

EXPERT GROUP ON THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT

TOWARDS MORE SUSTAINABLE URBAN LAND USE :

ADVICE TO THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION FOR POLICY AND ACTION

JANUARY 2001

PREFACE

The Working Group on Sustainable Land Use, steered by the Expert Group on the Urban Environment, was given the task of assessing whether the European Commission, through a range of activities, is helping or hindering the achievement of sustainable land use in urban areas, which especially requires reducing urban sprawl, the environmentally-sound re-use of previously-developed land and buildings and making more effective use of infrastructure.

We recognise that the main responsibility and competence for land use and urban policy rests with Member States, regional and local authorities, but many EU-level activities can influence the effectiveness of these policies. The Working Group has had a unique opportunity to review a wide range of instruments and to consider how they could be more effective in achieving a more sustainable pattern of land use. In our view, the recommendations we have made will help to make the Commission's activities more effective in helping national, regional and local authorities to secure the sustainable use of urban land.

Michael Bach Chair of the Working Group on Sustainable Land Use
Colin Fudge Chair of the Expert Group on the Urban Environment

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper has been prepared by the Expert Group's Working Group on Sustainable Land Use, which was established in January 2000 under the chairmanship of Michael Bach of the UK's Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions. The Group met in London in February and March, in Brussels in June and September, and in Paris in November.

The members of the group - drawn from different levels of government and other bodies active in the field and from a range of countries – were:

Lluís Boada I Domenech (City of Barcelona, Spain)
Axel Thrige Laursen & Kirsten Vintersborg (Miljø-og Energiministeriet, Denmark)
Brigitte Helff (Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau- und Wohnungswesen, Germany)
Maria José Festas (Direcção Geral do Ordenamento do Território e do Desenvolvimento Urbano, Portugal)
Mikko Jokinen (Environmental Department, City of Turku, Finland)
Sven Palmkvist (Halmstad Kommun, Sweden)
Alain Vanderputten (Ville de Charleroi, Belgium, the Architects' Council of Europe)
Hanns-Uwe Schwedler (Managing Director, European Academy for the Urban Environment, Berlin, Germany)
Jadwiga Kopec (Head of Environmental Department, City of Gdansk, Poland)
Debra Mountford (Consultant, Territorial Development Service, OECD)
Ivone Pereira Martins (European Environment Agency, Copenhagen).

The participation of the European Commission has been managed by Ursula Vavrik (DG Environment). Other representatives of the European Commission associated with the work of the group have included Kevin Leydon (DG Transport and Energy) and Rudolf Niessler (DG Regional Policy).

All these individuals contributed their time and expertise to the work, and for this we are very grateful.

We would like to record our thanks to Liz Mills, the Project Consultant, who prepared discussion papers for the meetings, the interim report and this policy paper on behalf of the group.

We are especially grateful for the financial support of the European Commission (DG Environment) and the UK's Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, without which this project would not have been possible. Travel expenses for the meeting held in Paris in November were generously provided by the OECD.

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1 A new task for the Expert Group as an EU approach on urban issues takes shape	1
2 Sustainable land use has been at the heart of the Expert Group's work	2
3 Sustainable land use challenges can usefully be tackled through processes of land development	2
4 Urban land use issues are high on the international policy agenda	3
5 Progress in the Member States will need to inform further work by the Commission	4
6 The Commission's 'tool kit' is extensive	6
7 The ESDP is the initiative with most direct relevance for the use of land	7
8 Community funding programmes support sustainable land use	7
9 EU environmental legislation is broadly helpful	8
10 Many other Community instruments need to be taken into account	11
11 The <i>Framework for Action</i> has had an impact	11
12 Conclusions and recommendations for the Commission	12
12.1 On policy development, objectives, targets and indicators	12
12.2 Some adjustments to the 'toolkit' of EU instruments would be beneficial	14
13 Further policy integration is required	20
13.1 Better understanding of the problems and of potential mechanisms for their solution	21
13.2 Better understanding of the impacts and outcomes of existing and proposed measures	22
13.3 Improving administrative arrangements and links	24
 Annexes	 27
References	31

1 A new task for Expert the Group as an EU approach on urban issues takes shape

In October 1998 the European Commission adopted the Communication *Sustainable Urban Development in the European Union: A Framework for Action* (COM(98)605), setting out objectives for urban areas and a range of existing and proposed actions to address these.

The Communication represents progress towards a more strategic and integrated approach to urban issues at European level. In adopting it the Commission made a commitment to further develop its urban perspective, especially to fulfil the follow-up actions set out in the document and to meet the expectations of the other European institutions, the Member States and local and regional authorities. Urban problems are going to remain high on the European agenda for some time, with enlargement of the EU, in particular, bringing fresh challenges.

