastery structures.

In 1931 Changchun had a total population of 128,040, of which 148,364 were Japanese and by 1940, the city had a population of 430,092. The city’s subsequent development has been prolific and now has a population of over 75 million. This development has radically altered the architectural character of the city, especially the buildings from the 1930s. Although many singular structures remain, especially the larger public and commercial buildings, the overall integrity of the attributes has been lost. Another important distinction between the two capitals of Kaunas and Hsinking is the political context in which they were both conceived and developed, the former being an expression of liberation and national self-determination and the other being the embodiment of imperial subjugation.
In 1927, under a new national government, Nanjing became the new capital of China, wresting the title from Beijing. The move presented unparalleled opportunities for China’s young, aspir- ing, modern architects and urban planners, as Nanjing became a laboratory for new ideas and approaches that incorporated the planned development of a uniquely modern local style of archi- tecture and urban planning based on pre-existing conditions and local precedents. Kaunas and Nanjing both had their own deep historical traditions (Nanjing had even been the capital of China from 1368 to 1421) that preceded their designation as new and modern capital cities in the early 20th century and rested on a subordinate status to the greater historical and cultural em- inence of their respective former capitals, Vilnius and Beijing. In both cases, the material and symbolic undertakings of creating a new capital of a newly established national government there- fore assumed a weight and significance that was dependent on being modern and national, an undertaking that had profound implications for architecture and urban planning.

In the 1920s, Nanjing’s municipality established a City Planning Bureau that by January 1928, had established the National Capital Con- struction Committee and, as with Kaunas around the same time, drafted a plan for the development of the new capital. Nanjing’s The Great Plan of the Capital, like Kaunas’ Frandsen Plan, was based on functional zoning, in this case residential, govern- mental, educational, shipping and industrial. In July 1928, the new Mayor, Liu Jiwu, like his Kaunas counterpart at exactly the same time, Jonas Vileišis, implemented a modern programme of city development and improvement, including a competition for the city’s urban plan and the design of its public buildings that, similar to Kaunas, stipulated a modern national aesthetic.

Kaunas and Nanjing also bear important comparison in seeking advice from foreign experts. Nanjing’s equivalent of Marius Frandsen could be said to be American architect Henry Murphy and the engineer Ernest Goodrich, who in turn hired two more Americans, Colonel Irving Moller and Theodore McCroskey, and the young Chinese architect Li Yanhu, Nanjing’s Antanas Jokimas. Liu was a graduate of Cornell University and former employee of Murphy, so, like many of Kaunas’ young local architects, had im- portant international experience but was also a local voice and an advocate for local knowledge and knowhow.

Kaunas and Nanjing both demonstrate the employment of contemporaneous urban planning principles. Where Kaunas pos- sesses authentic interpretations of the Garden City movement from Britain, Nanjing adopted ideas from the contemporaneous American City Beautiful and national sporting pioneers. The adoption of the latest ideas in urban planning were being implemented for the first time within their national contexts. Where they differ is that each stage of Kaunas’ planning [Old Town, Naujamiestis to the north and east, is Žaliakalnis] added to, rather than on [as in Nanjing’s case], the pre-existing urban form. This is important be- cause it highlights the sensitivity and success of Kaunas’ additive planning approach compared to Nanjing where the decision to overlay the new plan on the old caused the blunt and often brutal cutting through of an existing and ancient urban fabric, causing widespread anger among many local residents who lost homes or had their communities permanently altered or uprooted.

In December 1929, the Nationalist Government formally re- vealed the Plan of the Capital, which was said to be based on the European and American principles of science and the advan- tages of aesthetics of our country. Like its predecessor and like Kaunas’ plan, it advocated the zoning of different activities, with the town separated into eight districts, including three different classes of housing. In a first for both cities, the design of mass public housing became a municipal objective and a profes- sional undertaking that was markedly distinct from the provision of housing for government officials and wealthy classes in de- tached villas invariably in suburban settings amidst a natural envi- ronment – Purple Mountain in Nanjing and Žaliakalnis in Kaunas. However, Kaunas’ closest and most insightful comparison to Nanjing is in the stipulation in the Plan of the Capital that archi- tectural style – be specially a national style – be a constituent of planning, regulating that buildings. These design principles were depicted in a concept sketch by Murphy’s assistant, Huang Yiyu. Consequently, varying expressions of Chinese style can be seen in the design and layout of modern government offices – some of which had to contain an internal courtyard – down to small- est decorative feature in commercial buildings. Although Kaunas did not regulate the adoption of local characteristics, the desire among young, aspiring and modern local practitioners under the conditions of a newly independent nation state in the 1920s was a natural preference and response that can be seen in the architecture of both cities to this day.

Notable examples of Nanjing’s spectrum of national style in- clude the overly traditional National Central Museum in Nanjing. What is particularly interesting here in the context of this com- parative analysis is the question of what constitutes a local or national style. China’s National Central Museum’s original design was in a palace-style based on the Qing era, which ended in 1911 with the fall of China’s last dynasty. Consequently, the Qing, who were ethnic Manchurians from beyond the Great Wall, was deemed un-Chinese and an inappropriate precedent. The de- sign was therefore amended to the Liao style. Another exam- ple, which bears direct comparison to Kaunas, was the National Stadium and sports complex. With the modern requirements of leisure and sport, and the need to present a new image of the nation on the agenda, the new complex in Nanjing contained a 60,000 seat stadium, swimming pool, baseball field, basket- ball court, football pitch, horseracing track and martial arts hall. As public buildings, they had to display traditional characteristics while serving modern functions and agendas. The result was a series of structures in reinforced concrete: durable, cheap and practical, but with Chinese motifs adorning certain elements such as doorways, window frames and entablatures. The main building of the open-air swimming pool, designed in a palace style, was among the most traditional. The stadium’s monumen- tal entrance with its seven gilded bays flanked by two towers was an attempt to employ traditional elements in a new building type creatively. As in Kaunas, Nanjing also has examples of mod- ernist buildings possessing no discernible national characteris- tics, though these tend to be the exception rather than the rule.

Kaunas and Nanjing can also be compared for their role in their respective nation’s modern histories. In both cases, their role as national capital proved to be a short-lived political ex- periment with an accompanying economic boom, before being demoted to secondary city status under communism in the 1940s. For both cities, this bold and fleeting experiment ended with the onset of the Second World War, which for Nanjing start- ed in 1937 with the Japanese invasion. Both cities also share the same negative experiences during the war of their populations being victims of crimes against humanity. Today, for both cities, the interwar period therefore plays a very significant role in their modern history and the formulation of their respective cultural and historical identities, where the urban form and architecture bear testimony to their respective national efforts to combine the optimism of modernism with local traditions. However, one obvious distinguishing factor for Nanjing is the loss of integrity of its interwar architecture and planning. Nanjing today is a city with over 8 million residents, three times more than the whole of Lithuania. While many of the interwar buildings have survived, their integrity as part of an urban whole, unlike in Kaunas, bears no resemblance to that era.

Regional Capitals

The following list contains cities that, while not possessing the primary status of national capital and the investment and atten- tion that accompanied this status, were nevertheless significant and enjoyed a regional stature that attracted major develop- ments in modern urban planning and architecture during the interwar period or, in the singular case of Chandigarh, after the Second World War.

Casablanca (Morocco)

Casablanca is renowned for its modernist architecture and am- bitious urban planning that were carried out under the French colonial administration from 1906. Although these political and geographical contexts were different from Kaunas’, coloni- al Casablanca is comparable in being a modern city planned around an existing settlement that also functioned as a port and followed an evolutionary process of development after the First World War. Casablanca’s modern planning carried out by the French urbanist, Henri Prost, much like in Tripoli under Italian colo- nial rule and unlike Kaunas, encircled the old port with a series of concentric streets bisected by arterial roads forming civic spaces at their intersection.

Another pertinent comparison that can be made with Kaunas is the way French architects incorporated local characteristics to create an adaptive style that was functionally suited to its North African setting. This started with rather crude referencing of local Arab styles and developed into more sophisticated approaches to form, layout, ventilation, and circulation. Although Casablanca and Kaunas have little in common in terms of their architectur- al appearance, Casablanca does embody the reality of mod- ernism’s inherent plurality. This is not only expressed in the way French architects adopted modernism in this context, but, more fundamentally, how modernism and its leading proponents in Western Europe owed a creative debt to this context. The clue in the city’s name hints at the true origins of modernism’s claim to the white cuboid aesthetic, from outside Western Europe, and similarly supports the endorsement of a more plural understand- ing of modernism that is not limited to aesthetic or ideological purity and therefore comfortably accommodates examples like Kaunas’ modernism.

Chandigarh Capitol Complex (India)

As cities possessing strong and distinctive modern characteris- tics, Kaunas and Chandigarh bear important comparisons in their response to some of the fundamental issues of architecture and society in the 20th century. While Chandigarh’s Capitol Complex has been acknowledged by UNESCO as being representative of an outstanding example of the Modern Movement defined as ‘a major and essential socio-cultural and historical entity of the 20th century’, Kaunas’ inter-war development reflects the formative stages of this movement and, importantly and consequentially, reflects the true diversity of modernism from the outset. Where Chandigarh is claimed to ‘symbolise India’s accession to moder- nity’ in the post-colonial era globally, the same could be said of Kaunas in the post-imperial era in Europe.

Although the architecture of the Capitol Complex reflects the singular hand of its modernist designer, Le Corbusier, its collab- orative design process and response to local conditions in the form of ‘sunscreens, double-skinned roofs, and reflecting pools for the catchment of rainwater and air cooling’ can be compared to Kaunas’ similar response to local conditions, albeit not climate. However, despite their respective responses to local conditions and their political and administrative status as capitals, the two cities bear little comparison in their respective attributes associat- ed with their modern urban planning and architecture. Whereas
Chandigarh’s Capitol Complex was the product of a singular vision in the post-war era, Kaunas’ evolutionary development by a more diverse collection of architects and planners in the inter-war era reflects the inherent plurality of modernism and its deeper roots in the past. Shanghai (Greater Shanghai Plan and Civic Centre, China)
Urban planning furnished with a national style of architecture in the 1930s and 1930s was a central characteristic not only of Kaunas and Nanjing, but also of the new Civic Centre for Shanghai, then the world’s fifth largest city and global trading hub. Although Shanghai was not a capital city, it bears some comparison to the administrative and symbolic functions of a new capital like Kaunas, because of its role in asserting authority in the face of a foreign threat, which found expression in architecture. The Civic Centre plan was located in Chinese controlled territory to the north of Shanghai and proposed in 1927 to wrest control of the foreign influence over the treaty port of Shanghai, which was administered by foreign powers. As with Kaunas in 1930, this plan was dependent on and a product of a new political order following the establishment of a new national government after years of conflict and political turmoil. In both cases, political stability fostered a heightened sense of national self-confidence that found expression architecturally as well as in other art and cultural practices.
A Committee was established in July 1929 to oversee the implementation of the plan, headed by a young Chinese architect, Dong Dayou, who was appointed Chief Architect and Advisor. Kaunas and Shanghai both initiated design competitions for the master planning, but in Shanghai the judging panel’s assessment in 1930 was critical, claiming that there was a lack of appreciation of the full possibilities of Chinese architecture and knowledge of how to adapt it to the practical requirements of modern city-planning and construction. China had suppressed or denied within modernist practice and historiography in Western Europe that tried, successfully as it turned out, to promote modernism’s intellectual, aesthetic and material purity. However, after a century of the periphery deferring to the centre, examples from the former periphery like Kaunas and Shanghai provide the historical, material and architectural evidence of a much more complex and sophisticated global encounter with modernity, in which traditional played a formative and fundamental role from the outset. Shanghai’s Civic Centre scheme comprised monumental buildings, spacious parks and gardens, and a modern system of roads laid out in a grid ranging from 60-metre-wide avenues to 25-metre-wide streets. At the heart was a cruciform plan of approximately 330 acres containing ten government buildings and a towering 65-metre-tall pagoda. Its designers ascribed the plan’s axiality to traditional Chinese urban arrangements, but its monumentality might equally be attributed to contemporaneous planning principles in the west in the manner of the City Beautiful Movement. Gardens and green areas covering ‘no less than 15 per cent of the total area’ added ‘breathing spaces’.
The most insightful comparison with Kaunas (and Nanjing), was the persistent paradox facing local planners and architects as to how to pursue modernity in an urban context while retaining local (in this case Chinese) characteristics. At Shanghai the answer was sought not in the urban plan, but in the design and arrangement of individual buildings, the first of which, in Shanghai, was the Mayor’s Office (1931–1934), designed by Dong. After the plans for the Mayor’s Office were revealed in 1931, the design was said to include all the ‘Oriental beauty in architecture’ and became the benchmark for the generic term of ‘Chinese Renaissance’ architecture. The design of the Mayor’s Office might not please the architectural purist, but as the first attempt to integrate traditional aesthetics with modern construction in an office building by Chinese architects and builders, it was an important milestone.
Less stringent requirements to evince national characteristics were placed on buildings of lesser rank in Shanghai’s Civic Centre. In Kaunas, functional zoning was considered the most efficient solution to the new city’s efficient functioning. In both cases, the ambitious new plans were based on contemporaneous urban planning theory and practice. In Shanghai, this adhered more to the City Beautiful Movement with a road network combining grid and radial systems centred around prominent public buildings and spaces, though did also possess elements of the Garden City concept, found in Kaunas. However, the most explicit comparison can be seen in the architectural resolution of combining the modern and the traditional. The resolution in China.
Chandigarh (Greater Chandigarh Plan and Civic Centre, India)
the resolution in China. In Shanghai, this adhered more to the City Beautiful Movement with a road network combining grid and radial systems centred around prominent public buildings and spaces, though did also possess elements of the Garden City concept, found in Kaunas. However, the most explicit comparison can be seen in the architectural resolution of combining the modern and the traditional. The resolution in China. In Shanghai, this adhered more to the City Beautiful Movement with a road network combining grid and radial systems centred around prominent public buildings and spaces, though did also possess elements of the Garden City concept, found in Kaunas. However, the most explicit comparison can be seen in the architectural resolution of combining the modern and the traditional. The resolution in China. In Shanghai, this adhered more to the City Beautiful Movement with a road network combining grid and radial systems centred around prominent public buildings and spaces, though did also possess elements of the Garden City concept, found in Kaunas. However, the most explicit comparison can be seen in the architectural resolution of combining the modern and the traditional.
Other features of the Shanghai plan that can be compared with Kaunas include a Recreation Ground similar to that in Nanjing. Completed in autumn 1935, the sports complex contained a Gymnasium, Swimming Pool and Athletics Stadium, with additional land set aside for tennis courts and a baseball field. The massive Stadium formed the centrepiece, seating 70,000 and with potential for further expansion to include an extra 30,000 seats. The unprecedented structure was built in reinforced concrete, red brick and artificial stone. Described in the media as being ‘Chinese in character but in line with modern construction.’
Shanghai was returned to Chinese jurisdiction after the Second World War and the Civic Centre complex has since been completely subsumed into the greater metropolitan area. Today this area is home to over 25 million people, which is almost ten times the population of Lithuania. Therefore, unlike in Kaunas, which has retained its urban and architectural integrity from the interwar era, Shanghai’s Civic Centre complex has lost much of its integrity owing to the extraordinary urban expansion since, though most of the landmark public structures have survived. The civic centre’s functional role from the outset. Shanghai’s Civic Centre scheme comprised monumental buildings, spacious parks and gardens, and a modern system of roads laid out in a grid ranging from 60-metre-wide avenues to 25-metre-wide streets. At the heart was a cruciform plan of approximately 330 acres containing ten government buildings and a towering 65-metre-tall pagoda. Its designers ascribed the plan’s axiality to traditional Chinese urban arrangements, but its monumentality might equally be attributed to contemporaneous planning principles in the west in the manner of the City Beautiful Movement. Gardens and green areas covering ‘no less than 15 per cent of the total area’ added ‘breathing spaces’. The most insightful comparison with Kaunas (and Nanjing), was the persistent paradox facing local planners and architects as to how to pursue modernity in an urban context while retaining local (in this case Chinese) characteristics. At Shanghai the answer was sought not in the urban plan, but in the design and arrangement of individual buildings, the first of which, in Shanghai, was the Mayor’s Office (1931–1934), designed by Dong. After the plans for the Mayor’s Office were revealed in 1931, the design was said to include all the ‘Oriental beauty in architecture’ and became the benchmark for the generic term of ‘Chinese Renaissance’ architecture. The design of the Mayor’s Office might not please the architectural purist, but as the first attempt to integrate traditional aesthetics with modern construction in an office building by Chinese architects and builders, it was an important milestone. Less stringent requirements to evince national characteristics were placed on buildings of lesser rank in Shanghai’s Civic Centre. In Kaunas, functional zoning was considered the most efficient solution to the new city’s efficient functioning. In both cases, the ambitious new plans were based on contemporaneous urban planning theory and practice. In Shanghai, this adhered more to the City Beautiful Movement with a road network combining grid and radial systems centred around prominent public buildings and spaces, though did also possess elements of the Garden City concept, found in Kaunas. However, the most explicit comparison can be seen in the architectural resolution of combining the modern and the traditional. The resolution in China.
Tel Aviv (Israel)

The White City of Tel Aviv was the second modern city inscribed on the World Heritage List, joining the first, Brasilia, in 2003. As a component of a metropolitan area that also includes the ancient port of Jaffa, Tel Aviv bears some comparison to Kaunas, particularly in its Garden City planning and modernist architecture. Both cities possess strong master plans that responded to an existing historic settlement. It could be argued that Tel Aviv is to Jaffa what Naujamiestis is to Kaunas Old Town, but a more accurate typological comparison with Tel Aviv would be Žaliakalnis. Both were products of the early 20th century and represent innovative interpretations of contemporaneous planning ideas heavily influenced by the Garden City concept. They were also drafted around the same time. Frankl's plan for Žaliakalnis dates from 1923 and Sir Patrick Geddes' plan for Tel Aviv was approved in 1927, although it was not formally ratified until 1938.

Like Kaunas' urban planning from the mid-19th century onwards, the Geddes Plan for Tel Aviv was determined by pre-existing local natural and manmade conditions. As in the case of Žaliakalnis, Geddes' plan had to contend with a substantial urban settlement that had grown beyond the boundary of the original port. In Kaunas, this evolutionary development can be read in the successive growth of the Old Town, through Naujamiestis to Žaliakalnis (from the 1840s to 1940s). In Tel Aviv, a similar, albeit more temporally condensed, growth can be observed from Jaffa through Neve Tzedek/Manshiya to Tel Aviv (from the 1900s to 1940s).

The influence of the Garden City movement on Geddes when he devised the plan for Tel Aviv is well known and it has deservedly become one of the outstanding examples of the implementation of these planning ideas adapted to local conditions. Kaunas’ Žaliakalnis area is a similarly authentic manifestation of these ideas. Furthermore, both cities have successfully retained the integrity of these outstanding examples of early 20th century urban planning.

Another important comparison between Kaunas and Tel Aviv is the two cities' outstanding examples of modernist architecture adapted to local conditions and circumstances by a community of young foreign and overseas-trained local architects. While Tel Aviv's celebrated association with the German Bauhaus has tended to conceal the more plural and varied responses and global connections that contributed to the city's architectural character forged in the 1930s, the adaptation of modernism to local material and climatic conditions is less well known to those unfamiliar with the city. The use of piloti to encourage the circulation of air at ground level, the provision of balconies, limited glazed areas, garden courtyards, roof terraces and the ubiquitous use of concrete (helped by the abundance of local sand) are important attributes of Tel Aviv's particular dialect within the broader modernist language. Although Kaunas does not share the same attributes, owing to the very different climatic and geological conditions in northern Europe compared with the eastern Mediterranean, the city's modern architecture can be compared for the similarly innovative and progressive way it adapted to and assimilated with local conditions. Another important attribute that both cities share is the underlying sense of optimism that fueled their 20th century plans and modern architecture. Although Tel Aviv was not a national capital, it possessed similar features of a new primary metropolis that through its modernity symbolised hope in a future for its rapidly growing and largely emergent population.

Conclusion: Comparison of Kaunas in the national, regional and global contexts demonstrates, that the creation of a modern capital, during the interval period of the 20th century, is in itself a very rich topic in the context of the emergence and affirmation of new states. Compared to the Central and Eastern European capital cities and other well-known cities of the region that have a rich layer of modernist architecture built on historic urban layers, inspired by the socio-political imperatives of construction of the new capitals, Kaunas stands as a representative, combining most features characteristic to the region as well as exceptional features, and therefore proves that a study of Central and Eastern European modernist urbanity enhances the understanding of the modern global city.

In the global context Modernist Kaunas also adds a strong argument in the current international debate about different modernities. Modernism can be defined today not as a unified rationalist project or a doctrine but rather as a particular experience of change, consciousness of past achievements and failures. Modernist Kaunas demonstrates that modernity is plural in character and that it learnt from traditions within which it developed.

On the global scale, none of the already inscribed 20th century's urban developments, has had to work around the constraints of existing historic structures inside a modernist project, either because of the urban and architectural approach adopted, or because of the absence or destruction of any historic structures. Unlike most experiences of urban and architectural modernity, Kaunas reflects an evolutionary rather than revolutionary process of and response to modernisation. The modernist project in the historic and natural setting illustrates the innovative European trends of town planning sustainably adapted for construction of an evolving capital city. This comparative analysis shows that Modernist Kaunas is an outstanding example of a historic urban landscape inspired by the optimistic construction of a new capital city that reflects diversity and plurality of modernist architecture and witnessing a fundamental transformation of urban life in the 20th century retaining its authenticity and integrity up to this day.

3.3. Proposed Statement of the Outstanding Universal Value

Brief Synthesis

Modernist Kaunas is situated in central Lithuania, at the confluence of two major rivers, the Nemunas and the Neries. The area within the nominated property was planned in the mid-19th century and developed in 1919–1939 when, after the declaration of an independent Republic of Lithuania in 1918, Kaunas served as the provisional capital of the state. The status of provisional capital was crucial for the city’s unprecedented growth and architectural development. In less than twenty years, under the auspices of the new national government and civic initiative, Kaunas was transformed into a modern city based on the assimilation of modern urban planning and architecture with pre-existing natural, urban, and other local conditions. Architecture, specifically in the form of a local injection of the international language of modernism, played a particularly important role in that transformation.

Kaunas Modernism, therefore, bears exceptional testimony to an authentically multifaceted modernism born out of local political and cultural exigencies and an evolutionary urban modernisation responding to pre-existing humandomed and natural features.

The nominated property comprises two areas: Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis. Naujamiestis (New Town), a generous grid planned in 1847, was attached to the eastern edge of the Old Town and extends eastwards along the valley of the Nemunas River. Naujamiestis was modernised and intensively developed in 1919–1939. Encircling Naujamiestis to the north and east is Žaliakalnis (Green Hill) – a distinct natural plateau rising to an average of 33–40 metres. Žaliakalnis was developed as a garden city residential suburb in 1899–1939 according to a 1923 master plan of Kaunas, which enabled a seven-fold increase in area and accommodated a doubling of the city’s population to 155,000 over the same period.

The most significant attributes of the city’s resulting urban form and associated architecture are defined by the inherent optimism and civic initiative behind the creation of the new modern city as a provisional capital with inherited geographical and urban morphological distinctiveness. A rich architectural heritage of emerging modernism overlaid on the 19th century urban grid and a new garden suburb create a unique ensemble of two complimentary urban landscapes. The sensitive adaptation of the pre-existing 19th-century urban grid, implementation of a garden city residential suburb, the successful integration of the natural environment, and the assimilation of local and global interpretations of architectural modernism gave birth to Kaunas Modernism, that reflects a diverse and innovative response to Lithuania’s encounter with modernity and early 20th century European modernism. 1500 of the 6000 remaining buildings erected in Kaunas in 1919–1939 are concentrated in the nominated area and bear exceptional testimony to the multifaceted nature of architectural modernism in response to local conditions. The façades, streetscapes, and natural elements, combined with the pre-existing urban and geomorphological setting, create a unique sense of place exhibited through broad panoramas, open urban and natural spaces, and varied topography. Unlike many experiences of urban and architectural modernity, Kaunas reflects an evolutionary rather than revolutionary process of and response to modernisation in the early 20th century Europe.

World Heritage criteria under which the property is proposed

Criterion (ii) Kaunas Modernism of 1919–1939 expands the concept of Modernism beyond the International Style by revealing a more diverse, complex fabric of numerous, often divergent, cultural, social, political, and artistic trends. Kaunas Modernism is an exceptional example of rethinking architecture as a process of social, political, and cultural modernisation in the 20th century. Kaunas Modernism provides arguments for the decentralisation of modernism not only in the geographical sense, but also in terms of stylistic expression. Outstanding value of the Kaunas cityscape is its architectural diversity, represented through the plurality of modern architectural ideas, from modernised Neo-Classicism to National Modernism, which co-existed throughout the world in the first half of the 20th century. By integrating and locally interpreting the principles of the Modern Movement, Kaunas Modernism displays a bold plurality of modern architectural expression in response to local needs and conditions.

Criterion (v) Modernist Kaunas is an outstanding example of a historic city subject to rapid urbanisation and modernisation, encapsulated by diverse expressions of the values and aspirations associated with an optimistic belief in an independent future amid the turbulence of the early 20th century, when national borders were changing fast. The creation of a modern capital city of an emerging nation state is an outstanding testament to people’s faith in the future and their ability to be creative under difficult political and economic conditions. The gradual and sustainable modernisation of Kaunas, carried out through civic initiatives with respect to the urban context and natural environment, produced an outstanding urban landscape and modern architectural language serving the needs of provisional capital and possessing functions, structures, and building typologies that reflected the modernisation of urban life in the 20th century.

MODERNIST KAUNAS: ARCHITECTURE OF OPTIMISM, 1919–1939
Statement of integrity

Modernist Kaunas consists of Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis, two adjacent districts that have been preserved in adequate size in almost unchanged historical form and design. The significant architectural structures and the original urban layout, including the characteristic sloping natural and humanmade terrain, public spaces and historic parks, have been retained in their entirety. Of 6000 surviving buildings constructed in Kaunas in 1919–1939, the greatest concentration of significant modernist structures is located in Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis with 1500 buildings of representative administrative, public, industrial, and residential functions testifying to the speed and diversity of development undertaken in the spirit of modernity. 220 structures and urban areas, constructed in the period of 1919–1939 within the Nominated Property, are listed on the National Register of Cultural Heritage. The buffer zone contains structures and groups of buildings dating back to the interwar period which strengthen the character of the nominated property.

Kaunas lost its status as Lithuania’s provisional capital in October 1939, and the sudden change in the city’s political status helped to preserve the physical attributes of the 1920s and 1930s. Under the Soviet rule, which lasted from 1944–1990, the physical state of interwar modernist buildings was not deliberately neglected, since the superior quality of the architecture was put to pragmatic use. Intermittent development of the area continued with the construction of many buildings that, although new, were compatible with the interwar period of development by being restrained in volume and form. Construction during this era did not alter the established street grid and squares, but it did see the addition of large modernist buildings. The growth of contemporary Kaunas and developmental pressures resulted in several large structures along Karaliaus Mindaugo Prospektas and sparked numerous debates about the relationship between new commercial architecture and the historic surroundings. Any risk is mitigated by listing of all areas comprising the Nominated Property on the National Register of Cultural Heritage and preparing of adequate conservation and management plans.

Statement of authenticity

Because the historically evolved areas of Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis have changed relatively little, the Modernist Kaunas is truly a time capsule of the 1919–1939 period. The location and setting, form and design, material and substance as well as use and function of the Nominated Property all represent a historic modernist city of the interwar period that evolved harmoniously, integrating the natural and historic settings, producing a diverse legacy of architectural modernism. The area of Naujamiestis is home to the largest concentration of landmark modernist buildings that were part of the formation of a new administrative, cultural, and social core of the Lithuanian state in 1919–1939. Modernist residential areas of Naujamiestis constitute a superior architectural background for the landmark buildings, creating a harmonious cityscape. The urban structure of the Naujamiestis, embodying the architectural and urban nature of a modern city, is noted for the greatest diversity of stylistic forms, materials, and functions – a feature which is still evident in the city today.

The Žaliakalnis area with Ąžuolynas Park, designed in 1923 and gradually developed up to 1939, represents an outstanding example of the integration of urban and natural landscapes and the adoption of the contemporaneous garden city concept to local conditions. Although the plan was only partially implemented, the elements that were realised and which have survived to this day reflect the local interpretation of the most progressive garden city urban planning concepts of the time, adjusted with an intelligent approach to suit pre-existing natural, topographical, and humanmade features. Another feature of Kaunas Modernism that has retained its authenticity is its historical, cultural and symbolical significance (intangible heritage). Today, the Nominated Property continues to see the highest concentration of active social, cultural, and economic activity, as well as the evolution of new traditions and initiatives inspired by the legacy of Kaunas Modernism.

Protection and management system

The Nominated Property covers a central part of the city Kaunas – a group of areas that are legally protected on the national and local level under the Law on the Protection of Immoveable Cultural Heritage, the Law on Protected Areas, the Law on Spatial Planning, the Law on Construction, the Law on Landscaping, and the Law on Environmental Protection. The property consists of seven protected zones: Naujamiestis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of Cultural Heritage No. 22148); Žaliakalnis 1, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of Cultural Heritage No. 31280); Kaunas Ąžuolynas Park Complex (National Register of Cultural Heritage No. 44581); the Kaunas Ąžuolynas Sports Complex (National Register of Cultural Heritage No. 31618); the Research Laboratory complex (National Register of Cultural Heritage No. 28567) and Christ's Resurrection Church (National Register of Cultural Heritage No. 16005). There are 408 listed cultural heritage properties and areas within the nominated property.

The cultural significance of the Nominated Property is integrated into the Kaunas City General Plan 2013–2023, as well as in subsequent preservation, regulation, and special plans on the national and local level. In 2015, the Kaunas City Municipal Heritage Restoration Programme was launched to provide financial support for the maintenance of cultural heritage and to improve the condition of modernist buildings in Kaunas. In 2017, the Kaunas City Municipality approved a Cultural Strategy for 2027 to establish an integrated approach toward the interwar period heritage, with a view to protecting this legacy and meeting the contemporary needs of the public. The management plan was prepared in 2020 to safeguard the preservation of OUV and proper management of the Nominated Property.
4. STATE OF CONSERVATION AND FACTORS AFFECTING THE PROPERTY
4. Present state of conservation

The territory of the Nominated Property Modernist Kaunas: Architecture of Optimism, 1919–1939 consists of cultural heritage sites and their protected zones listed on the Lithuanian National Register of Cultural Heritage (the Register). The protected sites also include other cultural heritage properties such as buildings and groups of buildings (complexes). The protection of the cultural heritage sites and properties is regulated by the national legislation presented in Chapter 5 of this Nomination. The protected attributes of the Nominated Property are presented in the table No. 4.1.

Evaluation of the state of conservation of the Nominated Property is based on information available at the Register [https://www.kpd.lt] and annual monitoring reports and field surveys of sites and landmark modernist buildings performed by Kaunas city municipality administration in 2010. Monitoring data of the state of greenery: Analysis and monitoring database of Kaunas cultural field Monitoring of the Heritage restoration programme, and other. There is no digital integral monitoring database.

Due to the size of the Nominated Property and the different types of areas within it, the property is further subdivided into zones described in section 2A of this Nomination. The state of conservation of each zone is presented separately. Information about the state of conservation and protection status of the most valuable modernist buildings is presented in the additional table (see Annex I).

4.1. Central Naujamiestis

Geomorphic setting and landscape elements. The terrain of the lower terrace of the Nemunas River valley is unaltered and is unlikely to change in the future since there is no anticipating need for any alteration and the flat terrain type is protected under the national law. Perimetal street landscaping with deciduous trees, green spaces and other landscaping elements is protected and maintained. Most of the trees in landscaped areas are in satisfactory condition. Old and diseased trees are removed. During the repair of Vytauto Prospektas and Milšio Street in 2017, older trees were removed so that underground utility networks could be rebuilt. New linden trees were planted after the work was completed. New trees were also planted to replace older ones on Vasario 16-osios and Maironio Streets. The row of linden trees planted along Laisvės Alėja is protected by law. All trees are protected and maintained, and any diseased or decaying trees are removed. The overall condition of the street landscaping is satisfactory. Deciduous tree landscaping in the City Garden Square is protected. The City Garden Square has a prevalence of mature trees in good condition. Ramybės Park (the former Kaunas Carmelite Cemetery) is maintained as a city park, with mature trees in good condition. The overall condition of the street landscape, visually distinguishing the former vehicular and pedestrian sections of the street that has been lost during earlier renovations. In recent years, repair work has also been completed on other streets, mainly by replacing existing worn underground engineering networks, renovating old, inauthentic pavement, installing bicycle paths, and introducing safe traffic measures such as fencing and crosswalks. The reconstruction of Unity (Vinėbybių) Square was completed in 2020, with the installation of an underground car park, new pavement, and flowerbeds. The City Garden Square was renovated in 2019–2020, with new pavement and planting flowerbeds. The City Garden Square is currently being renovated to preserve landscaping type and green spaces, renovate pavements, and repair the garden’s fountain. Archaeological research was conducted at the site prior to the start of renovation work.

Reconstruction work is currently being conducted on Kęstučio Street and maintenance work is also underway on S. Daukanto and L. Sapiegos Streets. The historic street layout and type of tree landscaping are protected, as are sections of historic pavement on Maironio Street. One of the largest structural interventions was completed in 1985 with the introduction of Karaliaus Mindaugo Prospektas, separating the city from the river.

Urban morphology. The prevailing type of city block development in Central Naujamiestis is perimetal and is protected. New buildings must be constructed to correspond with the historic development type and the density and height of the surrounding historic development. Many designs are drafted in accordance with established heritage preservation requirements, but there are structures, particularly those built before 2009, which fail to comply with subsequently developed requirements. Most of these large-volume, active spatial landmarks were built in the Soviet period. But there have also been instances in the past decade of new architecture failing to fully correspond to historic scale. Examples include the multi-purpose building of the Vytautas Magnus University completed on V. Putvinskio g. 23 in 2016, and a residential building currently under construction at the corner of K. Donelaičio and Maironio Streets. There have been renovations to certain large Soviet-era buildings, such as the conversion of the large but never-completed Respublika Hotel into a contemporary office building. Most of the new architectural designs are neutral, harmoniously blending into the heterogeneous historical fabric of the city, as

Table 4.1. Attributes of the Nominated Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Attributes</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural elements:</td>
<td>Geomorphological setting and landscape elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>Buildings of modernist architecture [annex I] and buildings of other historical periods protected by national law and listed on Cultural Heritage Register, their physical form and fabric, functions, according to individually defined attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function:</td>
<td>Current and former uses; activities and practices: Naujamiestis – administrative-cultural centre. Žalakalnis – residential neighbourhoods, recreational and sports facilities. Authentic or similar function of landmark buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intangible heritage:</td>
<td>Official national holidays, international and local international festivals, programs and cultural events that are held annually, such as Independence Day, Song Festival, Poetry Festival, City-telling Festival. Houses called by the names of their historic owners; memorial houses; memorial museums of prominent personalities. Monuments, memorial plaques and displays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
new buildings are built on sites with less valuable, or undeveloped urban structure.

The protected main urban landmarks – St. Michael the Archangel Garrison Church (20104), Vytautas the Great Museum complex (16846), and Kaunas State Musical Theatre (10346) – are all in good condition. Restoration of the Vytautas the Great Museum was completed in 2019. The cantion tower and a gallery of the complex are currently under restoration. Repairs on the interior of the Kaunas State Musical Theatre were conducted in 2018–2019; restoration work is currently underway on the exterior. Restoration work on the façades of St. Michael the Archangel Orthodox Church has also started.

Architecture. There are 348 surviving buildings constructed in 1919–1940 in Naujamiestis. Maintenance work has been performed on many of the most important public buildings in recent years including the Bank of Lithuania (in 2010), the Kaunas Philharmonic (2011), the Kaunas Cultural Centre (2019), and numerous buildings along Laisvės Alėja. The Romuva Cinema is currently under restoration and a proposal has been prepared for maintenance work on the Kaunas Artists’ House, for which financing has already been allocated. The condition of the Evangelical Reformed (Calvinist) Church (37587) is satisfactory, but some details are in poor condition. In the Soviet period, the building housed an athletics hall and cafeteria and interiors had been modified. The general condition of the buildings within the Central Naujamiestis area is good or satisfactory. Some of the buildings have been assessed as deteriorating due to improper maintenance or reconstruction work, during which some of the attributes have been lost. The area also includes protected buildings from other historical periods, including structures from the 19th century and the Soviet period (second half of the 20th century). The protection of such properties preserves the area’s visual layering and highlights its developmental stages.

Historical value and intangible heritage. The central area retains its principal administrative and cultural function. The authentic function of the area’s main public buildings is protected. The function of iconic modernist buildings has either remained authentic or approximates such authenticity. Main residential buildings have also preserved their authentic function. One of the most significant landmarks and the principal site for public events in Central Naujamiestis is the War Museum Garden which was developed in 1919 near the Vytautas the Great Museum. A Monument to the Fallen for Lithuania’s Freedom was unveiled here in 1921, followed by the dedication of the Laisve (Freedom) Statue in 1928. Destroyed by the Soviet regime in 1950, the two monuments were reconstructed in 1989. Lithuania’s most important public holidays continue to be commemorated in the War Museum Garden. The area is protected, maintained, and is in generally good condition. A maintenance project of the War Museum Garden was carried out in 2020.

4.a.2. Residential Naujamiestis

Geomorphological setting and landscape elements. The slopes of the upper terrace are unaltered; there is slight impact from erosion. No essential change is anticipated in the future and the terrain type is protected under national law. The sloped landscapes of the upper terrace are protected. Landscaping works are permitted but construction on slopes with inclines exceeding 15 degrees is prohibited. Slope greenery has been inventoried; its overall condition is satisfactory and there is a prevalence of natural tree and bush growth. In the eastern section, individual green areas have been inventoried, with conditions ranging from good to poor.

Urban structure. The surviving mixed street grid developed in the 19th and 20th centuries, is a significant attribute and is protected by national law. Its condition is good and satisfactory. Maintenance work was conducted on K. Būgos Street in 2018 and Žemaičių Street was renovated in 2019, replacing the pavement and installing sidewalks. Very important infrastructure elements in this zone are numerous stairs installed in the interwar period to connect the upper and lower slope terraces: stairs at E. Žilinskienė Street (authentic, good condition, renovated in 2020), Aušros Vartų Street (rebuilt in the Soviet period, now in satisfactory condition), Džiaiškiai Stairs (authentic, in good condition), Kauno Stairs (authentic, in good condition, renovated in 2019), Vytautas Park stairs (authentic, in satisfactory condition), stairs to Valdžių Street (authentic, in good condition), Fryko Stairs (also known as the Pedelos Stairs, rebuilt in the Soviet period, now in satisfactory condition). An outstanding attribute in this area is the funicular railway operating since 1931 (16773), which is in good condition.

Urban morphology. The development morphology in this area is mixed, with a prevalence of perimetal (along V. Putvinskio and Trakų Streets) and urban villa development types, and the presence of some detached buildings and fragments of vernacular-type construction (dating from the 19th century). The development structure has relatively unchanged. In the Soviet period, several multi-unit standardised residential buildings were constructed in these areas, as well as an addition to the Saule secondary school, an addition to the school on Trakų Street, and several private, single-family homes which echoed the interwar architectural style or were constructed based on designs drafted prior to the war. The most profound intervention was introduced during the Soviet period in the area around the Resurrection Church, when the building was converted into a radio factory as part of the Soviet regime’s official policy of promoting atheism. New production and administrative buildings were constructed along Savanorių Prospektas in the 1960s, including the Šilelis Cultural Centre in the 1980s (now part of the protected area; abandoned private property; conversion design currently being drafted for residential, office, and cultural spaces).

Architecture. There are 187 surviving buildings constructed in 1919–1940. The most important is Christ’s Resurrection Church (16505), which is in good condition. Maintenance work on the building is conducted regularly. In the northern part of the zone, the most significant modernist buildings are located along V. Putvinskio Street. The section of this street and its perimetal development from Nos. 52 to 72 is protected as a complex of residential buildings (15922). The condition of this section is varied, with façade maintenance conducted on some of the buildings, which also contain authentic interior details. The condition of other buildings within the complex is satisfactory, although some exterior deterioration has been observed. The condition of the buildings at Nos. 70 and 68, as well as the Bank Employees’ Residence (20748) is deteriorating due to lack of maintenance. Buildings along E. Žilinskienė Street were renovated in 2018–2019, with repair work completed on façades and roofs. Restoration work was completed in 2019 on the façades of the former French Embassy building (43273) at V. Putvinskio 14. The rehabilitation of other buildings within this zone area ranges from good to satisfactory.

In the eastern part, the most important modernist buildings are located along Trakų, K. Būgos, V. Mykolaitis-Putinas, and Damos Streets. The condition of these buildings is good or satisfactory.

Facade and roof repair works were completed on some of these buildings in recent years. The façade damages were usually the result of atmospheric impact (humidity), as well as improper maintenance work and improper façade insulation.

Historical value and intangible heritage. In the interwar period, Residential Naujamiestis was home to many prominent figures and diplomatic missions. These buildings are now marked with commemorative plaques. Some of the structures have preserved authentic apartments once owned by prominent citizens, where memorial museums have been established. Christ’s Resurrection Church carries exceptional symbolic significance after the return to the Catholic Church in 1989 and subsequent restoration.

4.a.3. Industrial Naujamiestis

Geomorphological setting and landscape elements. The flat terrain of the lower Nemunas River valley has not been altered. National legislation protects the deciduous tree landscape of the Military Hospital complex and the Military Hospital garden. Mature trees are predominant in this garden and are in satisfactory condition, however, the area is currently designated as a military zone and is not accessible for residents. The perimetal deciduous landscaping along Vytauto Prospektas is also protected. Renovation work in 2017 included the removal and replacement of older trees.

Urban structure. The surviving mixed street grid developed in the 19th and 20th centuries, is a significant attribute and is protected by national law. The grid is in good and satisfactory condition. Renovation was completed on Vytauto Prospektas, the main axis of the area in 2017, and the pavement on Karo Ligoninės Street was renovated in 2020.

Urban morphology. The area has a prevalence of mixed construction representing different developmental stages. There are also altered, incomplete urban structures. Nevertheless, authentic historic land plat boundaries have been retained throughout most of the area. Significant perimetal development segments
include sections along Karo Ligoninės and Šiaulių Streets, on Vytauto Prospektas, as well as individual structures – a total of 84 buildings constructed before 1939. Prominent sites within this area include the Clinic and Military Hospital Complex (44001) and the Penoceretas Industrial Complex (29486). In terms of function, another valuable site is the Kaunas Railway Station Hall, rebuilt in 1953 to replace the previously existing facility. The Kaunas Bus Station was rebuilt in 2017 as an addition to the previous structure, which had been converted into a station in 1937 from the former Minerva factory building. This area’s urban structure was partially damaged in 2007, after the construction of the large Akropolis shopping centre, merging two city blocks, and limiting the visual connection to the river along A. Mickevičiaus Street. Some of the area’s former industrial buildings and surrounding land have been neglected and will likely be converted for other uses in the future. The Nerimas River was functionally cut off from the city in 1965 after a broadening of the embankment and the creation of Kanaliaus Mašinai-Prospektas. Architecture. There are 59 surviving buildings constructed in 1919–1940. The Penoceretas industrial complex (29486) is of exceptional architectural and urban significance. The condition of the buildings within the complex varies: the refrigeration building (29487), dairy (29488), and administrative building (29490) have been converted to commercial and residential functions; the warehouse (29489) is in satisfactory condition, while the juice factory (29492) is in poor condition as the building has been abandoned. The Eye and Ear Clinic building (16663), part of the Military Hospital Complex, is significant and shapes the view along Vytauto Prospektas. The building is in good condition and maintenance work has been completed on the façade. Former mixed-use and hotel buildings forming the ‘modernist gates of Kaunas’ along Vytauto Prospektas are also significant assets. The Apartment building (44010), once owned by prominent Kaunas businessmen Volfas and Romans, is in poor condition and a restoration and reuse project is currently being drafted. The former Locomo Hotel, however, is abandoned and in poor condition but the restoration project has been prepared in 2020. Other buildings are in good or satisfactory condition. Some of the zone’s former industrial buildings have been lost or have been substantially altered due to changes in industry type and technology [ex. the Volfas Engelmann brewery and some structures of JSC Stumbras]. Historical value and intangible heritage. This Naujamiestis zone has retained its main historic functions (as a transportation node, hospital centre, etc.) and character. Because the area is now a part of the city centre, its functional nature is also changing. A historical brewery [JSC Volfas Engelmann] and a spirits distillery [JSC Stumbras], which thrived in the interwar period, continue their production traditions, and have also opened museums and exhibition rooms to showcase their corporate history.

4.a.4. The Garden City Area

Geomorphological setting and landscape elements. National legislation protects the type of street space and land plot landscaping. Landscaped areas are in good condition.

