

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001694/26
to the Commission
Pina Picerno (S&D)
(24 April 2026)**

Subject: Construction of a repatriation centre (CPR) in Castel Volturno

The Italian Government has recently allocated EUR 41 million for the construction of a repatriation centre (CPR) in Castel Volturno (Campania), within the La Piana Wetland Park. This area comprises 63 hectares designated as a public leisure park, intended for nature-related and recreational use.

Castel Volturno is also a municipality that is already suffering from serious structural fragility: difficulties in collecting local taxes, a lack of essential services, and a socioeconomic situation that leaves the community vulnerable.

The decision to allocate this sum to the construction of a CPR in this context runs counter to the actual needs of the region, which requires investment in infrastructure, security and social cohesion.

Can the Commission therefore say:

1. Does it consider that allocating this sum to the construction of a CPR in an area with severe shortages of essential services is consistent with the territorial cohesion objectives enshrined in Articles 174 to 176 TFEU and with the principle of partnership referred to in Article 8 of Regulation (EU) 2021/1060?
2. Does it intend to verify that the construction of the CPR has been preceded by an environmental impact assessment (EIA) in accordance with Article 6 of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC), given that the chosen site is classified as a Site of Community Importance (SCI) or a Special Protection Area (SPA) within the Natura 2000 network?

Submitted: 24.4.2026

**Answer given by Executive Vice-President Fitto on behalf of the European Commission
(11 June 2026)**

1. The facility in question does not receive EU funding. It fully falls under the responsibility of the Member State in terms of its location, management and operation. Because of this, the principle of partnership referred to in Article 8 of Regulation (EU) 2021/1060 ⁽¹⁾, which provides for the close involvement of relevant partners in the implementation of the programmes, does not apply in this case.

2. Any plan or project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a Natura 2000 site but likely to have a significant effect thereon shall be subject to appropriate assessment of its implications, in line with Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive ⁽²⁾. Where a plan or project has been negatively assessed but must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including of social or economic nature, Article 6(4) requires Member States to take all necessary compensatory measures to ensure the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It must inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted, enabling the Commission to assess whether the coherence of the Natura 2000 network will be maintained in the long term. In case a priority habitat type or priority species is affected, the Member State has to request an opinion from the Commission.

⁽¹⁾ <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A02021R1060-20251025>.

⁽²⁾ <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A01992L0043-20250714>.