To help to maintain the momentum on urban thinking established at the 1998 Urban Forum in Vienna, DG Environment in 1999 re-launched the Expert Group on the Urban Environment. Originally set up in 1991 to take forward some of the ideas in the *Green Paper on the Urban Environment* (CEC 1990), the Expert Group has now been asked to consider what further steps the Commission should take on urban matters in the light of the policy objectives and actions contained in the *Framework for Action*. Accordingly, the Expert Group is steering a series of Working Groups exploring policy areas in which there may be scope for further action by the Commission.

A Working Group on Sustainable Land Use was set up in January 2000 charged with:

- reviewing the state of policy and practice on some key land use issues – the re-use of urban brownfield land, the better use of urban infrastructure, the discouragement of greenfield development and remediation of urban sprawl;
- identifying and commenting on existing and planned EU instruments having an impact on these processes (including some particular actions set out in the Communication); and
- making recommendations to the Commission as to possible adjustments and additions to policy instruments and actions in this area.

This paper – based on a fuller Interim Report (Working Group 2000) - summarises the results of this work and sets out the Expert Group's recommendations. Although these recommendations are addressed to the Commission, they are also intended to have resonance for national governments and for local and regional authorities and to facilitate action by them.

The Expert Group welcomes the opportunity to take up the issue of sustainable land use once more, and to give a view on EU-level policy tools having an impact in this area.

2 Sustainable land use has been at the heart of the Expert Group's work

Through the **European Sustainable Cities Project** the Expert Group has helped to build a set of ecological, socio-economic and organisational principles and tools for the more sustainable management of urban areas. The policy report *European Sustainable Cities* (1994,1996) called for an integrated ecosystems-based view of the city and emphasised, for example, demand-side management, equity and efficiency in the use of resources and effective engagement with local communities and other stakeholders. Practical application of these ideas and further development of local sustainability approaches has been carried out through the European Sustainable Cities and Towns Campaign.

Ecologically-sound urban renewal, the role of land-use planning systems, and some key issues such as the integration of land-use and transport planning received detailed treatment in the Sustainable Cities report, and the approaches recommended there have been widely disseminated (Annex 1). Within the European Commission, the analysis of urban problems and policy solutions recommended by the Expert Group informed the preparation of the *Framework for Action*.

3 Sustainable land use challenges can usefully be tackled through processes of land development

The *Framework for Action* summarises the main challenges for sustainable land use :

The extension of built-up areas... linked to the decentralisation of employment, retail and leisure centres as well as to patterns of consumption and to changes in residential preferences, reduces the environmental worth of large areas of land for an indefinite period. Loss of green space both within and around urban areas threatens biodiversity as well as the quality of life of citizens. Many European cities contain extensive areas of derelict and contaminated land (brownfield sites), the legacy of industrial restructuring.

Urban sprawl reinforces the need to travel and increases dependence upon private motorised transport, leading in turn to increased traffic congestion, energy consumption and polluting emissions including noise. These problems are most acute in urban areas where residential densities are low and where day-to-day activities (home, work, shopping) are widely separated.

Additionally, adequate and efficient infrastructure – broadly defined – is crucial for the economic, social and environmental sustainability of urban areas, underpinning economic competitiveness and opportunities for households and enterprises to achieve more socially and environmentally desirable ways of living and working. Poorly designed or badly located infrastructure can make urban problems worse, as is the case, for example, with large-scale transport or waste disposal facilities.

In Europe's cities and towns, the regeneration and recycling of existing infrastructures is more common than the creation of new ones. There have been significant advances

in the implementation of ecologically-informed solutions; for example, measures for energy efficiency, water saving and biodiversity are in some countries now routinely incorporated into urban regeneration schemes. However, there are major issues regarding the mechanisms through which infrastructure of different types is provided, financed and managed, with the balance between private and public sector effort, and ways of engaging stakeholders (especially local communities), being especially important.

These land-use issues are clearly linked and also highly complex. The re-use of urban brownfields and the more efficient use of infrastructure are ways of ‘retro-fitting’ existing areas of sprawl and preventing further outward urban expansion. However, brownfield land can constitute a problem in itself, especially if it is contaminated.

It is productive to approach these issues from the point of view of making interventions in processes of land development. However, consideration of the impact of EU policy and instruments on land development processes relating to brownfields, greenfields, infrastructure and urban sprawl is not straightforward, since the Commission has substantial influence, but very limited direct competence, in this area.