Urban structure. The historic street grid and the street structure has been preserved, including vehicle lanes and green strips with pathways and rows of trees. Only a segment of M. Jankaus Street between J. Basanauskius Aleja and Radišlienės Plentas has become dilapidated, and a section of V. Kudirkos Aleja has been closed to vehicular traffic and has been functionally incorporated into the adjacent square. The street grid and pattern are protected by national law. Within this structure, the most prominent axes are V. Kudirkos Aleja and J. Basanauskius Aleja – radiating symmetrically away from Gelučius Circle. The paved vehicular portion of these streets takes up 1/5 of their total width, creating a ratio to pathways and green bands of 2.3:1:2.3 – the same ratio recorded on the surviving 1938 plan. The initial structure of the segment of V. Kudirkos Aleja between Gelučius Circle and M. Jankaus Street has been preserved completely: the street lanes are framed by broad green strips and rows of trees planted on either side of paved sidewalks. The regular pattern of plain green strips has been interrupted where residents have planted decorative landscaping or hedges; the section between M. Jankaus Street and Radišlienės Plentas has multi-unit residential buildings set far back from the street as well as scattered clusters of landscaping. The district’s interior streets have retained the initial regular structure. The ratio of vehicular lanes to borders on these streets is 7.6:7 meters, i.e., the green strips are half as narrow. The initial structure has been retained on all sections of these streets. A negative maintenance impact has only been observed on the structure of Minties Circle. Because the street is curved, the uniform distance between paths and plot boundaries has not always been maintained and fences interject into the green strip zone in places. The short interior Gelučius and Skribony Street are narrower and do not have green strips. The streets marking the outer boundary of the area [Vyduonų Aleja, K. Petruškio Street, and Radišlienės Plentas] did not have a fully completed structure. On Vyduonų Aleja, a complete row of trees and a broad pathway was only installed on the Aþulytės Park side, while the developed side has only a sidewalk. The main structural elements on K. Petruškio Streets – a row of trees, a another valuable site is the Kaunas Railway Station Hall, rebuilt in 1953 to replace the previously existing facility. The Kaunas Bus Station was rebuilt in 2017 as an addition to the previous structure, which had been converted into a station in 1937 from the former Minerva factory building. This area’s urban structure was partially damaged in 2007, after the construction of the large Akropolis shopping centre, merging two city blocks, and limiting the visual connection to the river along A. Mickevičiaus Street. Some of the area’s former industrial buildings and surrounding land have been neglected and will likely be converted for other uses in the future. The Nerimas River was functionally cut off from the city in 1965 after a broadening of the embankment and the creation of Kanaliaus Mašinai-Prospektas. Architecture. There are 59 surviving buildings constructed in 1919–1940. The Penoceretas industrial complex (29486) is of exceptional architectural and urban significance. The condition of the buildings within the complex varies: the refrigeration building (29487), dairy (29488), and administrative building (29490) have been converted to commercial and residential functions; the warehouse (29489) is in satisfactory condition, while the juice factory (29492) is in poor condition as the building has been abandoned. The Eye and Ear Clinic building (16663), part of the Military Hospital Complex, is significant and shapes the view along Vytauto Prospektas. The building is in good condition and maintenance work has been completed on the façade. Former mixed-use and hotel buildings forming the ‘modernist gates of Kaunas’ along Vytauto Prospektas are also significant assets. The Apartment building (44010), once owned by prominent Kaunas businessmen Volfas and Romans, is in poor condition and a restoration and reuse project is currently being drafted. The former Locomo Hotel, however, is abandoned and in poor condition but the restoration project has been prepared in 2020. Other buildings are in good or satisfactory condition. Some of the zone’s former industrial buildings have been lost or have been substantially altered due to changes in industry type and technology [ex. the Volfas Engelmann brewery and some structures of JSC Stumbras]. Historical value and intangible heritage. This Naujamiestis zone has retained its main historic functions (as a transportation node, hospital centre, etc.) and character. Because the area is now a part of the city centre, its functional nature is also changing. A historical brewery [JSC Volfas Engelmann] and a spirits distillery [JSC Stumbras], which thrived in the interwar period, continue their production traditions, and have also opened museums and exhibition rooms to showcase their corporate history.

4.a.5. The Kaukas Area

Geomorphological setting and landscape elements. The area’s terrain, a naturally formed gully in which the Kaukas Stairs have been installed, and its landscaping are protected.

Urban structure. The authentic structure has been fully retained to this day. Interior streets are narrow and have no public landscaping. Their condition is satisfactory. Athletic fields have been established on Petras Vileišis Square (10721).

Urban morphology. The Kaukas District urban structure has short interconnecting streets and relatively small plots, arranged within blocks in rows, in some places two or three adjacent due to plot division. Building development on plots is irregular: some structures are built along the perimeter, adjacent to the sidewalk line, others are set back on their land plots. Urban morphological structure is uniform, with virtually no buildings of inconsistent height or volume.

The most prominent urban landmarks within the Kaukas area are Petras Vileišis Square, the Kaukas Stairs, and the Žaliakalnis Waterworks complex (28279) now owned by UAB Kauno Vandenvyys. These sites are in good condition. The Kaukas Stairs is an important pedestrian connection linking Naujamiesčiai and Žaliakalnis and have become a popular public recreation zone. In 2019, the Kaukas Stairs underwent a major renovation, and the Aukščiaus Street zone was also renovated comprehensively. The renovation included stair resurfacing, installation of fountains, the creation of an amphitheatre on one slope, and renovation of lighting fixtures. Original granite stair landings were preserved as part of the renovation and existing railings were restored. Maintenance and repair of the Waterworks complex were conducted in 2015–2016.

Architecture. The Kaukas area contains approximately 101 interwar-era buildings. Most buildings are authentic; or only slightly altered [installation of plastic windows, roof material replacement, etc.]. Approx. 18% of the pre-1940 buildings have been substantially altered through renovation but still retain the character of the period. Approximately 2–5% of the buildings have
4.a.6. The Perkūnas Area

Geomorphic setting and landscape elements. The type of terrain (slope) and landscaping is protected by national law. The area has surviving valuable old oak trees and other mature trees. Trees are planted along Perkūno Aleja, on Perkūnas Square, and in other individual green spaces. The important historic landscaping in Vytautas Park is protected under local legislation. The condition of landscaping in the park is good or satisfactory.

The area around the Radio Station is rather chaotically landscaped. In later periods, fir trees and red cedars (on the eastern side) were planted around the station, and blue spruces near adjacent homes. To the east of the station there is an increase in individual oak trees growing on a broad field. Over the past twenty years, a large natural cluster of bushes has matured on the property’s south-western edge. Where the terrain dips near a pond and a former spring. The condition of the landscaping is satisfactory, but the territory is quite abandoned. At the moment the territory is designated for engineering infrastructure and has no clear redevelopment vision as Radio Station is no longer in use.

Urban structure. The area retains a free-form street grid shaped by natural surroundings. Rows of trees line the main Perkūno Aleja on both sides, separating the vehicular lane from the sidewalks; lawn strips have been introduced to separate sidewalks and private plot boundaries. Their regularity has been interrupted by hedges and other landscaping (red cedars, firs, pine trees) planted by owners across property lines, and in some places grass lawns have been replaced with pavement. Važganto Street has no grass lawns or public landscaping. E. Fryko Street and the post-war-era Margo Street have no sidewalks or special landscaping.

Urban morphology. The Perkūnas District developed as a prestigious residential area and has remained so to this day. The area is predominantly residential. Public buildings are located in certain areas (e.g. the Neo-Lithuania Fraternity hall, today the Children’s and Students’ Recreation Hall, as well as structures in the Vytautas Park complex) or standing alone, including a hotel and a children’s nursery. The enclosed Radio Station grounds include buildings of the former radio and television centre, support structures, and radio towers. The whole area is no longer being heavily developed – recent years have seen the construction of several private homes designed in a contemporary architectural style.

Architecture. There are approximately 80 surviving buildings constructed in 1919–1940 in the Perkūnas area. The great majority of buildings are authentic or only slightly altered, with small modifications introduced during renovation. About 2% of pre-war homes have been significantly modified during reconstruction but still retain their period character. Fundamentally reconstructed buildings make up approximately 2–5% of structures, however all of them retain their original expressive elements. Brick buildings make up 91% of structures in this area and wooden buildings – 4%. The condition of most private houses is good or satisfactory. The condition of the Neo-Lithuania Hall is satisfactory, and the building is being restored in stages. Buildings on the Vytautas Park complex are abandoned and in poor condition. The radio station building is in satisfactory condition.

Historical value and intangible heritage. The area has retained its historically developed functions and buildings here are significant because of their historical and memorial value. One of the area’s most significant sites is the former residence of Dainų Valley (renovating pavement, outdoor stage steps and benches; and support structures located beneath the stage) has been prepared, also in 2019. The reconstruction of Darius and Girenas Stadium, already rebuilt in 1979, is currently underway, adapting it to contemporary needs and sports infrastructure standards. In the western section of Ažuolynas, a sports and health complex has been constructed facing the Hall of Physical Education, including the installation of tennis courts. As part of the effort to expand athletic activities in the area, a design competition for a new Track and Field Arena was held and a winning design selected. Planning for the new facility is underway. Reconstruction work is currently being conducted on Sporto Street around the Steponas Darius and Stasys Girėnas Monument, replacing existing pavement and utility systems. The condition of the monument is good. The Kaunas Regional Public Library built on former Parodos Square in 1987 has complemented the area’s cultural and social function.

4.a.7. Ažuolynas Park and Sports Complex

Geomorphic setting and landscape elements. Ažuolynas Park is protected by national law as part of the Natura 2000 network. Forested land makes up 97.52% of the total area here. Landscaping is in good condition; a maintained lawn has been created here and recreational infrastructure has been installed and is in good condition. The terrain and its naturally occurring deep gullies and creeks are protected. The Ažuolynas Nature Management Plan was approved by the Lithuanian Ministry of the Environment in 2019. The plan calls for the preservation of protected wild flora and fauna and the general maintenance of the entire Ažuolynas Park.

Urban morphology. The area retains its authentic structure and its principal components, which are in satisfactory condition. A plan for the renovation of the Ažuolynas recreational infrastructure was prepared in 2019. A proposal for the maintenance of Darių Valley (renovating pavement, outdoor stage steps and benches; and support structures located beneath the stage) has been prepared, also in 2019. The reconstruction of Darius and Girenas Stadium, already rebuilt in 1979, is currently underway, adapting it to contemporary needs and sports infrastructure standards. In the western section of Ažuolynas, a sports and health complex has been constructed facing the Hall of Physical Education, including the installation of tennis courts. As part of the effort to expand athletic activities in the area, a design competition for a new Track and Field Arena was held and a winning design selected. Planning for the new facility is underway. Reconstruction work is currently being conducted on Sporto Street around the Steponas Darius and Stasys Girėnas Monument, replacing existing pavement and utility systems. The condition of the monument is good. The Kaunas Regional Public Library built on former Parodos Square in 1987 has complemented the area’s cultural and social function.

4.a.8. Research Laboratory Complex

Geomorphic setting and landscape elements. The area’s terrain and oak trees (in satisfactory condition) are protected.

Urban structure. The authentic plan structure formed by the buildings within the complex has been retained, including the main Research Laboratory building set back from the street and its access road; a guard booth adjacent to the access road, and support buildings located in section R of the property. Only an administrative building constructed at a later time intersects into the northern part of the property.

Architecture. Four interwar era cultural heritage structures survive in this area. The condition of the Hall of Physical Education (1949) and the A. and P. Galaunė House (18670) is good. The stadium and sports arena had been reconstructed in the Soviet period as functional standards changed. The arena retains its main volume, wall and roof construction, and door type. The building is currently under renovation. Reconstruction of the stadium is also underway. The value of these structures rests on their inclusion within a larger complex whose location and function is significant. These are prominent symbols of urban athletics and the city’s evolution.

Historical value and intangible heritage. The original and historically developed recreational purpose of Ažuolynas Park is protected. Since 1904, Darių Valley has been the setting for the world-renowned and unique Song Festivals. The song festival traditions of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were inscribed on the UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage Representative List in 2003. Various cultural events continue to be held on the site.

The first Lithuanian national games were held on the athletics complex grounds in 1938, as was the European Men’s Basketball Championship in 1939. The athletics complex retained its authentic function and continues to host sports and cultural events today. The Sports Arena was the first venue constructed specifically for basketball in Europe. The Galaunė House now includes the A. and P. Galaunė Memorial Museum.
The urban morphology of perimetral block development in central Naujamiestis, mixed and urban villa development in residential areas, and the character of the southern industrial zone, as well as private detached development of Žalakairiai is easily recognizable and protected. Although the area has preserved its overall urban character, volumetric-spatial structure, and functions, there are sporadic examples of incompatible buildings. Violations of area planning regulations have also been observed.

The overall condition of buildings within the nominated property is satisfactory. The condition of all listed buildings is assessed every 5 years and is also inspected with every change in ownership. The most frequently observed damage is the result of facade deterioration due to atmospheric effects (humidity) and general wear, improper repair, or reconstruction (e.g., installation of incompatible additions), or improper energy efficiency improvement work (façade and attic insulation). The most common violation reasons are: (1) violations resulting from insufficient awareness of a property's value, leading to the replacement or destruction of authentic architectural details, construction of incompatible additions, or building abandonment; (3) incomplete maintenance—building upkeep completed in stages, without an overall plan or strategy; (4) lack of financing (mostly for private houses).

Considerable attention has been given to emphasizing the area's intangible and historical value. The Song Festival tradition is listed on the National Intangible Heritage List (http://savadas.lt/naruti/nuomai/studijos/songfestivalis). The Winter Museum celebrates the cultural heritage of the Kaunas region (http://pilnas3.kaunas.lt/divizija/vandens-historija/muziejaus-veiksmaiz/). The Kaunas Central Post Office (http://pilnas3.kaunas.lt/divizija/vandens-historija/muziejaus-veiksmaiz/) continues annually (held in June–August). The War Museum is regularly held in the War Museum garden (during the National holidays), etc. The interwar cultural heritage is accessible at https://maps.kaunas.lt/zeldynai/aplinka/

4.10. Applicable protection measures
The attributes (see Table 4) of sites and properties in Naujamiestis and Žalakairiai are protected by national law and documents regulating local activities, including special cultural heritage conservation plans and regulations governing cultural heritage protection. The area's sustainable development through the protection of cultural heritage and valuable attributes is regulated by the Kaunas City Municipal General Plan and other strategic documents and special plans. All documents governing protection and sustainable development are described in Chapter 5.

4.10.1. Protection of landscape elements
The protected natural elements and landscaping in the area are the Nemunas River valley (upper and lower flat terrain terraces and slopes), landscaping and green spaces, and landscaping type. The protection of these elements is ensured by the existing legal framework and planning documents. All proposed planning and design solutions are coordinated with accountable institutions. For the removal of mature trees an approval from the KCMA Environmental Protection Division is required. No essential terrain alterations are foreseen; however, slope erosion is possible due to heavy rains caused by climate change, active construction work, and loss of landscaped areas.

Current monitoring: The KCMA Environmental Protection Division monitors and records the quality of landscaping and green spaces in the city of Kaunas. A database created for this purpose can be accessed at https://maps.kaunas.lt/zeldynai/aplinka/

Proposed: monitoring of slope erosion; preservation of a consolidated slope development and maintenance concept.

4.10.2. Protection of urban structure and urban morphology
The protected attributes in the area are the street grid and pattern, urban structure and morphology, as well as important views (see figs. 6 on p. 19 and fig. 7 on p. 20 of the Management Plan (Annex 4)).

The protection of these elements is ensured by the existing legal framework and planning documents. According to applicable law, new buildings are constructed to correspond to the historical development type and the scale of surrounding historical development. Most designs are prepared in accordance with established heritage protection requirements. All development and new construction activities planned in the area are coordinated with the relevant institutions responsible for cultural heritage protection, and permits are obtained to conduct land development or construction work. The design quality of new urban elements is inspected by advisory organisations (Kaunas Regional Architecture Council [KAET], Kaunas Architecture and Urban Planning Experts Council [KAUET]), Cultural Heritage Experts Board and the Commission on Questions Pertaining to Urban Planning, Architecture and Investment, established by the Kaunas City Municipal Administration.

Current monitoring: Monitoring of nationally designated cultural heritage sites is conducted every 5 years by the Department’s Kaunas Division. Sites with municipal level protection designation are monitored by the KCMA Cultural Heritage Division every 5 years. The KCMA conducts monitoring of the city's General Plan every two years.

Proposed: site monitoring on an annual basis; develop a good practice guidance on quality contextual architecture; urban heritage protection and sustainable development.
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4.a.10.3. Protection of architecture (buildings)

The principal administrative and cultural functions of the central Naujamiestis and the residential and recreational functions of Žaliakalnis are preserved. The function of most of the landmark modernist buildings has either remained authentic (mostly of religious, cultural and educational buildings) or similar (mostly of administrative and mixed used buildings). Most of the residential buildings have also preserved their authentic residential function. Urban landmarks, such as the War Museum Garden, Dainų Valley, Ažuolynas Park, Sports Complex and other, have preserved their function and traditional events that take place in there.

The preservation of the attributes. The historic function of the urban areas comprising the nominated property (see Table 4.1) is protected by the General plan and special planning documents. Buildings, significant historical and memorial structures (former homes of prominent interwar figures or sites of important events) are designated with memorial plaques and displays. The intangible attributes are preserved through celebration of official national holidays, international and local international festivals, programs and cultural events that are held annually.

Other activities. Since 2017, the project Kaunas – European Capital of Culture 2022 established a Memory Office programme that collects stories and memories of people of various ethnic and religious communities of Kaunas. These stories are expected to strengthen the identity of the city. Together it will serve as a source of inspiration for various cultural and art projects that will increase the mutual respect and human rights. Memory Office is a partner of the project Amintines/vietos.lt [Places of memory], an interactive archive, where the urbanscape of Kaunas is presented as a map of collective memory: where the physical forms of memory – buildings, streets, courtyards, squares, monuments, museums, and public spaces – reveal the forgotten or hidden past.

Current monitoring: Current monitoring of cultural field covers the number of visitors; number of participants; number of participants in training; number of professionals involved; number of events; number of other activities; number of people reached by means of communication; number of local partners; number of international partners; enduring value (cultural products).

Proposed: to establish strategy for interpretation and communication of Kaunas as World Heritage Site and develop a program of themed events and engagement activities.

4.a.10.4. Protection of function and Intangible Heritage

From the perspective of urban development management, the Nomination of Modernist Kaunas to the UNESCO World Heritage List is seen as an integral part of territorial and spatial planning, helping to refine General plan solutions and foster the city’s identity in the context of development and future growth. The factors potentially affecting the nominated property are listed below. The management of these threats is important to ensure the integrity of the nominated area, the preservation of valuable elements, and their integral use in the city’s further development.

4.b. Factors affecting the property

4.b.1. Development pressures

Development trends that are likely to affect or threaten the OUV of the Nominated Property are categorised into the following themes: a) pressure for demolition, rebuilding, and new construction; b) pressure for high development intensity; c) pressure for renovation and maintenance; d) pressure of unsustainable mobility patterns. Most of the challenges outlined in separate sections apply to all the nominated property, specific challenges will be described separately for each zone if applicable.

4.b.11. Pressure for demolition, rebuilding, and new construction

Naujamiestis has seen the design of larger scale objects in recent years, including new office buildings, hotels, and multi-unit residential buildings. Intensity of the area increases with renovation as well. The scope and methods of development in the Žaliakalnis area are sufficiently restricted by special cultural heritage conservation plans (reconstruction and renovation work is conducted, and new structures appear on empty lots).

Kaunas City General Plan and the special cultural heritage conservation plans will continue to regulate technical development parameters of the developments in Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis while quality of significant developments will be under supervision of the Kaunas city architect and Regional Architecture Council under the Chamber of Architects. Moreover, considerable attention will be devoted to closely monitor development patterns and trends with the use of Kaunas City General Plan implementation monitoring program (conducted and approved by the Kaunas City Municipal Council every two years), and monitoring system specifically designed for the Nominated Property presented in the Management plan.

4.b.12. Pressure for higher development intensity

For the past 10 years population of Kaunas city was decreasing, which is a common trend in most of Eastern European counties. In the past several (2018–2020) years population started stabilizing given the successful efforts of Kaunas City Municipality and national investment attraction agency Invest Lithuania to attract international investors to Kaunas region, large public investments into mobility, communications, green and social infrastructure.

National and local commitment to promote compact development is expected to balance or reduce suburbanisation processes common in the region and bring/keep citizens to urban areas where local centres can be further developed. Kaunas City General Plan foresees intensified development within Naujamiestis. Higher intensity of urban structures and functions is necessary to attract residents and sustain and increase areas vitality. Given the appeal of the nominated area, increased pressure for intensified development is likely to continue in the future. Naujamiestis will remain an administrative, cultural, and business centre of the city, while Žaliakalnis will remain one of the most attractive residential areas in the city.

Žaliakalnis is an area of low or medium urban density which is not planned to be changed in the future according to the Kaunas City General Plan. Development in the area is regulated by the special cultural heritage conservation plans.

According to the 2013 Special Plan for High-Rise Building Location within the Kaunas City Municipality, high-rise structures are not permitted in the Nominated Property. One of the zones for high-rise development is on Lower Freda area. Area face Industrial Naujamiestis (1.3) zone and is within Naujamiestis visual protection zone and, accordingly, the Buffer Zone. A group of high-rise buildings is being proposed for location in the Lower Freda area, which is included within the Nominated Property’s Buffer zone. Special Plan stipulates that high-rise structures can be built in Lower Freda, only after an assessment of any potential impact on the visibility of Christ’s Resurrection Church from Europos Prospektas. Buildings up to 30 metres are allowed only in zone
1.3. Industrial Naujamiestis. Such projects require environmental impact assessment and approval by the Kaunas Architecture and Urban Planning Experts Council (KAUET).

4.13. Pressure for renovation and maintenance

The Kaunas city administration recognises that development in Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis comes with a greater development cost due to the high concentration of heritage restrictions and limited building intensities in the area. To ensure development is profitable, the city provides financial incentives (additional funding for façade renovation and accessibility for the disabled) and is open to discuss more liberal development regulations in places where development cannot have a negative impact on valuable properties in these areas.

There are signs of average or low-quality maintenance and construction where inferior materials are used, or architects fail to achieve overall development quality and spatial integrity. Capacity building regarding best practices for developers, architects and heritage specialists, as well as civil servants is needed to ensure superior reconstruction, renovation, and restoration projects.

A fair number of buildings in Žaliakalnis are wooden. Such buildings have usually not been well maintained and are thus unattractive for restoration and renovation due to their higher renovation cost, higher insurance burdens, and difficulties securing loans to acquire such buildings. This can mean an uncertain future for wooden architecture. Financial incentives are necessary to balance development costs. Awareness raising and capacity building regarding how to renovate wooden buildings is important to increase the appeal of such buildings.

Policies and Mitigation Measures:

Additional attention should be paid to raising awareness and competences of the public and specialists working with the modernist heritage. Good practice guidance could help owners and specialists ensure sustainable conservation.

- Financial incentives. The KCMA Cultural Heritage Division oversees the Heritage Conservation Programme (established in 2013) provides financial support to private owners of cultural heritage buildings for the preparation of conservation projects and performance of maintenance work.

- The General Plan of the Territory of Kaunas City Municipality (2004). The plan’s objectives call for the preservation of cultural heritage and are founded on sustainable development principles. The plan presents a development model for the urban space that emphasises the uniqueness of the city’s natural and cultural heritage – attributes which helped shape the city's exceptional urban structures – and adheres to suitable development principles and the planning practices and experience embraced by other European and world cities. (For more information, see section 5.1.2.)

- Monitoring of the General Plan of the Territory of Kaunas City Municipality. The monitoring programme approved by the Kaunas City Council can be supplemented with additional measures directed at the promotion of valuable attributes within the nominated property.

- Special plans regulating cultural heritage conservation. The objective of plans devoted to cultural heritage protection is the regulation of preserving cultural heritage objects and sites. Special plans and regulations have been established to regulate zones, boundaries, and areas, as well as requirements and methods for heritage conservation. The implementation programme for the General Plan calls for the adoption of a Special Plan for Naujamiestis to provide greater clarity regarding the area’s development strategy.

- The Special Plan for High-Rise Building in the Kaunas City Municipality regulates the location, size planning, and approval process of high-rise buildings (structures rising to 30 metres or more, measured from the average ground altitude of a given plot’s surface to a building’s top construction point) within the city of Kaunas. A high-rise structure (up to 30 metres) is allowed only in zone 1.3. Industrial Naujamiestis. Such projects require environmental impact assessment and approval by the Kaunas Architecture and Urban Planning Experts Council (KAUET). No other high-rise construction is planned for the remaining portion of the nominated area.

- The Special Plan for the Location of Large Commercial Enterprises in the City of Kaunas (2005) designates zones in which large commercial enterprise development is allowed within the nominated property. A “Commercial Passageway and Showroom Development Zone” has been foreseen in zone 11. Central Naujamiestis. Within zone 13. Industrial Naujamiestis, department stores (grocers and retailing of other daily goods), specialized shops (e.g., furniture, domestic appliances, etc.), and shopping centres may be developed. Such developments should face regeneratized post-industrial areas. The construction of large commercial enterprises is prohibited within 12. Residential Naujamiestis and entire Žaliakalnis.

- Monitoring of the condition of all listed properties in the city. Monitoring of the condition of all listed properties – buildings and groups of buildings – is conducted jointly by every 5 years by the Department’s Kaunas Division and KCMA Cultural Heritage Division. A condition assessment report is required upon any change in ownership (or execution of contract) of all buildings listed on the National Register of Cultural Heritage.

- Regional architecture councils. Since the adoption of the Law on Architecture in 2019, a Regional Architectural Council has been established in every Lithuanian region. The purpose of these councils is to provide recommendations regarding territory planning documents, draft proposals for architectural and cultural heritage adaptive reuse projects, to present architectural and urban planning solutions for proposed new development projects and their compliance with architectural quality requirements and other issues pertaining to architectural quality.

- The Commission on Questions Pertaining to Urban Planning, Architecture, and Investment. In 2019, the Kaunas City Municipal Administration has established a commission to examine issues related to the use of Kaunas City territory, urban and architectural development, and investment, and to provide findings, proposals, and recommendations on such matters to the Kaunas City Council, the city’s mayor, the Director of the Municipal Administration, and the Head of the Municipal Administration’s Planning and Architecture Division.

4.14. Pressure of unsustainable mobility patterns

The concentration of employment in the central area of Kaunas and growth of residential areas in outskirts of the city has led to an increase in the use of private vehicles in Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis, a growing demand for parking spaces, and increased air pollution. Kaunas City General Plan (2014) identified that transit traffic is one of the biggest challenges in the Old Town and Naujamiestis. The growth of vehicular traffic is one of the risk factors which may potentially have a negative impact on the spatial quality of Naujamiestis. The growth in traffic has not had such a great effect on Žaliakalnis since the area is less densely populated and the demand for parking spaces near public buildings is being resolved locally.

City has a clear strategy in place to tackle these issues. Kaunas City General Plan foresees changes in the traffic network that will remove transit traffic from the Old Town and Naujamiestis. These changes with which a ring road around the inner city will be created, are currently being prepared for implementation. Sustainable urban mobility plan suggested making central Kaunas a Zero-emission zone with increased parking prices, improvement of cycling and micro-mobility network and prioritizing public transport. New multi-storey and underground parking garages are planned in parallel to the plan to reduce amount of street parking. Smart solutions such as smart parking, traffic-light sensors that respond to increased and reduced traffic intensities, green public transport fleet, integrated e-ticket system are some of the measures that will encourage sustainable and balanced mobility system in the future.

Policies and Mitigation Measures:

- Development of a smart and sustainable mobility networks. Kaunas has a well-developed transport network. Private automobile is a dominant mode for residents, but public transport is an important mode of travel and cycling is gaining more popularity. The city seeks to ensure better conditions for sustainable mobility; by implementing such measures:

  • Cycling and micro-mobility: expansion of cycling network and support infrastructure (bike parking, bike fixing points) and designating spots for private shared and micro-mobility initiatives (shared cycling and e-scooter system).

  A development strategy for cycling paths in Naujamiestis was prepared in 2018 and is currently being implemented. Every year, the City Administration and its partners publish educational programmes and hold events promoting sustainable mobility.

- Public transport. The use of public transport is also being improved through the introduction various smart solutions: e-ticket mobile application, an application for the visually impaired, upgrading of the public transportation fleet, and the annual review of existing transportation routes to respond to passenger demand and changing functional distribution of the city.

- Sustainable Mobility Plan (2019). The Kaunas City Sustainable Mobility Plan (SMP) was approved in 2019. Action plan of the SMP outlines financial, technical, and educational measures to promote sustainable mobility and propose limitations on vehicular traffic and parking in the city centre. Implementation of the SMP will help create infrastructure that promotes healthy lifestyle and increase the environmental appeal of Kaunas.

- Parking requirement rates in Naujamiestis. The City Council may establish lower parking spaces rates compared to the Building Condo for newly constructed or reconstructed buildings in protected areas to help reduce the number of parking spaces in new developments in selected city areas. New underground and multi-storey parking are planned in Naujamiestis to ensure consolidation of cars and reduction of street parking.

- Air quality monitoring. Air quality monitoring is conducted regularly within the city. Monitoring is performed by the Environmental Protection Agency. Air quality information is publicly available and published daily on the internet and is broadcasted daily on the LCD screens in public transportation.
4. STATE OF CONSERVATION AND FACTORS AFFECTING THE PROPERTY

4.b.2. Environmental pressures and climate mediation

4.b.2.1. Environmental factors

The Nominated Property in Kaunas is not affected by significant environmental factors. There is nothing to indicate that climate change has had any significant impact on the Nominated Property or its valuable structures. The ability to perform necessary maintenance work is not impaired, nor is the ability to ensure access to and visitation of objects and sites.

The southern section of Naujamiestis (zones 1.1 and 1.3) falls within the Nemunas River rain and snowmelt low probability (0.1%) flood risk zone. The Nemunas River and territories along Nemunas River in zone 1.3. Industrial Naujamiestis are in 1% flood risk zone and perimeter of Nemunas Island is in the 10% flood risk zone. Construction within risk zones is regulated and protection and adaptation measures are required before acquiring building permission. Potential Impacts of Floods in Lithuania is monitored and managed through the implementation of the Flood Risk Management Plan, the Water Action Plan, the National Climate Change Strategy, various measures for flood prevention, preparedness, rehabilitation, as well as engineering non-structural flood protection are planned and implemented (fig. 456).

The Nemunas valley slopes are constantly being affected by rainfall. No clear damage from the impact of rainfall on slopes has been identified to date, but given the risks posed by climate change, it is important to appreciate the potential impact of such change and provide for climate mitigation measures.

There is no evidence suggesting that climate change has already had any significant impact on the nominated property or its valuable structures or that it will have in the near future. The ability to perform necessary maintenance work is not impaired, nor is the ability to ensure access to and visitation of objects and sites.

Kaunas does not record the quantity of permeable surfaces. The amount of impermeable surfaces in Naujamiestis appears large, however it is important to inspect the proportion of permeable versus impermeable surfaces to determine measures that may be required in the future. Permeable surface ratios are regulated on a national basis for new projects, but the experience of other municipalities shows that cities can also initiate appropriate local action plans.

Rising global temperature will in the future have impact on the urban vegetation, might disturb natural cycles of existing ecosystems. Kaunas City Municipality Environment protection division closely monitors state of urban vegetation. An extensive database of types of vegetation and its states is updated periodically. Ážuolynas park (zone 2.4.) has a Nature Management Plan approved in 2019 where state of the vegetation is assessed, and an action plan proposed to restore the favourable condition of the gloomy golden beetle [protected species] habitat in the territory.

4.b.2.2. Reduction of carbon footprint of listed buildings

Since 2005 Lithuania has been implementing Mass Housing Modernisation Program. The main goal of the program is to decrease consumption of energy for heating in buildings by encouraging owners and co-owners of buildings to do modernisation projects by using financial support from the government. Program is mostly designed for socialist housing stock, but owners of heritage buildings can apply to participate in the program as well. Modernisation projects mostly focus on improving insulation and renovation of heating systems. Modernisation of listed buildings comes with a higher cost due to strict requirements from the Cultural Heritage Department and not all renovation measures [materials, technological and engineering solutions] can be used for listed buildings. The National Building Code gives exemption for renovation of listed buildings from achieving energy efficiency standards if renovation might have negative impacts to the valuable properties of the building. Nonetheless, it is requested to decrease energy consumption in listed buildings too, therefore alternative strategies are required to reduce impact to climate such as encouraging heritage buildings to use green energy produced by outside the city or produce part of the energy locally where installation of infrastructure is feasible, ensure proper functioning of natural ventilation and shading systems originally installed in the buildings and similar. Additional research and best practice guides are needed to understand better the technical qualities of modernist structures and proper measures to ensure lower environmental footprint.
4.b.3. Natural disasters and risk preparedness

Potential hazards in Lithuanian municipalities are analysed considering the methodological recommendations of the Potential Hazards and Emergency Risk Analysis that are approved by the Director of the Fire Protection and Rescue Department under the Ministry of the Interior.

Level of water in Nemunas river is controlled by the Kaunas Hydroelectric Power Station that was built in 1960 with the goal to better manage water resources for energy production and protect the city from annual spring floods. Kaunas Hydroelectric Power Station is a strategic, protected object that is constantly being maintained and modernised. Theoretical possibility of the collapse of the Station exists; it is identified and monitored according to the Emergency Management Plan of the city.

In 2012, Kaunas City Municipality’s Emergency Management Plan has been approved by the Order No. A-828 of the Director of KCMA (last updated in 2017 by the Order No. A-702). The Plan is there to assist the Director and the Municipal Emergency Operations Centre in organising and coordinating the elimination of imminent or existing emergencies and the elimination of their consequences. The Emergency management plan is supplemented by the Kaunas City Municipality Hazards and Emergency Risk Analysis document, where the risk groups and risk levels are defined (last updated in 2019 by the Order No. 64-3). The Emergency Prevention Plan define mitigation measures for the emergencies of very high- and high-risk level groups such as fires, natural, catastrophic hydrological disasters (e.g., flood, drought, storm), collapse of buildings, collapse of Kaunas Hydroelectric Power Station, pandemics, etc. The threat of loss of cultural heritage properties is associated with violations of fire safety rules and intentional human activities and is of medium risk level so particular measures are not defined and general protection policies are applied.

4.b.4. Responsible visitation at World Heritage sites

4.b.4.1. The impact of visitors and tourists

Kaunas is becoming popular among tourists and, if visitor flows increase, the municipality has a sustainable tourism strategy in place to ensure responsible visitation to the area. Kaunas is visited annually by approximately 350,000 tourists and city guests, and this number continues to grow. There are currently no indications that these tourist activities could pose a threat to the nominated area or diminish its value. Kaunas City economy does not rely on tourism; it comprises up to 1.5% of city’s GDP annually.

Visitors flows are diverse: academic and business guests (due to large number of academic institutions and considerable amount international businesses), medical tourists (growing interest due to university hospital and supporting medical infrastructure); and cultural.

The Kaunas IN tourism information service is responsible for implementing the current the Kaunas City Tourism Marketing Plan for 2015–2020. The vision of the plan is to position the city as an innovative capital of European culture by showcasing its cultural heritage, its capacity to host high-level conferences, provide superior medical and health services, and ensure sustainable and technological progress in the city. As part of this plan, measures are being introduced to ensure the stable and sustainable growth of local and external tourism flows as well as increase tourism-derived income. Cultural tourism has been identified as a priority area. In recent years, construction of new hospitality centres (hotels, hostels, conference centres, etc.) and reconstruction of existing facilities has been undertaken to serve the growing flow of tourism.

One of the Kaunas City Cultural Strategy up to 2027 objectives is to promote a sustainable tourism model, linked to local heritage and community, and interaction with cultural ecosystems through actions outlined in the Strategy. Interest in the culture of the Kaunas interwar period – its architecture and way of life – continues to grow. Tours, guidebooks, virtual tours, and thematic exhibitions are regularly organized and published to present the interwar cultural legacy. Given the considerable effort directed at promoting tourism in Kaunas and a greater appreciation for its history by focusing attention on its interwar heritage, it is anticipated that tourism flows will continue to increase. A new tourism and marketing strategy for Kaunas is currently being developed, which will include measures to ensure sustainable site visitation, combine and reinforce various initiatives taking place within the city, and improve conditions for greater appreciation of the city.

4.b.4.1. The impact of European Capital of Culture 2022

At the beginning of 2017, Kaunas was awarded the title of the European Capital of Culture for 2022 (ECoC). A team comprising various cultural organisations, artists, and creatives, developed a programme with a theme “Contemporary Capital.” The years of preparation for the European Capital of Culture 2022 is focused on creating a sustainable, decentralised system of cultural services. The vision of the ECoC is underpinned by three main values – creative entrepreneurship, localism, and inclusivity. Main goals of the Capital of Culture project are to strengthen the competitiveness and professional qualification of employees in the organisations of the cultural sector, and their social responsibility; promote art, science, and design innovation; and build the identity of the Kaunas city and Kaunas region.

It is expected that years leading to ECoC and year of the program is expected to attract additional flows of tourists and rising number of cultural events but there are currently no indications that these tourist activities could pose a threat to the nominated area or diminish its value.

4.b.5. Number of inhabitants within the property and the buffer zone (in 2020)

Within the nominated property area: 13.472
Buffer zone: 7895
Total: 21.367
5. PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE PROPERTY
5.a. Ownership

The Nominated Property and the surrounding buffer zone administratively fall under the jurisdiction of the Kaunas City Municipality.

Private property is the prevalent form of ownership throughout the nominated area and the buffer zone. Naujamiestis is the city’s administrative, cultural and business centre, and includes numerous non-residential (administrative, public, academic, cultural, healthcare, food service, commercial) and mixed-use buildings, owned by national or municipal institutions. Private ownership also prevails in Žaliakalnis. Only approximately 5% of the structures in this area serve public functions and there are currently no trends indicating any increase in that proportion. The Research Laboratory complex falls under the jurisdiction of the Kaunas University of Technology. Streets, parks, squares and other public spaces are owned and managed by the Kaunas City Municipal Administration. The ownership status of the landmark modernist buildings is specified in the attached table (Annex I).

5.b. Protective designation

The nominated property includes listed cultural heritage sites and properties which have been subject to heritage preservation requirements for decades (see Table 5.1). Because these properties are subject to restrictions which most owners are now aware of, no significant management-related issues are anticipated.

The nominated area consists of the following listed sites and properties:

(a) Sites as Historic urban areas:
1. Naujamiestis, a Historic District of Kaunas;
2. Žaliakalnis, a Historic District of Kaunas; and
3. Žaliakalnis I, a Historic District of Kaunas.

(b) Complexes and buildings:
4. Christ’s Resurrection Church;
5. Kaunas Ąžuolynas Park Complex;
6. Kaunas Ąžuolynas Sports Complex;
7. The Research Laboratory Complex.

(c) Other cultural heritage properties located within the sites
(see fig. 457 and Annex I)
1. Naujamiestis, a Historic District of Kaunas, area: 2,266,991 m², visual protection zone: 1,716,600 m². Protected as a historic urban
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone No.</th>
<th>Title and unique code on the Register</th>
<th>Date and document of listing</th>
<th>Status of Protection / Document no.</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Protective documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Žaliakalnis, a Historic District of Kaunas (22148)</td>
<td>1995-01-01 (Order of the Director of the Department of Cultural Heritage Protection)</td>
<td>State Protected (Order of the Minister of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania No. [V-190, 2005-04-29])</td>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>Protection regulation plan No. PR-22148; Special plan No. IV-680 (2013-12-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The Research Laboratory Complex (28567)</td>
<td>2004-03-12 (Order of the Director of the Department of Cultural Heritage Protection No. 5-59)</td>
<td>State Protected (Order of the Minister of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania No. [V-190, 2005-04-29])</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Act No. KPD-SK-37 (2011-12-12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 The status and details of the protected sites within the nominated property.

**site (National Register of the Cultural Heritage unique code No. 22148):**

Attributes: urban structure and morphology (typology of street pattern and the grid, historic plot boundaries, block structure and morphotypes; typology of public spaces: streets, squares, passages, etc.; panoramas and vistas [from designated observation points], designated street elevations); landscape elements [terrain and greenery, parks; architecture [landmark buildings and other listed buildings], intangible attributes [such as former homes of prominent interwar figures or sites of important events, e.g., former residence of Japanese diplomat and consular official Chiune Sugihara].

**Protection and development regulation: Special Conservation Plan approved by the Kaunas City Municipal Council, Decision No. Т-444 of 18 July 2013 (see 5.d.3).**

4. Christ’s Resurrection Church, area 11700.00 m². Protected as a landmark building [National Register of the Cultural Heritage unique code No. 16005]. Protection zone not established.

Attributes: Architecture [volume of the building and floor layout plan; the modernist style architecture of the exterior, constructions; interior architectural details and function; worship building].

**Protection and development regulation: protected under the national law.**

5. Kaunas Ažuolynas Park Complex, Site area 846,682 m². Protected as a historic cultural, landscape site [National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 44581]. Protection zone not established, because the property is already surrounded by protected areas and natural/urban boundaries.

Attributes: landscape elements [terrain carved by deep ravines with flowing streams; oak groves and natural habitat; Gintupis Valley with ditches and streams which dry out in the summer, various small architectural landscape structures and fine art pieces; structure [pre-1940 network of pathways; location of former conservatory [foundation remains]; amphitheatre event space known as Dainų Valley], function [historical use: recreational]; Song festivals and celebration of Jonines (Midsummer) festivals, Adam Mickiewicz valley].

**Protection and development regulation: Provisional Protection Regulation for the Valuable Attributes of Immoveable Cultural Heritage [Kaunas Ažuolynas], No. 08-371 of 30 September 2006.**

6. Kaunas Ažuolynas Sports Complex, Total area – 128,696 m². Protected as a historic cultural site [National Register of the Cultural Heritage unique code No. 31618]. Protection zone: not established, because the property is already surrounded by protected areas and natural/urban boundaries.

Attributes: landscape elements [terrain and greenery of Vytautas Park, the slopes and former Radio station’s area] urban structure [street pattern adapted to terrain and former Kaunas fortress infrastructure, numerous stairs connecting upper and lower terraces], urban morphology [remnants of former complexes and elements of Kaunas Fortress, technical elements: the radio station structures, tower]; development of detached houses and villas; architecture [landmark buildings and other listed buildings], function [historically developed use: residential area], intangible attributes [such as former homes of prominent interwar figures or sites of important events, e.g., former residence of Japanese diplomat and consular official Chiune Sugihara].

**Protection and development regulation: Special Conservation Plan approved by the Kaunas City Municipal Council, Decision No. Т-444 of 18 July 2013 (see 5.d.3).**
7. The Research Laboratory Complex. Total area: 20,955 m². Protected as a historic cultural site (National Register of the Cultural Heritage unique code No. 28567).

Attributes: landscape elements (the terrain; old oak trees), urban structure and morphology (layout of buildings and paths; Research Laboratory Building set back from the street, including main path leading from Vydūno Alėja towards the Research Laboratory building; a guard house located on the avenue by the street, and two support buildings located in the Eastern part of the site), architecture (volumes and architecture of the buildings), function (Research Laboratory Building is still used as a laboratory).

Protection and management: the property is protected under the national law. A grant from the Getty Foundation's Keeping It Modern initiative was awarded in 2019 for the preparation of a conservation management plan (CMP) for the Research Laboratory building. Preparatory work for the conservation management plan is currently underway.

5c. Means of implementing protective measures

The legal protection of cultural heritage is regulated by the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania, general and special legislation governing cultural heritage protection and associated subordinate legislation, EU laws and international agreements governing the protection of cultural heritage. Should the property be inscribed in the UNESCO World Heritage List, the protection of the nominated area and its buffer zone, the development of these areas and activity undertaken within them, is ensured, and regulated by national legislation and applicable national and local strategic and territorial planning documents (see 5c).

The functions of cultural heritage administration on a national level are performed and overseen by the Department of Cultural Heritage under the Ministry of Culture (hereinafter – the Department), which includes identification and inventory, management, control and dissemination. Municipality perform cultural heritage administrative functions on the local level.

Within the nominated area and its buffer zone, the institutions responsible for cultural heritage protection are the Cultural Heritage Division of the Kaunas City Municipal Administration (KCMH) and the Department of Kaunas Division.