Further, our assessment of EU measures is necessarily selective. For example, it has not been possible to address questions of transport in detail, despite their relevance to the topic. In part this is a reflection of the Working Group’s terms of reference which required a focus on certain themes and the avoidance of duplication of work being undertaken elsewhere. But it is also the case that there is a lack of systematic evidence on the impacts of EU-level policy and instruments on land use, and collection of this kind of evidence is one of the areas in which we see a need for further action.

4 Urban land use issues are high on the policy agenda.

The better management of land resources is essential for sustainability and for improving the quality of life in cities and towns. It is also one of the keys to meeting commitments on Agenda 21 and the Habitat Agenda, and other international obligations on, for example, climate change and biodiversity. Internationally and within the EU there is widespread agreement of the need to develop integrated strategies to tackle urban sprawl, involving all levels of government.

Through the *Framework for Action* the Commission has put in place a set of policy objectives for urban sustainability in Europe, including several related to land use. The objectives for the urban environment support an overall policy aim to reduce the total environmental impact (or ‘ecological footprint’) of urban activities, and specifically to:

- promote resource-efficient settlement patterns that minimise land take and urban sprawl; and
- protect and improve the built environment and cultural heritage, and promote biodiversity and green space within urban areas.

The *Framework for Action* also establishes a policy line on the re-use of urban land. It calls for new development to take place on brownfield rather than greenfield sites, and acknowledges that ‘the efficient and more sustainable use of urban land is complicated by the cost of cleaning-up and re-using brownfield sites’. However, there is no specific objective relating to soil quality, nor to contamination of land within urban areas, a reflection of the current state of Community policy and instrumentation on these issues.

Though there is a lack of detailed comparable information across Europe on the distribution of derelict and contaminated land within cities and regions, it is clear that land-use problems are extensive. Reports by the European Environment Agency, for example (EEA 1998, 1999, 2000a) highlight issues of urban sprawl, brownfields and soil degradation. Significant dereliction and contamination exist in the accession countries where economic changes are contributing to the rapid degradation of land. Problems are most acute in areas which have suffered the collapse of heavy industries. In rural areas the over-production of food is leading farmers to sell plots to housing investors, contributing to urban sprawl. Addressing problems related to land use is especially complex in countries where land previously in state ownership is now being privatised.

In the light of these problems, the European institutions and some Member States are now calling on the Commission to further develop policy for land (COR 1999, ECOSOC 1999) and also for soil (Hamell 1999). At the April 2000 Informal Environment Council, ‘land-use policies to contain urban expansion’ were identified as one of the keys to a successful response to Europe’s main urban challenges (Portugal 2000).

There is a particular opportunity to respond to these calls through the **6th Environmental Action Programme** (6th EAP) and the EU’s **Strategy on Sustainable Development**, currently being drafted.

5 Progress in the Member States will need to inform further work by the Commission

The 6th EAP and Sustainable Development Strategy - key statements of policy and action – are expected to reflect recent initiatives establishing principles and approaches to guide the development of the EU territory. These initiatives bear upon sustainable land use and in turn help to build the rationale for further Community action.

- The **European Spatial Development Perspective**, prepared by the Committee on Spatial Development (CSD 1999a) and adopted by all Member States on a voluntary basis, sets out objectives and guidelines for balanced and sustainable spatial development. About one third of the 60 agreed policy options are directly related to land use, and especially to the question of how to control the physical expansion of cities and towns. Approaches such as pursuit of the compact city and the recycling of urban land are strongly advocated (Annex 2).

- The **Council of Europe** has recently adopted a set of *Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent* which sets out proposed measures for sustainable development in cities and towns, including for example controlling urban sprawl, limiting trends towards suburbanisation by increasing the supply of building land in towns and cities, activation of gap sites, use of space-saving building methods, and regenerating the environment of areas damaged by industrially polluting activities (Annex 3).
- Some of these approaches have been explored in detail via exchanges of experience at national level. The **Member States' Urban Exchange Initiative (UEI)** had a major focus on sustainable land use. The messages in its *Report on Elements of a sustainable urban development in the European Union* (UEI 1999) are similar to those in *European Sustainable Cities* and the ESDP (Annex 4). The **Urban Development Group**, established within the framework of the CSD to follow the UEI, identified the 'recycling of towns' as a topic which would benefit from further work.

In general we observe **widespread agreement on the causes of urban land-use challenges** (growth in the physical area covered by urban development being the outcome of a complex interplay between market forces and the – often unintended – consequences of a mix of sectoral policies and practices) and considerable **convergence as to the policy approaches** seen as most helpful in addressing them.

Moreover, **land development processes are key mechanisms** for putting these approaches into practice:

- much greater attention is being given to the processes (especially market processes) through which urban land becomes vacant and is then re-used, and to the blockages in these processes, with land contamination seen as a blockage to re-use rather than simply as an 'ecological' problem;
- greater emphasis is being given to questions of the density and character of development – as well as to location - whether on greenfield or on brownfield land, and especially to the need to find ways of convincing citizens to adopt different kinds of urban living; and
- increasing attention is being given to questions of infrastructure and cultural heritage within cities, in particular in relation to the creative renovation and re-use of historic urban cores for mixed-use development.

Research supported by the 4th Framework Programme has confirmed that the policy options highlighted in the Sustainable Cities Report, ESDP and other initiatives cited here are already being implemented in most Member States (Nadin 2000).

National systems of spatial planning and environmental protection, and dedicated strategies to tackle urban areas in difficulty, are being adjusted. Recognising that there are limits to what regulation can achieve in terms of restraining urban sprawl and securing the re-use of brownfields in the face of market pressures, Member States are seeking to develop fiscal instruments to complement existing arrangements (EEA 2000b) and placing more emphasis on working in partnership with the private and

community sectors, often within the context of broad strategies to manage urban change.

In some Member States – such as Ireland and the Netherlands – land-use planning, environmental protection and area-based initiatives for urban regeneration are being brought together within **national frameworks for territorial (or spatial) development** in pursuit of more sustainable solutions.

However, while national governments are actively seeking new measures and new ways of combining them, we find that Member States do not as yet have a complete range of instruments at their disposal. For example, as the OECD's work on brownfields and urban sprawl (OECD 1998, 1999, 2000) has demonstrated :

- there are no international obligations on national governments to maintain registers or maps of brownfield land – however defined;
- there are no international standards for land remediation;
- we lack tools adequately to assess the economic, social and environmental costs and benefits of urban sprawl and other patterns of development;
- while it is possible to develop and adjust policy interventions to tackle individual problems associated with barriers to land re-use or the impacts of sprawl, these are unlikely to succeed in the absence of overall strategies for whole urban areas; and
- coherent policy frameworks to tackle urban sprawl – involving all levels of government - are currently lacking.

It is against this background that the Expert Group has gone on to consider:

- whether EU level instruments are facilitating or hindering processes leading to the more sustainable use of urban land; and
- how EU level instrumentation might be adjusted, or new measures developed, to facilitate the efforts of Member States, regional and local authorities in this area.

6 The Commission's 'tool kit' is extensive

An essential step has been to identify those existing and potential EU-level instruments with most relevance for the sustainable use of urban land. The range of actions is very wide and the full potential of these initiatives probably underestimated. We have reviewed :

- The ESDP
- Financial support, especially the Structural Funds, Community Initiatives and LIFE programme
- Legislation, especially environmental legislation in the areas of environmental impact assessment, waste, water and integrated pollution prevention and control

- Market-based instruments
- Measures in the fields of transport and energy
- Selected strategies with territorial relevance
- The Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development
- ‘Horizontal’ measures, especially support for networking and the exchange of experience.

7 The ESDP is the initiative with most direct relevance for the use of land

Although developed primarily by the Member States, the ESDP is closely integrated into EU policy processes. However, its impact ‘on the ground’ will depend upon ways found to implement the policy approaches it recommends, especially since these approaches are expressed at a very general level in the ESDP document. Two of the keys to implementation of the ESDP are the Study Programme and follow-up Action Programme (CSD 1999b) associated with it, and we find that these programmes need to be more widely appreciated within the EU institutions.

8 Community Funding Programmes support sustainable land use

The **Structural Funds**, **Community Initiatives URBAN** and **INTERREG**, and **LIFE-Environment** offer major opportunities for physical development actions, and the increased attention now being given to networking and the exchange of experience in mainstream EU programmes (for example, through ‘Accompanying Measures’) is a very positive step. We highlight:

- the strong references to the *Framework for Action* in the **Structural Funds Regulations and Guidelines for the period 2000-2006** which provide much support for sustainable approaches to the use of urban land, including for example calls for priority to be given ‘to the rehabilitation of derelict industrial sites (brownfields) over the development of greenfield sites’;
- opportunities in **URBAN II** to support ‘mixed-use and environmentally-friendly brownfield redevelopment ... involving ... reduced pressures on greenfield development and urban sprawl’, with indicative eligible measures including ‘reclamation of derelict sites and contaminated land; rehabilitation of public spaces, including green areas; and renovation of buildings to accommodate economic and social activities, in a sustainable and environmentally-friendly manner’;
- relevant spatial planning projects undertaken through **INTERREG IIC** (covering, for example, urban growth management, housing demand and the use of brownfield and greenfield land, the re-use of land and buildings and the provision of urban open space) and new opportunities for ‘concrete’ projects – including infrastructure provision – in **INTERREG IIIB**;
- support for innovative urban projects through **LIFE-Environment** (with several LIFE II projects to ‘retro-fit’ areas of urban sprawl) and expanded opportunities under LIFE III, specifically for projects integrating environmental and