The practical cultural heritage preservation policies in the nominated area are based on the main national strategic documents:

- Cultural Heritage Preservation and Relevance Policy Concept approved in 2020. The aim of the concept is to formulate policies for the preservation of tangible and intangible cultural heritage based on the principles of sustainable development, considering the country's principal values, improving the existing legal framework, developing results-oriented management of cultural heritage, ensuring integrated and long-term progress in cultural heritage protection.
- The Lithuanian National Cultural Heritage Preservation Policy Guidelines, approved in 2012, establish systematic national priorities for cultural heritage preservation planning and implementation as well as the direction of heritage preservation policy. The priority areas are: (a) cultural heritage evaluation; (b) cultural heritage preservation and sustainable development; (c) assessment of the effective use of public investment in cultural heritage maintenance; (d) creation of incentives and measures for the proper protection and use of cultural heritage sites; (e) public information and dialogue-building; (f) training of specialists.
- The National Landscape Management Plan approved in 2015. The plan presents a detailed analysis of the cultural landscape of the Republic of Lithuania, a description of immovable cultural heritage resources, and the location of immovable cultural heritage properties and their clusters throughout Lithuania. The plan contains recommendations for the preservation of the cultural landscape identity. Within this plan, the nominated property is classified within the predominantly urban heritage area, for which priority management provisions have been recommended: cultural landscape management priorities (highlighting the historic urban landscape; sustainable urban landscape development in accordance with the formative principles of established morphotypes; preservation of the specific local character) and Principles for Establishing Property Protection Zones (maintaining the historic nature of the urban environment; increasing opportunities to access panoramic and silhouette viewing areas; preservation and exposure of visual connections; ensuring protection against visual pollution).

The principal law regulating relations pertaining to the protection of immovable cultural heritage is The Law of the Republic of Lithuania on the Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage (22 December 1994, No. I-733) [hereinafter – the PICH], see Annex 3. Required subordinate legislation has been drafted and approved as part of the law’s implementation, including the regulation of cultural heritage identification, and inventory declaration of protected status, management, planning, etc. Essential restrictions on activities depend on the conservation goals of protected sites. Cultural properties are listed on the National Register of Cultural Heritage (hereinafter – the Register) on the national, regional and local levels. In accordance with national cultural heritage protection system, the values of cultural heritage properties are determined, and their boundaries and protection (buffer) zones are defined by the Cultural Heritage Expert Boards established under the Department of Cultural Heritage and local municipalities. To be listed on the Register, the Immovable Cultural Heritage Assessment Act (hereinafter – the Act), a detailed reporting document, is being prepared for all properties, defining valuable elements and attributes, the protective status (State or Municipal, if defined) and the level of significance (National, Regional, or Local). Though status differs, protected cultural heritage properties on the national and municipal levels are subject to uniform requirements; protection requirements are not differentiated based on the status conferred on a given property.

The protection of cultural heritage within the nominated property is also regulated by other relevant legislation, including:
- The Republic of Lithuania Law on Environmental Protection (1992) governs the maintenance of protected areas such as reservations, reserves, and protected landscape objects.
- The Republic of Lithuania Law on Architecture (2017) regulates the defence of the public interest during the conduct of architectural activities; preserving the architectural and urban heritage; promoting contextual architecture; fostering the natural and urban landscape.

Other important legislation:
- Order No. IV-190 of the Minister of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania “On the declaration of protected immovable cultural heritage objects”, adopted on 29 April 2005
- Resolution No. 1025 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania “On the approval of rules for the designation of protection zones for cultural heritage objects and sites,”
- Order No. IV-261/01-322 of collegial institutions “On the approval of rules for the preparation of special territorial planning documents for the immovable cultural heritage sites”, adopted on 23 June 2005

The legal regulation of the national cultural heritage protection system is also based on conventions ratified by the Seimas (parliament) of the Republic of Lithuania and other international agreements pertaining to cultural heritage protection. The Seimas has ratified international agreements in the field of cultural heritage protection and conventions adopted by the Council of Europe, including the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe; the European Cultural Convention, the European Landscape Convention, the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, the UNESCO Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (the Aarhus Convention); as well as UNESCO conventions such as the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, the Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage, the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export, and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, and the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. The Lithuanian cultural heritage protection system also adheres to charters adopted by ICOMOS considered to be of a recommended nature: the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (the Venice Charter), the Charter on the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (the Washington Charter), the Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas, the Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (the Birra Charter), and others.
5.d. Existing plans related to municipality and region in which the proposed property is located

Existing planning system related to the cultural heritage protection policies and regulations in the nominated area consists of: (i) Strategic planning documents; (ii) The General Plan of the Territory of Kaunas City; (iii) Special planning documents.

(i) Strategic planning documents define policies for an integrated approach towards the cultural heritage protection and adaptation for contemporary public needs, dissemination and promotion. Strategic planning documents set the goals and indicators for which to achieve financial measures are foreseen in the Municipality’s Strategic Action Plan.

(ii) The General Plan of the Territory of Kaunas City is a spatial development planning and urban management document [Master Plan] defined by legal acts, which determines the objectives, tasks, priorities and measures for the implementation of the planned development. The Plan is supplemented by the groups of special plans dedicated to the conservation of cultural heritage and the development of overall city infrastructure.

(iii) Special cultural heritage protection plans, and regulations are prepared for the preservation of cultural heritage sites and the validation of heritage protection requirements. The purpose of drafting such documents is to determine [or amend] the boundaries of a given area and protected zone and to establish heritage protection requirements within the area and its zone of protection. Protection requirements set in these documents are then published according to procedures for public information and participation in the territorial planning process, regulated by a resolution of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania “On the approval of provisions for the public information, consultation, and participation in decision making regarding territorial planning’ [No. 1079 of 18 September 1996]. The maintenance, conservation and restoration of cultural heritage objects is subject to the Heritage Maintenance Regulation [HMR] and Construction Technical Regulation [CTR] systems.

5.d.1. Strategic planning documents

Strategic Development Plan for the City of Kaunas up to 2022 (SDP), see Annex 2. The SDP devotes considerable attention to the development of culture and cultural infrastructure, and the preservation, empowering, and promotion of cultural heritage. One of the priority tasks for the promotion of sustainable economic development and increasing competitiveness is “Item 1.2.3. Ensuring the preservation, management, and promotion of the cultural heritage”. To fulfill this goal, the municipal budget has allocated financial measures for the protection of cultural heritage sites, the organization of European Heritage Days events, and the drafting of cultural heritage inventory documents. The Kaunas City Municipality encourages and supports the restoration and maintenance of cultural heritage buildings in the city of Kaunas. A Kaunas City Municipal Restoration Programme has been in place since 2015, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Law on the Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage [see section 5.1.]. In the implementation of such measures, priority has been placed on the preservation and adaptation of interwar modernist architecture buildings. As part of the implementation of SDP Item 1.2.2. “Developing Public Cultural Infrastructure”, municipal budget financing has been allocated for the restoration and adaptation for cultural events of iconic modernist buildings such as the Romuva Cinema, the Kaunas Cultural Centre, and the Kaunas Artists’ House.

Kaunas City Cultural Strategy up to 2027. In 2017, the Kaunas City Municipality approved the Kaunas City Cultural Strategy, seeking an integrated approach toward the interwar heritage, to both protect that heritage and adapt it for contemporary public needs. The Kaunas City Cultural Strategy emphasizes three areas: increasing the quality and accessibility of cultural services, strengthening community and civil society, and developing creative industries. The strategy promotes the creation of measures and policies for sustainable urban development. One of the strategy’s goals is to strengthen the international image of Kaunas as a city with a modernist heritage, contemporary culture and design. The strategy emphasizes a regular increase in financial support for the renovation of building façades and strengthening the awareness of residents and the managers of these properties about the unique nature and value of the objects under their care. By communicating with property owners, the strategy seeks to revive activities in the principal buildings of the interwar period. The objectives of the Kaunas City Cultural Strategy shall be implemented in stages by the measures outlined in the Kaunas City Municipality’s Strategic Action Plan (SAP). The action plan is reviewed annually. The Cultural Division of the KCMA is responsible for the planning and implementation of cultural strategy fields in the city’s action plans through 2027.

5.d.2. The General Plan of the Territory of Kaunas City (2023)

The objectives of the General Plan of the territory of Kaunas City valid through 2023 [prepared by Kauno Planas and affirmed by Decision No. T–309 of the Kaunas City Municipal Council of 10 April 2014; hereinafter – the General Plan], calls for the preservation of the cultural heritage based on integral development. The plan’s urban development model highlights the unique nature of the city’s natural and urban heritage, and the unique urban structure, while following contemporary principles of sustainable urban development, planning practices and experience of European and world cities. An assessment of the importance and physical condition of heritage sites for the structure and image of the city helped establish measures for integral cultural heritage protection, identify opportunities to adapt heritage sites and buildings for contemporary functions, including cultural activities and tourism services. The approach of the General Plan identifies zones with the greatest number of interwar modernist structures which shape the areas’ spatial structure and unique architectural image. Within these zones, the preservation of all authentic interwar structures, including their volumes, the architectural expression and material quality of their façades, as well as authentic interior details has been foreseen [see fig. 458]. The Naujamiestis area and its interwar urban contribution has been designated an area of significance. This area is identified as a territorial-functional symbol shaping the identity of the city of Kaunas. The Žaliakalnis area is planned as a residential zone in keeping with the nature and function of the area developed in the interwar period. The plan preserves and develops the function of historical squares and green spaces, including the purpose of the most important public areas, such as the Sports Complex and Petra Vileišis Square. The management of Kaunas Ažuolynas Park is provided for under a provisional protection regulation plan that include the creation of functional connections such as pedestrian and bicycle paths between surrounding areas and Adomas Mickievičius [Adam Mickiewicz] Valley, as well as preservation of the Daini Valley.

The General Plan stipulates that the construction of larger buildings or complexes in cultural heritage site areas or protected zones shall only be permitted after the studies analysing their impact on existing spaces, panoramas, and silhouettes. This analysis shall be performed by observing views from designated observation points. The General Plan provides for the organization of traffic flows within the city centre to ensure the preservation of historic streets and the regulation of traffic volumes in the nominated area.

5.d.3. Special Plans

The conservation and development of the nominated area is regulated by two groups of special plans: those dedicated to the conservation of cultural heritage objects, and other special plans of a more general type that are meant to guide the development of overall city infrastructure.

5.d.3.1. Special Plans Regulating Cultural Heritage Conservation

The objective of plans for the protection of cultural heritage is to regulate the conservation of cultural heritage sites and properties. The special plans and regulations establish heritage protection requirements and measures in the protected areas, define the boundaries and protection zones of the properties. Special plans are approved by responsible authorities and coordinated with the public following the legal procedures for public information and participation in the territorial planning process. The requirements established in the special planning documents are mandatory in the preparation of general, special and detailed area planning documents as well as architectural and other projects.

The following are the main documents regulating activity in the protected cultural heritage sites of the nominated property. Two of them, Žaliakalnis and Žaliakalnis 1 special planning documents have been approved by the Ministry of Culture and Kaunas City Municipal Council accordingly. While Kaunas Naujamiestis Conservation Plan have been prepared but not approved yet, so only the approved concept of the plan is presented.
The excerpt of the General Plan for the nominated territory and its buffer zone.
Žaliakalnis, a Historic District of Kaunas Protection Regulation

No. FR-22148, approved in 2004 by the Order No. 14-359 of the Minister of Culture (covers area 2.1 of the Nominated Property).

The Protection Regulation specifies the principal inventory information (protected elements and attributes), cultural value indicators, public significance, conservation and rehabilitation systems, requirements for maintenance, restoration and use. The regulation defines the valuable elements, the preservation of which will determine the successful conservation of the entire site and specifies non-valuable new insertions to be retained or removed (fig. 459).

The significance of this Žaliakalnis cultural heritage site is the urban heritage embodied in the harmonious integration of the geometric structure and the garden-city type development, as well as landscaping. A conservation-restoration protection regimen has been established for the area's urban structure (plan, street and path grid, plot network and plot development type) and residential building character conservation regulations have been established. The protection of all authentic area's development elements have been recommended. It has also been stipulated to regulate change to preserve the urban character, scale, and proportions typical of Žaliakalnis. Buildings within the area have been classified into six categories based on their architectural value, degree of intactness, condition, and relationship with the traditional character. Corresponding restoration, maintenance, and rehabilitation conditions have been defined for each category and requirements for new construction have been outlined. Requirements have been established for buildings' exteriors, while changes to interiors are not regulated.

Žaliakalnis 1, a Historic District of Kaunas Special Plan (2013), approved by the Kaunas City Municipal Council in Decision No. T–444 of 8 July 2013 (covers areas 2.2 and 2.3 of the Nominated Property).

Because the interests pertaining to the preservation of the Žaliakalnis 1 Cultural Reserve are related to cultural, social, and economic development programmes for the entire city, corresponding paradigm for the special plan have been selected. Viewing the protected area as a living historical landscape, the cultural heritage within the area is assessed within the context of the linkages between protection and development, giving due respect to both old and new, where heritage preservation should not impede regulated, quality interventions and innovations should not be introduced to the detriment of past valuable elements. Each period is entitled to leave its mark on history and find its own place within the property (fig. 460).
The plan sets requirements for the maintenance, use, restoration and conservation of protected elements (applicable regulations). The outcomes of construction activity undertaken during all historical periods, the socio-cultural circumstances (distinctive features of society’s cultural development), and the interests of residents were taken into consideration in the preparation of the plan.

The plan was prepared adhering to the consistency principle according to the three levels of local urban morphostructure elements: morphozone, morphotype, building complexes and individual structures of exceptional significance, determining the measures necessary for the conservation, use and maintenance of the protected elements and attributes. This plan establishes regulation on building height, development density and development intensity, the preservation and maintenance of the protected elements and green spaces. The preservation of buildings is ensured based on the principles of heritage conservation methods (research, repair, conservation, restoration, rehabilitation, mitigation of emergency situations) which are selected according to protection level of the attributes. The protection levels, and protection measures have been determined according to five established buildings’ cultural value categories. According to the surviving level of cultural value of buildings in each category, conservation and rehabilitation measures, maintenance conditions and construction activity regulations have been established, permissible and prohibited activity, proposed and required actions have been outlined.

Conservation Plan Concept for the Naujamiestis (2015) concept approved by the Minister of Culture on 27 May 2015 (covers areas 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 of the Nominated Property (fig. 461)).

In areas with the greatest concentration of interwar period modernist structures, the Concept projects protection of all historical buildings and structures, their form and fabric, authentic interior details. When establishing land plots, priority is given to boundaries of plots based on historical, iconographic material. The Žaliakalnis slopes and the Nemunas River valley are perceived as integral parts of the urban landscape, therefore all planned construction and renovations to existing development must be visually assessed using a system of approved observation points (available on the Registers open data base https://kvr.ksp.lt; also see fig. 6 on p. 19 of the Management Plan (Annex 4)).

Historic green areas and street landscaping with deciduous trees are protected. Urban structure and morphotypes are preserved. The contemporary architectural intervention is permitted in not protected parts of the area without damaging the attributes of the protected urban structure and morphology: street pattern, form and scale of historic development, landscape elements, panoramas, perspectives, layouts, etc. A greater interventions and innovations are permissible in zone 1.3. Industrial Naujamiestis.

Given the potential of this former industrial district, it is possible to create larger-scale urban development incorporating existing protected buildings and other significant urban elements.

Different regulatory zones have been identified in the Concept according to the nature of protected elements and attributes:

- **Authentic Functional Regulated Zones.** Protection purpose: conservation of the authentic valuable features — elements and attributes of the historic urban structure including the initial and historically evolved use, physical shape and form, materials, constructions, planning, building technology, and environment. The priority protection focus is the conservation and restoration of urban structures.

- **Sustainable Use Regulated Areas.** There are three types of such areas:
  
  (i) Significant (listed) cultural heritage properties. Priority conservation areas: restoration and adaptive reuse of urban structures. All preservation and construction work shall be carried out based on scientific research data in accordance with requirements established by the Law. Regulated adaptive reuse activities are permitted.

  (ii) Zones with a prevalence of cultural heritage buildings. Priority conservation areas: preserving the attributes while highlighting and revealing their cultural value and adapting to contemporary needs. Priority management focus: adaptive reuse while preserving the protected elements and attributes.

  (iii) Zones where the urban structure has lost authenticity, and where altered, undeveloped urban structures prevail. In such zones, a greater degree of intervention is permitted, as are innovations. Priority conservation areas: adaptive reuse while preserving attributes and continuity of urban construction using the historic urban development principles.

- **Green space preservation (squares and parks),** Priority conservation areas: restoration of historical green spaces, preservation and adaptation of their valuable attributes such as: plan, pathways, plant species and landscaping.

- **Maintenance of streets and squares (S),** Priority conservation areas: preservation of historical street parameters and greenery, preservation and exhibition of historical street furniture and technical equipment as well as urban infrastructure; reconstruction of utility networks; revitalize the composition and functional links between the city of Kaunas and the Nemunas river. Development of transverses and passages is possible to improve functional characteristics of the city centre.
46.4. The excerpt of The Special Plan for the Location of Large Commercial Enterprises in the City of Kaunas: zones for development of large commercial enterprises (red, blue, purple) and zones for small retail premises and boutiques (orange).

5.3. Protection and Management of the Property

5.d.3.2. Citywide special plans

The Special Plan for the Location of High-Rise Buildings within the Kaunas City Municipality (2013) is most relevant in terms of special plans applicable citywide; it identifies visual identity zones, including for the area of Naujamiestis (area 1), and for the Nemunas River valley and slopes, and designates the city’s most significant buildings, including the Christ’s Resurrection Church. The plan designates existing high-rise structures (in grey) and planned high-rise buildings (in blue). A zone of high-rise buildings (up to 30 meters in height) is planned only for Industrial Naujamiestis zone. No high-rise construction is planned for the remaining parts of the nominated property.

463. Special Plan for the Location of High-Rise Buildings within the Kaunas City Municipality. Scheme of valuable urban landmarks (black dots); other high buildings (grey); planned high buildings according to approved development projects

The Special Plan for the Location of Large Commercial Enterprises in the City of Kaunas (2005) specifies zones where the expansion of large commercial enterprises is permitted and establishes requirements for the location within different planned area zones of various enterprises categorized into groups according to type and scope of operation. Within the nominated property, a “Commercial Passageway and Showroom Development Zone” has been envisioned for Central Naujamiestis area 1.1, which would allow the construction of various types of prestigious commercial showrooms and the creation of commercial passages inside historic city blocks, in accordance with regulations. In a section of Industrial Naujamiestis (area 1.3), the development of department stores (for groceries and other daily needs) and specialized shopping centres is permitted, with the goal of facilitating the conversion of industrial areas. The location of large commercial enterprises in residential areas of Naujamiestis (area 1.2) and Žaliakalnis (areas 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5) is prohibited.

464. The Special Plan for the Location of Large Commercial Enterprises in the City of Kaunas: zones for development of large commercial enterprises (red, blue, purple) and zones for small retail premises and boutiques (orange).
5.e. Property management plan or other management system

To achieve the proper balance between the protection of OUV and the pursuit of sustainable development objectives, the participation of partners, stakeholders, and local communities in the management of the nominated property is foreseen, and the inter-institutional coordination mechanism as well as the systematic assessment and effective monitoring is planned.

5.e.1 Vision and Aims of the Management Plan

The vision of the Management Plan is to ensure an appropriate and equitable balance between conservation, sustainability and development of the property, in order to protect and sustain its Outstanding Universal Value by safeguarding and enhancing its historic and cultural environment, through appropriate activities contributing to the inclusive social and economic development, and the quality of life.

The aims of the Management Plan are:

• To promote participation of all stakeholders and local communities in WHS management system through awareness raising and public engagement.
• To build and maintain strong cooperation between local and national institutions to pursue the smooth implementation of the Management Plan and effective monitoring.
• To ensure protection of OUV while ensuring the conservation of the nominated property and its attributes through integration of conservation into the main dimensions of sustainable development.

5.e.2 Protection Policy and Planning Framework

The protection of the nominated property and its buffer zone, the further development of these areas and activity undertaken in them, shall be ensured, and regulated by national legislation and applicable national and local strategic and territorial planning documents.

The entire nominated area and its buffer zone comprise listed cultural heritage sites, their protection zones, and cultural heritage properties that have been subject to national and municipal heritage preservation requirements for decades. The legal protection of cultural heritage is regulated by the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania, general and special legislation governing cultural heritage protection, associated subordinate legislation, EU laws and international agreements governing the protection of cultural heritage.

Cultural heritage and cultural heritage conservation are understood as important factors contributing to the sustainable development of the Kaunas city and are integrated in the city’s development policies and planning documents (see 5.d. of the Nomination file). As well as actions in strengthening the main dimensions of sustainable development – environmental sustainability, inclusive social and economic development, as described in the Policy for Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the World Heritage Convention (General Assembly of the States Parties to the Convention Resolution 20 GA 13, Paris, 2015), are present and reflected by priority development areas, aims and objectives set in Strategic Development Plan of Kaunas Municipality up to 2022. The development of those areas is expected to be continued, and relevant measures are integrated into the conservation and management system of the nominated property, complemented with World Heritage policies, to support its OUV.

5.e.3 Approval with Compatibility with Existing Planning Documents

The preparation and adoption of this Management Plan is seen as an integral part of territorial and spatial planning of the city of Kaunas that supplement the existing urban development management system and help to refine the Kaunas City General Plan’s decisions and nurture the highly valued landmarks that shape the city’s identity. A wide range of efforts and measures (both educational, financial, and planning) are already in place to manage the nominated property and highlight its values, mitigate existing and potential threats. The Management Plan is designed to supplement the existing management system of the nominated property, following the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, while preserving its Outstanding Universal Value and the constituting attributes, and ensuring sustainable development based on international policies.

The Management Plan, approved by the Kaunas City Municipal Council as a strategic planning document (sectoral strategy), will be linked to the other strategic plans of Kaunas City Municipality and the Kaunas City General Plan. Actions and measures set up in the Management Plan’s Action Plan will be integrated into the Strategic Heritage Preservation Plan (SHP) as well as lower strategic planning documents in order funding for implementation of the measures could be well planned and secured, and updated at parallel intervals.

5.e.4 Management System, Partners and Stakeholders

The management of the UNESCO World Heritage property is based on the existing management system and enhance it in terms of inter-institutional and integrated management. An inter-institutional Executive Committee is set up to address strategic issues and policies related to management of the nominated property on the State level. The Site Manager is appointed, and Site Management Unit is set up to be responsible for the management and coordination of the conservation and development of the nominated property at the local level. The Advisory Board is established to consult and provide guidance towards the management of the property both to the Executive Committee and the Site Management Unit.

The Site Management Unit is established at Kaunas City Municipality Administration’s Cultural Heritage Division and is responsible for the management of the proposed property and coordination of implementation of the Action plan at the local level. Its partners such as Cultural Heritage Department’s Kaunas Division, Kaunash and Kaunas 2022 (and beyond), stakeholders such as NGO’s, representatives of local communities and academia, professional groups, real estate developers and managers, are also present in the management process of the nominated property (see section 3 of the Management plan).

5.e.5 Preparation and Structure of the Management Plan

In 2014, Kaunas City Council by the decision No. T-279 supported the initiative to submit Kaunas Modernism to the State Party’s Tentative list. In 2017, when the nomination “Kaunas 1919–1939: The Capital Inspired by the Modern Movement” [10/01/2017] has been approved, the process of preparation of Nomination and Management Plan started. The work has been carried out by the Kaunas City Municipality Administration involving management partners and external experts in 2019–2020. The preparation of the Plan was overseen by the Steering Group, approved by the Order of Minister of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania.

The preparation of the Nomination file, deeper research and analysis of the area as well as information gathered during consultation and SWOT analysis, helped to determine the actions (measures) necessary to preserve the authenticity and integrity of the site as well as pursue a vision towards its sustainable development and further use.

The full Management Plan is presented in Annex 4.

5.f Sources and levels of finance

Each year, the Kaunas City Municipal Administration allocates funds for cultural heritage research, inventory, and dissemination. The budget for 2019 was 1,514,521 EUR. Financing is also provided to projects dedicated to culture and cultural heritage and activities undertaken by the public enterprises Kaunas N and Kaunas 2022 – European Capital of Culture. Funds are allocated for cultural heritage maintenance, restoration, and adaptation for public and tourism purposes. A portion of the projects and initiatives also receive financing from the national budget and international organizations, including EU structural funds.

In accordance with the PICH, property managers must maintain cultural heritage objects and sites therefore the financial burden of heritage preservation falls on property owners. The Kaunas City Municipality encourages and supports the maintenance and restoration of cultural heritage buildings in the city of Kaunas. One of the main tools in this endeavor is the Kaunas City Municipal Heritage Restoration Programme (hereinafter – the Programme) in effect since 2015. In 2015, the Kaunas City Municipal Council had allocated nearly 29,000 EUR for the implementation of the Programme. That year, the managers of three protected cultural heritage buildings took advantage of this assistance. In 2016, 400,000 EUR was allocated toward the Programme’s implementation, and financing agreements were concluded with custodians of 22 cultural heritage buildings. In 2017, managers of 39 heritage buildings utilized Programme support, receiving a total of 792,951 EUR paid for completed projects. In 2018, support was provided to 27 cultural heritage buildings managers, in the amount of 667,088 EUR. In 2019, 23 managers took advantage of this assistance, receiving a total of 544,460 EUR. The open access database of the restored and repaired buildings during the implementation of the program is available online.
5.g. Sources of expertise and training in conservation and management techniques

On the national level, the main organisers of training related to cultural heritage preservation and promotion are the Ministry of Culture and the Department of Cultural Heritage under the Ministry of Culture, the Lithuanian National Commission for UNESCO, the State Cultural Heritage Commission and Universities. The Lithuanian Ministry of Culture is responsible for the training and accreditation of specialists working in the cultural heritage field. In addition, international conferences, seminars, and training programmes are periodically held.

In 2017, the Lithuanian National Commission for UNESCO and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre organized the capacity building seminar for World Heritage Site Managers to strengthen the role of site managers in the implementation of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and the decisions of the World Heritage Committee. The seminar prepared a document entitled Recommendations on the Role, Functions and Competences of World Heritage Managers to define the responsibilities of site managers on the national and international levels.

In 2019, Kaunas City Municipality organized the Second International Modern Cities Forum From Modern to Contemporary: Practices in Preserving Architectural Legacy of the 20th Century, based on the “Tel Aviv Document for Modern Cities”. During the forum, presentations were made regarding the diversity of the world modernist heritage, the different approaches to its preservation, and the solutions implemented for heritage management based on UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape.

Kaunas has many architects, restorers, historians, and contractors qualified and certified to work in the cultural heritage field. Vilnius University, Vilnius Academy of Fine Arts, Kaunas University of Technology and Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas train cultural heritage specialists and conduct academic projects in the field. A digital archive of architectural heritage AUTC focuses largely on the interwar buildings was developed by the Centre of Architecture and Urbanism at the Kaunas University of Technology. Another important digital archive Archimede.lt dedicated to wooden architecture of Kaunas, was developed by Vytautas Magnus University. The NGO Architektūros fondas / Architecture Fund runs the digital archive of modernist architecture Modernimus.lt.

In 2019, Kaunas University of Technology together with the Kaunas City Municipality received funding from the Getty Foundation programme Keeping it Modern for developing the conservation and management plan of the Research Laboratory (1935) which is currently a Faculty of Chemistry of the Kaunas University of Technology.

An important initiative launched in 2020 by the Cultural Heritage Centre and the Cultural Infrastructure Centre is the FORUS Mobile project, which seeks to improve the management of cultural heritage sites by encouraging a better property care. The project aims to provide assistance and practical training to culture heritage site communities, owners and managers at no charge.

Training programmes are also organized by non-governmental and private organizations and public agencies. In keeping with the principles of social responsibility and sustainable growth, the public institution Gražinkime Kauną (Let’s Make Kaunas Beautiful) and the Kaunas University of Applied Sciences have begun to implement a social project entitled Assisting with Wood Professional Skills and Motivation for EconomicallyInactive Youth in Zalakalnis, an initiative launched to help young and economically active residents of Zalakalnis acquire and develop skills necessary for the restoration of wooden houses and the production of exterior and interior details and souvenirs.

5.h. Visitor facilities and infrastructure

Kaunas is visited annually by approximately 350,000 tourists and guests and this number continues to grow. The visibility, accessibility, and distribution of the interwar legacy is convenient given its concentration in the city centre – in Naujamiestis and the neighbouring residential district of Zalakalnis. Many cultural heritage objects are accessible to visitors.

5.h.1. Accessibility

Kaunas is easily reached by various means of transportation. Due to its convenient geographical location, Kaunas is linked by road with other major Lithuanian and foreign centres. The Kaunas international airport is located 14 km north-east of the city centre and can receive and handle nearly all types of aircraft. The Nominated Property can be reached from the international airport by the city-bus in 40 min. or by taxi in less than half an hour. The Darius and Girenas Business Class Airport (ICAO: EYKS) was founded in 1915, is located three kilometres from the nominated territory and is the oldest airport in Lithuania and one of the oldest still operating in Europe. The city’s railway and bus stations are located within the nominated property and is only fifteen minutes walking distance from Laisvės Alėja. The entire area can be explored on foot, by bicycle, private vehicle, and by an extensive public transportation system. Individuals with limited mobility are fully enabled to reach the main cultural heritage objects that are equipped with special access ramps and lifts. A website and a mobile application allow people with limited mobility to view all city locations providing access for the disabled.

Sustainable tourism. City municipal and private companies encourage environmentally friendly modes of travel. The Likebike initiative promotes bicycle tourism and there are comfortable options to rent a bike by using CityBee app or use Kaunaslike rent service. In 2016, tourism e-marketing project “Lithuanian Interwar (1919–1940) Architecture” was developed in collaboration with the 6 different municipalities to promote walking tours and to develop a mobile application, a website and ensure good communication.

Tourism development, reducing tourism seasonality. The Kaunas City Municipality has implemented the Kaunas City Competitiveness and Attractiveness Development Programme. Municipally collected taxes are being invested into city marketing and infrastructure improvement. All these measures help to reduce tourism seasonality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Excursions</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Excursions</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2854</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2. Tours organized by Kaunas IN during which visitors were acquainted with cultural heritage sites and modernist architecture.
5.h.2. Tourist facilities and statistics on visitors

According to the Lithuanian Department of Statistics, in 2019 accommodation establishments in Kaunas received 349,530 guests, who spent a total of 650,336 visitor nights in the city. Compared with 2018, this was a 10% increase in tourists and a 16% growth in visitor nights, with an average stay in Kaunas of 1.9 nights. 67.6% of all guests seeking accommodation in Kaunas were from foreign countries (236,398; 11% more than 2018), and 32.4% were Lithuanian citizens (115,132, an increase of 9%). In 2019, the average room occupancy rate for Kaunas hotels was 71.5%. The highest occupancy rate in 2019 was in May (81.3%), June (80.2%) and August (80.9%), and the lowest occupancy was recorded in January (57.2%).

More than fifty 1-to-5-star hotels and guest houses are located within five kilometres of all sites (Currently Airbnb infrastructure development is not a concerning practise and its impact is not analysed). A great variety of dining places are located next to objects of interest. Car parking lots are located throughout the city and the main tourist attractions also have dedicated parking lots. City infrastructure is continuously improved.

In 2019, 120,012 visitors consulted Kaunas IN tourism information centres, of which 37.1% were Lithuanians (44,547) and 62.9% were from foreign countries (75,465). The highest number of tourists visiting these information centres was in August (16,576) and July (15,496).

Because the nominated property encompasses the city’s central zone, most guests organize their own individual approach to seeing the area, making it difficult to provide precise statistical information.

5.h.3. Visit routes [tours]

Interest in the culture, history, architecture, and way of life of interwar Kaunas continues to grow. Excursions, guidebooks, virtual tours, and thematic exhibitions about the period are regularly organized and held to showcase the city’s interwar cultural heritage. The city’s art galleries exhibit fine and applied art from the era, as well period household items and furniture. The authentic interwar period buildings and their surroundings have become particularly popular with filmmakers (Kaunas in Film).

The main organizers of tours and guidebooks in the city are: Kaunas IN, Centre of Architecture and Urbanism at the Kaunas University of Technology, Kaunas Artists’ House and NGO’s Grazinkė Kaunų and Eiškūna. Tours are offered for both general overviews of the interwar legacy, as well as thematic programmes exploring different perspectives of the cultural heritage (Reflections of Kaunas Modernist Architecture). These tours not only showcase the city’s material heritage (buildings, squares, streets, monuments, and the natural environment), but also intangible heritage (human relationships and interactions, lifestyles, traditions, and urban folklore). Grazinkė Kaunų organizes educational tours about the architects, artists, and creators of applied arts and crafts who have lived in Kaunas. The organization provides an opportunity for visitors to enter authentic interwar apartments and collaborates with various Kaunas city museums and memorial homes. The tours are very well attended by residents and community members.

Tours for People with Hearing Disabilities. In 2017, a study commissioned by the Kaunas City Municipality showed an enormous level of interest among the hearing impaired in cultural events, exhibitions and the city’s architectural heritage, but it also revealed a concern about problems pertaining to the presentation of information and conducts of tours and events in sign language. A project entitled Signs of Modern Lithuania was begun in 2019 by the Kaunas Artists’ House, aimed at presenting the architecture of Kaunas to the deaf and hard of hearing. The first tours for the hearing impaired were organized to visit the modernist buildings designated with the European Heritage Label.

Guidebooks. Many guidebooks presenting a detailed exploration of the Kaunas interwar heritage have been published in print and electronically in recent years, allowing readers to learn about the nominated property on their own. Reflections of Modernism in the Temporary Capital of Lithuania offers a look into a period of the early modernist architecture that flourished in Lithuania from the early 1930s until the start of the Soviet occupation. On this walk, visitors will visit various buildings designed by renowned architects. The tour route passes through two main areas of Lithuanian interwar modernism: Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis.

The Kaunas city guide Contemporary Kaunas, published in eleven languages by KaunasIN presents the city’s interwar architecture and culture and includes walking tours, such as “Diplomatic Kaunas” and “Wooden Kaunas” (fig. 465). The guide also presents information on the nominated property. Another walking tour, the Modernist’s Guide, has been published in Lithuanian, English, and Japanese. Suggested routes cover much of the nominated property and introduce visitors to Kaunas’ architecture. From Kovno to Kaunas, The Lithuan Landscape presents the rich Jewish community of Kaunas of yesterday and today – a community which has always played an important role in shaping the Kaunas cultural landscape and continues to do so today. The guide also includes information on visiting Jewish sites and the best ways to explore them. The Sugihara Route guide is dedicated to exploring the historic world of Japanese Consul-General Chiune Sugihara, who issued several thousand visas to Jewish refugees, saving countless lives during the chaos of the Second World War. The guide also presents information about Sugihara’s collaboration with Dutch Consul Jan Zwartendijk.

5.i. Policies and programmes related to the presentation and promotion of the property

The principal strategic documents associated with the policies and programmes of presenting and promoting valuable properties are described in sections 5.c and 5.d.1. Within these strategies, considerable attention is directed toward cultural development and the expansion of the cultural infrastructure, and the preservation, empowerment, and promotion of the cultural heritage. The strategies devote special attention to the interwar heritage: calling for the strengthening of the international image of Kaunas as a city of modernist heritage and contemporary culture and design; capitalizing on the uniqueness of modernist architecture in heritage and city centre protection plans; steadily increasing co-financing for the renovation of buildings and increasing information provided to residents and heritage object managers about the uniqueness and valuable attributes of the properties under their care; revitalizing activity in the main buildings of the aforementioned period through communication with property owners.

Kaunas City Museum (established and financed by the Kaunas City Municipality), Kaunas 2022 – European Capital of Culture is company established and financed by the Kaunas City Municipality, and the National M. K. Čiurlionis Museum of Art are the main cultural and memory institutions promoting history, culture and heritage of Kaunas.

5.i.1. Presentation of the modernist heritage on the international level

The interwar architecture of Kaunas has been presented at numerous international conferences (including the international conference ‘Modernism for the Future’ in 2018, accompanied by a book and the international Modern Cities Forum ‘From Modern to Contemporary: Practices in Preserving Architectural Legacy of the 20th Century. Based on the Tel Aviv Document for Modern Cities’ in 2019) and through various projects, such as the international summer school organized by Kaunas 2022 and supporting partners, and in the international publications about Kaunas modernist architecture and culture.
The international travelling exhibition *Architecture of Optimism: The Kaunas Phenomenon, 1918–1940* is dedicated to the Kaunas modernist architecture as a reflection of political, social, economic, and cultural optimism. The exhibition is accompanied by a comprehensive book *Architecture of Optimism: The Kaunas Phenomenon, 1918–1940* (Vilnius: Lapas, 2018) published in Lithuanian and English. The exhibition was organised by the Lithuanian National Commission for UNESCO and was on display at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris (2018); at Regione Lombardia Hall in Milan (2018); the Auditorium Parco della Musica in Rome (2018); the National Library of Estonia in Tallinn (2018); the Museum of Architecture in Wroclaw (2018); the BOZAR Centre for Fine Arts in Brussels (2018); the City Museum of Gdynia (2019); and at the Maison d’Architecture in Grenoble (2019). Since 2019 the exhibition is coordinated by the Kaunas 2022 – European Capital of Culture programme Modernism for the Future. The large-scale international architectural festival KAFe (Kaunas Architecture Festival) has been held in Kaunas every other year since 2013. A photograph exhibition entitled Kaunas: Undiscovered Capital of Modernism in Europe, curated by architects Gintaras Balčytis and KAFe was first held in 2017 and has travelled to Tallinn, Brno, Berlin, Grenoble, and Ankara. The exhibition is accompanied by two publications released in Lithuanian and English: the book *Architecture of Interwar Kaunas* (2018) and a catalogue titled *Kaunas Interwar Architecture and Interiors*.

5.i.2. Promotion of the modernist heritage and inclusion of local communities

The Kaunas 2022 – European Capital of Culture programme Modernism for the Future is dedicated to promoting the modernist heritage in Kaunas and Lithuania, and internationally. The programme’s strategic objective is to showcase 360 modernist buildings. All of the buildings are identified on a map and their history is being carefully documented. The team working on the Modernism for the Future programme undertakes activities to bring the local community together by including them in creative and educational processes. Artists, residents are also being organized in collaboration with the programme’s partners. In addition, the programme is organizing meetings, discussions, tours, lectures, creative workshops, and practical activities (such as restoration and other workshops) to develop hospitality skills and share good practices. These activities will be continued in 2021 and 2022 based on the needs of local residents, i.e. to address the challenges they face while living in or caring for the interwar modernist heritage.

The interwar modernist architecture has also inspired artists and designers, who interpret architectural heritage in design products: a collection of purses by Karlt studio (2018), concrete jewellery by Cetus 273, wooden nesting-boxes for birds replicating the forms of interwar architecture (artist Timotejus Norvila-Morla, 2019); perfume “Kaunas Art Deco” (by Egle Jonušyte, 2018), and other products.

5.i.3. Presentation of the modernist heritage in the tourism sector

The public institution Kaunas IN is an agency of the Kaunas City Municipality devoted to promoting business, tourism, and international marketing development. The activities undertaken by Kaunas IN within the tourism sector are presented in sections 5.h.2 and 5.h.3.

It should also be noted that, as part of its effort to highlight the modernist heritage, Kaunas IN also organizes tours for individuals, groups, or companies, provides tour guide services, and publishes informational material in various languages, including video films, mobile applications, and games.

5.j. Staffing levels and expertise

The Kaunas City Municipal Administration’s Cultural Heritage Division is staffed by historians trained and experienced in the field of cultural heritage, specialists in the field of culture heritage administration, as well as a construction engineer and architect certified to work at cultural heritage objects and sites. The Cultural Heritage Division works closely together with the Kaunas Division of the Lithuanian Cultural Heritage Department, which employees staff with extensive training and experience in the cultural heritage field. The city of Kaunas also has architects and planners certified by the Ministry of Culture to prepare cultural heritage restoration projects as well as other projects at cultural heritage sites. The Kaunas City Municipality in 2010 established an Expert Board for Cultural Heritage assessment (for nominating the protected objects and sites on local level, providing expertise and consultation). In the research field a close collaboration is underway with academic institutions in Kaunas and Lithuania. This cooperation is expected to continue in the future.
6. MONITORING
UNESCO World Heritage List sites in Lithuania are monitored in accordance with the legislation of the Republic of Lithuania, Lithuania’s international commitments, decisions of the World Heritage Committee, and the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre.

Monitoring within the nominated property and its buffer zone is currently being conducted in accordance with the Republic of Lithuanian Law on Immovable Cultural Heritage (LLICH) and other legislation:

- Order of the Minister of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania “Approving Rules for the Monitoring of Cultural Heritage Sites”, No. IV–94, 6 February 2012, Vilnius
- Cultural Heritage Properties Condition Inspection Rules, approved on 9 May 2005 by Order No. IV–199 of the Minister of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania, “Approving the Cultural Heritage Properties Condition Inspection Rules”
- Procedures for the Organization of Monitoring of Cultural Heritage properties in the City of Kaunas, approved on 2 November 2009 by Order No. A–4151 of the Director of the Kaunas City Municipal Administration

Site monitoring is coordinated by the Ministry of Culture. Monitoring of all sites within the nominated area is currently being conducted every five years by the Cultural Heritage Department’s (DHC) Kaunas Division, except for Kaukas and Perkūnas Areas (Žaliakalnis I protected site) that are monitored by the Kaunas City Municipality Administration (KCMA) Cultural Heritage Division. In accordance with local legislation, monitoring of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List is performed on an annual basis.

Site monitoring consists of:
- periodic review of sites and their protected zones to establish any changes in site condition and affecting factors,
- summation, assessment, and prognosis of site condition changes and any anthropogenic or environmental impact.

Monitoring of cultural heritage properties, listed on the National Register of Cultural Heritage, are inspected by the DCH Kaunas Division and the KCMA Cultural Heritage Division at least once every five years, recording its condition, compiling relevant information, and making it available to territorial divisions of the DCH. Monitoring reports are public documents and are available at http://www.kaunas.lt/kultura-ir-turizmas/kulturos-paveldas.

### Site monitoring indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Responsibility/Location of records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cityscape/ Silhouette (axis, views)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>DCH Kaunas Division/KCMA Cultural Heritage Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of public spaces (streets, squares, etc.)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>DCH Kaunas Division/KCMA Cultural Heritage Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations of historic urban fabric (urban morphology)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>DCH Kaunas Division/KCMA Cultural Heritage Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrain alterations, erosion</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>KMCA Environmental Protection Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenery condition</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>KMCA Environmental Protection Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of landmark modernist buildings (including EHL buildings)</td>
<td>Annually/On-going</td>
<td>DCH Kaunas Division/KCMA Cultural Heritage Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Responsibility/Location of records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of restored/repaired historic buildings</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>KCMA Cultural Heritage Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing of cultural heritage activities [eur]</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>KCMA Cultural Heritage Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of capacity-building and training programmes(s)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>KCMA Cultural Heritage Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of heritage education programmes for children and youth</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>KCMA Cultural Heritage Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new developments in the area</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>KCMA Division of Urban Planning and Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of inhabitants</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tourists</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Lithuanian Department of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tours related to cultural heritage, number of participants</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>KaunasiN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. b. Administrative arrangements for monitoring of the property

Monitoring will be conducted and coordinated by the Site Management Unit – KCMA Cultural Heritage Division, in cooperation with other KCMA units and the DCH Kaunas Division. The KCMA Cultural Heritage Division will be responsible for the compilation and storage of monitoring data, and the preparation of annual monitoring reports and their submission to the Executive Committee and Advisory Board.

Contact information:

Saulius Rimas
Head of Cultural Heritage Division
Kaunas City Municipal Administration
saulius.rimas@kaunas.lt
+370 614 79553

Sigita Bugenienė
Specialist of Cultural Heritage Division
Kaunas City Municipal Administration
sigita.bugeniene@kaunas.lt

6. c. Results of previous reporting exercises

Current monitoring databases are (in Lithuanian):
- Reports of monitoring the listed cultural heritage properties by KCMA Cultural Heritage Division:
  - Heritage restoration programme monitoring:
    - https://maps.kaunas.lt/portal/apps/opsdashboard/index.html?/9530265687ac4672947f36ce6c1f1bc3867/, on-going
  - Greenery state monitoring:
    - https://maps.kaunas.lt/zeldynai/aplinka/, on-going
- Analysis and monitoring of Kaunas cultural field:

Recent conservation documentation and reports

Naujamiestis, a Historic District of Kaunas (22149)
- Site monitoring report No. AAK-448, DCH Kaunas Division
- Updated inventory documentation, Act No. KPD-SK-229/6, via:
  - https://kvr.kpd.lt/#/static-heritage-detail/A1C598E4-FEC0-45CD-96AB-6AB549A4874

Žaliakalnis, a Historic District of Kaunas (22148)
- Site monitoring report No. AAK-384, DCH Kaunas Division

Žaliakalnis 1, a Historic District of Kaunas (31280)
- Analyses and assessment of Žaliakalnis 1 condition, 2013, Special plan No. T-444 (2013-07-18), via:
  - https://kvr.kpd.lt/#/static-heritage-detail/97e9d5f-4370-4b2f-a7b7-539d05133a14
- Site monitoring report No. 55-16-58, KCMA Cultural Heritage Division

Christ’s Resurrection Church (16005)
- Updated inventory documentation, Act No. KPD-RM-342, via:
  - https://kvr.kpd.lt/#/static-heritage-detail/b24b13f5-8c04-44d6-9dec-9c3702855c8
- Property monitoring report No. 55-16-I, KCMA Cultural Heritage Division

Kaunas Ąžuolynas Park Complex (17381)
- Updated inventory documentation of the Complex, Act No. KM-RM-04
- Updated inventory documentation of the Sports Hall, Act. No. KPD-SK-261
- Updated inventory documentation of the Sports Hall, Act. No. KPD-SK-261/1
- Via: https://kvr.kpd.lt/#/static-heritage-detail/37885d4-614f-4d8d-81d3-d1ce334f248

The Research Laboratory Complex (28567)
- Property monitoring report No. 55-16-I, KCMA Cultural Heritage Division
- Draft state of conservation report of Research Laboratory building, Sigita Bugeniene and Vite Janušauskaitė, KTU
- Polychromy research project of Research Laboratory building, Venuta Trečiokienė, KTU
- Functional equipment and furniture of Research Laboratory building, condition assessment report, Bangutis Prapuolenis, KTU
7. DOCUMENTATION
### 7. Photographs and audiovisual image inventory and authorization form

**Photographs and audiovisual image inventory and authorization form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id. No.</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Date of Photo</th>
<th>Photographer/ Director of the video</th>
<th>Copyright owner</th>
<th>Contact details of copyright owner (Name, address, tel/fax, and email)</th>
<th>Non exclusive cession of rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Contemporary photographs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id. No.</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Date of Photo</th>
<th>Photographer/ Director of the video</th>
<th>Copyright owner</th>
<th>Contact details of copyright owner (Name, address, tel/fax, and email)</th>
<th>Non exclusive cession of rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 33 | 40 | 99 | 106 | 107 | 112 | Digital 2017 | Gintaras Česonis | Gintaras Česonis | Gintaras Česonis, Leliūnų g. 6-2, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: gintaras@kaunas.galikt/lt | No |
| 239 | 332 | 337 | 338 | 346 | 365 | Digital 2017 | Vaidas Petrušis | Vaidas Petrušis | Vaidas Petrušis, Autoraž g. 10-14, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: vaidas.petru\(\)is@ktu.lt | Yes |
| 148 | Digital 2020 | Sigita Bugenienė | Sigita Bugenienė | Sigita Bugenienė, Tel/tel/fax) | No |
| 336 | 342 | Digital 2020 | Marija Diemati | Marija Diemati | Marija Diemati, Kaučiuko g. 7-1, Vilnius, Lithuania; email: marija.diemati@gmail.com | Yes |
| 4 | Digital 2019 | Živilė Šmukliūtė | Živilė Šmukliūtė | Živilė Šmukliūtė, Neries krant. 3-46, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: z.smukliute@gmail.com | Yes |
| 467 | Digital 2018 | Taistytas Šukulis | Taistytas Šukulis | Lapių bičių archy\(\)v | Yes |

**Plans of buildings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id. No.</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Date of Photo</th>
<th>Photographer/ Director of the video</th>
<th>Copyright owner</th>
<th>Contact details of copyright owner (Name, address, tel/fax, and email)</th>
<th>Non exclusive cession of rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 77 | 84 | 101 | 130 | 132 | 140 | 164 | 169 | 180 | 183 | 189 | Digital 2015 | Archifondas | Archifondas | Archifondas, Germanavичius, K. Kalėdų g. 10-23, Vilnius, Lithuania; email: archifondas@archifondas.lt | Yes |

**Video**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id. No.</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Date of Photo</th>
<th>Photographer/ Director of the video</th>
<th>Copyright owner</th>
<th>Contact details of copyright owner (Name, address, tel/fax, and email)</th>
<th>Non exclusive cession of rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 2020 | Digital | 2015 | Video | Rudolfas Lavelis | Paulaus Maži\(\)s [company pvz.) | Yes |
| Video | UO / LO – Lithuanian Culture Institute | Z. Serautka\(\)s g. 15, Vilnius, Lithuania; email: info@lithuaniaculture.it | Yes |

**Archival material and historic images**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id. No.</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Date of Photo</th>
<th>Photographer/ Director of the video</th>
<th>Copyright owner</th>
<th>Contact details of copyright owner (Name, address, tel/fax, and email)</th>
<th>Non exclusive cession of rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 452 | 453 | 454 | Digital 1985 | Romainda Pociak \(\)s | Romainda Pociak \(\)s, A. Miglo g. 8-2, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: romindapociaks@gmail.com | Yes |
| 44 | Digital | Geidrė Jankausk\(\)\(\) | Geidrė Jankausk\(\)\(\) | Vykintos g. 27-9, Vilnius, Lithuania; email: geidre.janka@gmail.com | Yes |
| 25 | Digital | Saulius Kulikausk\(\)s | Saulius Kulikausk\(\)s | Bokšto 33-os g. 19-37, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: antanas.bokbus@ktu.lt | Yes |
| 34 | 62 | 87 | 88 | 98 | 102 | 147 | 200 | 257 | 294 | 359 | 414 | Digital 2017 | Antanas Burkus | Antanas Burkus, Bokšto 33-os g. 19-37, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: antanas.bokbus@ktu.lt | Yes |
| 18 | 405 | 439 | 440 | Digital 2017 | Jonas Palys | Jonas Palys, Akadēmijos g. 6-4, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: jonas.palys@gmail.com | Yes |
| 39 | 41 | 75 | 276 | 387 | 437 | Digital | ČDKM – M. K. Čiurlionis National Museum of Art | K. Donelačio g. 6-4, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: k.m.c.curtio@cntsion.com | Yes |
| 28 | 56 | 82 | 102 | 103 | 107 | 109 | 160 | 240 | 242 | 251 | 274 | 281 | Digital | KAVĮ – Kaunas County Public Library | Rastadygų g. 2, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: info@kavib.lt | Yes |
| 335 | 402 | 420 | 436 | 445 | Digital | KCMA – Kaunas City Municipality Administration | L. Žmiholaitis \(\) g. 8, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: muziejus@kaunsmuzeja\(\)s | Yes |
| 210 | 225 | Digital | KNM – Kaunas City Museum | L. Žmiholaitis | L. Žmiholaitis, g. 8, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: muziejus@kaunsmuzeja\(\)s | Yes |
| 52 | 333 | 344 | 350 | 390 | 448 | 449 | 450 | 451 | Digital | KTU AŠI – Kaunas Institute of Technology, Institute of Architecture and Construction | Tunoka g. 60, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: as@ktu.lt | Yes |
| 35 | 149 | 160 | 212 | 216 | 245 | 305 | 334 | 432 | Digital | KPA – Kaunas Regional State Archives | Maironio g. 28, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: kpa@as.lt | Yes |
| 12 | 23 | 24 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 43 | 46 | 47 | 52 | 109 | 139 | 142 | 153 | 156 | 197 | 292 | 331 | 396 | 403 | 404 | 439 | 438 | 447 | Digital | LCVA – Lithuanian Central State Archives | O. Miklačius g. 21, Vilnius, Lithuania; email: lcva@archivy.lt | Yes |
| 167 | 261 | 373 | 374 | 407 | 409 | Digital | LLMA – Lithuanian Archives of Literature and Arts | O. Miklačius g. 35, Vilnius, Lithuania; email: lma@archivy.lt | Yes |
| 13 | 22 | 38 | 42 | 45 | 57 | 59 | 137 | 171 | 214 | 225 | 234 | 258 | 288 | 433 | 435 | 441 | 442 | Digital | LNM – Lithuanian National Museum | Arsenalo g. 1, Vilnius, Lithuania; email: museju@archivy.lt | Yes |
| 179 | 284 | Digital | ŠAM – Šaukė Audio Museum | Šaukė, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: raita@audio museus.lt | Yes |
| 11 | 50 | 112 | 269 | 327 | 444 | 446 | Digital | VDKM – Vytautas the Great War Museum | K. Donelačio g. 6-4, Kaunas, Lithuania; email: vdkm@archivy.lt | Yes |
| 13 | 14 | 297 | 301 | Digital | VDU – Vilnius Regional State Archives | O. Miklačius g. 25, Vilnius, Lithuania; email: vdu@archivy.lt | Yes |
7.b. Texts relating to protective designation, copies of property management plans or documented management systems and extracts of other plans relevant to the property


2. Strategic Development Plan of Kaunas City Municipality up to 2022, approved by the Kaunas City Municipality Council in 2015, Annex 2.


7.c. Form and date of most recent records or inventory of property

All files of listed properties and areas in the nominated area and the buffer zone are stored at the Department of Cultural Heritage Kaunas Division and at the Kaunas City Municipality Administration Division of Cultural Heritage. Information about the listed properties and areas in the nominated area is available online at the National Register of Cultural Heritage of the Republic of Lithuania (Kultūros vertybių registras): https://kvr.kpd.lt/#/static-heritage-search

Recent inventories, records and reports of the property:

- **Naujamiestis, a Historic District of Kaunas (22149)**
  - 2018: Site monitoring report No. AAK-448, DCH Kaunas Division
  - 2020: Updated inventory documentation, Act No. KPD-SK-229/6, DCH Kaunas Division

- **Žaliakalnis, a Historic District of Kaunas (22148)**
  - 2019: Site monitoring report No. AAK-384, DCH Kaunas Division

- **Žaliakalnis I, a Historic District of Kaunas (31280)**
  - 2013: Analyses and assessment of Žaliakalnis I condition, 2013, Special plan No. T-444, KCMA Cultural Heritage Division
  - 2020: Site monitoring report No. SS-16-58, KCMA Cultural Heritage Division

- **Christ’s Resurrection Church (16005)**
  - 2007: Updated inventory documentation, Act No. KPD-RM-342, DCH Kaunas Division
  - 2017: Property monitoring report No. SS-16-1, KCMA Cultural Heritage Division

- **Kaunas Ažuolynas Park Complex (17381)**
  - 2020: Updated inventory documentation, Act No. KPD-SK-424, DCH Kaunas Division

- **Kaunas Ažuolynas Sports Complex (31618)**
  - 2007: Updated inventory documentation of the Complex, Act No. KM-RM-04, DCH Kaunas Division
  - 2015: Updated inventory documentation of the Sports Hall, Act. No. KFD-SK-261, DCH Kaunas Division
  - 2016: Updated inventory documentation of the Sports Hall, Act. No. KFD-SK-261/1, DCH Kaunas Division

- **The Research Laboratory Complex (28567)**
  - 2016: Property monitoring report No. SS-16-1, KCMA Cultural Heritage Division
  - 2019: Draft state of conservation report of Research Laboratory building, Sigita Bugeriene and Vite Janušauskaitė, Kaunas University of Technology

7.d. Address where inventory, records and archives are held

The main Lithuanian official heritage institutions and archives / museums where records and archival material on Modernist Kaunas are held:

- **Kaunas City Municipality Administration, Division of Cultural Heritage**
  - Address: J. Gruodžio g. 9, Kaunas, Lithuania, email: kulturos.paveldo.skrynis@kaunas.lt

- **Department of Cultural Heritage, Kaunas Territorial Division**
  - Address: Rotušės a. 29, Kaunas, Lithuania, email: kaunas@kpd.lt

- **Kaunas Regional State Archives**
  - Address: Maironio g. 288, Kaunas, Lithuania, email: kaunas@archyvai.lt

- **Lithuanian Central State Archives**
  - Address: O. Milašiaus g. 21, Vilnius, Lithuania, email: lcva@archyvai.lt

- **National M. K. Čiurlionis Museum of Art**
  - Address: K. Donelaičio g. 64, Kaunas, Lithuania, email: mkc.info@ciurlionis.lt

- **Kaunas City Museum**
  - Address: L. Zamenhofo g. 8, Kaunas, Lithuania, email: muziejus@kaunomuziejus.lt
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Tel: +37061479553
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Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania
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KaunasIn [official Kaunas tourism information centre]
Address: A. Mickevičiaus g. 58, Kaunas, Lithuania
Email: info@kaunasin.lt

National M. K. Čiurlionis Museum of Art
Address: E. Donelaičio g. 64, Kaunas, Lithuania
Email: mka.info@ciurlionis.lt

Kaunas City Museum
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https://www.kaunasmodernism.lt
Contact name: Saulius Rimas
Email: saulius.rimas@kaunas.lt
9. SIGNATURE ON BEHALF OF THE STATE PARTY

Simonas Kairys
Minister of Culture
Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania
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ANNEXES
Annex 1.
List of cultural heritage properties and sites in the Nominated Property, constructed or reconstructed in 1919–1940 and associated with the attributes of the Nominated Property, and listed on the National Register of Cultural Heritage of the Republic of Lithuania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Unique Code</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>European Heritage Label (EHL)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Naujamiestis (historic urban site)</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 5</td>
<td>22449</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Šlapoberski Family</td>
<td>S. Daukanto g. 14</td>
<td>37189</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>S. Daukanto g. 17</td>
<td>16545</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Hotel Lietuva</td>
<td>S. Daukanto g. 21</td>
<td>32615</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>M. Dobužinskio g. 5</td>
<td>16660</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>M. Dobužinskio g. 6</td>
<td>10672</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 3</td>
<td>39359</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Pranas Malūtis House</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 4</td>
<td>16658</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Pranas Augustaitis</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 7A</td>
<td>16659</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Crafts (currently the Kaunas County Public Library)</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 8</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Matiežaitis Family</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 9</td>
<td>16524</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Doma and Mykolas Slabčius House</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 13</td>
<td>10401</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Mikas Grodzenskis House</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 17</td>
<td>27932</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The Išaicius Family House</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 19</td>
<td>27953</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Apartment Building of General Iusitės Kraucevičiūtės</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 26</td>
<td>10402</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Architect Vytautas Landsbergis House</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 38</td>
<td>30617</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Stasia M. O’Hourne</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 51</td>
<td>44457</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Jadvyga and Stasys Montvila Apartment Building</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 55</td>
<td>44458</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Petras Mačius Apartment Building</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 57</td>
<td>43977</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 58</td>
<td>16580</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Petras Gučas Apartment Building</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 61</td>
<td>43979</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Dovydas and Gedalis Igoziokš Apartment Building</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 63</td>
<td>44969</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The Vytautas the Great National Museum (Vytautas the Great War Museum and M. K. Čiurlionis National Museum of Art) complex (1-3)</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 64</td>
<td>16946</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The Vytautas the Great War Museum and M. K. Čiurlionis National Museum of Art</td>
<td>K. Donelaičio g. 64</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Valuable attributes and date**

- Defined valuable attributes and date: yes / no
- Naujamiestis (22449), Žaliakalnis (22448), Pranas Mačiulis Apartment Building (23836), Vytautas the Great War Museum and M. K. Čiurlionis National Museum of Art (1-3)

**Territory plan**

- In a cultural heritage site

**Architect**

- Vytautas Landsbergis

**Construction date**

- yes

**Ownership**

- State / Municipal / Private

**State protected**

- Yes

**Regional / National**

- No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Unique Code</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>European Heritage Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>2. Gallery</td>
<td>Kęstučio g. 64</td>
<td>32476</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>National EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>3. Bell Tower</td>
<td>Kęstučio g. 64</td>
<td>25963</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>National EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Leonas Markovčius</td>
<td>Kęstučio g. 71</td>
<td>43258</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>The Agriculture Bank (currently the main building of the Kaunas University of Technology)</td>
<td>Kęstučio g. 73</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Apartment Building for War Invalids</td>
<td>Kęstučio g. 75</td>
<td>44856</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Polish Bank</td>
<td>Kęstučio g. 76</td>
<td>30614</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>State protected n/d -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Petras Leonas</td>
<td>Kęstučio g. 77</td>
<td>44890</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>Gedimino g. 31</td>
<td>10676</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>n/d -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Romanos Polockokas Apartment Building</td>
<td>Gedimino g. 45</td>
<td>44491</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Pranas Gudavičus Apartment Building</td>
<td>Gedimino g. 48</td>
<td>27994</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>State Printing House – Vytautas the Great University main building</td>
<td>Gedimino g. 50</td>
<td>37625</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Woman’s Housing Block</td>
<td>Grumvaldo g. 8</td>
<td>44195</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Elchanian Elias Private Hospital</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 8</td>
<td>44770</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Chaja Brimanenite Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 11</td>
<td>43130</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Berta and Jankelis Vinokuras Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 15</td>
<td>42955</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Pranas Jagminas Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 17</td>
<td>42887</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Architect Grigorius Gumieniukas Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 19</td>
<td>42961</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Apartment Building for the Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 27A</td>
<td>16547</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>State protected n/d -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 32</td>
<td>16665</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>n/d -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>The Lapenas family Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 38</td>
<td>32101</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 40</td>
<td>43364</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Stasys Dovydas Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 47A</td>
<td>43776</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Augustinas Janulaitis House</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 48B</td>
<td>10685</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>State protected n/d -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 57</td>
<td>10686</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>n/d -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 65A</td>
<td>16949</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>American-Lithuanian Trade Company “Amlit” Building Complex (I–II)</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 72</td>
<td>25984</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>American-Lithuanian Trade Company “Amlit” Building Complex – I. Workshops</td>
<td>Kystučio g. 72</td>
<td>25984</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>American-Lithuanian Trade Company “Amlit” Building Complex – II. Garage</td>
<td>Marniojo g. 7</td>
<td>2611</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>American-Lithuanian Trade Company “Amlit” Building Complex – 3. Workshop Garage</td>
<td>Kystučio g.</td>
<td>43390</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>American-Lithuanian Trade Company “Amlit” Building Complex – 4. House</td>
<td>Marniojo g. 9A</td>
<td>44515</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table: List of Cultural Heritage Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Unique Code</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>European Heritage Label</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Apartment House of Bakas Family</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 90</td>
<td>44452</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Kaunas Jewish Realgymnasium</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 95</td>
<td>44854</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Aleksandras Radzivikienė</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 2</td>
<td>44843</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>House of Doctors</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 3</td>
<td>42758</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 5</td>
<td>4473</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Lithuanian Red Cross Hospital</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 17</td>
<td>36080</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Apartment Building of A. Lapinas</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 30</td>
<td>32175</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 48</td>
<td>16548</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>n/d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>The Pažažis Headquarters Building</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 53</td>
<td>15919</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>The Romora Cinema</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 54</td>
<td>3215</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Pinocentras Headquarters Building</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 55</td>
<td>15968</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Mina Krikaukienė Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 69</td>
<td>10414</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 73</td>
<td>16950</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>n/d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 84</td>
<td>38399</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>State Theatre (currently Kaunas Musical Theatre)</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 91</td>
<td>10416</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>State Savings Bank (currently the Kaunas City Municipal Building)</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 96</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>The Central Post Office</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 102</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Apartment Building Complex with a garage (1-2)</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 2</td>
<td>44901</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>1. Apartment Building of Jonas Rinkūnas</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 3</td>
<td>44823</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>2. A garage</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 3</td>
<td>44902</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Ona and Jonas Malčios</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 4</td>
<td>44824</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>The Chaimsonas Family Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 13</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Gilda and Vytautas Klodki</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 18</td>
<td>42756</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>The Bank of Lithuania Building</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 25</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Kaunas Department of the Russian State Bank (former Kaunas City Municipal Building)</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 27</td>
<td>37081</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>State Insurance Building</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 29</td>
<td>36353</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Vytis Magnus University Faculty of Medicine building</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 9</td>
<td>15970</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Tulpė Co-operative Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 15</td>
<td>4472</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 16</td>
<td>10700</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Apartment Buildings Complex of Salamonas Gudziūnas (1-2)</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 17, 17A</td>
<td>43182</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>1. Apartment Building of Salamonas Gudziūnas</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 17</td>
<td>43228</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>2. Apartment Building of Salamonas Gudziūnas</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 17A</td>
<td>43229</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>The Lithuanian Officers' Club building complex (1-3)</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 19</td>
<td>25982</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>1. The Lithuanian Officers' Club building complex (1-3)</td>
<td>Kaunas, A. Mickevičiaus g. 19</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Defined (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Unique Code</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Level of Significance</td>
<td>European Heritage Label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Multi-apartment house</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 30</td>
<td>10704</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Algirdas Šeissontis Residential building</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 32</td>
<td>44492</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Apartment house</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 33</td>
<td>16534</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>n/d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>The Bank of Lithuania Employees' Residential Building</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 38</td>
<td>20748</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 39</td>
<td>10673</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Building of Birutė Goldbergas</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 52</td>
<td>34853</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Building of Nidažio Nagorniena</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 54</td>
<td>34854</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>The Apostolic Nunciature (Kaunas Artists' House)</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 56</td>
<td>34855</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Kazimieras Šeima</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 60</td>
<td>34856</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Antanas Gysys Private Hospital and Apartment Building</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 62</td>
<td>34857</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Artist Antanas Žmudzinavičius House and Studio</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 64</td>
<td>10426</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Jonas Vileikis</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 68</td>
<td>34859</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Antanas Grantogas</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 70</td>
<td>34860</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Ona and Vincas Tercionijos</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 72</td>
<td>34861</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>The Butas Housing co-operative</td>
<td>Trakų g. 5</td>
<td>42759</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>House of Sofija Kymantaitė-Čiurlionienė</td>
<td>Žemaičių g. 31A</td>
<td>10571</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>n/d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Residential Building</td>
<td>Žemaičių g. 12</td>
<td>16722</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>n/d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Apartment House of Vysočius Kuzminas</td>
<td>Žemaičių g. 16</td>
<td>44431</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Christ's Resurrection Church</td>
<td>Žemaičių g. 31A</td>
<td>16005</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.a.1.3 Industrial Naujamiestis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Unique Code</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Defined valuable attributes and date</th>
<th>EHL</th>
<th>Exported / National Heritage label</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Valuable attributes and date</th>
<th>European Heritage label</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region / City</th>
<th>Municipality / Local Authority</th>
<th>Date of construction</th>
<th>Municipal / Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Pienocentras Industrial Complex (1-6)</td>
<td>V. Putvinskio g. 1</td>
<td>29486</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>1 Cold Storage</td>
<td>Kaunakieviškio g. 1</td>
<td>29487</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>2 Central Dairy</td>
<td>Kaunakieviškio g. 1</td>
<td>29488</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>3 Warehouse</td>
<td>Kaunakieviškio g. 1</td>
<td>29489</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>4 Administration Offices</td>
<td>Kaunakieviškio g. 1</td>
<td>29490</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>6 'Sodožių' Juice Factory</td>
<td>Kaunakieviškio g. 3</td>
<td>29492</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Apartment House</td>
<td>Vytauto pr. 1</td>
<td>44010</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Apartment Building of Juzas Daugirdas</td>
<td>Vytauto pr. 30</td>
<td>11154</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>n/d</td>
<td>EHL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Lietuvos Administrativa Building</td>
<td>Vytauto pr. 43</td>
<td>45896</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Military Hospital Complex (1-10)</td>
<td>Vytauto pr. 49</td>
<td>44001</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>1 ENT Hospital</td>
<td>Vytauto pr. 49</td>
<td>16663</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>2 Military Hospital</td>
<td>Vytauto pr. 49</td>
<td>44002</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Apartment Building</td>
<td>Karo Ligotėnės g. 3</td>
<td>10400</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>n/d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Unique Code</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Level of Significance</td>
<td>European Heritage Label</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.</td>
<td>Tenement House</td>
<td>Aukštoji g. 36</td>
<td>33819</td>
<td>Municipality protected</td>
<td>Local -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165.</td>
<td>Žaliakalnis Waterworks Group of Buildings (1-9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>28279</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.</td>
<td>1. Žaliakalnis Waterworks Building</td>
<td>Aukštoji g. 45</td>
<td>28280</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167.</td>
<td>2. Žaliakalnis Waterworks Administrative Building</td>
<td>Aukštoji g. 45</td>
<td>28281</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168.</td>
<td>3. Žaliakalnis Waterworks Pumping Station</td>
<td>Aukštoji g. 45</td>
<td>28282</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169.</td>
<td>4. Žaliakalnis Waterworks Water Reservoir</td>
<td>Aukštoji g. 45</td>
<td>28283</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170.</td>
<td>5. Žaliakalnis Waterworks Canteen</td>
<td>Aukštoji g. 45</td>
<td>28284</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.</td>
<td>6. Žaliakalnis Waterworks Guard</td>
<td>Aukštoji g. 45</td>
<td>28285</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172.</td>
<td>7. Žaliakalnis Waterworks Outbuilding</td>
<td>Aukštoji g. 45</td>
<td>28286</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td>8. Žaliakalnis Waterworks Sculpture “Water bearer”</td>
<td>Aukštoji g. 45</td>
<td>7559</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td>9. Žaliakalnis Waterworks Fence</td>
<td>Aukštoji g. 45</td>
<td>44460</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.</td>
<td>House of Antanas Gedmaraitis</td>
<td>Aukštoji g. 44</td>
<td>35057</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176.</td>
<td>Villa of the Prime Minister Juzfas Tūbelis</td>
<td>Dainavos g. 1</td>
<td>25796</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional - EHL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177.</td>
<td>Villa of the Daugvilis Family</td>
<td>Kauko al. 7</td>
<td>16955</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178.</td>
<td>House of Kazmers Barlauskas</td>
<td>Kauko al. 20</td>
<td>10440</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>n/d -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179.</td>
<td>House of Ignas Jonytis</td>
<td>Rūžų g. 3</td>
<td>16774</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180.</td>
<td>Villa of the Cenušias Family</td>
<td>Tulpių g. 21</td>
<td>10675</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>n/d -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181.</td>
<td>Villa</td>
<td>Tulpių g. 22</td>
<td>16557</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>n/d -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.4. Ažuolynas Park and Sports Complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Unique Code</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>European Heritage Label</th>
<th>EHL (European Heritage Label, 2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Kaunas Ažuolynas Park Complex (1-5)</td>
<td>Vytisnio al.</td>
<td>44581</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Vyalova et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>2. Apartment Building of Adelė and Paulius Galaunė</td>
<td>Vytisnio al.</td>
<td>16570</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Vyalova et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>3. Memorial stone for Adomas Mickėvičius</td>
<td>Radvyšnio pl.</td>
<td>34599</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Vyalova et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>4. Old Cemetery of the Old Believers</td>
<td>Radvyšnio pl.</td>
<td>44582</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Vyalova et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>5. Electric Transformation Station</td>
<td>Radvyšnio pl.</td>
<td>44583</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Vyalova et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Kaunas Ažuolynas Sports Complex (1-5)</td>
<td>Sporto g. 6</td>
<td>33618</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Vyalova et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>1. The Hall of Physical Education (currently Lithuanian Sports University)</td>
<td>Sporto g. 6</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Vyalova et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>2. The Sports Hall (Basketball Arena)</td>
<td>Perkūno al.</td>
<td>15971</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Vyalova et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>3. The Kaunas Stadium</td>
<td>Sporto g. 6</td>
<td>33619</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Vyalova et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>4. Kaunas Fortress Garage</td>
<td>Sporto g. 6</td>
<td>33620</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Vyalova et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>5. Monument to Steponas Darius and Stasys Girėnas</td>
<td>Sporto g. 6</td>
<td>33621</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Vyalova et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Unique Code</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Level of Significance</td>
<td>European Heritage label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Research Laboratory Complex (1-4)</td>
<td>Radvilienės pl. 19, 19A</td>
<td>28567</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1. Research Laboratory (currently KTU Faculty of Chemical Technology)</td>
<td>Radvilienės pl. 19</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>EHL (European Heritage Label, 2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>2. Administration office</td>
<td>Radvilienės pl. 19A</td>
<td>28568</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>3. Glassblowing laboratory</td>
<td>Radvilienės pl. 19</td>
<td>28569</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>4. Workshops</td>
<td>Radvilienės pl. 19</td>
<td>36150</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 a 2.5. The Research Laboratory Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Unique Code</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>European Heritage label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Research Laboratory Complex (1-4)</td>
<td>Radvilienės pl. 19, 19A</td>
<td>28567</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1. Research Laboratory (currently KTU Faculty of Chemical Technology)</td>
<td>Radvilienės pl. 19</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>EHL (European Heritage Label, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>2. Administration office</td>
<td>Radvilienės pl. 19A</td>
<td>28568</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>3. Glassblowing laboratory</td>
<td>Radvilienės pl. 19</td>
<td>28569</td>
<td>State protected</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>4. Workshops</td>
<td>Radvilienės pl. 19</td>
<td>36150</td>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increasing the efficiency of energetics systems and energy consumption
High-quality and publicly available healthcare and social services
Ensuring favourable conditions for business and encouraging entrepreneurship
Conditions created for the inclusion of all social groups in sports activities
Renewing and developing the water supply and wastewater management infrastructure
Increasing the social responsibility of businesses
Improving the quality and availability of sports services
Development of the system for promotion of business entities
Ensuring the implementation of a purposeful youth policy
Provide high-quality and safe healthcare services
Improving the quality of urban management and public services
Increasing the social responsibility of businesses
Increasing the attractiveness of the central part of the city to business and residents

Plan for development measures of Kaunas City Municipality

Abbreviations used in the document:
KCMA shall mean Kaunas City Municipality Administration;
KCM shall mean Kaunas City Municipality;
NGO shall mean any non-governmental organization;
PhQ shall mean any Police Headquarters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure implementation indicator</th>
<th>Implementation period</th>
<th>Competent authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Kaunas turned into the most favourable city for business in Lithuania</td>
<td>Ensure favourable conditions for business and encouraging entrepreneurship</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, business promotion institutions, associated business structures and higher education institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Strengthening of cooperation of the municipality, business promotion institutions, associated business structures and higher education institutions</td>
<td>Establish structure operating under the partnership principles, i.e. the KCMA’s advisory body for the issues of economic development of Kaunas city; Studies on business environment in Kaunas city carried out and presented regularly; Number of the signed cooperation agreements</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, business promotion institutions, associated business structures and higher education institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Development of the system for promotion of business entities</td>
<td>Number of the initiated and supported fairs, conferences encouraging new business ideas and development of business relations; Number of the implemented small and medium enterprises (SME) development programmes (measures); Number of SMEs which have received the support</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, business promotion institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Increasing the social responsibility of businesses</td>
<td>Number of the initiated / supported events intended for increasing the social responsibility of businesses; Number of the implemented measures contributing to increasing the social responsibility of businesses</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, business promotion institutions, associated business structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Increasing the attractiveness of the central part of the city to business and residents</td>
<td>Draft project for improving the visual attractiveness of the Old Town prepared and being implemented; Cooperation conducted in order to prepare and implement the programme of system-traditional events of the Old Town</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KMSA, Kaunas Old Town Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Measure implementation indicator</td>
<td>Implementation period</td>
<td>Competent authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>Development of Laisvės Aleja (liberty avenue) as the business and service centre</td>
<td>Improved environment of Laisvės Aleja (paving, building facades, lighting, planting, etc.) Strategy for development of Laisvės Aleja prepared and being implemented</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5</td>
<td>Dissemination of information encouraging entrepreneurship of the residents, organization of events, competitions, trainings</td>
<td>Number of the organized events encouraging entrepreneurship Number of the participants in such events Number of information initiatives</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, business promotion institutions, associated business structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.6</td>
<td>Development of business promotion institutions where KCMA has a stake</td>
<td>Number of the implemented projects for development of business promotion institutions Developed science and technology park Technopolis Number of economic operators established in the science and technology park Technopolis</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, business promotion institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Increasing the city’s investment attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Preparation and implementation of the investment attraction strategy programme</td>
<td>Formalized investment attraction strategy programme prepared and being implemented</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, business promotion institutions, higher education institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Presentation of the city to the potential investors</td>
<td>Created analogue of Invest Lithuania (Investuok Lietuvoje) for Kaunas city; Created database (placed in the new web site or <a href="http://www.kaunas.lt">www.kaunas.lt</a>) for investors in the Lithuanian, English, German and Russian languages Number of the organized presentations of the city to the potential investors</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, public institution Invest Lithuania, business promotion institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>Provision of administrative assistance to the potential investors</td>
<td>Prepared procedure for fast track coordination procedures containing the transparently described procedures for selection of the potential investors and for possible provision of the administrative assistance to them by the municipality in order to accelerate the internal coordination procedures</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, public institution Invest Lithuania, business promotion institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4</td>
<td>Conversion of the former production (industrial) areas or present production areas</td>
<td>Number of the prepared area planning documents, technical projects Prepared area development plans (for the areas of the former aviation plant, former meat processing plant and other areas) Attracted private investments (thousand EUR) Number of newly established enterprises</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5</td>
<td>Development of business and industrial areas</td>
<td>Number of the prepared area planning documents, environmental impact reports, technical projects, investment projects Attracted private investments (thousand EUR) Number of newly established enterprises</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.6</td>
<td>Initiation of improvement of legal acts</td>
<td>Number of the initiated amendments to legal acts with a view to reduce the amount of neglected buildings and areas in the city Number of the initiated amendments to the respective legal acts which are directly associated with improvement of business environment and / or reduction in administrative burden in Kaunas city</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.7</td>
<td>Promotion of cooperation between the public and private sectors</td>
<td>Number of the prepared and implemented public-private partnership investment projects Number of local and foreign institutions cooperated on the issues of investment attraction and project implementation Attracted private investments (thousand EUR)</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, agencies and enterprises subordinate to KCMA, business promotion institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Kaunas turned into the cultural leader of the Nordic and Baltic region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.1</td>
<td>Implementation of the part-financing programmes of cultural projects</td>
<td>Number of the implemented programmes, financed events / projects Prepared new part-financing programmes</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.2</td>
<td>Implementation of ‘Kaunas is the Lithuanian Capital of Culture’ preparation of the programme ‘Centenary of Lithuania’ submission of the application to the Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Prepared programme ‘Centenary of Lithuania’ and submitted application; Kaunas designated as the Lithuanian Capital of Culture in 2018</td>
<td>2016–2018</td>
<td>Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.3</td>
<td>Participation in the EU initiatives, i.e. ‘European Capital of Culture in 2022’ Preparation of the plan of work and submission of the application to the EU programme ‘European Capital of Culture’</td>
<td>Prepared plan, submitted application; Kaunas designated as the European Capital of Culture in 2022</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.4</td>
<td>The programme of organisation and part-financing of cultural events in Kaunas city</td>
<td>Prepared programme aimed at reducing the seasonal nature of tourists Number of the financed events</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.5</td>
<td>Realization of the idea ‘Kaunas is the Christmas Capital’ Prepared and realized concept of Christmas events and festive city decorations</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.6</td>
<td>Modernization of the operational measures of cultural institutions</td>
<td>Plan for modernization of the operational measures of cultural institutions prepared and being implemented</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Education, Culture and Tourism Development Board of KCMA, cultural institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.7</td>
<td>Preparation of the strategy for dissemination of the professional information on the city’s cultural resources and events in Lithuania and abroad and its inclusion in the general marketing programme of the city</td>
<td>Prepared strategy for dissemination of the professional information on the city’s cultural resources included in the general marketing programme of the city; the measures provided and being implemented</td>
<td>2016–2018</td>
<td>Culture and Tourism Development Division, Investment and Strategic Planning Division; Public Relations Subdivision of KCMA, public institution Kaunas Tourism Information Centre and Convention Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.8</td>
<td>Preparation of the electronic map of the culture of Kaunas city Prepared electronic map of the culture of Kaunas city (application for smartphones, tablet PCs and other portable devices)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016–2018</td>
<td>Culture and Tourism Development Division, Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA, public institution Kaunas Tourism Information Centre and Convention Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.9</td>
<td>Sustainable development of the cultural events of Kaunas city Plans of the main events of Kaunas city being prepared and implemented every year Number of the mentioned / coordinated cultural events of Kaunas city</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016–2018</td>
<td>Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1.10</td>
<td>Setting of the needs and priorities of Kaunas city in the field of culture at the national level, initiation of amendment to special legal acts</td>
<td>Objects which are important for Kaunas but do not belong to it being managed and maintained in coordination with the Government of the Republic of Lithuania the number of the financed projects; Amended special legal acts regulating the activities of cultural institutions</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Culture and Tourism Development Division, Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Development of the public cultural infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2.1</td>
<td>Movement of Kaunas City Museum into the new premises fitted for the museum activities Acquired or leased building fitted for the activities of the museum</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Property Division, Culture and Tourism Development Division, Investment and Strategic Planning Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2.2</td>
<td>Development of the infrastructure of the new concert and performing arts, conference, exhibition spaces, creative industries, residencies and clusters Built Palace of Concerts, Congresses and Conferences or acquired or fitted building / premises Established multifunctional arts centre, art incubator, creative cluster</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Construction Division, Investment and Strategic Planning, Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Measure implementation indicator</td>
<td>Implementation period</td>
<td>Competent authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.3</td>
<td>1.2.3.4</td>
<td>Increasing the effective use of the cultural infrastructure by optimizing the network of the institutions, renovating the buildings of the institutions</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.5</td>
<td>Strategy for adaptation and application of Kaunas city public spaces to the needs of culture and tourism: Creating the Owl Hill Cultural and Tourism Park, improvement of the Alybėnai (Oak Grove) Recreational and Cultural Park, adaptation of Alekšiškės observation decks, Kaunas Santaka Park for recreation, culture and tourism</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA, Urban Management Division, Environmental Division, Physical Planning Division, Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.6</td>
<td>Prepared strategy for adaptation and application of Kaunas city public spaces to the needs of culture and tourism: Creating the Owl Hill Cultural and Tourism Cluster</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA, Urban Management Division, Environmental Division, Physical Planning Division, Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.7</td>
<td>Prepared programme of the Heritage Register of Kaunas city</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Heritage Management programme of Kaunas City Municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.8</td>
<td>Organized the Heritage Register of Kaunas city</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.9</td>
<td>Organized and supported the activities aimed at inclusion of Kaunas Interwar Modernism Architecture into the UNESCO World Heritage List</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division, Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.10</td>
<td>Prepared the programme of the Kaunas Artists’ House on Jonavos Street; Preparation of the programme for inclusion in the Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Owners of objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.11</td>
<td>Proposed programme of the promotion of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre, establishment of the Kaunas Artists’ House Museum, actions taken by the Kaunas Artists’ House</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.12</td>
<td>Prepared programme for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.13</td>
<td>Propagation of Kaunas city public spaces to the needs of culture and tourism: Creating the Owl Hill Cultural and Tourism Cluster, improvement of the Alybėnai (Oak Grove) Recreational and Cultural Park, adaptation of Alekšiškės observation decks, Kaunas Santaka Park for recreation, culture and tourism</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA, Urban Management Division, Environmental Division, Physical Planning Division, Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA, Investment and Strategic Planning Division of KCMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.14</td>
<td>Prepared programme of the promotion of Kaunas city public spaces to the needs of culture and tourism: Creating the Owl Hill Cultural and Tourism Cluster</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.15</td>
<td>Prepared programme for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.16</td>
<td>Proposed programme of the promotion of Kaunas city public spaces to the needs of culture and tourism: Creating the Owl Hill Cultural and Tourism Cluster</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.17</td>
<td>Proposed programme for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.18</td>
<td>Organized the Heritage Register of Kaunas city</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.19</td>
<td>Organized and supported the activities aimed at inclusion of Kaunas Interwar Modernism Architecture into the UNESCO World Heritage List</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division, Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.20</td>
<td>Prepared the programme of the Kaunas Artists’ House on Jonavos Street</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Owners of objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.21</td>
<td>Proposed programme for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.22</td>
<td>Proposed programme of the promotion of Kaunas city public spaces to the needs of culture and tourism: Creating the Owl Hill Cultural and Tourism Cluster</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.23</td>
<td>Proposed programme for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.24</td>
<td>Organized and supported the activities aimed at inclusion of Kaunas Interwar Modernism Architecture into the UNESCO World Heritage List</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division, Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.25</td>
<td>Prepared the programme of the Kaunas Artists’ House on Jonavos Street</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Owners of objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.26</td>
<td>Proposed programme for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.27</td>
<td>Proposed programme of the promotion of Kaunas city public spaces to the needs of culture and tourism: Creating the Owl Hill Cultural and Tourism Cluster</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.28</td>
<td>Proposed programme for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.29</td>
<td>Organized and supported the activities aimed at inclusion of Kaunas Interwar Modernism Architecture into the UNESCO World Heritage List</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division, Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.30</td>
<td>Prepared the programme of the Kaunas Artists’ House on Jonavos Street</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Owners of objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.31</td>
<td>Proposed programme for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.32</td>
<td>Proposed programme of the promotion of Kaunas city public spaces to the needs of culture and tourism: Creating the Owl Hill Cultural and Tourism Cluster</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.33</td>
<td>Proposed programme for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.34</td>
<td>Organized and supported the activities aimed at inclusion of Kaunas Interwar Modernism Architecture into the UNESCO World Heritage List</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division, Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.35</td>
<td>Prepared the programme of the Kaunas Artists’ House on Jonavos Street</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Owners of objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.36</td>
<td>Proposed programme for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.37</td>
<td>Proposed programme of the promotion of Kaunas city public spaces to the needs of culture and tourism: Creating the Owl Hill Cultural and Tourism Cluster</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.38</td>
<td>Proposed programme for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.39</td>
<td>Organized and supported the activities aimed at inclusion of Kaunas Interwar Modernism Architecture into the UNESCO World Heritage List</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division, Culture and Tourism Development Division of KCMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.40</td>
<td>Prepared the programme of the Kaunas Artists’ House on Jonavos Street</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Owners of objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.41</td>
<td>Proposed programme for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.42</td>
<td>Proposed programme of the promotion of Kaunas city public spaces to the needs of culture and tourism: Creating the Owl Hill Cultural and Tourism Cluster</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.43</td>
<td>Proposed programme for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Kaunas Artists’ House and the Kaunas Art Centre</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Library of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTENTION:**

- **Columns:**
  - **Item No.**
  - **Measure**
  - **Measure implementation indicator**
  - **Implementation period**
  - **Competent authority**

- **Rows:**
  - Each row represents a specific measure or program related to cultural heritage and tourism promotion and adaptation.
  - Measures include activities such as preparing programmes, organizing events, and promoting heritage sites.
  - The implementation periods range from 2016 to 2022.
  - Competent authorities vary, including KCMA, KCMA Division, Urban Management Division, Environmental Division, Physical Planning Division, and Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA.
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**MODERNIST KAUNAS: ARCHITECTURE OF OPTIMISM, 1919–1939**

- **ANNEX 2**

---
1.3.9. Modernization of S. Darius and S. Girenas Aerodrome
Renewed runway, taxiway, artificial covers of aircraft parking bays; The following objects restored and adapted for the needs of aviation tourism: squadron staff building, wooden hangar, hangar of the Ministry of Transport and Communications.
2016–2019

1.3.10. Promotion and development of cooperation with the business sector and scientific communities
Preparation and implementation of the ambassador programme: Number of the prepared / available ambassadors.
2016–2022

1.3.11. Creating favourable conditions for the development of tourism services and improving their quality
Ensuring of operation of the Tourism Information Centre(s) during the following business hours: Mon–Fri 9 a.m.–6 p.m.; Sat–Sun 10 a.m.–3 p.m. During the tourism season: Mon–Fri 9 a.m.–7 p.m.; Sat–Sun 10 a.m.–5 p.m. (ensuring of operation on holidays and weekends); Placement and maintenance of information in the website visitkaunas.lt in the following five languages: Lithuanian, English, German, Polish, Russian; Linking of the information of public institution Kaunas Tourism Information Centre and Convention Bureau with the information technologies and social networks; Tourist satisfaction and opinion surveys carried out every year during the tourism season.
2016–2022

1.3.12. Implementation of the marketing and communication campaigns of Kaunas city
Kauas city tourism marketing strategy as well as the action plan prepared and being implemented; Number of implemented campaigns of the brand of Kaunas city; Presentation of Kaunas city as the green, technologically advanced city.
2016–2022

1.3.13. Improvement of the quality of the services of the tourism sector and strengthening of the abilities of workers
Number of the trainings organised for tourism service workers; Number of the participants of the trainings implemented programme of Kaunas hospitality.
2016–2022

1.3.14. Supporting the diversity of tourism products and increasing the supply of tourism products
Number of the developed products of cultural, conference, incentive tourism; Number of the initiative of information on tourism products on the local and foreign tourism markets; Number of the newly created tourism packages encouraging tourists to visit Kaunas outside the tourist season.
2016–2022

1.3.15. Preparation of the programmes and itineraries of international and domestic specialized and educational tourism by integrating the cultural heritage
Number of the prepared programmes and itineraries of international and domestic specializations and educational tourism by integrating the cultural heritage; In case necessary, inclusion of new objects into the tourism itineraries (interwar, wooden, classtr architecture, Hanza, The Gediminas Way, route of Gothic, forts, etc.)
2016–2022

1.3.16. Dissemination of information on events taking place in Kaunas city among tourists at the local and international level
Number of the events organised in cooperation with business representatives; Three-year events plans being prepared and presented; Number of published and distributed information publications on the future events; Number of information initiatives aimed at propagating the traditional cultural events taking place in Kaunas (Festivals Festival, etc.) at the international level.
2016–2022

1.3.17. Participation in the international events promoting tourism and the activities of international tourism organizations
Number of the attended international tourism exhibitions, business missions and other events promoting tourism; Number of the involving international tourism projects; Representation of Kaunas city in the European Cities Marketing
2016–2022

2. DEVELOPING A CLEVER AND CIVIL SOCIETY

2.1. Educational services matching the needs of a learning society

2.1.1. Forming an effective formal and non-formal education institution network
Achieved results of the economic education monitoring indicators (approved by the order of the Director of KCMA).
2016–2020

2.1.2. Ensuring the availability of the pre-school education by reasonably combining the creation initiatives of the municipality and private pre-school education institutions
Condition of the grounds of schools of general education complying with the sanitary and hygiene requirements; Number of the newly built sports facilities of educational institutions (4); Availability of the sports facilities of schools ensured for local communities (90 per cent).
2016–2022

2.1.3. Renovation and development of the infrastructure of pupils’ sports employment by ensuring its availability for the local communities
Number of the newly created places of pre-school education (100 in 2016; 100 in 2017); Satisfaction of the needs of the residents wishing that their children would attend the pre-school education institutions (100 per cent).
2016–2019

2.1.4. Modernization of the buildings of the institutions providing educational and training services and improvement of the infrastructure
Number of the reconstructed or repaired buildings (10); Number of the refurbished playgrounds of the institutions carrying out the pre-school education curriculum (10).
2016–2022

2.1.5. Creation and development of modern educational environments in the educational institutions of Kaunas city
Created educational e–services system; Number of the institutions of general education where the modern educational environments have been created; Part of the Kaunas city educational institutions which have made their educational environments available (100 per cent).
2016–2022

2.1.6. Guaranteeing the child wellbeing with a minimum or average care
Created effective partnership network among the KCMA, the Child Wellbeing Commissions of educational institutions and the NGO open to international partners; Number of the practical trainings organized for the heads of the Child Wellbeing Commissions and social pedagogues (30).
2016–2022

2.1.7. Guaranteeing the quality of general education regulated in the purposes of the Law on Education of the Republic of Lithuania
Part of the institutions which have undergone an external audit (100 per cent).
2016–2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure implementation indicator</th>
<th>Implementation period</th>
<th>Competent authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.1.8</td>
<td>Development of non-formal education services and improvement of their quality</td>
<td>Part of the institutions which have implemented the formal education activities; quality assessment and self-assessment (30 per cent); Dissemination of the achievements of the pupils and students belonging to the artistic groups of educational institutions / higher education and research institutions being conducted among the urban public; Organized city’s representative events (Kaunas Soronut, Teacher’s Day, Honouring Ceremony for Gifted Children, Kaunas Talent, International Entrepreneurship Fair, Children and Youth Song Festival, Celebration of Learning Families)</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Education and Training Division of KCMA, educational institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.2.</td>
<td>Developing an academic, learning and clever city</td>
<td>The programme prepared by focusing on the following a) promotion of lifelong learning of all residents of the city; b) solution of the problems of the city and its residents through creation of the networks of mutual assistance and clever activities; c) consolidation of the activities of higher education institutions</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Education and Training Division of KCMA, Kaunas City Council of Education, educational institutions, NGO, business organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.3.</td>
<td>Development of cooperation of the municipality, higher, vocational and general education schools and business organizations by consolidating the intellectual resources of the city</td>
<td>Made up of the exceptional competences / intellectual resources of Kaunas city; Created partnership network of higher education schools and the municipality as well as city’s organizations which enables to use the resources in a clever manner for learning of students, work of teaching staff, employment of students in Kaunas city; Implementation of innovations in business organizations and improvement of the high-level competencies of the residents of the city; Provided new employment and occupation opportunities enabling to reach the certain level of occupation of the learning / graduated youth of Kaunas city (up to 28 years old); Created Kaunas city’s system for formalization the non-formal education (recognition of the qualifications acquired in a non-formal way); System of talent identification operating in all pre-school education institutions of Kaunas city; Career education system(s) operating in all secondary, vocational and higher education schools of Kaunas city; Created centre of catering- intellectual activities common for all students of the higher education schools of Kaunas city</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Education and Training Division of KCMA, Kaunas City Council of Education, educational institutions, NGO, Kaunas Regional Labour Exchange, business organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.4.</td>
<td>Establishing the image of Kaunas as an academic, learning and clever city</td>
<td>Programmes and plan of measures for developing the image of Kaunas as an academic, learning and clever city at the Lithuanian and international level (100 per cent); Creation of the strategy for development of the image of Kaunas City Municipality; establishment and improvement of the intellectual resources of the city; Established office for implementation of the programmes; Centre of School Museum</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Education and Training Division of KCMA, Kaunas City Council of Education, educational institutions, NGO, business organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.5.</td>
<td>Establishment of the Science Museum in Kaunas city</td>
<td>Established Science Museum</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, educational institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.6.</td>
<td>Ensuring the implementation of a purposeful youth policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.7.</td>
<td>Promotion of acquisition of the practical skills of students in business and state institutions as well as occupation during the leisure time of the youth</td>
<td>Number of the students who have undergone practical training in Kaunas City Municipality Administration and in the enterprises subordinate to the municipality (1,800); Number of the programmes for occupation during the leisure time (4)</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Public Management and Personnel Division of KCMA, Kaunas Municipal Labour Exchange, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.8.</td>
<td>Establishment of open youth centres and open youth spaces</td>
<td>Established open youth space; Established youth information centre; Number of the established open youth centres (5)</td>
<td>2016–2019</td>
<td>KCMA, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.9.</td>
<td>Creation of new work spaces promoting entrepreneurship and creativity of the youth</td>
<td>Established youth business centre; Number of the funded youth NGO entrepreneurship projects (35); Number of the prepared youth entrepreneurship promotion projects (5)</td>
<td>2016–2019</td>
<td>KCMA, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.10.</td>
<td>Development of non-formal education and employment increase; programmes aimed at integration of the youth experiencing social exclusion; learning difficulties which has left the education system early and has less opportunities into the labour market</td>
<td>Youth employment increase programme prepared and being implemented; Number of the funded NGO projects involving inactive young people (50); Number of the concluded agreements on voluntary practice (150)</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, Kaunas Territorial Labour Exchange, Kaunas county PHD, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.11.</td>
<td>Implementation of the cultural initiatives of the youth</td>
<td>Number of the organized events (International Students’ Day, Kaunas Youth Days, Spring Festival, etc.) (34)</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.12.</td>
<td>Ensuring the involvement of the youth in adoption of decisions</td>
<td>4 councils / commissions, where the representatives of the youth are included, operating in KCM, Youth Affairs Division established by KCMA</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2. Conditions created for the inclusion of all social groups in sports activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure implementation indicator</th>
<th>Implementation period</th>
<th>Competent authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.1.</td>
<td>Improving the quality and availability of sports services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.2.</td>
<td>Modernization of the operational measures of the sports training institutions (acquisition of sports equipment, modernization of sports facilities; installation of the electronic control system)</td>
<td>Number of the budgetary KCM sports training institutions in which the operational measures have been modernized (11)</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.3.</td>
<td>Ensuring the coordination of the organization of the mass events taking place in Kaunas city</td>
<td>Number of the financed events: International Children Games organized in Kaunas city (in 2017)</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division, Culture and Tourism Development Division, International Relations and Protocol Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.4.</td>
<td>Preparation and implementation of the non-cross-financing programmes of the sports projects of the non-governmental physical training and sports organizations</td>
<td>Number of the financed projects: Number of the new non-cross-financing programmes prepared and being implemented; Number of the financed non-governmental disabled physical training and sports organizations; Number of the participants involved in the programmes financed by the disabled sports organizations; Number of the people engaged in sport in non-budgetary sports organizations</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.5.</td>
<td>Creation of Kaunas city interactive sports system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.6.</td>
<td>Increasing the effective use of the sports infrastructure by renovating / modernizing sports facilities and administrative premises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.7.</td>
<td>Developing the public sports infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Measure implementation indicator</td>
<td>Implementation period</td>
<td>Competent authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.2</td>
<td>Reconstruction / renovation and adaptation of the facilities of the public institution S. Darius and S. Girėnas Sports Centre for the social and cultural needs of residents</td>
<td>Reconstructed stadium of the Sports Centre, finished thermal insulation renovation of the building of the sports hall</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division, Investment and Strategic Planning Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.3</td>
<td>Development of the sports infrastructure by using the urban public areas for construction of new sports objects and modernization of the existing sports objects</td>
<td>Number of the equipped objects of the sports infrastructure (including: the rugby stadium located at Parintazgų g. 192, the football stadium located at Kairėnų g. 11 and Jovu g. 4, the paddling route in Lampėdžiai lake complying with the international standards, handball and combat sports centre located at Kovo II–čios g. 26, track and field area, sports facilities within the territory of the second shelf of Kaunas Reservoir, i.e. R. Kalantos g. 152, indoor and outdoor tennis courts)</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division, Construction Division, Investment and Strategic Planning Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.4</td>
<td>Adaptation of Kaunas city’s public spaces, recreational spaces and parks for sports activities and organization of active leisure</td>
<td>Created and developed sports infrastructure in the Nėriniaus island, Santaka Park, Abiejų park, other parks of the city, territories of neighbourhoods</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.5</td>
<td>Adaptation of the operating sports facilities for the needs of the disabled</td>
<td>Ratio of the sports facilities adapted for the needs of the disabled (50 per cent)</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division, Construction Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.3 High-quality and publicly available healthcare and social services

### 2.3.1 Providing high-quality and safe healthcare services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure implementation indicator</th>
<th>Implementation period</th>
<th>Competent authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.1</td>
<td>Improvement of the availability and the quality of the primary healthcare services in the public institution Kauno Centro Poliklinika</td>
<td>Number / area of the reconstructed or repaired buildings (m²); Total area of the improved areas [ha]; Number of the upgraded (acquired) medical, medical waste disconnection and other equipment; Number of the acquired vehicles; Number of the installed models of provision of healthcare services</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division, Construction Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.2</td>
<td>Development of provision of electronic services in the health sector</td>
<td>Number of the installed (upgraded) e-services; part of electronically provided services in all services which may be provided electronically (per cent); Number of the persons who have used e-services</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division, Construction Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.3</td>
<td>Development of psychological services, promotion of healthy diets and physical activity, prophylaxis of infectious and non-infectious diseases, prevention of suicides, violence, unintentional injuries and addictions</td>
<td>Number of information initiatives; Number of the provided services (consultations); Number of the organized events; Number of the participants in such events</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division, Construction Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.4</td>
<td>Provision of integrated services for the persons in crisis situations</td>
<td>Number of information initiatives; Number of the provided services (consultations); Number of the organized events; Number of the participants in such events</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division, Construction Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.5</td>
<td>Implementation of public health promotion programmes (measures)</td>
<td>Number of the implemented programmes; Number of the participants involved in the programmes; Number of the conducted surveys; Number of the social partners</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division, Construction Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.6</td>
<td>Disease prevention, development of availability of prophylaxis and health promotion services, promotion of healthy aging</td>
<td>Number of information initiatives; Number of the provided services (consultations); Number of the organized events; Number of the participants in such events</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division, Construction Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.7</td>
<td>Involvement of persons in the disease prevention programmes funded from the Compulsory Health Insurance Fund</td>
<td>Number of the programmes being implemented; Number of the informed patients; Number of the participants involved in the programmes</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division, Construction Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.3.2 Social services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure implementation indicator</th>
<th>Implementation period</th>
<th>Competent authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.1</td>
<td>Development of social services by providing the integrated help to the families in crisis situations (cases of domestic violence, lack of parenting skills and other crises)</td>
<td>Established Shelter House (R. Kalantos g. 57) for the families in crisis situations and the victims of violence with their children: Number of the social projects [programmes] being implemented by NGO in this field; Number of the established centres providing the integrated help to the family in a crisis situation; Number of the families who have received the services in crisis situations</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Physical Training and Sports Division of KCMA, Healthcare Institutions, Social Services Division of KCMA, Shelter House, Kaunas Nursing Home, Children Welfare Centres, NGO Kaunas Children Foster Home, Kaunas City Social Services Centre, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Measure implementation indicator</td>
<td>Implementation period</td>
<td>Competent authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.2.</td>
<td>Increasing the availability and development of social services for families</td>
<td>Number of the early prevention services (programmes, projects) provided to families</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Social Services Division of KCMA, Kaunas City Social Services Centre, Children Welfare Centre &quot;Pastojo&quot;, Day Care Centre of the Children Foster Home of the Kaunas Municipality, Kaunas Social Services Centre, Kaunas Generation House, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.3.</td>
<td>Improvement and development of the services provided to the persons at social risk</td>
<td>Primary healthcare programme among the persons who do not have social insurance being implemented throughout the year</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Health Division, Social Services Division, Housing Fund Administration of KCMA, Kaunas City Social Services Centre, Shelter House, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.4.</td>
<td>Increasing the availability of social services for elderly and very elderly people</td>
<td>Number of the posts of the employees providing the home assistance, day social care, integral assistance at persons home</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Social Services Division of KCMA, Kaunas Panemunė Home for the Elderly, Kaunas City Social Services Centre, Kaunas Generations House, neighbourhoods, community centres, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.5.</td>
<td>Development of social services for children with disabilities (intellectual, physical, mental) and their families</td>
<td>Number of the families raising children and receiving social services at home (home assistance, day care, respite), Number of the established day care centres for children with disabilities (educational, physical, mental)</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Social Services Division of KCMA, Kaunas Disabled Youth Occupation Centre, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.6.</td>
<td>Initiation of improvement of legal acts</td>
<td>Initiation of amendments to legal acts in order to enable not only parents, but also the child rights protection divisions to apply for the return of a child to his/her biological family when the parental authority has been restricted by the judgement; in case of improvement of the situation in the family: Improvement of the legal acts defining the children in the families to pay wages by providing social guarantees to the families providing this service at the national or municipal level</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Child Rights Protection Division, Social Services Division of KCMA, NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.7.</td>
<td>Development of the integrated social services for foster parents and adopters</td>
<td>Number of newly prepared foster families and foster children</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Social Services Division, Child Rights Protection Division, Child Welfare Centre “Pastojo&quot;, Kaunas Children Foster Home, “Atžalynas”, Kaunas Municipality, Children Foster Home, NGO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNEX 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure implementation indicator</th>
<th>Implementation period</th>
<th>Competent authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.8.</td>
<td>Savanariškio gyvenimo namų pasiūlymu priežiūrės įsipareigojimų globėjų sistemos</td>
<td>Implemented restructuring of Kaunas Children Foster Home “Atžalynas” [4 operating subdivisions: Long-term (short-term) guardianship for children deprived of parental care; Day Care Centre for a child and family with accommodation in a case of crisis; Advisory unit providing assistance to a family; Independent living houses intended for children who have left the foster home and the children who have been identified as able to live separately with the assistance of a social worker]. Number of the established independent living houses in the guardianship institutions for the foster youth aged 16 years old and for the youth above 18 years old (who have left the guardianship system); Purchasing of the services from the experienced non-governmental organizations accompanying the youngsters who have left the foster home; Number of the youngsters residing in independent living houses</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Social Services Division, Housing Division of KCMA, Kaunas Children Foster Home “Atžalynas”, Kaunas Municipality, Children Foster Home, Kaunas Generation House, Children Welfare Centre “Pastojo” NGO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4. Effective city management, high quality of public services

2.4.1. Increasing the quality of urban management and public services

2.4.1.1. Improvement of the activities of the municipality aimed at integrated decision-making and more efficient performance of functions

Reviewed structure of Kaunas City Municipality. Prepared description of the procedure for information exchange and integrated decision-making among the structural subdivisions of KCMA. Introduced project management system.

2016
KCMA

2.4.1.2. Improvement of the competences of the KCMA’s civil servants and workers employed under the employment contracts with a view to increase the quality of urban management and provided services

Number of the persons who have improved their competences

2016–2022
Public Management and Personal Division of KCMA

2.4.1.3. Development of global quality management and results-focused management principles

Number of the introduced modern quality management methods and modules

2016–2022
KCMA

2.4.1.4. Study on satisfaction of the needs of the users of public services provided by the municipality and its subordinate institutions and enterprises

Studies periodically carried out and made publicly available

2016–2022
KCMA

2.4.1.5. Renewal and development of the stock of hardware of the municipality and its subordinate institutions and enterprises

Number of the institutions which have renewed the stock of hardware

2016–2022
KCMA

2.4.1.6. Preparation and implementation of strategic planning documents

Number of the strategic planning documents (strategic plans, strategies, studies, etc.) prepared and being implemented

2016–2022
KCMA

2.4.1.7. Promotion of implementation of the principles of gender equality in the municipality’s administration and its subordinate institutions

Established Public Commission on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men Programme of Equal Opportunities for Women and Men prepared and being implemented. Number of implemented information initiatives.

2016–2022
KCMA

2.4.1.8. Provision of equal working conditions, privileges, opportunities for training and re-training, gaining of practical experience

Provided equal working and training conditions for women and men

2016–2022
KCMA

2.4.2. Improving and expanding the range of the city’s e-services

2.4.2.1. Development of geographic information system (GIS)

Number of the developed and introduced new information systems based on GIS. Developed system for representation of area planning documents on a map

2016–2022
Information Technology Division of KCMA

2.4.2.2. Development of the smart urban resident information system

Number of the developed and introduced information systems

2016–2022
Information Technology Division of KCMA

2.4.2.3. Creation of the electronic services of ordering the permits to perform excavation works and making the street repair works public

Number of the developed and introduced information systems

2016–2022
Urban Management Division, Information Technology Division of KCMA

2.4.2.4. Integration of the registers held by the municipality (permits, certificates, etc.) into one common publicly available register

Number of the developed and introduced information systems

2016–2022
Information Technology Division of KCMA

2.4.2.5. Development of information systems through modernization of public administration

Number of the developed (expanded) and introduced information systems

2016–2022
Information Technology Division of KCMA

2.4.2.6. Initiating creation of the modern websites of the enterprises monitored by the municipality and provision of electronic services for the residents

Number of the updated websites

2016–2022
KCMA

Item
No.
Measure
Implementa-
tion period
Competent authority

2.4.2.7. Development of the measures of electronic democracy

Introduced new e-democracy measures

2016–2022
Information Technology Division of KCMA

2.4.2.8. Development of the system of electronic services provided by the municipality and integration with the state information systems

Expanded number of interactive e-services

2016–2022
Information Technology Division of KCMA

2.4.2.9. Renewal and development of the infrastructure of information and communication technologies [ICT] of the Administration of the municipality

Renewed ICT infrastructure [computer networks, computers, printing equipment]

2016–2022
Information Technology Division of KCMA

2.4.2.10. Introduction of an Electronic Consultant in Kaunas City Municipality

Introduced information system

2016–2022
Information Technology Division of KCMA

2.4.3. Shaping the city image; developing international and cross-institutional cooperation

2.4.3.1. Improvement of shaping of the municipality image

Strategy for shaping the municipality image at the Lithuanian and international level and action plan prepared (renewed), and being implemented

2016–2022
KCMA

2.4.3.2. Involvement in the international organizations [UBC, ECAD, Hanseatic League of Cities, European Healthy Cities Network, etc.]

Number of the representatives of the city involved in the activities of committees and board of organizations; Number of the representatives of the city who have participated in conferences; Number of the organized joint events

2016–2022
International Relations and Protocol Division of KCMA, Kaunas City Municipality Public Health Bureau

2.4.3.3. Involvement in the network of partner cities and signing of new contracts with the partner cities

Number of the representatives of the city involved in the exchange programmes; Number of the joint implemented projects; Number of the signed contracts with the partner cities

2016–2022
International Relations and Protocol Division of KCMA

2.5. A safe and communal city

2.5.1. Ensuring public order in the city

2.5.1.1. Complete assessment of the safety needs of residents

Population surveys organized every 3 years in neighbourhoods with a view to assess the safety needs of residents; Number of the potentially dangerous places of Kaunas city identified; Places included in the maps of dangerous places of Kaunas city

2016–2022
Public Order Division of KCMA, Kaunas county PHQ, neighbourhoods

2.5.1.2. Increasing the safety of the residents through implementation of various preventive, educational programmes

Information on the state of safety in the city and the preventive measures implemented jointly by KCMA, Kaunas county PHQ and NGO provided to the media and public; Number of the information initiatives promoting safety; Number of the implemented preventive programmes (measures) implemented preventive measures (nads) as well as the preventive programmes initiated and implemented by KCMA, Kaunas county PHQ, NGO; Number of the traffic safety events organized in the educational and training institutions, Number of the implemented measures intended for the elderly on the topic of traffic safety; Number of the newly established safe neighbourhood groups; Number of the measures implemented by KCMA for prevention of emergencies

2016–2022
Public Order Division of KCMA, Kaunas county PHQ, neighbourhoods, educational and training institutions, NGO

2.5.1.3. Renewal and development of the infrastructure of the measures for recording of offences

Number of the installed video surveillance cameras (300); Number of the installed speed measuring devices (50); Number of the renewed and newly installed safety measures (50)

2016–2022
Public Order Division, Transport and Traffic Planning Division of KCMA, Kaunas county PHQ

2.5.2. Promoting and nurturing the community spirit

2.5.2.1. Development of the multifunctional community centres (homes) in the neighbourhoods

Multifunctional community centres [homes] established in each neighbourhood; Number of the recipients of the services provided by the multifunctional centres

2016–2022
KCMA, NGO, neighbourhoods

Item
No.
Measure
Implementa-
tion period
Competent authority

2.5.2.2. Development of the multifunctional community centres (homes) in the neighbourhoods

Multifunctional community centres [homes] established in each neighbourhood; Number of the recipients of the services provided by the multifunctional centres

2016–2022
KCMA, NGO, neighbourhoods

...
### SUSTAINABLE TERRITORY AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

#### 3.1. Efficient and modern engineering supply infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure implementation indicator</th>
<th>Implementa-</th>
<th>Competent authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.</td>
<td>Renovating and developing the drinking water supply and wastewater management infrastructure</td>
<td>Length of renovated water supply systems (75 km); Length of the renovated water supply systems (70 km); Number of the renovated and installed water supply systems (51 km); Number of the renovated and installed water supply systems (30 km); Number of the renovated and installed water supply systems (25 km); Water improvement equipment installed in the water intake of the Kaunas city (5);</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno vandenys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2.</td>
<td>Renovation and installation of drinking water supply and wastewater collection systems</td>
<td>Length of the renovated water supply systems (75 km); Length of the renovated domestic wastewater systems (70 km); Length of the newly installed domestic wastewater systems (65 km); Number of the renovated domestic wastewater pump-houses (35); Number of the newly installed water supply pump-houses (2); Water improvement equipment installed in the water intake of the Kaunas city (5);</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno vandenys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3.</td>
<td>Reconstruction and installation of run-off water collection and treatment infrastructure</td>
<td>Length of the renovated run-off water systems (10 km); Length of the renovated run-off water systems (12 km); Number of the installed run-off water treatment plants (70); Number of the renovated run-off water systems (10 km); Number of the renovated run-off water systems (12 km); Number of the installed run-off water treatment plants (70); Number of the renovated run-off water systems (10 km); Number of the renovated run-off water systems (12 km); Number of the installed run-off water treatment plants (70);</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno vandenys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.4.</td>
<td>Increasing the efficiency of energy systems and energy consumption</td>
<td>Number of the prepared energy performance certificates and investment plans (150); Number of the prepared energy performance certificates and investment plans (150);</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno vandenys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.5.</td>
<td>Increasing the energy efficiency of public buildings</td>
<td>Number of the buildings with the improved energy efficiency (50); Number of the buildings with the improved energy efficiency (50);</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno vandenys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.6.</td>
<td>Renovation and development of the lighting network, introduction of energy saving measures</td>
<td>Implemented Kaunas city street lighting modernization project (based on the principle of public-private partnership and other sources of financing); Number of the renovated (installed) light points; Number of the improved energy saving measures; Number of the improved energy saving measures;</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno vandenys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.7.</td>
<td>Increasing and developing the heat generation efficiency</td>
<td>Number of the reconstructed and installed heat generation plants; Number of the reconstructed and installed heat generation plants; Number of the reconstructed and installed heat generation plants;</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno energija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.8.</td>
<td>Increasing the safety and reliability of heat supply</td>
<td>Length of the reconstructed heat transmission pipeline (18 km); Reduced heat grid losses (8.0); Length of the reconstructed heat transmission pipeline (18 km);</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno energija</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.2. High-quality and safe transport infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure implementation indicator</th>
<th>Implementa-</th>
<th>Competent authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.</td>
<td>Ensuring the quality of transport infrastructure</td>
<td>Number of the equipped car / cycle parking lots (35); Number of the equipped car / cycle parking lots (35);</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno autobusų, public institution Automobilio parkavimo aktiškai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2.</td>
<td>Development and implementation of intelligent information systems in such fields as public transport management, motor transport flows and parking</td>
<td>Introduced smart parking information system; Introduced smart parking information system;</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno autobusų, public institution Automobilio parkavimo aktiškai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3.</td>
<td>Development of the system of technical traffic regulation measures</td>
<td>Introduced system for management of technical traffic regulation measures CS and collected data on the road signs built in Kaunas city; Introduced system for management of technical traffic regulation measures CS and collected data on the road signs built in Kaunas city;</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno autobusų, public institution Automobilio parkavimo aktiškai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.4.</td>
<td>Preparation and implementation of the solutions for traffic operation in Studentų g. (from A. Baranausko to K. Baršausko g.)</td>
<td>Prepared and implemented solutions for traffic operation in Studentų g. (from A. Baranausko to K. Baršausko g.);</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno autobusų, public institution Automobilio parkavimo aktiškai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.5.</td>
<td>Developing the public and non-motorized transport systems</td>
<td>New cycle paths: cycle path by Užnemunė g.; cycle path by Užnemunė g.; cycle path by Užnemunė g.; cycle path by Užnemunė g.;</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno autobusų, public institution Automobilio parkavimo aktiškai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.6.</td>
<td>Equipment and renovation of the infrastructure of pedestrian walkways, cycle and other non-motorized transport paths, roads and other related infrastructure</td>
<td>New cycle paths: cycle path by Užnemunė g.; cycle path by Užnemunė g.; cycle path by Užnemunė g.; cycle path by Užnemunė g.;</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno autobusų, public institution Automobilio parkavimo aktiškai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.7.</td>
<td>Introduction of the public and private transport interaction systems</td>
<td>Number of the equipped car / cycle parking lots &quot;Park and Go&quot;; Number of the equipped car / cycle parking lots &quot;Park and Go&quot;; Number of the equipped car / cycle parking lots &quot;Park and Go&quot;;</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>KCMA, UAB Kauno autobusų, public institution Automobilio parkavimo aktiškai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Measure implementation indicator</td>
<td>Implementation period</td>
<td>Competent authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2.3</td>
<td>Introduction of the automated bike rental system in Kaunas city</td>
<td>Number of bike rental points; Number of rented bikes</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>KCMA, private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.4.2</td>
<td>Preparation and implementation of Kaunas City Municipality’s sustainable mobility plan</td>
<td>Kaunas City’s sustainable mobility plan prepared and being implemented</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Transport and Traffic Planning Division, Urban Development and Architecture Division, Environmental Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.5</td>
<td>Development of environmentally-friendly transport</td>
<td>Number of the acquired new environmentally-friendly public transport vehicles [100]; Number of the introduced electric vehicle charging stations</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Transport and Traffic Planning Division of KCMA, UAB Kauno autobusai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.6</td>
<td>Installation and renovation of the public transport infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructure of the trolley-bus network adapted to the innovative electric public transport systems; CNS (compressed natural gas) slow-fill station equipped in the territory of UAB Kauno autobusai; Number of the sheds equipped at public transport stops [400]; Number of the information scoreboards installed at public transport stops [50]; Number of the equipped transfer points [3]</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Transport and Traffic Planning Division of KCMA, UAB Kauno autobusai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. A safe and clean environment, efficient waste management

#### 3.3.1. Preparation and implementation of programmes for improvement of environment quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Implementation period</th>
<th>Competent authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.1</td>
<td>Number of the programmes for improvement of environment quality being implemented</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Environmental Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.2</td>
<td>Noise prevention plans</td>
<td>Noise prevention plans prepared every 5 years; Number of the implemented noise prevention and reduction measures</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.3</td>
<td>Public education in the fields of environmental protection and waste management</td>
<td>Environmental educational programmes being prepared and implemented; Number of the implemented public education initiatives</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.4</td>
<td>Inventory, maintenance and restoration of areas of natural and urbanized landscape</td>
<td>Area of the inventorized areas [ha]; Area of the maintained / restored areas, [ha]; Length of the cleaned coats of water bodies (km)</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.5</td>
<td>Development of the infrastructure of separate collection of municipal waste</td>
<td>Number of the provided slots of the mixed municipal waste and recyclables containers (underground and semi-underground) [100]; Number of the equipped sites of the mixed municipal waste and recyclables containers [300]</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Sustainable city area development, high-quality living environment

#### 4.1. Preparation and updating of area planning documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Implementation period</th>
<th>Competent authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>Updated special plan for Kaunas city’s heating facility; Number of the prepared area planning documents (including: for slope area preservation; for layout of new recreational plantings of local importance; for maintenance of protection zones for coasts of Kaunas city surface water bodies; for maintenance of the Nemunas Island with the park; for formation and legalization of the protection zones for the plantings in the industrial areas existing or newly equipped near the residential urban districts; for development of Industrial Centre in Júlijai)</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>Energy Division, Environmental Division, Urban Management Division, Urban Development and Architecture Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.1.2. Improvement of viability of the New Town and promotion of intensive development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Implementation period</th>
<th>Competent authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2.1</td>
<td>Prepared document of integrated area planning</td>
<td>2016–2020</td>
<td>Urban Development and Architecture Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ANNEX 2**
### Annex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure implementation indicator</th>
<th>Implementation period</th>
<th>Competent authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Kaunas turned into a competitive cultural and conference tourism attraction centre</td>
<td>Installation of the lighting networks in the pedestrian walkways at the approaches to Kaunas County Public Library near Radžiūnų street, in Kaunas.</td>
<td>2016–2017</td>
<td>Energy Division, Urban Development and Architecture Division of KCMA; Architects Association of Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1. Developing the public infrastructure that improves the public tourism and general image of the city</td>
<td>Installation of street lighting networks. Stage II: Kaunas Castle surroundings – Santaka walkways – Nemunas quay (near the amphitheatre dock)</td>
<td>2016–2019</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1.6. Annex to the measure “Improvement of the city image by installing the lighting of the tourism infrastructure and objects”</td>
<td>Approaches to St. George Church</td>
<td>2017–2018</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting of the façade of the building of Kaunas St. Michael the Archangel’s (the Garrison) Church, Independence Square</td>
<td>2017–2019</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renovation of the lighting in the Town Hall Square</td>
<td>2018–2019</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Installation of the lighting in Vytautas Park</td>
<td>2019–2020</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting of the façade of the building of M. Zilinskas Gallery, Independence Square</td>
<td>2021–2022</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Installation of the lighting in the Student Square near K. Donelaičio g.</td>
<td>2020–2021</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Installation of the lighting in the Student Square near K. Donelaičio g.</td>
<td>2020–2021</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction of the lighting of the streets of the Old Town and the New Town – light points: Santaka g. (30 units), Muziejaus g. (4 units), Peršlapaukos ir Kantinės g. (10 units), Juoz. skersgat. (4 units), Matrinos g. (9 units), V. Kuzmin g. (7 units), J. Naugardo g. (8 units), Kurekų g. (8 units), M. Daubliūs g. (24 units), Kupiškų g. (13 units), L. Zamenhofo g. (5 units), A. Maupo g. (7 units), J. Jablonsko g. (5 units), Palangos g. (11 units), Didz. g. (17 units), Karo Ligoninės g. (7 units), M. Valniūnas g. (44 units), Vilniaus g. (11 units)</td>
<td>2016–2018</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting of the building of Maironis Gymnasium (former building of the Seimas)</td>
<td>2018–2020</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting of Kaunas St. Nicholas Church, Benediktinų g.</td>
<td>2019–2020</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting of the building of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Karaliaus Mindaugo pr.</td>
<td>2019–2020</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other objects according to the need</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2. High-quality and safe transport infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure implementation indicator</th>
<th>Implementation period</th>
<th>Competent authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1. Ensuring the quality of transport infrastructure</td>
<td>Reconstruction of Laisvės al.</td>
<td>2015–2022</td>
<td>Urban Development Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction of Raudondvario pl</td>
<td>2015–2017</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction / new construction of the Southwest Bypass</td>
<td>2015–2022</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction of H. ir O. Minkovskų g</td>
<td>2016–2016</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction of Skirno g</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction of Verkių g</td>
<td>2018–2019</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction of Francūžų g</td>
<td>2017–2018</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction of Užkūno g. and Žemaičių pl.</td>
<td>2018–2020</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction of Panemunė Bridge</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formed bypass of the Old Town – the New Town by equipping Kiodamų g. routes with the bridge over the Nemunas River and by improving the parameters of H. ir O. Minkovskų g. on the left bank of the Nemunas River as far as M. K. Ciurlionis Bridge</td>
<td>2020–2022</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipped deficient connections of streets Všlės g., Europos pr., Mirkovskų g., Bruselio g.</td>
<td>2016–2022</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE
GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1. Purpose of the Law

1. The purpose of this Law shall be to preserve Lithuania’s immovable cultural heritage and to transmit it to future generations, to provide conditions for the public to become knowledgeable about and use it.

2. This Law shall:

1) implement the provisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania, the Law on Treaties and the Law on the Basics of National Security in the field of the protection of immovable cultural heritage;

2) lay down legal grounds for the accounting, safeguarding and maintenance of immovable cultural heritage situated in the territory of the Republic of Lithuania, for the supervision of compliance with the heritage protection requirements set by this Law and other legal acts and for the monitoring of the condition of objects of cultural heritage;

3) protect intangible cultural heritage by establishing the protection of the places and other immovable items associated therewith;

3. The immovable cultural heritage is of importance to Lithuania and is situated in other states shall be protected under treaties and laws of the foreign states.

4. The immovable cultural heritage which is of importance to foreign states and is situated in the Republic of Lithuania shall be recognised, uplifted and maintained under treaties of the Republic of Lithuania, laws and other legal acts of the Republic of Lithuania. Legal and natural persons of foreign states shall maintain this heritage in accordance with the procedure established by laws and other legal acts of the Republic of Lithuania and by the Minister of Culture subject to obtaining a consent of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Article 2. Definitions

1. Protection regulation means a document which sets heritage protection requirements for a specific object of immovable cultural heritage, territory or protection zone thereof or a type of such objects.

2. Protection zones means the territories in the vicinity of a protected object or site of cultural heritage subject to special conditions of the management and use of land plots and other immovable items to protect the valuable properties of the object or site of cultural heritage against the likely adverse impact of activities in the said neighbouring territories.

3. Archaeological findings means the items or remnants thereof which have been created by man or bear signs of human existence, which have been found during research or otherwise and which either on their own or in relation to other signs possess a scientific value of the knowledge of history. The former owner of these items cannot be identified normally due to a considerable lapse of time since the burying or disposal of the said items. Bodies of the ancients or remnants thereof shall also be held archaeological findings.

4. Destructive research means physical research irrevocably affecting an object, part or element thereof which are or can be authentic material sources of scientific knowledge.

5. Recreation means the recreation of an unpreserved immovable cultural property in exceptional cases according to determined unpreserved valuable properties by carrying out research-based maintenance operations of heritage protection, construction and landscaping. In the course of recreation, the remaining parts and elements of the property under recreation shall be preserved and returned to the original location, unprepared served parts and elements shall be precisely replicated or created anew.

6. Elimination of the threat of an accident means the removal of the reasons which may lead to a sudden collapse of an object of cultural heritage or other loss thereof by minimally altering its valuable properties and carrying out maintenance operations of heritage protection, construction and landscaping.

7. Authenticity means the surviving properties of an object or site of cultural heritage including the original or historically formed purpose of the object, appearance and a peculiar physical shape and form, the materials used, constructions, layout, technique of execution, the surrounding environment.

8. Basic research means experimental and/or theoretical operations which are carried out primarily to know the essence of phenomena and observed reality without the aim of using the obtained results for a specific purpose.

9. Conservation/safeguarding purpose means the purpose of the use of a protected object, territory of the object or land plots of the site set in accordance with the procedure laid down by legal acts, where the purpose of the use is to preserve the valuable properties of the said land plot or object by using or adapting for the use in the original or historically formed, closely related thereto or purposefully selected manner [for such purpose] which would ensure adequate upkeep and reveal valuable properties.

10. Conservation means putting an end to the influence of the factors destroying or damaging the valuable properties of an object of cultural heritage and reinforcement of authentic characteristics by carrying out research-based maintenance operations of heritage protection, construction and landscaping.

11. Cultural landscape means a landscape created as a result of human activities and reflecting his coexistence with the environment.

12. Cultural monuments means objects of cultural heritage which are of national significance.

13. Cultural heritage means the cultural property inherited, taken over, created and transmitted from generation to generation and significant from the ethnic, historical, artistic or scientific point of view.

14. Objects of cultural heritage means the single objects, complex objects or the objects being part of a complex which are registered as immovable cultural property, i.e. structures or other immovable items which are located in land plots, parts of the plots, water and forest areas or parts thereof which have valuable properties and, together with the territory assigned there-to, are or may be separate objects of rights in rem.

15. Territory of an object of cultural heritage means a land plot or other area occupied by and required for the use of an object of cultural heritage and subject to heritage protection requirements.

16. Repair of a structure of cultural heritage means the repair of a structure defined by the Law on Construction, where the operations are unrelated to the changing of the valuable properties of the structure. In other cases, conservation, restoration, adaptation or recreation operations shall be carried out as defined by this Law.

17. Structure of cultural heritage means a building or part thereof having valuable properties, engineering structures or remaining part thereof, monumental immovable works of art.

18. Site of cultural heritage means a territory which is characterised by historically formed peculiarities, homogeneity and/or place in the natural environment and wherein objects of cultural heritage are situated.

19. Interim protection regulations (special heritage protection requirements) means a document whereby the Law on Construction sets heritage protection requirements for a specific item of immovable cultural property, the territory thereof, a specific structure of cultural heritage or a structure located within the territory or protection zone of the immovable cultural property.

20. Immovable cultural property means a part of cultural heritage or constituent parts thereof for use by agreeing the institution in charge of the protection of this object.

21. Restoration means the restructurin of an object of cultural heritage or constituent parts thereof for use by agreeing the needs of the manager and the public, minimally altering the valuable properties and providing for a possibility to restore to a condition prior to the changes and carrying out research-based maintenance operations of heritage protection, construction and landscaping.

22. Research of immovable cultural property means the determination, generalisation and documentation of the surviving, changed or lost valuable properties and of the facts evidencing the historical development of immovable cultural property.

23. Heritage management means the creation of the system of the standard legal acts regulating heritage protection, the formation of institutions and organisation of activities thereof, the drafting and implementation of heritage protection programmes, maintenance administration and monitoring.

24. Initial protection means the requirements set under this Law for the protection of the objects of cultural heritage entered in the Register of Cultural Property, but not declared protected as well as of the immovable cultural property discovered when carrying out construction or other operations.

25. Heritage protection requirements means operations which are regularly carried by managers and do not change the valuable properties of an object of cultural heritage and are not subject to a consent of an institution in charge of the protection of this object.

26. Adaptation means the restructuring of an object of cultural heritage or constituent parts thereof for use by agreeing the needs of the manager and the public, minimally altering the valuable properties and providing for a possibility to restore to a condition prior to the changes and carrying out research-based maintenance operations of heritage protection, construction and landscaping.

27. Protection zones means the territories in the vicinity of a protected object, territory of the object or land plots of the site set in accordance with the procedure laid down by legal acts, where the purpose of the use is to preserve the valuable properties of the said land plot or object by using or adapting for the use in the original or historically formed, closely related thereto or purposefully selected manner [for such purpose] which would ensure adequate upkeep and reveal valuable properties.

28. Conservation means putting an end to the influence of the factors destroying or damaging the valuable properties of an object of cultural heritage and reinforcement of authentic characteristics by carrying out research-based maintenance operations of heritage protection, construction and landscaping.
30. Protected site means a site of cultural heritage which, in accordance with the procedure laid down by legal acts, has been declared protected and which is subject to requirements of heritage protection or for the protection whereof a historical national park, a historical regional park, a cultural strict reserve or a cultural reserve has been established in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Law on Protected Areas.

31. Protected object means an object of cultural heritage declared a protected object or a cultural monument in accordance with the procedure laid down by this Law.

32. Monitoring means the periodic observation and recording of the condition of objects and sites of cultural heritage and changing thereof, the assessment, generalisation and forecasting of the influence destroying or damaging valuable properties.

33. Applied scientific research means the experimental and/or theoretical operations of acquiring knowledge primarily aimed at attaining specific practical objectives or as solving tasks.

34. Maintenance means the following operations carried out to preserve cultural heritage (applied) research, repairs, elimination of the threat of an accident, conservation, restoration and the planning and designing of these operations.

35. Supervision of the implementation of a design documentation of maintenance operations means supervision organised by the builder (client) the purpose of which is to control that the maintenance operations of an object of cultural heritage be carried out in compliance with a design documentation and heritage protection requirements and in a quality manner. The results of such supervision shall be presented in a report.

36. Maintenance operations of heritage protection means the maintenance operations carried out by employing the special technologies ensuring the preservation of authenticity.

37. Operations of construction or demolition operations as defined by the Law on Construction and carried out at an object of cultural heritage, within the territory or protection zone thereof or at a site of cultural heritage.

38. Mothballing means the elimination of the threat of an accident and other actions required to preserve the valuable properties of a structure of cultural heritage where maintenance operations thereof are suspended or it is no longer used.

39. Manager means the owner or other holder of the management rights of an object of cultural heritage and other immovable items situated in the territory or at the site of a single object or a complex object.

40. Valuable property means a feature of an object or site of cultural heritage, part or element thereof which is of value from the ethical, historical, aesthetic or scientific point of view.

41. Change of valuable properties means the maintenance operations affecting valuable properties [the elimination of the threat of an accident, conservation, adaptation, restoration, recreation] and selected and carried out pursuant to the requirements set by this Law to maximally preserve authenticity and to ensure that an object or a site of cultural heritage is suitable for use.

Article 3. Classification of Immovable Cultural Heritage

1. Immovable cultural heritage shall be classified according to the structure according to the nature of valuable properties determining significance thereof.

2. According to the structure, immovable cultural heritage shall be:

1) an individual object – a location, structure or other immovable item possessing valuable properties;
2) a complex object – a group of objects of cultural heritage which is significant in its totality;
3) a site.

3. According to the nature of valuable properties determining significance or combination thereof, immovable cultural heritage may be:

1) archaeological – locations of past economic or defensive activities, residential, burial or cult sites, complexes thereof or the sites the only or one of the main sources of scientific data whereon is archaeological research and findings;
2) underwater – the archaeological objects, sites and the items of immovable or movable property recognised as significant which are totally or partially under water, where the only or one of the main sources of scientific data thereof is underwater research and findings;
3) mythological – the objects of ancient cult or other human activities recognised as significant and referred to in folklore;
4) ethnocultural – the structures recognised as significant, complexes thereof, locations or sites revealing the singularity of the ethnic culture;
5) architectural – the architectural structures recognised as significant, parts thereof, futures and the integral architectural compositions of such structures and/or complexes of locations, clusters, locations and sites;
6) urban – historical parts of cities, towns and similar locations and sites recognised as significant;
7) green areas – objects of cultural heritage – the historical green areas recognised as significant [parks, gardens and other historical green areas];
8) engineering – engineering technical structures and complexes thereof recognised as significant as well as industrial or technological equipment;
9) historical – the objects or sites recognised as significant, related to important events or persons of the public, cultural and historical history or made well-known by literature or other works of art;
10) (memorial – the objects whose purpose is to commemorate significant events or persons of the cultural and state history.

11) artistic – works of monumental art, miniature chapels, pillar-type crosses, roofed pillar-type crosses, monument crosses, memorial structures and other works of art recognised as significant and directly related to the territory occupied by and required for use thereof.
12) cultural – the objects, locations, complexes thereof and sites significant for religious communities, societies and centres;
13) cultural expression – the results of non-traditional creative activities of an individual or group of individuals recognised as significant.

4. Immovable cultural heritage shall be an integral part of cultural landscape the nature of valuable properties whereof may also be recognised as significant.

Article 4. Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage

1. The protection of immovable cultural heritage shall consist of:

1) accounting;
2) declaring protected;
3) safeguarding – maintenance and use;
4) knowledge, dissemination thereof;
5) rehabilitation.

2. The protection of immovable cultural heritage shall be regulated for the following protection purposes:

1) scientific knowledge – to preserve archaeological and other unique sources of the historical data which could be taken over by conducting scientific research of a protected object or a site.
2) public knowledge and use – to provide conditions for the present and future generations to become knowledgeable about, be admitted to and use immovable cultural heritage;
3) public respect – to protect memorial and sacral objects, the locations of the burial and commemoration of the dead or the killed (soldiers, insurgents, participants in the resistance against occupations and other unused cemeteries or individual graves).

3. One or several protection purposes of an object or site of immovable cultural heritage may be set.

4. Legal protection of immovable cultural heritage shall consist of:

1) the heritage protection requirements set by this Law and other laws for the objects of cultural heritage, territories, sites and protection zones thereof;
2) the requirements set by the Law on Protected Areas and this Law for the objects of cultural heritage located in reserves, strict reserves and state parks;
3) the requirements set by the Law on Territorial Planning, the Law on Protected Areas and the territorial planning documents prepared in compliance with this Law;
4) obligations of managers specified in protection agreements.

5. The heritage protection requirements set by laws and other legal acts shall be listed in the protection regulations handed to managers of specific objects of cultural heritage.

CHAPTER TWO
ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROTECTION OF IMMOVABLE CULTURAL HERITAGE

Article 5. State Administration of the Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage

1. The national policy of the protection of immovable cultural heritage shall be formulated by the Seimas, the Government and the Ministry of Culture having regard to the assessments, analyses and proposals of heritage protection experience and tendencies as submitted by the State Commission for Cultural Heritage.

2. The Minister of Culture shall organise the state administration of the protection of immovable cultural heritage and be in charge thereof. The Minister of Culture shall authorise the divisions of the Ministry and the institutions under the Ministry to exercise protection functions.

3. Municipalities shall perform the functions assigned thereto by the Law on Local Self-Government, this Law and other laws.

4. Regulatory enactments on the protection of immovable cultural heritage shall, within their remit, be adopted by the Government, the Minister of Culture, the Director of the Department of Cultural Heritage Protection under the Ministry of Culture (hereinafter: the 'Department') and a municipal council.

5. The Government shall declare as cultural monuments the objects and sites of cultural heritage of national significance, be in charge of the implementation of the heritage protection obligations assumed under international treaties and perform other functions specified by laws.

6. The Minister of Culture shall approve sample protection regulations, the immovable cultural heritage protection [accounting, heritage management, control, protection and management of protected areas, other] programmes funded from the state budget, declare objects of cultural heritage state-protected, submit objects and sites of cultural heritage for inclusion in the lists of the objects and sites of cultural heritage of international significance, except where treaties provide otherwise, and perform other functions specified by laws and other legal acts.

Version after 1 January 2014:

6. The Minister of Culture shall approve immovable cultural heritage protection [accounting, heritage management, control, protection and management of protected areas, other] programmes funded from the state budget, declare objects of cultural heritage state-protected, submit objects and sites of cultural heritage...
heritage for inclusion in the lists of the objects and sites of cultural heritage of international significance, except where treaties provide otherwise, and perform other functions specified by laws and other legal acts.

7. The Ministry of Culture shall, in conjunction with the Ministry of Education and Science, organise the training, vocational training and in-service training of the specialists of the protection of immovable cultural heritage.

8. The regulatory enactments of the Government, ministries and other Government agencies on the protection of immovable cultural heritage must, prior to adoption thereof, be submitted to the Ministry of Culture for agreement in accordance with the procedure laid down by legal acts. The legal acts adopted by municipal institutions and contradicting the requirements set by this Law must be suspended or repealed in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Law on Administrative Supervision of Local Authorities.

9. The Department shall perform and be in charge of the implementation of specific functions of the state administration of immovable cultural heritage. It shall have accounting, heritage management and control services and territorial divisions. The Department shall be headed by the Director.

10. The Department shall:
   1) methodically direct the protection of immovable cultural heritage;
   2) draft legal acts regulating the protection of immovable cultural heritage;
   3) use the funds of the state budget allocated for the implementation of specific functions of the state administration of immovable cultural heritage as the objects of rights in rem and on the restrictions on the use of real estate;
   4) develop programmes for the accounting, heritage management and control of immovable cultural heritage;
   5) organise the training for the accounting, heritage management and control of immovable cultural heritage;
   6) initiate and organise the declaration of objects of cultural heritage for inclusion in the lists of the objects and sites of cultural heritage of national and regional significance;
   7) set the protection requirements based on this Law for natural and legal persons;
   8) examine complaints and applications of managers;
   9) manage the Register of Cultural Property, wherein immovable cultural property and data thereon shall be registered; collect, handle and store the documents related to this Register pursuant to the requirements set by laws;
   10) forward the applications accompanied by a subdivision’s proposals to the Department; accept applications of the managers, forward them to the Department and present replies to the managers;

   Article 6. Administration of the Protection of Immoveable Cultural Heritage in Municipalities

1. In municipalities, the functions of protection of immovable cultural heritage as stipulated (assigned) by the Constitution and laws of the Republic of Lithuania shall be performed by municipal institutions in accordance with the procedure laid down by legal acts.

2. Municipal institutions shall issue sets of the conditions of development of objects of cultural heritage as the objects of rights in rem and on the restrictions on the use of real estate; authorize the maintenance of objects of cultural heritage; organise the drafting of the territorial planning documents on the implementation of the requirements of this Law; organise the implementation of the requirements of this Law; forward notifications in the cases referred to in Article 10(1) and (3) of this Law; examine the cases of administrative offences within its remit; notify these institutions of established infringements of this Law; notify the Ministry of Culture and to the State Commission for Cultural Heritage.

3. The heritage protection subdivisions of municipalities, in performing the functions of the protection of state-protected objects assigned to a municipality, shall:
   1) act as intermediaries between managers and the Department; accept applications of the managers; forward the applications accompanied by a subdivision’s proposals to the Department and present replies to the managers;
   2) submit to the State Commission for Cultural Heritage and to the Ministry of Culture annual reports on the implementation of the programmes for the accounting, heritage management and control of immovable cultural heritage and notify these institutions of established infringements of this Law;
   3) draft up administrative offence reports in the cases and in accordance with the procedure laid down by laws and examine the cases of administrative offences within its remit;
   4) forward notifications in the cases referred to in Article 10(1) and (3) of this Law; examine the cases of administrative offences within its remit; notify the Ministry of Culture and to the State Commission for Cultural Heritage.

4. The heritage protection subdivisions of municipalities shall, with regard to the objects declared protected by a municipal council, perform the functions referred to in Article 5(10)(2), Article 5(10)(7) to (11) and (13) to (19) of this Law as well as:
   1) develop programmes for the municipality’s immovable cultural heritage accounting, heritage management, education, schooling and other heritage protection programmes and organise implementation thereof;
   2) initiate and organise the declaration of objects of cultural heritage municipality-protected and submit data thereof to the Register of Cultural Property;
   3) co-operate with the heritage protection subdivisions of other municipalities in the field of the protection of immovable cultural heritage;
   4) organise international co-operation related to the protection of immovable cultural heritage;
   5) submit to other subdivisions of the municipality, undertakings, agencies, organisations and other legal and natural persons proposals and methodical and professional assistance on the issues of explanation, protection, dissemination of knowledge and rehabilitation of immovable cultural heritage;
   6) have the right to obtain from state and municipal institutions, managers and other natural and legal persons information on objects of cultural heritage, survey, record and research the immovable property and immovable items which may possess valuable properties;
   7) perform, within their remit, other functions specified by laws and other legal acts.

Article 7. State Commission for Cultural Heritage

The State Commission for Cultural Heritage shall be the expert and adviser of the Seimas, the President of the Republic and the Government on the issues of the national policy of the protection of immovable cultural heritage. The management, financing, tasks and rights of the Commission shall be set out by the Law on the State Commission for Cultural Heritage.
CHAPTER THREE
ACCOUNTING OF IMMOVABLE CULTURAL HERITAGE AND DECLARATION OF AN OBJECT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE PROTECTED

Article 8. Accounting of Immovable Cultural Heritage

1. The accounting of immovable cultural heritage shall consist of drawing up of inventories, making specific items of immovable cultural property known and registration thereof.

2. Inventories of immovable cultural heritage shall be drawn up by compiling a list of all works and other items which could be assigned thereto. Inventory data shall be regularly updated, accumulated and systematised. The procedure for drawing up of inventories shall be approved by the Minister of Culture.

3. In order to make immovable cultural property known, historical and physical research shall be conducted. On the basis of data of this research, the significance of objects or sites of cultural heritage or valuable properties thereof shall be determined.

4. The making known of specific items of immovable cultural property shall be organised by the Department and municipal institutions. Traditional religious communities, societies and centres, higher education and research institutions and state research institutions may organise the drawing up of inventories and making known of the immovable cultural heritage corresponding to their field of activities or belonging to them by the right of ownership by coordinating their actions with the Department.

5. The significance of immovable cultural property and the valuable properties of objects or sites of cultural heritage shall be determined and the boundaries of territories shall be defined by the immovable cultural heritage assessment councils formed by the institutions referred to in paragraph 4 of this Article (hereinafter: assessment councils). The assessment councils formed by a municipality or several municipalities shall decide on the determination of valuable properties of immovable cultural heritage or protection zone thereof, restrictions of rights in rem and other legal acts.

6. Criteria for the assessment, selection and determination of the level of significance of immovable cultural property, the volume of data of the research required for the making known of this property and the sample regulations of assessment councils shall be approved by the Minister of Culture.

7. The Register of Cultural Property shall be set up, managed, used and reorganised in accordance with the procedure laid down by this Law on State Information Resources Management, the Law on the Protection of Movable Cultural Property and other legal acts.

8. Inventories of immovable cultural heritage shall be drawn up by compiling a list of all works and other items which could be assigned thereto. Inventory data shall be regularly updated, accumulated and systematised. The procedure for drawing up of inventories shall be approved by the Minister of Culture.

9. In order to make immovable cultural property known, research shall be conducted. On the basis of data of this research, the significance of objects or sites of cultural heritage and valuable properties thereof shall be determined, and the boundaries of territories thereof shall be defined or revised.

10. The Register of Cultural Property shall be organised by the Department and municipal institutions. Traditional religious communities, societies and centres, higher education and research institutions and state research institutions may organise the drawing up of inventories and making known of the immovable cultural heritage corresponding to their field of activities or belonging to them by the right of ownership by coordinating their actions with the Department.

11. The Register of Cultural Property shall, in accordance with the procedure laid down by laws and other legal acts or under agreements on exchange of data, exchange required data with the Register of Immovable Property and other state registers, cadastres, classifiers, specialised data banks as well as with the developers of state programmes, the organisers of general, detailed and special planning, where they are state or municipal institutions. The Register of Cultural Property shall have the right to obtain the data of other state registers and cadastres required by it free of charge.

12. Data of the Register of Cultural Property shall be public and shall not be re-entered in other registers.
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Article 8. Accounting of Immovable Cultural Heritage

1. The accounting of immovable cultural heritage shall consist of drawing up of inventories, making specific items of immovable cultural property known and registration thereof.

2. Inventories of immovable cultural heritage shall be drawn up by compiling a list of all works and other items which could be assigned thereto. Inventory data shall be regularly updated, accumulated and systematised. The procedure for drawing up of inventories shall be approved by the Minister of Culture.

3. In order to make immovable cultural property known, research shall be conducted. On the basis of data of this research, the significance of objects or sites of cultural heritage and valuable properties thereof shall be determined, and the boundaries of territories thereof shall be defined or revised.

4. The making known of specific items of immovable cultural property shall be organised by the Department and municipal institutions. Traditional religious communities, societies and centres, higher education and research institutions and state research institutions may organise the drawing up of inventories and making known of the immovable cultural heritage corresponding to their field of activities or belonging to them by the right of ownership by coordinating their actions with the Department.

5. The significance of immovable cultural property and the valuable properties of objects or sites of cultural heritage shall be determined and the boundaries of territories shall be defined by the immovable cultural heritage assessment councils formed by the Department and municipalities (hereinafter: assessment councils). The assessment councils formed by a municipality or several municipalities shall decide on the determination of valuable properties and the level of local significance of immovable cultural heritage of local significance located on the territory of the municipality, the definition of the boundaries and the necessity of the protection of the territory of immovable cultural heritage or protection zone thereof, restrictions of rights in rem and other legal acts.

6. Criteria for the assessment, selection and determination of the level of significance of immovable cultural property, the volume of data of the research required for the making known of this property and the sample regulations of assessment councils shall be approved by the Minister of Culture.

7. The Register of Cultural Property shall be set up, managed, used and reorganised in accordance with the procedure laid down by this Law, the Law on State Information Resources Management, the Law on the Protection of Movable Cultural Property and other legal acts.

8. Immovable cultural property shall be registered after an assessment council decides that a property is in need of protection. This property shall be registered as single or complex objects or sites of cultural heritage or objects or sites of cultural heritage being a part of a complex which are of considerable scientific, historical or cultural significance. Decisions of assessment councils shall be published on the websites of the Department and the municipalities which have formed the assessment council, and information on registration—in the Register of Cultural Property in accordance with the procedure laid down by legal acts.

9. The following data of each property to be registered shall be entered in the Register of Cultural Property and in an immovable cultural property certificate (extract from the data of the Register) compiled on the basis of data thereof:
1) name of the immovable cultural property, unique code and address thereof;
2) the valuable properties determined by an act/acts of an assessment council and the boundaries of the territory to be protected together with the property.

10. The Department shall set a code for each registered immovable cultural property, enter it in the Register of Cultural Property and check the already entered code (codes) provided by the public register (the Real Estate Register) for the land plots of an object or site of cultural heritage and other immovable items situated in the territory of the object or the site as well as other data established by legal acts.

11. The Register of Cultural Property shall, in accordance with the procedure laid down by laws and other legal acts or under agreements on exchange of data, exchange required data with the Register of Immovable Property and other state registers, cadastres, classifiers, specialised data banks as well as with the developers of state programmes, the organisers of general, detailed and special planning, where they are state or municipal institutions. The Register of Cultural Property shall have the right to obtain the required data of other state registers and cadastres free of charge.

12. The data of the Register of Cultural Property shall be public. Under data provision agreements, these data shall be transferred free of charge to related registers and state information systems.

On the basis of these agreements, the manager of the Register of Immovable Property shall, free of charge, make notes of the following immovable items as contained in the Register of Immovable Property: the entry of the immovable item in the Register of Cultural Property, the presence thereof on the territory or site of an object of cultural heritage or protection zone thereof, restrictions of rights in rem
Article 9. Initial Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage

1. The manager of an object of cultural heritage registered in the Register of Cultural Property wherein no decision has been taken whether or not to declare it protected, wishing to carry out the maintenance operations which may affect the valuable properties of the object of cultural heritage, must submit design proposals to the heritage protection subdivision of a municipality or to list in writing the operations to be carried out. The heritage protection subdivision of the municipality shall forthwith notify thereof the Department.

2. Where it is established that the operations to be carried out would damage valuable properties, the declaration of an object of cultural heritage protected must be initiated within 15 days. A decision on the initiation of the declaration of the object of cultural heritage state-protected shall be taken by the Department, and municipality-protected – by the heritage protection subdivision of a municipality.

3. Where, in the course of construction or other operations, archaeological findings or valuable properties of an immovable item are discovered, the managers or the persons carrying out the operations must notify thereof the heritage protection subdivision of a municipality, and the latter shall inform thereof the Department. The Department may suspend operations for 15 days. Within this time limit, it must, in conjunction with the heritage protection subdivision of the municipality, verify the notification and take a decision whether or not to initiate the registration of a discovered immovable cultural property, the declaration of an object of cultural heritage protected or the making of the discovered valuable property known and the revision of the protection requirements.

4. The Department may also suspend operations for 15 days. Within this time limit, it must, in conjunction with the heritage protection subdivision of the municipality, verify the notification and take a decision whether or not to initiate the registration of a discovered immovable cultural property, the declaration of an object of cultural heritage protected or the making of the discovered valuable property known and the revision of the protection requirements.

5. A legal act whereby an object or site of cultural heritage is declared protected by the State by the Minister of Culture. The objects and sites of cultural heritage of regional significance shall be declared protected by the Government.

6. Where an object of cultural heritage has deteriorated, has been destroyed or its valuable properties have been otherwise lost and the reasons for and/or the persons responsible for causing this damage have been established or the object or site of cultural heritage does not meet the specified significance criteria and valuable properties of objects or sites of immovable cultural heritage, a decision shall be taken on the repeal or amendment of an act on the declaration of the object or site of cultural heritage protected subject to giving at least three months’ advance notice thereof in the press. Upon the taking of a decision canceling the protection of the object of cultural heritage, the said object or site shall not be stricken off the Register of Cultural Property.

7. The Register of Cultural Property must contain the following data on protected objects and sites of cultural heritage:

1) the legal acts and amendments thereof laying down protection and approving the territory and protection zones, the codes of entries in the registers registering these acts;

2) the institution in charge of the protection of an object or site of cultural heritage;

3) the terms and conditions of a protection agreement concluded with the manager, where such an agreement has been concluded;

4) the name of the protected area where the object or site of cultural heritage is located.

8. Where the purpose of a movable item located in an object of cultural heritage and protected under the Law on the Protection of Movable Cultural Property is integral of the purpose of the object and where the item is historically related to the object and contributes an additional value thereto, the item shall be entered in the Register of Cultural Property as an item being one of valuable properties thereof. Where the object of cultural heritage is declared protected by the State, the movable cultural property specified as a valuable property shall also become protected under this Law.

Article 11. Territories, Protection Zones and Sub-Zones of Objects and Sites of Cultural Heritage

1. An object of cultural heritage shall be protected together with the territory which it occupies and which is assigned thereto. This territory shall be integral of the object of cultural heritage.

2. The boundaries of the territory of an object of cultural heritage and a site of cultural heritage shall be defined on the basis of data of historical and other research so that they correspond to the boundaries of existing land plots or parts thereof which are objects of rights in rem or to other boundaries of immovable items or natural or anthropogenic elements.

3. Territories of sites of cultural heritage shall be determined by documents drawn up in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Law on Territorial Planning and this Law.

4. The territories of objects and sites of underwater heritage and the territories of the objects of cultural heritage situated in forest shall be described, established and legalized as objects of civil right and registered in the Register of Cultural Property in accordance with the procedure laid down by this Law and other legal acts.

5. The conservational/safeguarding purpose shall be set for the land plots or parts thereof located within the territory of a protected object and being objects of rights in rem.

6. An intermediate protection zone mitigating the adverse impact of human activity shall be established for a protected object or site. This zone may have one or both of the following sub-zones of a different protection and use regime:

1) the subzone of protection against physical impact – the land plots or parts thereof outside the territory of an object of cultural heritage together with other immovable items situated therein as the forest and water areas subject to the requirements of this Law and other legal acts prohibiting in this subzone the activities likely to physically impair the valuable properties of the object of cultural heritage;

2) the subzone of visual protection – the land plots or parts thereof outside the territory of an object of cultural heritage or the subzone of protection against physical influence together with other immovable items situated therein and being subject to the requirements of this Law and other legal acts prohibiting in this subzone the activities likely to hinder the survey of the object of cultural heritage.

7. The boundaries of a protection zone shall be determined in compliance with the Law on Territorial Planning and this Law. The boundaries of the protection zone of an object of cultural heritage located in a reserve or a strict reserve shall not be determined in this case. The territorial planning documents of the reserve or strict reserve and/or the regulations of these protected areas shall be supplemented with requirements for protection against the likely adverse impact of activity in adjacent territories.

Article 12. Marking of Objects of Cultural Heritage

1. Protected objects shall be marked by typical boards and signs in accordance with the procedure approved by the Government or an institution authorized by it.

2. Historical objects of cultural heritage may be marked by individually designed, decorative, cultural signs, memorial structures or perpetuated by the recreated structures exhibiting the valuable properties of former structures.
Chapter Four

Safeguarding of Immovable Cultural Heritage

Article 13. Safeguarding Regimes

1. Protected objects and territories thereof may be subject to the following safeguarding regimes: the reserve regime, the authentic regime, the supplementary regime, and the Idea regime.

2. The reserve regime shall be applied to the objects of cultural heritage expedient to be preserved so that they could be researched in the future by making use of broader scientific possibilities. The activities which may destroy scientific data — destructive research, maintenance operations, economic activities — shall be prohibited therein. The list of the objects subject to the reserve regime shall be approved by the Minister of Culture.

3. The authentic regime shall be introduced for the objects of cultural heritage whose use in the original or historically formed manner would ensure the upkeep thereof and would make the valuable properties of the protected object known better than the other manner of use.

4. The supplementary regime shall be introduced for the objects of cultural heritage for protection whereas it is expedient to select such a manner of use and adaptation that the valuable properties of the object be least damaged and the manager be interested in keeping it up.

5. The authentic regime or the supplementary regime shall be introduced for objects and territories of cultural heritage by an institution which has declared an object protected. The conservation/safeguarding purpose may be set for such objects as the supplementary rather than the main purpose.

Article 14. Rights and Duties of the Manager

1. The manager shall have the right:

1) to use the property managed by him according to its purpose without prejudice to the requirements set by this Law and other laws;

2) to receive methodical, technical, financial and/or other support for the upkeep and maintenance of an object of cultural heritage, to be granted access to the research data held by state and municipal institutions and other information on the object of cultural heritage;

3) to obtain information on an immovable cultural property declared protected or planned to be declared protected, a reserve or a strict reserve set up to protect a site and the heritage protection requirements set therefor for the property (items) managed by him;

4) to file proposals, comments and claims on the registration of his property in the Register of Cultural Property and declaration of an object or site of cultural heritage or cultural monument protected;

5) to refer to court, where an object or site of cultural heritage has been declared protected and the conditions or restrictions of activities have been laid down or amended disregarding his claims or where he is dissatisfied with the amount of compensation for the restrictions of activities.

6. To obtain a protection agreement under the terms and conditions referred to in Article 16 of this Law to undertake additional commitments and/or specify the ways of compensation for the protection of the object of cultural heritage.

3. The manager’s duty shall be to preserve an immovable cultural property. The manager must:

1) keep up an object of cultural heritage, the territory thereof and a site, timely remove emerging defects and protect structures against adverse environmental impact, maintain adequate microclimate conditions in premises with valuable interior, timely renew vegetation, remove volunteer plants, mow grass and trim trees, clean debris and eliminate sources of pollution within the territory; keep up and maintain historical green areas which are objects of cultural heritage in compliance with the heritage maintenance regulations approved by the Minister of Culture and coordinated with the Ministry of Environment and intended for historical green area maintenance;

2) notify an institution in charge of protection of a threat posed to an immovable property which he cannot eliminate himself or does not possess required qualifications or permission therefor;

3) permit, in accordance with the procedure established by the Minister of Culture, the members and officials of the Department, the heritage protection subdivision of a municipality and the National Cultural Heritage Commission or the professionals authorised thereby to survey an object or site of cultural heritage, record the condition of the object or site of cultural heritage and conduct research under the agreed conditions. In this case, the parties must agree on the duration of the research, boundaries of land plots, the time of carrying out of the operations and compensation for losses;

4) submit to the heritage protection subdivision of a municipality a design documentation of the maintenance of a protected object or an object subject to a pending procedure for declaring the object protected and the entire design documentation implementation whereof would affect the surrounding environment of the said object;

5) provide the property (item) manager with the Law and other laws for the public to be admitted to and be familiarised with immovable cultural properties;

6) permit an institution in charge of protection to mark an object of cultural heritage by typical and/or individually created boards and signs.

7) implement operations of the introduction of technical protection measures and other urgent safeguarding operations specified by the Minister of Culture.

4. The manager may use own funds to finance the drafting of special plans of cultural heritage protection.

Article 15. Transactions on Objects of Cultural Heritage

1. The seller or the manager of an object of cultural heritage otherwise transferring rights of management [hereinafter: the seller] shall give at least a one-month advance notice of his intention to conclude a transaction to the heritage protection subdivision of a municipality. Within this time period, the subdivision must verify whether the condition of the said object and valuable properties thereof correspond to the condition specified in the certificate of the immovable cultural property.

2. The condition of an object of cultural heritage shall be verified in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Minister of Culture. Where maintenance operations have not been carried out therein, where no damage therto has been established and where requirements set for use thereof have not been violated, the verification act shall remain in force for six months from the signing of the act. Upon the request of the seller or acquirer, the said verification of the condition may be carried out for a state charge of the amount established by the Government not later than within 15 working days of the notification of an intention to conclude a transaction.

3. The rights, duties and liability of the transferor of an object of cultural heritage shall, upon the verification of the condition of the object, be transferred to the new manager/Receiver from the signing of a statement of acceptance. Where the condition established at the time of the verification does not correspond to the condition specified in the certificate of the immovable cultural property, the transferor shall be held liable therefor.

Article 16. Protection Agreements

1. Protection agreements shall establish the servitudes of structures and formalise other heritage protection requirements for objects and sites of cultural heritage.

2. Agreements may be concluded with the owners and users of land, forest and water bodies, where the land, forest or water body is situated in a protected area, by an institution authorised by the Government and being in charge of the protection of the protected property.

3. Protection agreements may be concluded with the managers of the objects of cultural heritage registered in the Register of Cultural Property and with the managers of the land plots or immovable items situated in the territories and protection zones of the objects by the Department, the heritage protection subdivision of a municipality, funds or other public institutions charged with the protection of cultural heritage.

4. The procedure for concluding protection agreements shall be laid down by the Government or an institution authorised by it.

5. Protection agreements shall be registered in the Real Estate Register. In the event of change of the manager, the heritage protection requirements listed in an agreement shall be transferred together with an object to the new manager.

6. Protection agreements may establish:

1) the commitment of the manager not to build the structures likely to obstruct or change the existing view;

2) the commitment of the manager not to carry out specific actions which would change the valuable properties or hinder public knowledge thereof;

3) the conditions of accessing an object of cultural heritage and/or access fee;

4) methodical, technical, financial and/or other support for the maintenance of an object of cultural heritage;

5) lump-sum compensation to the manager, where the commitments agreed upon considerably reduce the profit obtained from the managed object.

7. In a protection agreement, an institution in charge of the protection of a specific object or site may specify the application of heritage protection requirements and lay down additional protection measures.

Article 17. Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage

Safeguarded for the Purposes of Scientific Knowledge

1. In an object, territory thereof or a site safeguarded for the purposes of scientific knowledge, it shall be prohibited:

1) without the consent of an institution in charge of protection, to uncover the authentic unresearched parts or elements under protection as specified in the property’s certificate, to unearth unresearched cellars of buildings, to open crypts or bural vaults, to uncover and move archaeological layers and to use metal, electronic or other detectors;

2) in the territory of a protected object, at a site and in a sub-zone of protection thereof against physical impact, to carry out any operations changing the water level or the actions likely to cause deformation of soil and vibration on land or under water or waves;

3) in the territory of a protected archaeological object, to engage in farming or forestry; with the exception of the removal of volunteer trees and scrub;

4) without the consent of an institution in charge of protection, to move research, lift underwater objects, separate parts thereof or archaeological findings in inland waters, the territorial sea and contiguous zone as defined in international treaties of the Republic of Lithuania.
The archaeological findings discovered during research shall be organised by an institution in charge of maintenance operations, additional research required for making them known shall be organised by an institution in charge of maintenance. Where a legal act declaring the object, site or part thereof as an object, site or part thereof the protection requirements of a researched object, site or part thereof may be changed by a legal act declaring the object protected upon striking off scientific knowledge from the objectives of protection.

Article 19. Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage Protected for Public Knowledge and Use

1. The manager of an object protected for public knowledge and use, another object located in a complex object or at a site protected for public knowledge and use may use it in the ways specified in the certificate of the immovable cultural property.

2. In an object protected for public knowledge and use, territory thereof, at a site, it shall be prohibited:

1) to destroy or to otherwise damage the valuable properties specified in the certificate of immovable cultural property;

2) in the territory or protection zone, to build the structures likely to eclipse the object or objects of cultural heritage by height, size or appearance or hinder survey thereof;

3) to destroy or damage monument boards, information stands of the immovable cultural property or the boundary marks of the territory of an object or site of cultural heritage.

3. The unresearched parts of an object or site protected for public knowledge and use as specified in the certificate of immovable cultural property shall be subject to the requirements referred to in Article 17 of this Law.

4. In an immovable cultural property protected for public knowledge and use, the construction operations diminishing valuable properties shall be prohibited adaptation of the object of cultural heritage for the uses other than specified in the certificate of immovable cultural property; increase of the intensity of the use of protected structures the building of extensions to buildings, additional floors, the equipment of new mansards, the formation of a new planned structure and otherwise destroying signs of authenticity.

5. Where the manager proves that the use of a protected object or site is not in the ways and within the scope specified in the certificate of the said property is unprofitable, does not justify the costs of maintenance thereof and that there are no persons wishing to take over the use of the object of cultural heritage without damaging valuable properties thereof, the institution in charge of the protection of this object shall suggest to carry out, at the expense of the manager, all required operations of scientific examination and document management in order to enable to establish the likely changes least impairing valuable properties or shall demand to mothball the object. In the latter case, mothballing costs shall be reimbursed, in accordance with the procedure approved by the Minister of Culture, by the institutions in charge of the protection of the object.

6. In order to avoid adverse impact on the valuable properties of a protected object or site, a consent of an institution in charge of the protection of cultural heritage must be obtained, where the intention is:

1) to divide the land plots situated within territory of the immovable cultural property into separate parts and to change boundaries thereof, except for the cases established by the Law on Protected Areas;

2) within the territory of the object of cultural heritage, to change the way and character of land use, the development regime and the purpose of buildings or structures;

3) within the territory of the immovable cultural property and protection zone thereof, to build structures, to change the flow of rivers, to change existing and establish new water bodies, to alter the relief, to set up new or expand current quarries, to plant the plantations which are going to obstruct valuable properties;

4) to place commercial advertising, field antennas and other technical installations outside the protected structures.

Article 20. Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage of Public Respect

1. All cemeteries shall be kept pursuant to rules for the upkeep of cemeteries approved by the Government or an institution authorised by it. The main conservation/safeguarding purpose of land use shall be set for the territories of unused cemeteries and may be changed only upon recognising the priority of another public need and upon transferring the bodies of the dead.

2. A place of immovable cultural heritage of public respect may be protected, although there are no authentic parts or elements significative of a person, an event or other valuable properties of the place. This place shall be marked by monument boards, sculpture works, memorial structures and the items demonstrating the former surroundings of an event or residential surroundings. It shall be prohibited to demolish or damage the structures designated for the marking of the valuable properties of the said place. These structures may be altered or constructed anew only upon the receipt of the consent of an institution in charge of the protection of this place.

Article 21. Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage Situated in a Reserve, Strict Reserve or State Park

1. The immovable cultural heritage situated in a reserve, strict reserve or state park shall be protected pursuant to the requirements of this Law and the Law on Protected Areas.
2. For the protection of sites of cultural heritage, in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Law on Protected Areas, historical national parks, strict cultural reserves and cultural reserves shall be set up.
3. The Minister of Culture shall approve the procedure for the use of and admission to strict cultural reserves/reserves-museums, approve or submit for approval to the Government the criteria for the setting up of strict cultural reserves and historical national parks, submit these protected areas for entry on international lists of protected areas, unless international treaties stipulate otherwise, set up directorates of state strict cultural reserves and historical national parks and approve territorial planning documents referred to in the Law on Protected Areas.
4. The Ministry of Culture shall exercise the following functions of the management of state strict cultural reserves/reserves-museums, historical national parks and state cultural reserves:
   1) organise the drafting of a protection strategy and management programmes;
   2) draft legal acts;
   3) organise the drafting of territorial planning documents;
   4) organise international cooperation;
   5) perform other functions prescribed by laws and other legal acts.
5. The Department, in carrying out the protection of immovable cultural heritage in reserves, strict reserves and state parks, shall control:
   1) compliance with the established protection and use regime; assurance of the protection and maintenance of objects of cultural heritage and the implementation of targeted programmes;
   2) activities in state reserves related to the heritage protection requirements set in regulations of the reserves and territorial planning documents;
6. Municipal institutions shall supervise the use of the objects and sites of cultural heritage declared protected by municipalities and located in protected areas and the construction or maintenance operations carried out in relation thereto, control the ensuing of protection of the objects and sites protected by a municipality and the compliance with the established protection and use regime in planning or carrying out of activities, draft protection regulations of the objects of cultural heritage protected by the municipality and organise the drafting of plans of management of cultural heritage sites and protection zones thereof.

**Article 22. Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage and Territorial Planning**

1. Immovable cultural properties, territories and protection zones thereof shall be maintained and activities therein shall be developed pursuant to general and special territorial planning and strategic planning documents, protection regulations and the heritage protection requirements set thereby and prepared on the basis of the provisions of this Law and the Law on Territorial Planning.

2. Objects of cultural heritage, territories thereof, sites of cultural heritage and protection zones thereof shall be maintained and activities therein shall be developed:
   1) objects of cultural heritage, territories and protection zones thereof – under heritage protection requirements set forth in typical and individual protection regulations of cultural heritage drafted and approved in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Government or an institution authorised by it;
   2) sites of cultural heritage and protection zones thereof – under special territorial planning documents of immovable cultural heritage protection, that is, management plans. The management plans may, in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Minister of Culture, drafted also in respect of complex objects of cultural heritage;
3. A plan of the management of sites of cultural heritage and protection zones thereof shall be a special territorial planning document which sets out heritage protection requirements for the protection of immovable cultural heritage and development of activities at a site of cultural heritage and protection zone thereof and the boundaries of the site of cultural heritage and the protection zone thereof.
4. The special territorial planning of the protection of immovable cultural heritage shall be organised by:
   1) the Department – the drafting of plans of management of the sites of cultural heritage and protection zone thereof at the national and regional levels; funding shall be allocated from the state budget or other sources of funding, directorates of protected areas may also act as organisers of this planning;
   2) the director of a municipal administration – the drafting of plans of management of the sites of cultural heritage and protection zone thereof at the district level; funding shall be allocated from the municipal budget or other sources of funding;
5. The heritage protection requirements set in special planning documents and protection regulations shall be binding for the drafting of general, special and detailed territorial planning documents. The heritage protection requirements set by special planning documents shall, in addition to other requirements set by laws, also regulate land use, the construction of structures or installations, height and capacity of the structures, density and intensity of development, exterior finishing materials, planting of greenery, height, density and type of plantations, transport flows and intensity thereof;
6. The special territorial planning documents of the protection of immovable cultural heritage shall be drafted pursuant to the rules for the drafting of these documents prepared by the Ministry of Culture and approved by the Minister of Culture and the Minister of Environment. The rules shall specify the planning documents of immovable cultural heritage protection, the territorial protection measures stipulated by these documents, the procedure for the drafting, public consultation, coordination, approval and validity of the documents;
7. Master and detailed plans of the territories wherein registered immovable cultural property is situated shall be approved according to the levels of the institutions in charge of the approval of territorial planning documents:
   1) at the level of the State, the Government and an institution authorised by the Government – under reasoned conclusions of the Department and subject to consent on the basis of the trained professionals provided for in the articles of association of the legal persons. The procedure for certifying the professional plans shall be laid down by the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Culture;
   2) at the municipal level – under an act of the Standing Commission on Construction signed by representatives of the Department and of the heritage protection subdivision of a municipality and recommending to approve a plan;
8. The master plans being drawn up must specify the protection measures of immovable cultural heritage covering various fields of public life;
9. Where registered immovable cultural property is situated in a planned territory, consultations must be held with a specialist authorised by the Department on the drawing up of master, special and detailed plans.
10. The special planning documents of the protection of immovable cultural heritage shall be drafted by certified professionals and may also be drafted by legal persons, where the operations are directed by certified professionals and where territorial planning activities have been provided for in the articles of association of the legal persons. The procedure for certifying the professionals shall be laid down by the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Culture;
11. Plans of management of the sites of cultural heritage protected by the State and protection zones thereof shall be approved by the Minister of Culture, and plans of management of the sites of cultural heritage protected by a municipality shall be approved by a municipal council;
12. The drafting of special plans of immovable cultural heritage protection as set forth by this Article may be financed also by managers of an object of cultural heritage and owners of other immovable items situated in the territory of the object of cultural heritage or protection zone thereof or other holders of management rights.

Version after 1 January 2014: Article 22. Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage and Territorial Planning

1. Immovable cultural properties, territories and protection zones thereof shall be maintained and activities therein shall be developed pursuant to complex and special territorial planning and strategic planning documents, protection regulations and the heritage protection requirements set thereby and prepared on the basis of the provisions of this Law and the Law on Territorial Planning.

2. Objects of cultural heritage, territories thereof, sites of cultural heritage and protection zones thereof shall be maintained and activities therein shall be developed:
   1) objects of cultural heritage, territories and protection zones thereof – under heritage protection requirements set forth in special territorial planning documents of immovable cultural heritage protection approved by the Government and individual protection regulations drafted and approved in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Minister of Culture;
   2) sites of cultural heritage and protection zones thereof – under special territorial planning documents of immovable cultural heritage protection approved by the Government and individual protection regulations drafted and approved in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Minister of Culture.

3. A plan of the management of sites of cultural heritage and protection zones thereof shall be a special territorial planning document which sets out heritage protection requirements for the protection of immovable cultural heritage and development of activities at a site of cultural heritage and protection zone thereof and the boundaries of the site of cultural heritage and the protection zone thereof.

4. The special territorial planning of the protection of immovable cultural heritage shall be organised by:
   1) the Department – the drafting of plans of management of the sites of cultural heritage and protection zone thereof at the national and regional levels; funding shall be allocated from the state budget or other sources of funding, directorates of protected areas may also act as organisers of this planning;
   2) the director of a municipal administration – the drafting of plans of management of the sites of cultural heritage and protection zone thereof at the district level; funding shall be allocated from the municipal budget or other sources of funding;
complex objects of cultural heritage, where a municipality declares them protected or they are protected by the municipality, and protection zone thereof. Funding shall be allocated from the municipal budget or other sources of funding.

5. The heritage protection requirements set forth by special territorial planning documents of immovable cultural heritage and protection regulations shall be binding when drafting complex and special territorial planning documents. These heritage protection requirements shall, in addition to other requirements set by laws, also apply to land works, the construction of structures or installations, height and capacity of the structures, density and intensity of development, exterior finishing materials, planting of greenery, height, density and type of plantations, transport flows and intensity thereof.

6. The special territorial planning documents of the protection of immovable cultural heritage shall be drafted pursuant to the rules for the drafting of these documents prepared by the Ministry of Culture and approved by the Minister of Culture and the Minister of Environment. The rules shall specify the territorial protection measures stipulated by special planning documents of immovable cultural heritage protection and the procedure for the drafting, public consideration, coordination, approval and validity of these documents.

7. The complex and special territorial planning documents of the territories wherein registered immovable cultural properties are located shall be approved:

1) at the level of the State – under reasoned conclusions of the Department and subject to consent on coordination of prepared solutions of territorial planning documents pursuant to the planning conditions issued by the Department;

2) at the municipal and local level – under an act of the Territorial Planning Commission signed by representatives of the Department and of the heritage protection subdivision of a municipality and recommending to approve a territorial planning document.

8. The special territorial planning documents of immovable cultural heritage protection shall be drafted by certified professionals and also drafted by legal persons, where the operations are directed by certified professionals and where territorial planning activities have been provided for in the articles of association of the legal persons. The procedure for certifying the professionals shall be laid down by the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Culture.

9. Plans of management of the sites of cultural heritage and complex objects of cultural heritage and protection zones thereof protected by a municipality shall be approved by a municipal council.

10. The drafting of special territorial planning documents of immovable cultural heritage protection as set forth by this Article may be financed also by managers of an object of cultural heritage and owners of other immovable items situated within the territory of the immovable cultural property or protection zone thereof or other holders of management rights.

Article 23. Maintenance of Immovable Cultural Heritage

1. The maintenance of cultural heritage shall be carried out:

1) pursuant to established heritage protection requirements;

2) pursuant to the regulations of maintenance operations of construction of a structure of cultural heritage [technical construction regulations] approved by the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Culture;

3) pursuant to the heritage maintenance regulations approved by the Minister of Culture and setting requirements for specific maintenance operations.

2. A design documentation of maintenance shall be prepared on the basis of the data of the Register of Cultural Property, the conclusions of the research required prior to designing and upon assessment of the environmental impact of planned economic activity, where this is carried out in the cases specified by the Law on the Environmental Impact Assessment of Planned Economic Activity. Heritage maintenance regulations shall establish the binding character and scope of the research conducted prior to designing and required for the assessment of the environmental impact.

3. Where new valuable properties are discovered during maintenance, operations shall be suspended in accordance with the procedure laid down by Article 93 of this Law in order to make the discovered valuable properties known, additional research shall be conducted. On the basis of conclusions thereof, additional maintenance operations of an object of cultural heritage may be requested.

4. The objects of cultural heritage destroyed by natural disasters or man may, in exceptional cases and without posing threat to remnants, parts or elements thereof possessing valuable properties, be restored in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Government or an institution authorised by it, where:

1) the possibility of restoration is based on the thorough data of historical sources and physical research;

2) an object possesses particular artistic or symbolic significance, is of especial importance to the fostering of the national objects of cultural heritage and matches the landscape character;

3) state and municipal institutions and the public support the recreation.

5. The removal of an object of cultural heritage shall be prohibited, except where the safeguarding of such an object makes removal imperative. All necessary precautions must be taken for its dismantling, transfer and reinstatement at a suitable location.

6. The right to prepare the design documentation of maintenance operations of heritage protection, to carry out maintenance operations of heritage protection, [special] expert examination of heritage protection and to head the said operations shall be vested in a specialist certified in accordance with the procedure approved by the Minister of Culture. Certain operations may be carried out by uncertified assistants under the supervision of a certified specialist in charge of the operations. The right of natural and legal persons to be the contractors of such activities or providers of services shall be established by this Law and other laws.

7. The right to be in charge of design documentation of the maintenance operations of construction of the structures of cultural heritage, such operations, supervision of the implementation of a design documentation, expert examination of the design documentation of the structure and technical supervision of construction of the structure shall be vested in a head of operations certified in accordance with the procedure approved by the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Culture conditional upon holding a business certificate or employment by an undertaking certified in accordance with the procedure approved by the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Culture.

8. Special heritage protection requirements for maintenance operations of construction/interim protection regulations and documents permitting construction shall be issued in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Law on Construction. Prior to issuing a document permitting construction, a [special] expert examination of the heritage protection pertaining to the design documentation of the operations must be carried out not later than within one month of the submission of the design documentation in accordance with the procedure specified by the Minister of Culture and expert examination of a design documentation of the structure in the cases and in accordance with the procedure specified by the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Culture. The design documentation must be correct in compliance with binding notes to the statements of the expert examinations prior to issuing the document permitting construction operations. The document permitting construction for the carrying out of construction operations pertaining to maintenance of a cultural heritage structure shall be issued when such a project is not in conflict with heritage protection requirements established by representatives of the Department and a municipality.

9. Prior to issuing a permission to carry out maintenance operations of heritage protection, [special] expert examination of heritage protection pertaining to a design documentation of the operations must be carried out in the cases and in accordance with the procedure approved by the Minister of Culture. The design documentation must be corrected in compliance with binding notes to the statement of the expert examination. Design conditions of maintenance operations of heritage protection (in term protection regulations) and permissions to carry out the operations shall be issued in accordance with the procedure approved by the Minister of Culture. The permissions shall be issued not later than within one month from the submission of a design documentation or a corrected design documentation.

10. The manager, the Department and municipal institutions and the entities referred to in other laws controlling the progress and quality of implementation of a project of maintenance operations in relation to an object of cultural heritage must, upon establishing that heritage protection requirements were violated in the course of carrying out of the operations or due to faults of the project the threat of the loss of or damage to valuable properties has arisen, give a notice thereof to the Department. The Department must suspend the operations which cause damage or threat to the valuable properties of the object of cultural heritage. Such suspension shall remain in force until elimination of violations of the heritage protection requirements or the arising threat or until adoption of a decision by court.

11. Repealed as of 1 July 2013.

12. The procedure for accepting maintenance operations of objects of cultural heritage shall be approved by the Minister of Culture, with the exception of maintenance operations of construction of structures of cultural heritage and maintenance operations of green areas the procedure of accepting whereof shall be approved by the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Culture.

CHAPTER FIVE KNOWLEDGE OF IMMOVABLE CULTURAL HERITAGE, DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE AND REHABILITATION

Article 24. Knowledge of Immovable Cultural Heritage, Dissemination of Knowledge and Public Use of Heritage

1. The knowledge of immovable cultural heritage shall be disseminated and the heritage shall be publicly used in the following manner:

1) possibilities shall be provided for the public to acquire direct knowledge and to develop awareness of it being under protection and made known in the historical surroundings;

2) cultural and recreational tourism shall be developed;

3) information on heritage shall be disseminated;

4) knowledge of heritage shall be included in educational and scientific programmes.
CHAPTER SIX
FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 27. Financing of the Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage

1. State guarantees for the accounting, heritage management and control of immovable cultural heritage shall be financed from the state budget.

2. Immovable cultural property shall be made known and objects shall be declared protected by heritage protection allocations from the state and municipal budgets. The right to make a property known at own expense shall be vested in religious communities, societies and centres as well as public organisations of heritage protection.

3. The operations of keeping up of a protected object shall be financed by managers, maintenance operations — by the managers, where possible, partially by heritage management allocations from the state or municipal budgets, international funds and programmes or other sources of financing. The managers shall be applied tax reliefs established by laws.

4. The Minister of Culture shall approve the programmes for the protection of immovable cultural heritage which are financed from the state budget, while municipal councils shall approve the programmes financed from municipal budgets as well as the procedure for financing of the said projects from the budgets.

5. Research of immovable cultural properties and operations of responding to the threat of an accident, introduction of technical protection measures and other urgent safeguarding operations may be financed from the funds allocated for heritage management. A list of such operations and priorities of financing thereof shall be approved by the Minister of Culture. A procedure for allocating municipal funds to maintenance operations shall be laid down by municipal councils.

Article 28. Reimbursement to Managers

1. Expenses for maintenance operations of heritage protection of a private property, that is, a publicly accessible object of cultural heritage protected by the State shall be reimbursed from the funds of the state budget allocated for the maintenance of immovable cultural heritage in accordance with the procedure and by the amount approved by the Government or an institution authorised by it.

2. Under a decision of a municipal council, the municipality may, from the funds of its budget, reimburse expenses for maintenance operations of an object of cultural heritage declared protected which does not belong to the municipality by the right of ownership, but is situated on its territory.

3. Upon the request of the institutions in charge of protection, the managers of the mothballed structures under protection shall, in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Minister of Culture, be reimbursed mothballing expenses.

4. Reimbursement shall be paid to the manager of an object of cultural heritage declared protected, where the established or tightened activity restrictions prohibiting previous activities factually reduce the profit obtained by the manager. The procedure for calculating and paying reimbursement shall be laid down by the Government or an institution authorised by it.

Article 29. Compensation for Damage to Immovable Cultural Property

1. The legal and natural persons who have caused damage to an immovable cultural property, also caused damage within the territory or protection zone thereof must restore, to the maximum extent practicable, the condition prior to damage and compensate for direct and indirect losses incurred by the public and the manager.

2. An institution in charge of the protection of an immovable cultural property must propose to a person who has caused damage to restore the condition prior to damage and to compensate for the losses incurred. Where no agreement is reached, the Department shall apply to court for compensation of the damage caused to the immovable cultural property and recovery of losses.

3. The losses incurred by the State may include the expenditure of state and municipal budgets on the maintenance of a damaged cultural property. Tourism income not received, the loss of an unknown source of scientific data and educational and schoolying means, also the expenditure of the state and municipal budgets on making the last or damaged property known and protection thereof.

Article 30. Taking over of Immovable Cultural Property

1. In exceptional cases, an immovable cultural property may be taken over by the State for public needs, with a fair recompense in accordance with the procedure laid down by laws of the Republic of Lithuania and by the Government, where:

1) the cultural property is situated in a state strict cultural reserve/reserve-museum set up or being set up;

2) a state museum or a branch of the state museum has been or is being set up for the exhibition of cultural properties;

3) a cultural monument is entered in the list of historical, archaeological and cultural objects of national significance to ensure accessibility, admission or knowledge.

2. In the case of the taking over of immovable cultural property for public needs, the owner shall be compensated at market
Article 31. Liability for Violations of This Law

1. The natural and legal persons in breach of the provisions of this Law shall be held liable under law.

2. For violations of this Law, legal persons or other organisations or divisions thereof shall be subject to a fine from three thousand up to forty thousand Litas. Violations of this Law committed by the legal persons or other organisations or divisions thereof shall be examined; decisions shall be appealed against and executed in accordance with the procedure laid down by this Law and other laws.

3. The specific amount of a fine imposed according to paragraph 2 of this Article shall be determined having regard to the nature and extent of a committed violation, mitigating and aggravating circumstances, other relevant circumstances. In the presence of any mitigating circumstances, the amount of the fine shall be reduced from the average to the minimum value, and in the presence of any aggravating circumstances the fine shall be increased from the average to the maximum amount. If there are both mitigating and aggravating circumstances, the fine shall be imposed taking into account their amount and significance. The reduction or increase of the amount of the fine shall be substantiated in the decision of the institution imposing the fine for non-compliance with the requirements established in this Law.

4. The fact that, having committed a violation, legal persons or other organisations or divisions thereof have voluntarily prevented the harmful consequences of the violation, assisted competent institutions in the course of the investigation and compensated for losses or eliminated the damage caused shall be regarded as mitigating circumstances. The institution which imposes a fine may also recognise other circumstances which have not been indicated in this paragraph as mitigating.

Article 31i. Record of Violations of the Law and Time Limits for the Hearing of Cases

1. Only authorised officers of the Department shall, having determined that the requirements of this Law have been violated, draw up a record of the content set forth in the Code of Administrative Offences for violations of this Law in respect of the entities indicated in Article 31(2) of this Law.

2. The cases initiated against the entities indicated in Article 31(2) of this Law shall be heard and fines shall be imposed not later than within one month from the establishment of a violation, however not later than within three years from the commission of the violation, and in the event of a continuous violation – within three years from the transpiration thereof.

Article 31j. Participants in the Proceedings

1. The following persons shall participate in the proceedings regarding violations of this Law:

   1) the persons suspected of the commission of a violation of this Law;

   2) by a decision of the entity hearing a case, experts, professionals, interpreters and other persons whose interests are directly related to the case being heard (participants in the proceedings and parties to the proceedings) and representatives of state and municipal institutions at their request (participants in the proceedings).

2. The persons indicated in point 1 of paragraph 1 of this Article shall be referred to in this Law as parties to the proceedings.

3. Representatives authorised by the parties may represent them in the proceedings.

Article 31k. Notice of the Hearing of a Case

Parties to proceedings shall be given a written notice regarding the established violations of this Law, the time and venue of the hearing of a case and shall also be offered access to the case material and requested to present written explanations.

Article 31l. Hearing of a Case

1. A case shall be heard by officers authorised by the Director of the Department. The case shall be heard in the presence of the parties to the proceedings and other participants in the proceedings.

2. During the hearing of a case, the parties shall have the right to familiarise themselves with the collected material, give oral and written explanations, present evidence and lodge applications.

3. If parties to proceedings do not participate in the hearing of a case, the case may only be heard in those instances when information is available that the parties to the proceedings have been informed in due time of the place and venue of the hearing of the case.

Article 31m. Decisions Adopted upon Hearing a Case

1. The entities indicated in Article 31(1) of this Law, having heard a case, shall have the right to adopt a decision to:

   1) impose a fine specified in Article 31(2) of this Law; the amount of which shall be determined having regard to the nature and extent of a committed violation, mitigating and aggravating circumstances and other relevant circumstances;

   2) close case, when no violation of this Law has been committed;

   3) refer the case back for further investigation.

2. Upon hearing a case and adopting a decision on the imposition of a fine, the decision must indicate: the name of the institution which has adopted the decision; the date and venue of the hearing of the case; information regarding the violator; circumstances of the violation; proof of the violator’s guilt on which the decision is based; the article of this Law which establishes liability for the violation; the explanations of the violator and the assessment thereof; the adopted decision; the time limits and procedure of the appeal against the decision.

3. The decisions indicated in paragraph 2 of this Article shall be delivered to persons in respect of whom such decisions have been adopted within three working days from their adoption.

Article 31n. Recovery of Fines

1. A fine shall be paid to the state budget not later than within one month from the delivery of the decision on the imposition of a fine to the violator of this Law.

2. Bailiffs shall collect unpaid fines enforcing the decisions indicated in Article 31(1) of this Law in accordance with the procedure established by the Code of Civil Procedure. The decisions may be referred for enforcement no later than within three years of the day of adoption thereof.

Article 31o. Appeal against Decisions

1. Legal persons or other organisations or divisions thereof objecting to the decisions indicated in Article 31(5) of this Law shall have the right to appeal against a decision to court in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Law on Administrative Proceedings within one month from the delivery of the decision thereto.

2. A referral to court shall suspend the implementation of decisions indicated in Article 31(5) of this Law regarding the imposition of sanctions.

3. The court investigating a complaint shall, taking into account the nature and extent of a committed violation, mitigating and other relevant circumstances (due to which a respective fine imposed on an offender would be excessive and disproportionate to the committed violation and therefore unfair) and acting in compliance with the principles of fairness and prudence, have the right to impose a fine smaller than the minimum fine stipulated in Article 31(2) of this Law.

I promulgate this Law passed by the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania.

PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC
ALGIRDAS BRAZAUSKAS
Nomination for the UNESCO World Heritage List
Modernist Kaunas: Architecture of Optimism, 1919–1939
MANAGEMENT PLAN
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1. A view of Modern Kaunas. Photo: Martynas Plapytis, 2020
In 1919–1939, Kaunas assumed a status as a provisional capital of the Republic of Lithuania, a designation that led to its radical transformation from a 19th century provincial town, to a 20th century modern cultural city which encapsulated diverse expressions of the values and aspirations associated with optimistic belief in an independent future of a young nation. Though the city has lost the capital status in 1939, Kaunas has kept its interwar cultural identity, that provided a great stimulus to develop under changed political and economic environment, until the Lithuanian independence has been restored in 1990. In the 21st century, Kaunas’ testament of the interwar period – its urban, architectural, and intangible heritage – remain the main driving force of the city’s creative economy. This led to the membership in the UNESCO Creative Cities Network (2015) and the title of European Capital of Culture 2022 (2017).

1.1. Vision and Aims of the Management Plan

The vision of this Management Plan is to ensure an appropriate and equitable balance between conservation, sustainability and development of the property, in order to protect and sustain its Outstanding Universal Value by safeguarding and enhancing its historic and cultural environment, through appropriate activities contributing to the inclusive social and economic development, and the quality of life.

The aims of the Management Plan are:

- To promote participation of all stakeholders and local communities in implementing the Management Plan and effective monitoring.
- To build and maintain strong cooperation between local and national institutions to pursue the smooth implementation of the Management Plan, and effective monitoring.
- To ensure effective protection and management of the nominated property, and its attributes throughout collection of data related to the nominated property within the parameters of sustainable development.
- To ensure participation of all stakeholders and local communities in the implementation of the Management Plan, and effective monitoring.

1.2. Protection Policy and Planning Framework

The protection of the nominated property and its buffer zone, the further development of these areas and activity undertaken within them, shall be ensured, and regulated by national legislation and applicable national and local strategic and territorial planning documents.

The entire nominated area and its buffer zone comprise listed cultural heritage sites, their protection zones, and cultural heritage properties that have been subject to national and municipal heritage preservation requirements for decades. The legal protection of cultural heritage is regulated by the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania, general and special legislation governing cultural heritage protection, associated subordinate legislation, EU laws and international agreements governing the protection of cultural heritage.

Cultural heritage and cultural heritage conservation are understood as important factors contributing to the sustainable development of the Kaunas city and are integrated in the city’s development policies and planning documents (see 5.d. of the Nomination file). As well as actions in strengthening the main dimensions of sustainable development – environmental sustainability, inclusive social and economic development, as described in the Policy for Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the World Heritage Convention (General Assembly of the States Parties to the Convention Resolution 20 GA 13, Paris, 2016), are present and reflected by priority development areas, aims and objectives set in Strategic Development Plan of Kaunas City Municipality up to 2022 (see Annex 2). The development of those areas is expected to be continued, and relevant measures are integrated into the conservation and management system of the nominated property, complemented with World Heritage policies, to support its OUV.

1.3. Approval and Compatibility with Existing Planning Documents

The preparation and adoption of this Management Plan is seen as an integral part of territorial and spatial planning of the city of Kaunas that supplement the existing urban development management system and help to refine the Kaunas City General Plan’s decisions and nurture the highly valued landmarks that shape the city’s identity. A wide range of efforts and measures (both educational, financial, and planning) are already in place to manage the nominated property and highlight its values, mitigate existing and potential threats. The Management Plan is designed to supplement the existing management system of the nominated property, following the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, while preserving its Outstanding Universal Value and the constituting attributes, and ensuring sustainable development based on international policies.

The Management Plan, approved by the Kaunas City Municipal Council as a strategic planning document (sectoral strategy), will be linked to the other strategic plans of Kaunas City Municipality and the Kaunas City General Plan. Actions and measures set up in the Management Plan’s Action Plan will be integrated into Strategic Development Plan (SDP) as well as lower strategic planning documents in order funding for implementation of the measures could be well planned and secured, and updated at parallel intervals.

1.5. Preparation of the Management Plan

In 2014, Kaunas City Council by the decision No. T-279 supported the initiative to submit Kaunas Modernism to the State Party’s Tentative List. In 2017, when the submission “Kaunas 1919–1939: The Capital Inspired by the Modern Movement” (10/01/2017) has been approved, the process of preparation of Nomination and Management Plan started. The work has been carried out by the Kaunas City Municipality’s Administration involving management partners and external experts in 2019–2020. The work of preparation of the Plan was overseen by the Steering Group, approved by the Order of Minister of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania.

The preparation of the Nomination file, deeper research and analysis of the area as well as information gathered during consultation and SWOT analysis, helped to determine the actions (measures) necessary to preserve the authenticity and integrity of the site as well as pursue a vision towards its sustainable development and further use.

The Site Management Unit is established at Kaunas City Municipality Administration’s Cultural Heritage Division and is responsible for the management of the proposed property and coordination of implementation of the Action Plan at the local level. Its partners such as Cultural Heritage Department’s Kaunas Division, Kaunas2022 (and beyond), stakeholders such as NGO’s, representatives of local communities and academia, professional groups, real estate developers and managers, are also present in the management process of the nominated property [see section 3 of the Management Plan].
Lithuania

State Party: Lithuania
State, Province or Region: Kaunas Region / Kaunas

2. Description of the Property

2.1. Brief Synthesis

Modernist Kaunas is situated in central Lithuania, at the confluence of two major rivers, the Nemunas and the Neris. The area within the nominated property was planned in the mid-19th century and developed in 1919–1939 when, after the declaration of an independent Republic of Lithuania in 1918, Kaunas served as the provisional capital of the state. The status of provisional capital was crucial for the city’s unprecedented growth and architectural development. In less than twenty years, under the auspices of the new national government and civic initiative, Kaunas was transformed into a modern city based on the assimilation of modern urban planning and architecture with pre-existing natural, urban, and other local conditions. Architecture, specifically in the form of a local inflection of the international language of modernism, played a particularly important role in that transformation. Kaunas Modernism, therefore, bears exceptional testimony to the multifaceted nature of architectural modernism. 1500 of the 6000 remaining buildings erected in Kaunas in 1919–1939 are concentrated in the nominated area and bear exceptional testimony to the dynamic interpretation of the interwar architectural legacy that, in each new generation, has inspired new architecture. During the subsequent years of Soviet occupation (1945–1990), Kaunas’ unique interwar spirit endured through different forms of spatial resistance. The city was developed as an industrial hub with residential districts outside the limits of the former capital. The legacy of modernist interwar architecture was maintained in the construction of single-family residences and even in some direct copies of interwar buildings.

Kaunas’ interwar modernism inspired generations of Soviet Lithuanian architects and their colleagues in the Lithuanian diaspora in the United States, Canada, Australia, Great Britain, and South America throughout the 20th century. After the restoration of Lithuania’s independence in 1990, the legacy of Kaunas Modernism caused it to become the subject of increasing recognition publicly and professionally, evidenced by growth in the number of tours, articles, books, exhibitions, and internet websites. In 2015, the European Commission awarded the European Heritage Label to ‘Kaunas 1919–1939’ and that same year Kaunas received the status of UNESCO City of Design. In 2017, Kaunas was inscribed on the UNESCO State Parties’ Tentative List, and in 2022 Kaunas will be the European Capital of Culture, with the city’s modernist architecture expected to play an important role as part of the ‘Modernism for the Future’ programme. The heritage of modernism has the core attribute of the city’s identity nationally and internationally.

2.2. World Heritage Criteria under which the Property is Proposed

Criterion (ii): Kaunas Modernism of 1919–1939 expands the concept of Modernism beyond the International Style by revealing a more diverse, complex fabric of numerous, often divergent, cultural, social, political, and artistic trends. Kaunas Modernism is an exceptional example of rethinking architecture as a process of social, political, and cultural modernisation in the 20th century. Kaunas Modernism provides arguments for the decentralisation of modernism not only in the geographical sense, but also in terms of stylistic expression. Outstanding value of the Kaunas cityscape is its architectural diversity, represented through the plurality of modern architectural ideas, from modernised Neoclassicism to National Modernism, which co-existed throughout the world in the first half of the 20th century. By integrating and locally interpreting the principles of the Modern Movement, Kaunas Modernism displays a bold plurality of modern architectural expression in response to local needs and conditions.

Criterion (iv): Modernist Kaunas is an outstanding example of a historic city subject to rapid urbanisation and modernisation, encapsulated by diverse expressions of the values and aspirations associated with optimistic belief in an independent future amid the turbulence of the early 20th century, when national borders were changing fast. The creation of a modern capital city of an emerging nation state is an outstanding testament to peoples’ faith in the future and their ability to be creative under difficult political and economic conditions. The gradual and sustainable modernisation of Kaunas, carried out through civic initiatives with respect to the urban context and natural environment, produced an outstanding urban landscape and modern architectural language serving the needs of provisional capital and possessing functions, structures, and building typologies that reflected the modernisation of urban life in the 20th century.
2.3. Statement of Integrity

Modernist Kaunas consists of Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis, two adjacent districts that have been preserved in adequate size in almost unchanged historical form and design. The significant architectural structures and the original urban layout, including the characteristic sloping natural and humanmade terrain, public spaces and historic parks, have been retained in their entirety. Of 6000 surviving buildings constructed in Kaunas in 1919–1939, the greatest concentration of significant modernist structures is located in Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis with 1500 buildings of representative administrative, public, industrial, and residential functions testifying to the speed and diversity of development undertaken in the spirit of modernity. 220 structures and urban areas, constructed in the period of 1919–1939 within the Nominated Property, are listed on the National Register of Cultural Heritage. The buffer zone contains structures and groups of buildings dating back to the interwar period which strengthen the character of the nominated property.

Kaunas lost its status as Lithuania’s provisional capital in October 1939, and the sudden change in the city’s political status helped to preserve the physical attributes of the 1920s and 1930s. Under the Soviet rule, which lasted from 1944–1990, the physical state of interwar modernist buildings was not deliberately neglected, since the superior quality of the architecture was put to pragmatic use. Intermittent development of the area continued with the construction of many buildings that, although new, were compatible with the interwar period of development by being restrained in volume and form. Construction during this era did not alter the established street grid and squares, but it did see the addition of large modernist buildings. The growth of contemporary Kaunas and developmental pressures resulted in several large structures along Karaliaus Mindaugo Prospektas and sparked numerous debates about the relationship between new commercial architecture and the historic surroundings. Any risk is mitigated by listing of all areas comprising the Nominated Property on the National Register of Cultural Heritage and preparing of adequate conservation and management plans.

2.4. Statement of Authenticity

Because the historically evolved areas of Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis have changed relatively little, the Modern City of Kaunas is truly a time capsule of the 1919–1939 period. The location and setting, form and design, material and substance as well as use and function of the Nominated Property all represent a historic modernist city of the interwar period that evolved harmoniously, integrating the natural and historic settings, producing a diverse legacy of architectural modernism. The area of Naujamiestis is home to the largest concentration of landmark modernist buildings that were part of the formation of a new administrative, cultural, and social core of the Lithuanian state in 1919–1939. Modernist residential areas of Naujamiestis constitute a superior architectural background for the landmark buildings, creating a harmonious cityscape. The urban structure of the Naujamiestis, embodying the architectural and urban nature of a modern city, is noted for the greatest diversity of stylistic forms, materials, and functions – a feature which is still evident in the city today.

The Žaliakalnis area with Ąžuolynas Park, designed in 1923 and gradually developed up to 1939, represents an outstanding example of the integration of urban and natural landscapes and the adoption of the contemporaneous garden city concept to local conditions. Although the plan was only partially implemented, the elements that were realised and which have survived to this day reflect the local interpretation of the most progressive garden city urban planning concepts of the time, adjusted with an intelligent approach to suit pre-existing natural, topographical, and humanmade features. Another feature of Kaunas Modernism that has retained its authenticity is its historical, cultural and symbolic significance (intangible heritage). Today, the Nominated Property continues to see the highest concentration of active social, cultural, and economic activity, as well as the evolution of new traditions and initiatives inspired by the legacy of Kaunas Modernism.

### Groups of Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Natural elements: Geomorphological setting and landscape elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River valley’s lower and upper terraces, slopes, greenery, parks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban structure and urban morphology: Implementation of the Garden City residential suburb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street grid and pattern: streets, squares, axes, views, landmarks. Plot type, building type, form and position [perimetric, mixed, detached etc.].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture: Buildings of modernist architecture and of other historical periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings of modernist architecture [annex I] and buildings of other historical periods protected by national law and listed on Cultural Heritage Register; their physical form and fabric, functions, according to individually defined attributes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function: Of urban areas [zones] and buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current and former uses, activities and practices: Naujamiestis – administrative-cultural centre. Žaliakalnis – residential neighbourhoods, recreational and sports facilities. Authentic or similar function of landmark buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intangible heritage: Memory, tradition, association, experience and feeling of the place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official national holidays, international and local international festivals, programs and cultural events that are held annually, such as Independence Day, Song Festival, Poetry Festival, City-telling Festival. Houses called by the names of their historic owners: memorial houses; memorial museums of prominent personalities. Monuments, memorial plaques and displays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Attributes of the Nominated Property
3. Position of the nominated property and buffer zone

Map of the nominated property
Modernist Kaunas: Architecture of Optimism, 1919–1939

Geographical coordinates of the central point of the nominated property: N 54° 53' 49"; W 23° 55' 45"

Legend
- Nominated property
- Buffer zone
- Buildings in the nominated property constructed in 1919-1939
4. Delimitation and zoning of the nominated property

Map of the nominated property
Modernist Kaunas: Architecture of Optimism, 1919–1939

Legend
- Nominated property
- Buffer zone
- Buildings in the nominated property constructed in 1919–1939

Territories of listed cultural heritage objects and areas
1.1. Central Naujamiestis
1.2. Residential Naujamiestis
1.3. Industrial Naujamiestis
2.1. The Garden City Area
2.2. The Kaukas Area
2.3. The Perkunas Area
2.4. Ėžuolynas Park and Sports Complex
2.5. Research Laboratory Complex
2.5. Current Protection and Management System

The nominated property covers a central part of Kaunas city – a group of areas that are legally protected on the national and local levels under the Law on Protection of Immoveable Cultural Heritage, the Law on Protected Areas, the Law on Spatial Planning, the Law on Construction, the Law on Landscaping and the Law on Environmental Protection. The property consists of seven protected zones: Nažuamiestis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Zalakalnės, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22148); Zaliakalnis I, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 31280); Kaunas Ažuolynas Park Complex (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 44588); Kaunas Ažuolynas Sports Complex (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 31668); the Research Laboratory complex (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 28557); and the Christ’s Resurrection Church (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 16005). There are 234 listed cultural heritage properties and areas in the nominated property.

The cultural significance of the nominated property is integrated in the Kaunas City General Plan 2013–2023, and the subsequent preservation, regulation, and special plans on the national and local levels. In 2015, the Kaunas City Municipal Heritage Restoration Programme was launched to provide financial support for the maintenance of cultural heritage and to improve the condition of modernist buildings in Kaunas. In 2017, the Kaunas City Municipality approved a Cultural Strategy for 2027 to establish an integrated approach toward the interwar period heritage, to protect it and meet the contemporary needs of the public. The administration of the protection of the cultural heritage on the nominated property and its buffer zone is carried out in accordance with the provisions of The Law of the Republic of Lithuania on the Protection of Immoveable Cultural Heritage (22 December 1994, No. 1-733) (hereinafter – the LPICH). The national policy of the protection of immovable cultural heritage is formulated by the Seimas, the Government and the Ministry of Culture having regard to the assessments, analyses and proposals of heritage protection experience and tendencies as submitted by the Lithuanian National Commission for Cultural Heritage (NCCH).

On the state level, the administration for the protection of cultural heritage is organized and is the responsibility of the Minister of Culture. The Ministry of Culture authorizes subdivisions of the Ministry, institutions established under the Ministry, and other budgetary institutions to perform the functions of protection of immovable cultural heritage. The Department of Cultural Heritage under the Ministry of Culture (hereinafter – the Department), performs the functions of cultural heritage identification and inventory, management, control, and dissemination.

Municipalities perform the functions of cultural heritage administration locally in accordance with the provisions of PICH and other laws. The nominated property and its buffer zone are administrated by Kaunas City Municipal Administration and its divisions.

Within the nominated property and its buffer zone, the institutions responsible for cultural heritage protection administration are the Cultural Heritage Department’s Kaunas Division and the KCMA Cultural Heritage Division.

2.6. State of Conservation

The territory of the nominated property consists of cultural heritage areas – sites, and their protected zones listed on the Lithuanian National Register of Cultural Heritage (here Register). The protected sites also include other cultural heritage properties such as buildings and groups of buildings.

The protected attributes of the nominated property are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Various modernist buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups of Buildings</td>
<td>Collections of modernist buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>Sites with cultural significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas</td>
<td>Cultural heritage areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zones</td>
<td>Protected zones of cultural heritage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The protected sites include protected properties such as: The Church of St. John, 39–41 Didžioji Street; Kaunas Castle (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 31669); Kaunas Student House and Student Club buildings (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 36582), Žaliakalnis Park Complex (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22148); Kaunas Ažuolynas Sports Complex (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 31668); Kaunas Ažuolynas Park Complex (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 44588); the Research Laboratory complex (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 28557); and the Christ’s Resurrection Church (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 16005).

The protected areas include: M. K. Čiurlionis Square; M. K. Čiurlionis Square and permeable green areas; the City Hall Square; the Kaunas City Administration building; Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakalnis, a historic district of Kaunas (National Register of the Cultural Heritage No. 22149); Žaliakaln

2.6.1. State of Conservation in Brief

The condition of the landscape elements is protected and monitored. The area’s terrain type, the flat lower terrace, and the upper terrace of the Nemunas river valley and slopes, has not changed, despite the presence of slight slope erosion in some places. Protected landscaping and green areas, such as parks, slopes’ greenery, perimetral street landscaping with deciduous trees and alleys, in satisfactory condition are predominant. The condition of greenery is deteriorating due to age and worsened...
2.6.2. Current Protection Measures

The attributes (fig. Table of attributes) of listed sites and properties are protected by national law and documents regulating local activities, including special cultural heritage conservation plans and regulations governing cultural heritage protection. The area’s sustainable development through the protection of cultural heritage and valuable attributes is regulated by the Kaunas City Municipal General Plan and other strategic documents and special plans. All documents governing protection and sustainable development are described in section 5 of the Nomination File.

Protection of landscape elements

The protected natural elements and landscape in the area are the Nemunas River valley (upper and lower flat terrains, slopes), landscaping and greenery. The protection of these elements is ensured by the existing legal framework and planning documents. All proposed planning and design solutions are coordinated with accountable institutions. For the removal of mature trees an approval from Kaunas City Municipal Administration’s Environmental Protection Division is required. No essential terrain alterations are foreseen; however, slope erosion is possible due to heavy rains caused by climate change, active construction work, and loss of landscaped areas.

Current monitoring: The Kaunas City Municipal Administration’s Environmental Protection Division monitors and records the quality of landscaping and greenery in the city of Kaunas. A database created for this purpose can be accessed at https://maps.kaunas.lt/zeldyna/aplikacija/.

Proposed monitoring of slope erosion; preparation of a consolidated slope development and maintenance concept.

Protection of urban structure and urban morphology

The protected attributes in the area are the street grid and pattern, urban structure and morphology, as well as important observation points (fig. 6) and visual axes (fig. 7). The protection of these elements is ensured by the existing legal framework and planning documents. According to applicable law, new buildings are constructed to correspond to the historical development type, as recorded in inventory documentation, and the scale of surrounding historical development. Most designs are prepared in accordance with established heritage protection requirements. All development and new construction activities planned in the area are coordinated with the relevant institutions responsible for cultural heritage protection, and permits are obtained to conduct land development or construction work. The design quality of new urban elements is inspected by advisory organizations (the Kaunas Regional Architecture Council [KRAT], the Kaunas Architecture and Urban Planning Experts Council [KAUET]), the Cultural Heritage Experts Board and the Commission on Questions Pertaining to Urban Planning, Architecture and Investment, established by the Kaunas City Municipal Administration:

Current monitoring: Monitoring of nationally designated cultural heritage sites is conducted every 5 years by the Department of Cultural Heritage (the Department) Kaunas Division. Sites with municipal level protection designation are monitored by the KCMA Cultural Heritage Division every 5 years. The KCMA conducts monitoring of the city’s General Plan every two years.

Proposed site monitoring on an annual basis; to develop a good practice guidance on quality contextual architecture, urban heritage protection and sustainable development of historic urban areas.
Since 2017, the Memory Office programme (established in 2015) which provides financial support to private owners of cultural heritage buildings for the preparation of conservation projects and performance of maintenance work.

Current monitoring: Monitoring of the condition of all listed properties – buildings and groups of buildings – is conducted jointly every 5 years by the DCH Kaunas Division and KCMA Cultural Heritage Division. A condition assessment report is required upon any change in ownership (or execution of contract) of all buildings listed on the Cultural Heritage Registry.

Proposed: Monitoring of landmark buildings on an annual basis (annual monitoring of European Heritage Label buildings’ condition is already performed) to develop a good practice guidance for the care, maintenance, and adaptation of cultural heritage properties.

Protection of Function and Intangible Heritage

The principal administrative and cultural function of the central Naujamiestis and the residential – recreational function of Žaliakalnis are preserved. The function of most of the landmark modernist buildings has either remained authentic (mostly of religious, cultural and educational buildings) or similar (mostly of administrative and mixed used buildings). Most of the residential buildings have also preserved their authentic residential function.

Urban landmarks, such as the War Museum Garden, Dainų Valley, Ažuolynas Park, Sports Complex and others, have preserved their function and traditional events that take place in them.

The preservation of the attributes: The historic function of the urban areas comprising the nominated property (as stated in the table of attributes, see fig. 2) is protected by the General plan and special planning documents. Buildings, significant historical and memorial structures (e.g., former homes of prominent interwar figures or sites of important events) are designated with memorial plaques and displays.

Considerable attention has been given to emphasizing the area’s intangible and historical value. The Song Festival tradition is listed on the National Intangible Heritage List (http://savadas.hnc.lt/dainu_sventes.html) and continues annually (held in June-August). Events are regularly held in the War Museum garden (during the National holidays), etc. The interwar cultural heritage is especially important for local communities: residents readily participate in events, tours, and initiatives, and take part in activities related to city planning processes and the preservation of iconic buildings, such as Architectural Workshops held in 2019 regarding the reuse of the Kaunas Central Post Office.

Commemorative plaques, displays, and sculptures are regularly installed to preserve the historical memory. The intangible attributes are being preserved through celebration of official national holidays such as Independence Day, and international and local festivals including the Song Festival, Kaunas Art Biennale, Kaunas Architectural Festival (KAF’e), Poetry Festival, Kaunas 2022 program City-telling Festival and many other periodically held cultural activities.

Other activities. Since 2017, Memory Office programme (the project of the “Kaunas – European Capital of Culture 2022”) started collecting stories and memories of people of various ethnicities and religions https://www.atmintiesvietos.lt/en/kaunas-2/interviews-with-ethnic-communities-of-kaunas. These stories are expected to help to know the city and its inhabitants better, to strengthen the identity of the city. Together it will serve as a source of inspiration for various cultural and art projects that will increase the respect for the other and for the different, for human rights and human dignity. Memory Office is a partner of AtmintiesVietos.lt project, an interactive archive website (https://www.atmintiesvietos.lt/en/), where the urban space of Kaunas is presented as a map of collective memory, where the physical forms of memory – buildings, streets, courtyards, squares, monuments, museums, public spaces, etc. – reveal the forgotten or hidden past.

Current monitoring: the number of visitors; number of participants; number of participants in training; number of professionals involved; number of events; number of other activities; number of people reached by means of communication; number of local partners; number of international partners; enduring value (cultural products).

Proposed: to establish strategy for interpretation and communication of Kaunas as WHS and develop a program of themed events and engagement activities.
2.7. SWOT analysis

Different aspects of the development patterns have been reviewed to better understand the development capacities of the city and possible effects on the nominated property. Data for analysis have been used from: “Monitoring Report on the Implementation of the Solutions of the Kaunas City General Plan in 2018-2019” [No. A-1527, 2020], Kaunas City Cultural Strategy up to 2027 [No. T-2, 2017], and information provided by Kaunasin [https://kaunasin.lt/old/news-events/?lang=lt].

Analysis is presented in eight sections that are inspired by the UNESCO Recommendations for Historical Urban Landscape [2011]. The sections are not listed in a particular hierarchical order. They help provide a holistic look at the territory, trying to better understand how it could become a liveable historical area that is resilient and able to fulfill its cultural, social and spatial needs of its current and future population. The aim of the SWOT analysis is to prepare assessment that would help to determine the aspects that should be considered when preparing the Management Plan.

1. Cultural heritage
2. Role in social and cultural lives
3. Quality of living environment
4. Function and use
5. Climate resilience
6. Potential for economic growth
7. Potential for urban growth
8. Population

2.7.1. Cultural Heritage

The territory of the nominated property consists of cultural heritage sites and their protection zones listed on the Lithuanian National Register of Cultural Heritage. The protected sites also include other listed cultural heritage properties such as buildings and groups of buildings (complexes). The protection of the cultural heritage sites and properties is regulated by the national legislation. There is a strong legal framework of cultural heritage protection, but there is a lack of unified monitoring database, lack of cross-sectoral collaboration and uniform implementation of protective measures.

There are 408 listed cultural heritage properties (buildings, groups of buildings, and monuments) in the nominated property’s areas of Naujamiestis (328) and Žaliakalnis (80). Most of the properties are operational, of good and average quality.

Wooden buildings are usually of worse condition and are thus unattractive for restoration and renovation due to their higher renovation cost, higher insurance burdens, and difficulties securing loans to acquire such buildings. Financial incentives are necessary as well as awareness raising and capacity building regarding how to restore and increase the appeal of wooden as well as other historic buildings. The better monitoring database is needed.

Cultural heritage has international recognition and is attracting foreign visitors. However, cultural heritage properties, especially from the interwar period, are particularly important to the local community. Activities of Kaunas 2022 aims to strengthen emotional connection with modernist heritage. It is expected that this initiative will result in promotion of the sense of responsibility, respect, knowledge, and values of local communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A rich and exclusive range of cultural heritage properties.</td>
<td>Lack of cross-sectoral collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A strong legal framework of cultural heritage protection.</td>
<td>Unused cultural heritage potential for the needs of residents and city guests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural heritage has international recognition (EHL) and is attracting foreign visitors.</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge or will in maintenance of cultural heritage properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary use of cultural heritage properties is encouraged.</td>
<td>Lack of unified monitoring database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of cultural heritage properties has financial support from City’s administration.</td>
<td>Lack of attention to wooden heritage preservation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use cultural heritage for awareness raising and to strengthen identities of local communities.</td>
<td>Loss of cultural heritage properties due to lack of awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve and expand the cultural heritage monitoring database.</td>
<td>Loss of cultural heritage properties due to lack of financial support or other economic difficulties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand funding and scope of the heritage conservation program.</td>
<td>Loss of wooden heritage buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guidance for the better maintenance of cultural heritage buildings.</td>
<td>Over-regulation might lead to the natural deterioration of protected buildings and sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use cultural heritage for marketing to attract more cultural tourism and create jobs connected to it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage public-private partnerships in cultural heritage maintenance through measures of financial incentives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.7.2. Role in Social and Cultural Lives

There is a number of cultural institutions and NGOs operating in the city, ensuring the diversity of cultural services; continuous international festivals of music, dance, contemporary art, photography, poetry, design, architecture take place in the city. Public spaces and buildings in Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis facilitate diverse range of cultural activities: from ‘intimate concerts’ to big scale ‘neighbours festivals’ and national song festivals. The city is a member of the UNESCO Creative Cities network since 2015. This provides with opportunities of using the cultural capacity of the area to bring more activities to the nominated property and to exploit these activities for awareness raising in cultural values and sharing them with the city and beyond.

Historically Kaunas has always been a multicultural city and it is represented in rich cultural heritage. Kaunas is still characterized by subcultural diversity, and the community spirit arising from similar hobbies, ethnic and religious factors is strong. Support for NGO’s and local communities’ initiatives is important to preserve the intercultural city’s heritage and involvement in cultural life.

There is a big potential for development of cultural tourism sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of cultural institutions and NGOs operating in the city ensure the diversity of cultural services. Most of them located in the city centre.</td>
<td>Centralization of cultural services, insufficient supply of cultural services outside the city center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis are core zones of socio-cultural lives in the city due to high concentration of cultural venues and public spaces.</td>
<td>Not all cultural infrastructure is adapted for groups of visitors with different needs, especially for people with disabilities and families with young children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural city’s heritage.</td>
<td>The city is not very well known for international and local cultural tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The city is a member of the UNESCO Creative Cities network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of indoor and out-door spaces for cultural activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use the cultural capacity of the area to bring more activities to the nominated property.</td>
<td>Cultural activities continue to be centralized in the city centre, lost cultural connections with the other neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use cultural activities to raise awareness about the values of cultural heritage properties.</td>
<td>Not all cultural activities may be available for all groups of visitors due to poorly adapted infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote projects revealing the identity of multicultural Kaunas, representation of ethnic communities in the city, diversity of subcultures.</td>
<td>Loss of multicultural diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide financial support for NGOs and local communities to ensure the diversity of cultural services and activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote and develop cultural tourism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7.3. Quality of Living Environment

Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis are becoming popular locations for living due to the compactness of the spatial structure, dense pedestrian and cyclist network, high concentration of academic, social, and civil institutions, rich cultural and natural environment. Most public spaces in the territory are well maintained. Most buildings are of good or average condition. Concentration of functions results in high concentration of traffic followed by air and noise pollution in the area. Kaunas City Council has approved The Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan that provides mitigation measures for reducing pollution caused by traffic.

High-quality planning is needed to ensure that the quality of the living environment is maintained. As well as the positive response from residents to preserve quality environment and engagement in public-private partnerships for maintenance of public spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compact spatial structure, dense slow traffic network, diverse program and rich cultural environment make the area attractive for living.</td>
<td>Lack of up-to-date spatial development programs or plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High concentration of urban amenities.</td>
<td>The maintenance of greenery and public spaces is costly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of public spaces are of good quality.</td>
<td>Intensive use of private cars for commuting causes air pollution and noise pollution. These two aspects decrease life quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest greenery density regarding other city districts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most buildings are of good or average condition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports infrastructure is being upgraded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan of Kaunas provides mitigation measures for reducing pollution caused by traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public funds are dedicated to improving physical qualities of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality urban development could create the opportunity for more people to enjoy the living environment.</td>
<td>The responsibility of building maintenance depends not only on residents, but also the municipality. If the municipality does not invest to maintain the buildings, their quality decreases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great diversity of program and proximity of services is economically beneficial for the city to invest into quality infrastructure.</td>
<td>Shortage of budget and funds could reduce improvement and quality of public spaces and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The positive response from local residents to preserve quality environment.</td>
<td>Loss of quality living environment due to intensive or poorly controlled development in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibilities for public-private partnerships in maintenance of public spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.7.4. Function and Use

Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis maintained their historical functions which are protected. Naujamiestis remains the administrative-cultural centre of the city and Žaliakalnis – a residential area with vast recreational and sports amenities. Protection and development of the territories’ functions is regulated by the Kaunas City General Plan and special plans.

Public facilities, businesses, and public spaces in Naujamiestis are mostly used by all citizens and visitors, while Žaliakalnis residential zones are used mostly by residents, except Ąžuolynas park with sports infrastructure is used by the citizens and visitors. Research Laboratory complex is mainly used by Kaunas Technical University personnel. To ensure the atmosphere of quiet residential neighbourhoods, tourists flows management could be necessary in the future.

There is no evidence suggesting that the function and use of the most nominated areas (zones 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4) would change. Just the Industrial Naujamiestis (zone 1.3), since the adoption of the first Kaunas City General Plan, has been planned for regeneration and is slowly transforming. The territory is likely to extend the mixed-use nature of the whole area but will keep the post-industrial spirit through its spatial structure. Quality planning for the area is needed.

Most of the landmark modernist buildings have either maintained original function or have changed function but maintained use (public or private use). Some administrative or public landmark historical buildings (like the Post office) are difficult to adapt to contemporary needs; they have high exploitation cost and are poorly maintained.

There are mostly used by all citizens and visitors, while Žaliakalnis residential zones are used mostly by residents, except Ąžuolynas park with sports infrastructure is used by the citizens and visitors. Research Laboratory complex is mainly used by Kaunas Technical University personnel. To ensure the atmosphere of quiet residential neighbourhoods, tourists flows management could be necessary in the future.

2.7.5. Climate Resilience

There is no high probability of natural disasters that might affect the nominated property. Naujamiestis, located in the Nemunas river valley, falls into the low-risk flood zones and protection measures are in place. To date, no clear damage has been identified to the effects of rainfall on slopes, but given the risks posed by climate change, it is important to understand the potential effects of climate change and to apply climate mitigation strategies. Naujamiestis could be threatened by the loss of vegetation and decrease of permeable surfaces due to new development.

Modernist residential buildings in Naujamiestis area consume approximately 1.5-2 times more energy to heat the building per square meter than average. Modernization projects mostly focus on improving insulation and renovation of heating systems. Modernization of listed buildings comes with a higher cost due to more strict requirements and not all renovation measures (materials, technological and engineering solutions) can be used for listed buildings or could lead to loss of attributes. Development of energy efficiency improvement guidance with the aim of increasing energy efficiency in historic buildings is needed.

Strengths
- There is no high probability of natural disasters that might affect the nominated property.
- The large amounts of vegetation increases air quality in the area.

Weaknesses
- Interwar period buildings have low thermal insulation character of Industrial Naujamiestis (zone 1.3).
- There is no clear regeneration program for Industrial Naujamiestis (zone 1.3).
2.7.6. Potential for Economic Growth

Favourable economic state of the country and the changing habits of the inhabitants lead to a slow increase in the population in the nominated property and its buffer zone, as well as rising real estate prices. Foreign companies set up their headquarters in Naujamiestis or in Žaliakalnis and near the KTU campus. Cultural heritage buildings are attractive for HQ of local and foreign companies such as service centres as such job-places can be adapted to building layouts.

The threat is that Cultural heritage buildings are more expensive to renovate which might frighten off investors, so incentives are needed.
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**Strengths**
- Nominated property, especially Naujamiestis, is attractive for new businesses.
- New A Class offices provides new space for business expansion.
- Cultural heritage buildings are attractive for HQ of local and foreign companies.
- Area has well developed transport infrastructure.
- Planning city policies prevent occurrence of large scale commercial centers which ensure a competitive environment for small businesses.

**Weaknesses**
- Size of businesses that can enter Naujamiestis is limited.
- Žaliakalnis zone is residential in nature therefore there is limited space for new businesses.

**Opportunities**
- Naujamiestis is a mixed-use zone that is favourable for emergence of new businesses.
- City has a strategy to attract investors who could create well paid jobs in the city.
- Nominated property could become attractive for new businesses related to heritage protection and maintenance, hospitality, excursions and similar.

**Threats**
- Cultural heritage buildings are more expensive to renovate which might frighten off investors.
- High pressure on green and public spaces in the city to be used for development.

2.7.7. Potential for Urban Growth

Areas of nominated property have a capacity to take in additional developments. There is space for development within the urban structure of Naujamiestis, especially in post-industrial area (zone 1.3). There is little empty space for development in Žaliakalnis which puts pressure on green and public spaces.

City administration recognizes that development in Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis comes with a bigger development cost due to high concentration of heritage restrictions and limited building intensities in the area. To ensure development is profitable, the city provides financial incentives and is eager to discuss more liberal development regulations that comply with the Kauonas City General Plan in places where development cannot have a negative impact on protected properties.
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**Strengths**
- Areas of nominated property have a capacity to take in additional developments.
- There is a fair amount of land designated for urban regeneration in zone 1.3 of Naujamiestis.
- High quality living environment.
- City already has financial incentives to promote restoration and regeneration.
- There is enough space to integrate infrastructure for sustainable and micro-mobility into the spatial structure of the nominated territories.

**Weaknesses**
- Higher development cost related to heritage restrictions.
- High concentration of functions results in high concentration of traffic and therefore air and noise pollution.
- Practice in urban regeneration is still new and weak in Lithuania.
- There is not enough empty space for development in Žaliakalnis which puts pressure on green and public spaces.
- Weak public participation in planning processes.
- Cases emerge when planning policies are not respected or are misinterpreted.

**Opportunities**
- Urban liveability through adaptive reuse of cultural heritage properties.
- Liberated development regulations in post-industrial zone of Naujamiestis to compensate for strictly controlled intensities in other areas (progressive zoning regulations).
- Better community engagement in planning processes.
- Capacity building to ensure superior reconstruction, renovation, and restoration projects.
- Promotion of sustainable urban mobility.

**Threats**
- Loss of attributes of cultural heritage properties due to intensive or poorly controlled development in the area.
- Loss of green and public spaces due to high development pressure for empty space.
- Loss of quality living environment due to loss of attractive historical cultural and natural environment.
2.7.8. Population

Currently (Feb. 2020) 13,472 residents live in the nominated areas of Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis. Detailed data about the local population and diversity of housing stock is collected nationally every 10 years. Municipality collects data about the number of households and number of residents per household, but there is a lack of data illustrating the types of population: age groups, income levels, homeowners and tenants, occupation, etc.

High-quality living environment of Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis makes these areas a popular location for new residents. The area is suitable for long and short stay rentals especially targeting students and tourists. The number of academic institutions in the area determines a high concentration of young people.

Diverse rental prices reflect the variety of users and economic power and current socio-economic diversity among residents. But the real estate prices in Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis compared to the rest of the city are higher and are consistently increasing. The trend is that these areas would be less affordable to low- or mid-income homeowners in the future and that some level of gentrification is inevitable but mitigation measures should be foreseen. Socio-economic diversity of the population is important to ensure sustainability, equity and livability of the area.

Some level of gentrification in Naujamiestis and Žaliakalnis is inevitable and must be taken into consideration by the local government. Socio-economic diversity of the population is important to ensure sustainability, equity and livability of the area.

Lack of current data illustrating the types of population: age groups, income levels, homeowners vs. tenants, occupation, etc.

Strengths
- There is a high concentration of young people in the area.
- Diverse rental prices reflect the variety of users and economic power.
- Socio-economic diversity among residents.

Weaknesses
- Lack of current data illustrating the types of population: age groups, income levels, homeowners vs. tenants, occupation, etc.

Opportunities
- Attractive location for short and long stay rentals.
- New programs attract new urban amenities and people. It strengthens societal diversity.
- Collecting more data could help better understand the social structure of the communities and thus better reflect their needs.

Threats
- Gentrification: current residents cannot afford renovation and might be forced to move out, middle- and low-income families cannot afford rent/ownership of properties in the nominated territories.
- Decreasing socio-economic diversity due to gentrification might cause challenges to ensure the sustainable future of the area.

2.8. Information and Public Engagement in the Preparation Process

In the Nomination and the Management Plan preparation process, great emphasis was placed on public involvement. The events for public engagement were divided into two categories:
- (i) events related to the preparation of the Nomination, concerning the application process and procedures, the territory and buffer zone of the nominated property, its OUV and attributes, conservation and management, and (ii) events presenting the importance of the legacy of Kaunas Modernism and the interwar period in general.

(i) Presentation of the nomination process and procedures to local communities and stakeholders.

In the nomination preparation process (2017–2020) 2 main stages of public engagement could be distinguished, which are related to the presentation of the nominated territory, its values and the process of preparation of the Nomination itself: one in the beginning of the process and the other when the draft version of the Nomination File and the Management Plan has been prepared.

On the first phase, public engagement event (presentation – discussion) took place in June 2018. During the event, the main objectives of the World Heritage Convention were introduced together with description of the nominated property, the concept and structure of the Nomination file and the good management practice of the other properties already on the World Heritage List. The country’s heritage conservation practices, their advantages and disadvantages were discussed, and 3 possible variants of the proposed nominated territory were presented for further discussion.

In 2020, the planned public engagement activities on the processes of the preparation of the Management Plan to the target groups were adjusted for the onset of global pandemics. Still in July 2020, two events took place – the meeting with the community of architects and the community of residents. Both events were broadcasted live on “Modernism for the Future” FB account. Questions and comments also could be submitted remotely. In September 2020, the Nomination and the Management Plan was presented to the Lithuanian National Commission for Cultural Heritage and to the Rotary Club. In October – November 2020, the Nomination file and the planned management of the site have been presented and discussed during a series of urban planning workshops called “Naujamiestis Code”.

The presentations and discussions highlighted the main points of interest and concern of professionals, architects and residents, which were considered in the planning of further actions and their inclusion in the Action Plan.

(ii) The presentation of the of Kaunas modernism to local communities and international audiences.

Interest in the culture, history, architecture, and way of life of interwar Kaunas continues to grow. In 2013 the Kaunas Architectural Festival (KAF-e) was initiated by several architects with a focus on Kaunas Modernism, international travelling exhibition “Architecture of interwar Kaunas” (curated by Gintaras Balčytis, Jolita Kančienė, Asta Prikockienė) and a publication. The exhibition was later shown in Berlin, Brno, Tallinn, and Antalya International Architectural Biennial. The KAF-e successfully
In 2019 the 2nd International Modern Cities Forum “From Modern to Contemporary: Practices in Preserving Architectural Legacy of the 20th Century” took place in Kaunas on September 12–13. The forum discussed the practical aspects of the implementation of the Tel Aviv document, proposed measures for the preservation of the modernist heritage and innovative development strategies for urban areas where the heritage of the 20th century prevails. The forum was open to the public and specialists, during which the progress of the Nomination preparation was presented and discussed.

In 2017 the programme “Modernism for the Future” has started as a part of “Kaunas – European Capital of Culture 2022”. The programme’s international focus covers promotion of Kaunas Modernism through the web platform, international conferences and events. The team working on the Modernism for the Future programme also undertakes activities to bring the local community together through creative and educational processes. The programme is organizing meetings, discussions, tours, lectures, creative workshops, and practical activities (such as restoration and other workshops) to develop hospitality skills and share good practices. These activities will be continued in 2021 and 2022 based on the needs of residents, i.e., to address the challenges they face while living in or caring for the interwar modernist heritage. A series of articles dedicated to Kaunas Modernism and the Nomination are regularly published in the local press (Kauno diena, Kaunas pilnas kultūra/Kaunas Full of Culture).

It is planned in the approved Kaunas 2022 Contemporary Capital programme, that in 2023 and beyond, the public engagement activities would continue, and the newly established Modernism Interpretation Centre would work on interpretation and dissemination of Kaunas Modernism locally and internationally. Numerous public engagement activities are foreseen in the Action Plan as well.

The protection of the nominated area and its buffer zone, the development of these areas and activity undertaken within them, is ensured and regulated by national legislation and applicable national and local strategic and territorial planning documents, supplementing them with the recommendations of the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention; following the objectives of UNESCO World Heritage Convention, UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape and international good practice. The management of the nominated property overlaps with the competences of the ministries, institutions, property owners and interest groups, presented in the sections below.
The Executive Committee consist of:

- Representative of Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania (Vice Minister)
- Representative of Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Lithuania (Vice Minister)
- Representative of the Ministry of the Economy and Innovation of the Republic of Lithuania (Vice Minister)
- Kaunas City Mayor
- Chairperson of Lithuanian National Commission for Cultural Heritage
- Director of Department of Cultural Heritage under the Ministry of Culture
- Representative of the Advisory Board
- World Heritage National Focal Point of Culture
- Site Manager

The Executive Committee shall be approved by an order of the Minister of Culture.

The Executive Committee:

- Approves the Site Manager and site management strategies, Management Plan's revisions and allocation of funds.
- Periodically (annually) organizes meetings and evaluation on the management of the property and implementation of the Action Plan, performance of indicators.
- Provide decisions and policies on the main strategic issues concerning managing of the World Heritage property and implementation of the Management Plan.
- In case of necessity (e.g., possible threat for OUV) organizes urgent meetings.

The Executive Committee comprise representatives of the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Economy and Innovation, which are responsible for developing national policies in the fields of cultural heritage protection and dissemination, sustainable development and sustainable tourism that are of equal importance for the management of the nominated property. While the Mayor of Kaunas City Municipality represents Municipal Council and the city's community, Lithuanian National Commission for Cultural Heritage is the main expert and advisory body on the highest national level on cultural heritage policies and strategies and Cultural Heritage department is the main institution of cultural heritage administration under the Ministry of Culture. The World Heritage National Focal Point mediates the submission of reports on the legislative and administrative provisions that Lithuania as the State Party has adopted.

Representatives of other institutions and external experts could be invited to participate in the decision making if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Executive Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice Minister of Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td>The Ministry develop cultural heritage preservation policies. Areas of activities of the Vice Minister of Culture: policies of cultural heritage and memory institutions, digitisation and spread of cultural content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Minister of Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
<td>The Ministry develop policies concerning sustainable development, climate change, territory planning and architecture, construction and housing, etc., in order to ensure environmental quality. The Ministry's strategies to implement climate change policies to change consumption patterns, increase energy efficiency and promote the use of renewable energy sources and technologies, and to implement the state regulation of territorial planning, construction and housing development processes, use of buildings and their maintenance in accordance with the principles of sustainable development are important in managing World Heritage properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson of Lithuanian National Commission for Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>The Commission is an expert and advisor to the Seimas, the President and the Government on the issues of the state cultural heritage protection policy, its implementation, evaluation and improvement. The main mission of the Commission is to participate in the formation of the cultural heritage protection policy and strategy, to inform the Seimas, the President and the Government about the problems of cultural heritage protection, to draft laws and other legal acts related to cultural heritage protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of the Department of Cultural Heritage under the Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>The Department performs the functions of the protection of immovable cultural heritage and movable cultural properties. The Department develops programmes for the assessment, conservation and control of cultural heritage, and organizes implementation thereof. The Department is responsible for the presentation of cultural heritage to the society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Heritage National Focal Point</td>
<td>Chief Officer of the Cultural Heritage Policy Group at the Ministry of Culture is the respective National Focal Point of the UNESCO World Heritage Sites in Lithuania. The focal point mediates the submission of reports on the legislative and administrative provisions that Lithuania as the State Party has adopted and other actions which it has taken for the application of the World Heritage Convention, including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties. The preparation of the Periodic Reporting questionnaires is also the responsibility of the National Coordinator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2. Advisory Board

The Advisory Board is approved by an order of the Minister of Culture and shall comprise representatives of the main advisory bodies, listed below. It shall provide professional assistance and advice in the process of management for the Executive Committee as well as Site Management Unit.

The Advisory Board organizes annual meetings to discuss the annual monitoring reports and provide Executive Committee and Site Management Unit with the informed guidance for better decision making. In case of necessity, it can hold urgent meetings. The representative of the Advisory Board is a member of Executive Committee. The Site Management Unit can seek individual assistance to a member of the Advisory Board for the specific matters in the management process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory Board to the Executive Board and Site Management Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lithuanian National Commission for UNESCO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICOMOS LIUTHANIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lithuanian Real Estate Development Association (LNTPA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaunas Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Crafts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architects’ Chamber of Lithuania</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council of Community Organizations of Kaunas City Municipality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representatives of academia</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The stakeholders and partners of the Site Management Unit and Site Manager are:

- Department of Cultural Heritage Kaunas Division
- Kaunas IN
- Kaunas 2022
- Representatives of academia
- Professional groups
- NGO’s and Local Communities

The KCMA Cultural Heritage Division works together with the Department of Cultural Heritage Kaunas Division in the field of heritage conservation daily. The Department’s Kaunas division would remain one of the main partners in managing the World Heritage property. The partner for promotion of the city’s business development, tourism development and international marketing is KaunasIn [https://kaunasin.lt/]. The partner in the field of cultural heritage promotion and interpretation, community engagement is Kaunas – European Capital of Culture 2022 team [https://kaunas2022.eu/en/about-the-project/]. Current scientific partners are the representatives of academia, which also manage two important digital archives: AUTC (focusing largely on the interwar buildings; developed by the Centre of Architecture and Urbanism at the Kaunas University of Technology) and Archimede [dedicated to wooden architecture of Kaunas and developed by Vytautas Magnus University].

It is expected that management process on the local level will include other stakeholders such as professional groups of architects and urbanists which provide consultation and expertise, as well as NGO’s and local communities with which cooperation is already under way within Kaunas City Municipality’s “Initiatives for Kaunas” program. The program invites NGO’s and city communities to contribute to the quality of life of Kaunas by offering initiatives and submitting applications. Under this program, the city does not fund organizations, but projects that address relevant issues and are focused on clear results. One of the areas of the program – “Kaunas Full of Culture” [http://pilnas3.kaunas.lt/]. The focus in this area is on cultural opportunities to promote diversity of explanation through creative activities, community involvement and participation in the creative process, and the involvement of citizens in cultural life.

### Site Management Unit

Site Manager

The municipal official in Kaunas City Municipal Administration’s Cultural Heritage Division and authorized representative of the Site Management Unit is a cultural heritage specialist capable of participating in the processes of cultural heritage conservation, maintenance, monitoring, etc., and contributing to the dissemination, presentation and promotion of World Heritage property.

Could be cultural heritage specialist, historian, architect, planner or similar, and should have at least 3 years of experience in the field of cultural heritage conservation or management.

Site Management Unit

Kaunas City Municipal Administration’s Cultural Heritage Division

Currently the Division is the mediator between owners and managers of the objects of the cultural heritage and the Department. Carries out cultural heritage assessment, management, education, training and other heritage protection programs and organizes their implementation on the local level. Performs the monitoring of cultural heritage objects and submit the information to the Department. Notify the Department of the decision taken by the municipality on state-protected objects and sites. Initiate and organise the declaration of cultural heritage objects municipal-protected and submit data thereon to the Register of Cultural Heritage. Provides heritage conservation and planning requirements for municipality protected objects and sites; draw up protocols of administrative offenses. Submit to other divisions of the municipality, undertakings, agencies, organisations and other legal and natural persons proposals and methodical and professional assistance on the issues of explanation, protection, dissemination of knowledge and rehabilitation of cultural heritage. Co-operate with the heritage protection subdivisions of other municipalities and organise international co-operation related to the field.

### Partners and stakeholders

**Department of Cultural Heritage Kaunas Division**

- Issue protection regulations for cultural heritage objects of national and regional significance;
- set the requirements for cultural heritage protection and planning; present conclusions whether the design proposals for objects and sites of cultural heritage meet heritage protection requirements;
- examine the cases of administrative offences within its remit; determine the method of restoration of damaged immovable cultural property and the amount of damage;
- examine complaints and inquiries.

**Kaunas IN**

- The main partner for promotion of the city’s business development, tourism development and international marketing.
- Cooperate with representatives of real estate developers and managers. 

**Kaunas – European Capital of Culture 2022 (Kaunas 2022)**

- The main partner in the field of cultural heritage promotion and interpretation, community engagement. Main goals of the project are: strengthening of commonality; strengthening the competitiveness and professional qualification of employees in the organizations of the cultural sector; and their social responsibility; promoting art, science, and design; innovation; building the identity of the city and district.

**Representatives of academia**

- Partners in study and research fields are: Architecture and Urbanism Research Centre at the Kaunas University of Technology (KTU); VGTU University, Vytautas Magnus University, local colleges and other representatives of academia.

**Professional groups**

- The Architects’ Chamber of Lithuania Kaunas division is a public sector entity. The objective of the Chamber’s activities is to ensure the transparency and quality of architectural activities, to oversee architect certification, recognition of qualifications, professional qualification development and compliance with professional ethics standards, to carry out monitoring of professional activities, to represent architects in dealings with state and self-governance institutions and other legal and natural persons at both the national and international level, to act as an expert in courts and other institutions on issues concerning the professional activities of architects, to satisfy and defend public interest related to architecture, and to resolve other related issues.

**LAU Kaunas**

- The Kaunas branch of the Lithuanian Union of Architects is a creative association uniting about 200 of the most active architects in the region. The main goals of the activity at present are to develop and nurture architectural culture, to promote and defend free creation, dissemination of professional architecture, to spread it in Lithuania and abroad. Implementing this mission, the association organizes architectural events, exhibitions, discussions, creative workshops, competitions, tries to actively cooperate with Lithuanian public authorities in the fields of development, urban planning, architectural development, cultural heritage and protection of natural environment, participate in architectural policy, publicize its position, strengthen the community of architects and their professional reputation.

**Other stakeholders, NGO’s and local communities**

- Kaunas City Municipal Budget Office “Kaunas Artists’ House”
- Public Institution “Grąžinkime Kauną”
- Kaunas Jewish Community
- Public Institution “Travel in Lithuania”
- Other NGO’s and local communities.

* Kaunas 2022 Community and Modernism Programs brings together active residents and leaders of informal local communities (and keeps their contacts database), which help to spread the information, and at the same time invite others to participate in the activities. In the case of the Community program, these are a kind of community mediators, provocateurs, and in the case of Modernism program, these are the champions of the houses’ communities, or the active residents. In both cases, these are the persons through which the message can be spread more widely and spread to further contacts.
4. Action Plan

The preparation of the Nomination file, deeper research and analysis of the area as well as information gathered during consultation process and SWOT analysis, helped to understand that existing legal framework of cultural heritage conservation, mostly based on restrictions and prohibitions, is not easily understood by the general public. Local monitoring and consultation revealed that owners are not always able to properly maintain and restore their properties due to lack of knowledge and lack of financial resources, and there are cases where laws are manipulated for the personal benefit. To ease the financial burden and to encourage protection, Kaunas City Municipal Administration has a possibility to co-finance the maintenance and repair works of historic buildings through dedicated program, but the appropriate development plan for the area as urban territory is missing as well as general guidance. Awareness raising, and public engagement activities are also in place and Kaunas has strong and creative communities that identify themselves with the place. Still better management of heritage resources and highlighting of opportunities to integrate heritage among different cultural and economic sectors as well as more proactive and community-based approaches is still needed.

In order to highlight core values of the nominated property, ensure the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), and to pursue the sustainable development priority areas are designated following the integrated development policies (OUV), and to pursue the sustainable development priority areas. The actions below are colour coded into four categories based on HUL tools to better analyse and understand the type of measures that are needed and planned. Each area comprises certain objectives and actions (measures), planned to achieve them. For the implementation of actions, the responsible institutions and stakeholders are identified, and indicators are set to help to better evaluate the progress. Some actions will be short term and easier to achieve such as developing the engagement or consultation programs, while other actions, such as those that require the establishment of new partnerships or preparation of planning documents, are time consuming and will take longer to achieve.

The Historic Urban Landscape approach for conservation and development of Modernist Kaunas (case studies and best practice in its implementation) is seen beneficial for the nominated property which is seen as evolving and living historic city centre. While the Approach will not replace existing legal framework of conservation and planning, it is understood as the additional measure to better integrate policies and practices of conservation of the built environment into the wider goals of urban development, whilst respecting the OUV.

The HUL Toolkit for Kaunas

The proposed actions (measures) are formed based on the outcome of research and analyses performed while preparing the nomination file, as well as information gathered during consultation process and SWOT analysis. The actions below are colour coded into four categories based on HUL tools to better analyse and understand the type of measures that are needed and planned.

Most of the measures are already in place but either they need to be supported and projected to the future or are not working properly and need to be revised, supplemented, or even redesigned to perform better.

Knowledge and planning tools are to help to better evaluate and protect the integrity and authenticity of the attributes of the property in order to support sustainability and continuity in planning and design. In the Action Plan they are linked with measures for improved inventorization, assessment and monitoring of cultural heritage sites and properties, and further development of open data and information on existing web platforms and digital data bases.

Regulatory systems. There is a complex heritage protection system that is seen as complicated, hard to understand and need to be revised and adapted to uniform up to date standards. Measures for better regulation of heritage conservation and sustainable development in the area, as well as measures for adaptation of historic buildings and sites and energy efficiency improvement are planned.

Community engagement tools. There are plenty of community engagement activities planned for 2021-2022 period as a particularly important part of Kaunas European Capital of Culture 2022 project, but it is necessary to have a strategy in place for further development and support of the activities. There is still a lack of community engagement in planning processes that must be strengthened, and the stakeholders better identified. Other community engagement tools are linked to awareness raising and capacity building.

Financial tools are in place and could be linked to already successful city’s programs: The Heritage preservation program, the “Initiatives for Kaunas” program, also programs encouraging sustainable mobility and tourism. It is important to ensure the continuity and better development of these programs in the future.
4.1. Cultural Heritage Conservation

The nominated property comprises cultural heritage sites and buildings listed on the National Register of Cultural Heritage and protected by national and local cultural heritage legal frameworks.

The cultural heritage inventory and conservation planning documentation for cultural heritage sites have been prepared, but it should be revised and updated for better compatibility with OUV and attributes and to meet changes in legal framework.

The condition of the urban structure network is good and is both retained and protected. The urban morphology and structure are easily recognizable and protected. Although the area has preserved its overall urban character, volumetric-spatial structure, and functions, there are sporadic examples of incompatible buildings. Violations of area planning regulations have also been observed. The cultural heritage conservation planning documentation should be revised to meet changes in legal framework, in order to better protect the OUV comprising attributes.

The overall condition of buildings within the nominated property is satisfactory. The most frequently observed damage is the result of façade deterioration due to atmospheric effects and general wear, improper repair, or reconstruction (e.g., installation of incompatible additions), or improper energy efficiency improvement work (façade and attic insulation). Usually, it is due to lack of financing (mostly for private houses) and lack of knowledge.

Wooden buildings are usually of worse condition and are thus unattractive for restoration and renovation due to their higher renovation cost, higher insurance burdens, and difficulties securing loans to acquire such buildings. Financial incentives are necessary as well as awareness raising and capacity building regarding how to restore and increase the appeal of wooden buildings.

### Cultural heritage conservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Actions (measures)</th>
<th>Responsible institution and stakeholders</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved heritage inventory</td>
<td>To revise and update inventory documentation of cultural heritage sites, listed on National Cultural Heritage Register those comprise the nominated property, for better compatibility with OUV and attributes.</td>
<td>Cultural heritage Department at the Ministry of Culture and Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA</td>
<td>Number of sites those records updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved condition monitoring</td>
<td>Building a GIS heritage condition monitoring database</td>
<td>Cultural heritage Department at the Ministry of Culture and Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA</td>
<td>Building of the database and collecting relevant data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved conservation of historic sites and buildings</td>
<td>Revise cultural heritage conservation planning documentation of the protected sites that comprise the nominated property.</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture, Cultural heritage Department at the Ministry of Culture and Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA</td>
<td>Number of revised documents or in process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage preservation programme of Kaunas City Municipality</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA, owners of objects</td>
<td>Number of repaired and restored buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation and promotion of Kaunas Wooden Architecture</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA, owners of objects, Representatives of Academia (such as KTU, VU, VMU)</td>
<td>Number of repaired and restored buildings. Number of workshops and lectures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of the cultural heritage during reconstruction and conversion in the former and current industrial, infrastructure areas</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA, owners of objects, Representatives of Academia</td>
<td>Number of repaired and restored buildings. Number of workshops and lectures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of preservation and awareness raising programmes to encourage community demand</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA</td>
<td>Gather feedback from community and groups in receipt of support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guidance for the care, maintenance, and adaptation of cultural heritage buildings</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA, Stakeholders: Cultural heritage Department at the Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Release of the guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to share common vision and to achieve the balance between development, heritage conservation and climate resilience, the urban development plan (or programme) for Naujamiestis area should be prepared. Strong attention in the planning process must be paid to public participation (current practices in engagement processes are very bureaucratic, stakeholders are barely identified, their influence is unclear).

Adaptive reuse. City administration prioritizes liveability through adaptive reuse of cultural heritage. While modernist architecture is valued in terms of cultural significance, building owners and real estate developers face challenges in adapting them to contemporary needs and ensuring payback of the investments: expensive maintenance and repair of these buildings, difficulties to meet parking requirements on small plots, and achieving contemporary energy efficiency standards, fire safety requirements, etc.

There are cases of average or low-quality maintenance and construction where cheap materials are used, or architects fail to achieve overall development quality and spatial integrity. Capacity building regarding best practices for developers, architects and heritage specialists is needed to ensure superior reconstruction, renovation, and restoration projects.

The public consultation process revealed a lack of clarification on values that make the OUV and guidance on their use in the planning process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managing change</th>
<th>Actions (measures)</th>
<th>Responsible institution and stakeholders</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of the OUV in planning, quality design and new development</td>
<td>Exploring the values that make the OUV and producing guidance on their use in the planning process</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA, Cultural Heritage Department under the Ministry of Culture, Representatives of Academia (KTU, VU, VMU)</td>
<td>Publish the attributes of the WHS and reaffirm their status in the planning process by means of policy and guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Capacity building regarding best practices for developers, architects and heritage specialists, civil servants to ensure high quality projects' designs</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA, LAU Kaunas branch, KAF e. Representatives of Academia, other</td>
<td>Number of lectures, Workshops, seminars, conferences, training programmes to targeted audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development of historic urban landscape</td>
<td>To prepare a draft urban development plan (or programme) for Naujamiestis area, to complement heritage conservation planning documents, with a special focus on OUV and quality of public spaces and architecture</td>
<td>KCMA Division of City planning and Architecture, and Cultural heritage division, Community, Professional groups, Academia</td>
<td>Prepared and approved draft plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement in planning processes</td>
<td>KCMA Division of City planning and Architecture, LAU Kaunas</td>
<td>Number of workshops organized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guidance for maintenance and protection of slope areas</td>
<td>KCMA Division of Environmental protection</td>
<td>Release of the guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a regulatory mechanism on parking space rates for newly constructed, restored or reconstructed buildings to help reduce the number of parking spaces in new developments in selected city areas.</td>
<td>KCMA</td>
<td>Approved policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation of historic buildings and sites, energy efficiency improvement</td>
<td>Develop guidance for historic buildings' and sites' adaptation to contemporary needs: accessibility, fire safety, change of use</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA, Cultural Heritage Department under the Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>Release of the guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop energy efficiency improvement guidance with the aim of increasing energy efficiency in historic buildings.</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA, Cultural Heritage Department under the Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>Release of the guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. Education and Awareness Raising

There is a strong focus on interwar period and modernist architecture as the city is building its cultural identity around it. The main document for awareness raising and community engagement policies is the Kaunas City Cultural Strategy up to 2022, approved by Kaunas City Municipal Council, February 7, 2017, by decision No. T-2, based on Strategic Development Plan for the City of Kaunas up to 2022.

Cultural Heritage Division – Site Management Unit – would be responsible for sharing information and providing consultation on Kaunas as the WHS, its OUV and values, attributes, activities, good practices, etc. The information also would be available via modernism kaunas.lt supported by links to other relevant platforms.

Heritage objects and territories are particularly important to the local community. “Modernism for the future” and other programmes of Kaunas European Capital of Culture 2022 project aims to improve emotional connection with modernist heritage. “Modernism for the future” and other programmes are planned for 2021 and 2022. After 2022, the activities are expected to be continued under the programme “Initiatives for Kaunas”, funded by Kaunas City Municipal Administration. Also, co-funding from international and national institutions and initiatives is expected. In order to achieve the best results, the strategy and programme for interpretation and communication of Kaunas as WHS, aligned with the Kaunas City Cultural Strategy up to 2027, would be in need to develop.

Information about interwar modernist architecture and planning is constantly collected and presented on digital archives and interactive maps by the KTU Architecture and Urbanism Research Centre (http://tarpukas.au.lt/lit/azemelapis). Information about interwar wooden architecture is collected on digital archive: www.archimede.lt. List of interwar buildings, accompanied by stories, is collected on the website of Kaunas 2022 platform: www.modernizmasateiciai.lt. The further development of the current web platforms is expected.

4.4. Accessibility and Sustainable Tourism

The visibility, accessibility, and distribution of the interwar legacy is convenient given its concentration in the city centre – in Naušiškis and the neighbouring residential district of Žaliakalnis. Many landmark cultural heritage objects are accessible to visitors.

Kaunas city economy does not rely on tourism sector. Kaunas is visited annually by approximately 350,000 tourists and city guests; it comprises up to 1,5% of city’s GDP annually. According to the Lithuanian Department of Statistics in 2019, the average room occupancy rate was 71.5%. The highest occupancy rate in 2019 was in May (81.3%), June (80.2%) and August (80.9%), and the lowest occupancy was recorded in January (57.2%). The fee is collected from the hotels, the so-called ‘pillow fee’, which is paid by accommodation establishments for each night spent. The funds raised are transferred to further promotion and improvement of the tourism sector by measures approved by...

**Kaunas Literature Week (International Literature Festival) organized by Vytautas Magnus University, for the dissemination of literature.**
Performing arts festival ConTempo, where in addition to foreign performers, Kaunas and Lithuanian theatrical organizations, such as the National Kaunas Drama Theater, Kaunas City Chamber Theater, present their productions.

Contemporary electronic music festival Optimismo, which is directly inspired by Kaunas modernism, and the events of the festival are organized in the locations of modernist heritage, thus promoting its legacy.

---

### Education and Awareness raising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Actions (measures)</th>
<th>Responsible institution and stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation platform established</td>
<td>Information and consultation</td>
<td>Establish a consultation platform</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy established and a program of events to reach a diverse audience developed</td>
<td>Interpretation and engagement</td>
<td>Establish strategy for interpretation and communication of Kaunas as WHS and develop a program of themed events and engagement activities*</td>
<td>KCMA, KKKS2022, Kaunashin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of heritage properties and museums operating heritage awareness programmes for children and youth</td>
<td>Establish heritage education programmes</td>
<td>Cultural division and Heritage Division of KCMA, Kaunas City Museum, “Kaunas Artists’ House”, NGO’s and communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of projects implemented related to Kaunas as WHS.</td>
<td>Further development of “Initiatives for Kaunas” program to promote creative inclusion of NGO’s and local communities</td>
<td>KCMA, NGO’s and communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of existing databases, making them bi-lingual (Lithuanian and English)</td>
<td>Knowledge on open databases</td>
<td>Further development of information on existing web platforms to be available for broader audience</td>
<td>Representatives of Academia (KTU, VU, VMU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building of the database and collecting relevant data</td>
<td>Building a database on construction technologies of the period</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Division of KCMA, NGO’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* To ensure the continuity of the Kaunas 2022 program and activities such as the Kaunas Modernism Movement, Design Event, Fluxus and City-telling Festivals, Happiness Days and other initiatives designed to bring together local cultural actors to collaborate and develop joint city-wide initiatives. At present they tend to involve from 20 to 150 participant organizations from cultural, social and business sectors.

** Kaunas Literature Week (International Literature Festival) organized by Vytautas Magnus University, for the dissemination of literature.
The Kaunas City Municipality has implemented the Kaunas City Competitiveness and Attractiveness Development Programme. Municipally is investing into city marketing and infrastructure improvement to reduce tourism seasonality and to increase the share of tourism in GDP.

One of the Kaunas City Cultural Strategy up to 2027 objectives is to promote a cultural tourism model, linked to local heritage and community, and interaction with cultural ecosystems through actions outlined in the Strategy and implemented through city’s strategic planning policies.

Excursions are regularly organized to explore the city’s interwar cultural heritage. Thematic heritage tours are very well attended by residents and community members. A project entitled “MODERNIST KAUNAS: ARCHITECTURE OF OPTIMISM, 1919–1939” to foster active local cultural tourism and to increase the number of visitors have been successful.

In 2019 Kaunas City Municipality approved the Plan for Sustainable Urban Mobility that prioritize public transport, cycling, walking and environmentally friendly transport for visitors and locals.

Sustainable tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Actions [measures]</th>
<th>Responsible institution and stakeholders</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation &amp; engagement</td>
<td>Update current Kaunas City Competitiveness and Attractiveness Development programme</td>
<td>KCMA</td>
<td>Updated programme, planned measures related to Kaunas as WHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop new products focusing on OUV and being a WH property</td>
<td>KCMA, KaunasIn</td>
<td>Number of products developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain the value of WH to tourism industry and business community</td>
<td>KaunasIn</td>
<td>Number of representatives of tourism industry in meetings and follow up actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand and promote best practices of sustainable tourism in other WHs</td>
<td>KaunasIn, NGO ‘Travel in Lithuania’</td>
<td>Activities in engagement with world heritage community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable mobility</td>
<td>Update equipment of the education trails by using available natural and cultural tourism resources</td>
<td>Environmental Division, Urban Management Division of KCMA and KaunasIn</td>
<td>Developed tour routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage walking and cycling within the WHS through actions outlined in the approved Sustainable mobility plan</td>
<td>Transport and Traffic planning, Urban Development and Architecture, Environmental divisions</td>
<td>Publish actions in place to achieve this and monitor trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of NGOs and local communities</td>
<td>Tours for People with Disabilities</td>
<td>Kaunas Artists House, Cultural Heritage division of KCMA</td>
<td>Number of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To foster active local cultural tourism</td>
<td>KKSS2022, Stakeholders NGO’s, local communities</td>
<td>Number of activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustainable tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Actions [measures]</th>
<th>Responsible institution and stakeholders</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation &amp; engagement</td>
<td>Update current Kaunas City Competitiveness and Attractiveness Development programme</td>
<td>KCMA</td>
<td>Updated programme, planned measures related to Kaunas as WHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop new products focusing on OUV and being a WH property</td>
<td>KCMA, KaunasIn</td>
<td>Number of products developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain the value of WH to tourism industry and business community</td>
<td>KaunasIn</td>
<td>Number of representatives of tourism industry in meetings and follow up actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand and promote best practices of sustainable tourism in other WHs</td>
<td>KaunasIn, NGO ‘Travel in Lithuania’</td>
<td>Activities in engagement with world heritage community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable mobility</td>
<td>Update equipment of the education trails by using available natural and cultural tourism resources</td>
<td>Environmental Division, Urban Management Division of KCMA and KaunasIn</td>
<td>Developed tour routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage walking and cycling within the WHS through actions outlined in the approved Sustainable mobility plan</td>
<td>Transport and Traffic planning, Urban Development and Architecture, Environmental divisions</td>
<td>Publish actions in place to achieve this and monitor trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of NGOs and local communities</td>
<td>Tours for People with Disabilities</td>
<td>Kaunas Artists House, Cultural Heritage division of KCMA</td>
<td>Number of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To foster active local cultural tourism</td>
<td>KKSS2022, Stakeholders NGO’s, local communities</td>
<td>Number of activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the nominated area flooding risks poses a threat to a limited area – the South-Western part – of the nominated property. Though most of the buildings have insurance in place, and all the public buildings have emergency management systems and must meet higher fire safety requirements, the greater focus on protection of cultural heritage properties in the emergency situations is needed.

COVID–19. Since March 16, 2020, with the introduction of quarantine in Lithuania, the daily lives of both the country’s residents and businesses have changed. Up to date statistics, information and recommendations concerning coronavirus is available on Kaunas City Municipality’s website. KaunasIn also provides systematically and constantly updated information on coronavirus prevention, also links to the consultations for businesses. Articles and explanations of legal acts concerning current situation are presented, conferences are held online, where experts from different fields answer arising questions and help to solve the challenges that businesses face.

The biggest changes have been experienced with the tourism industry. This year the activities responded very quickly to the dramatic change in the situation, directing communication to Lithuanian and nearby markets (such as Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Finland) and paying great attention to digital routes, inviting to travel around Kaunas and get to know individually Kaunas residents themselves were encouraged to become tourists in their city: to experience its tastes, new discoveries and entertainments. Much attention has been paid to digital advertising in web platforms [such as Instagram, Spotify, Facebook] that has been successful.

Climate change. It is understood that changing climatic and air quality conditions affect terrain, landscape elements and building fabric [for example, speeding up slopes erosion, establishment of invasive species, plant diseases, the quicker decay of building materials]. Environmental protection measures that tackle air quality, soil and greenery quality, waste management and overall environment condition monitoring are set in city’s Environmental Protection Program’s Financing Plan [annually revised and approved by Kaunas City Council].

Stakeled climate change mitigation measures are creating pressure for the adaptation of historic buildings to reduce carbon emissions and meet current energy efficiency requirements. Actions concerning energy efficiency of historic buildings are already included in the objective “Adaptation of historic buildings and sites, energy efficiency improvement” (see section 4.2. Managing change).

4.5. Emergency and Risk Management

UNESCO 2019 Operational Guidelines recommend that risk assessment and response is an important tool in site management and should be included into Management Plan.

Cultural heritage is defined as one of the main elements of national security in the Law on the Fundamentals of National Security of the Republic of Lithuania and the State shall develop measures to ensure the protection of the cultural heritage in the event of emergencies (acts of terrorism, fires, floods, accidents, etc.)

In 2007, the Instruction on The Participation of The Armed Forces in The Protection of Cultural Heritage Property in The Event of Armed Conflict and Other Extreme Situations have been approved by the order No. 5-20. The Order of National Defence of the Republic of Lithuania. The Instruction regulates actions in preserving or rescuing cultural heritage properties in the event of an armed conflict or other emergency in the territory of the Republic of Lithuania.

4.5.1. Physical risk – fire and flood risk, pandemics, terrorism, climate change, development pressure

General risk responses for the city and nominated property are provided by the fire and police services, and the Kaunas City Municipality’s Emergency Operations Centre (this includes pandemics, terrorism-related risk and other risks’ management described in Emergency Management Plan).

Emergency management. In 2012, Kaunas City Municipality’s Emergency Management Plan has been approved by the Order No. A-8/12 of the Director of KCMA last updated in 2017 by the Order No. A-7/20. The Plan is there to assist the Director and the Municipal Emergency Operations Centre in organizing and coordinating the elimination of imminent or existing emergencies and the elimination of their consequences. The Emergency Management Plan is supplemented by the Kaunas City Municipality’s Emergency Response Plan and Engagement of NGOs and local communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Actions [measures]</th>
<th>Responsible institution and stakeholders</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation &amp; engagement</td>
<td>Update current Kaunas City Competitiveness and Attractiveness Development programme</td>
<td>KCMA</td>
<td>Updated programme, planned measures related to Kaunas as WHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop new products focusing on OUV and being a WH property</td>
<td>KCMA, KaunasIn</td>
<td>Number of products developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain the value of WH to tourism industry and business community</td>
<td>KaunasIn</td>
<td>Number of representatives of tourism industry in meetings and follow up actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand and promote best practices of sustainable tourism in other WHs</td>
<td>KaunasIn, NGO ‘Travel in Lithuania’</td>
<td>Activities in engagement with world heritage community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable mobility</td>
<td>Update equipment of the education trails by using available natural and cultural tourism resources</td>
<td>Environmental Division, Urban Management Division of KCMA and KaunasIn</td>
<td>Developed tour routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage walking and cycling within the WHS through actions outlined in the approved Sustainable mobility plan</td>
<td>Transport and Traffic planning, Urban Development and Architecture, Environmental divisions</td>
<td>Publish actions in place to achieve this and monitor trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of NGOs and local communities</td>
<td>Tours for People with Disabilities</td>
<td>Kaunas Artists House, Cultural Heritage division of KCMA</td>
<td>Number of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To foster active local cultural tourism</td>
<td>KKSS2022, Stakeholders NGO’s, local communities</td>
<td>Number of activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development pressure. Development which undermines the Outstanding Universal Value and pose a threat to attributes is also a great risk. The risk is managed through the implementation of the existing planning and heritage conservation policies. The targeted measures such as release of guidelines and awareness raising are necessary and are already included in section 4.2. Managing change. Development pressure and the effectiveness of the protective measures are subject to monitoring.

4.5.2. Intellectual risk – lack of awareness/understanding

Though awareness raising activities are in place and community is more and more interested and engaged of interwar culture and history, the risk associated with lack of awareness and understanding, especially in preparation of planning and architectural projects, as well as practical issues, such as maintenance of modernist buildings, is still evident. It is important to implement measures such as release of good practice guidelines, provide with professional consultation and other targeted actions set in sections 4.2 and 4.3. It is also important to facilitate online access to the Nomination File and Management Plan, to clearly explain and present the information in order to maintain the narrative of OUV and the nominated property’s management.

### Emergency and Risk Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Actions (measures)</th>
<th>Responsible institution and stakeholders</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online access to WHS documentation</td>
<td>Provide online access to the Management Plan and Nomination file on the official Kaunas WHS web platform</td>
<td>KCMA Cultural heritage division</td>
<td>Creating and maintenance of the official WHS database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better cultural heritage emergency management</td>
<td>To update existing Emergency Management Plan giving greater importance to heritage protection</td>
<td>KCMA</td>
<td>The updated Emergency Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To prepare a list of landmark modernist buildings that should be put on the List of Cultural Heritage properties of Exceptional Cultural Value – Cultural Heritage Buildings</td>
<td>KCMA Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>The list buildings prepared and attached to risk Management Plans on the local and national levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Implementation of the Management Plan

The Management Plan is seen as an integral part of territorial and spatial planning of the city of Kaunas. The Management Plan will be approved by the Kaunas City Municipal Council as a strategic planning document (sectoral strategy). The Management Plan will be linked to the Kaunas City Strategic Development Plan (SDP), the Strategic Action Plan (SAP), as well as the Annual Activities Plans (AAP). Actions (measures) set out in the Action Plan will be incorporated in these strategic planning documents so funding for implementation of the measures could be well planned and secured (see fig. 11).

To better integrate within local planning system, the preparation of the Management Plan followed the Law on Strategic Management of The Republic of Lithuania [2020, No. XIII-3066] and Description of Kaunas City Municipality’s Strategic Planning Documents Preparation and Monitoring Implementation Procedures (2016, T-438), where:

- **SDP** – Strategic Development Plan (hereinafter – SDP) – a planning document prepared for a period of at least 7 years and approved by the Municipal Council. SDP, considering the state long-term planning documents and the conclusions of the environmental analysis, envisages the vision of urban development, long-term strategic goals, objectives, intended results, their evaluation criteria and indicators.

The actions (measures) set out in the Action Plan will be financed by national budget, municipal budget and other legally received funds, such as Lithuanian Council for Culture grants, and by the private sector. The implementation of actions may be financed as part of an integrated, sustainable urban development strategy addressing the economic, environmental, climate, demographic, health and social problems of urban areas with European Union funds.

The Site Management Unit will be responsible for implementation of the Management Plan and coordination of the actions foreseen in the Action Plan on the daily basis.

---

**Kaunas City Strategic Development Plan** (revised every 7 y.)

**WHS Management Plan** (revised every 7 y.)

**WHS Action Plan** (revised every 3 y.)

**Kaunas City Annual Activities Plans**

**Vision**

**Priority areas**

**Aims, objectives**

**Management system**

**Programs**

**Goals, objectives, criteria, indicators**

**Measures, funds**

**Measures, criteria, indicators**

**Activities, tasks**

**Monitoring**

11. Integration of the Management Plan with the existing strategic planning system
6. Monitoring

Monitoring includes both monitoring the condition of the nominated property (State of Conservation) and monitoring the implementation of the Management Plan (Actions and indicators).

To ensure the availability of relevant data and statistics, the Site Management Unit collects systematic data, such as state of cultural heritage properties, landscape elements, etc., related to the status of the nominated property and the indicators set out in the Action Plan. The Site Management Unit is also responsible for gathering information and monitoring data from other institutions, commissioning analysis and research, initiating heritage impact assessments, identifying weaknesses in site management.

The Site Management Unit prepares annual monitoring reports and is responsible for their submission to the Executive Committee and Advisory Board. Site Manager will hold a meeting with the Advisory Board and then Executive Committee on the progress of the Management Plan implementation process. During these meetings, the progress of achieving the objectives and specific goals of the Management Plan will be assessed according to the indicators provided in the Action Plan and the strategic issues will be discussed. Representatives of other institutions or other stakeholders could be invited to participate in the meetings if needed.

The results of the annual monitoring are integrated into the 6-year periodic monitoring report. Based on annual and periodic monitoring findings the Management Plan is revised every 7 years and the Action Plan is revised every 3 years (see section 5).

6.1. State of Conservation Monitoring

UNESCO monitors the State of Conservation of each World Heritage Site through its Periodic Reporting process every six years. These reports gather information to identify possible changes to the condition of a Site.

Monitoring is currently being conducted within the nominated property and its buffer zone in accordance with the Cultural Heritage conservation legal framework. In addition to the regular monitoring, the special attention will be paid to the monitoring of selected indicators, presented in the Nomination file.

Site monitoring is coordinated by the Ministry of Culture. Monitoring of all sites within the nominated area, is currently being conducted every five years by the Cultural Heritage Department’s Kaunas Division, except Kaukas and Perkūnas Districts (of Žaliakalnis the 1st protected site) that is monitored by the KCMA Cultural Heritage Division. In accordance with local legislation, monitoring of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List would be performed on an annual basis.

Monitoring of cultural heritage properties, listed on the Cultural Heritage Registry, are inspected by the DCH Kaunas Division and the KCMA Cultural Heritage Division at least once every five years, recording its condition, compiling relevant information, and making it available to territorial divisions of the Department of Cultural Heritage. Monitoring reports are public documents and are available at http://www.kaunas.lt/kultura-ir-turizmas/kulturos-paveldas.

6.2. Management Plan Monitoring

The Site Management Unit is responsible for monitoring the property and to ensure the implementation of the Management Plan. It will hold a meeting with the Executive Committee once a year on the progress of the plan implementation process. During the meetings, the implementation of indicators provided in the Action Plan of the Management Plan, will be used to assess progress towards the objectives of the Plan, assess changes and trends, and discuss related strategic issues.