sustainability considerations into 'land use development and planning'. In line with the *Framework for Action* there is a call for projects with multiple objectives, which demonstrate the use of various policy instruments in combination (for example, combining regulation with fiscal measures), and which reduce the 'ecological footprint' of cities and towns, all of which are in line with the previous advice of the Expert Group;

- in general, encouragement in Community funding programmes for Member States to develop the more strategic and integrated approaches which are needed to deal with issues of sustainable land use; and
- opportunities to use the stronger provisions for environmental impact assessment now in place to ensure that EU programmes do not exacerbate problems of urban sprawl and land-take.

But we are also concerned that:

- areas eligible for Structural Funds may not be taking full advantage of the opportunities to pursue urban sustainability initiatives, such as brownfield re-use and the provision of environmentally-sound urban infrastructure :
 - Objective 1 and 2 programmes do not necessarily propose actions in the areas of soil and land, even where large areas of derelict or contaminated sites are identified as an issue in the baseline analysis which each programme must contain, and this is at least partly a reflection of the absence of Directives in these policy areas;
 - having established policy goals for the re-use of brownfields and restraint of urban sprawl, the Commission could probably do more to ensure that opportunities to address these goals are maximised;
- the **Instrument for Structural Policies for Pre-Accession (ISPA)**, which funds large environment and transport infrastructure projects in accession countries, is not routinely available for the environmental clean-up of brownfields – such as former industrial sites, waste heaps and mining spoils – because this is not included in the *Acquis Communautaire*; and
- political realities still dictate that funds for physical development actions outside Objective 1 and 2 regions are very limited.

9 EU Environmental legislation is broadly helpful

Environmental Directives increasingly foster integrated planning approaches across particular geographical areas and encourage the safe and 'good neighbour' behaviour on which more mixed and compact urban land uses depend. Legislation which sets Community objectives and targets but which allows Member States to establish their own mechanisms to reach these and to proceed in incremental steps is the type likely to be most appropriate in matters related to land use. However, there are some shortcomings. We note in particular that:

- new provisions on the disposal of hazardous substances set out in the **Landfill Directive** 1999/31/EC may raise the costs and complexity of disposal of certain contaminated soils, potentially creating a further obstacle to re-use of land;
- although the **IPPC Directive** (96/61/EC) is relevant for preventing and remediating land contamination, since it includes the obligation to return a permitted site to a satisfactory condition after closure, the requirements on site restoration could be clearer and the Commission currently does not have systematic information from the Member States as to how clean-up of sites will be assured;
- the proposed **Community Framework Directive on Environmental Liability** is viewed as unlikely to assist the policy of recycling urban land, since it will not tackle past pollution;
- the **Water Framework Directive** will have major implications for urban areas (especially because so many cities and towns are located on estuaries and on the coast and because they are major consumers and potential polluters of groundwaters) and also for land use planning systems, since there will have to be close coordination between river basin management plans and regional and local land-use plans;
- while the **Habitats and Birds Directives**, strongly emphasised in relation to Structural Funds, mainly influence the use of land outside urban areas, the **Community Biodiversity Strategy** provides an opportunity to give more attention to nature conservation within cities and towns;
- the **Seveso II Directive** (96/82/EC) contains a new provision recognising that the implications of major accident hazards should be taken into account in the land-use planning policies of the Member States;
- the **Directive on Environmental Impact Assessment** (85/337) has had major effects on national systems of land-use planning and is directly relevant in regulating the development of potentially environmentally-damaging large infrastructure installations (such as airports and ports);
- the **proposed Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment of plans and programmes** is likely to be similarly influential; and
- the proposed **Directive relating to the Assessment and Management of Environmental Noise**, is likely to have highly beneficial impacts on urban areas, facilitating more compact and mixed forms of urban development as well as contributing to improvements in the quality of life.

Detailed consideration of the **implementation** of existing Directives is beyond the scope of this project, but we note that the following seem to be lacking:

- in the procedures to monitor compliance, a reliable and accessible overview of implementation and impact in urban areas; and
- an understanding of how different pieces of legislation could be used more effectively – and in a complementary way – in relation to certain urban land use problems.

Disappointingly, though urban local authorities were directly involved in drafting the proposed Noise Directive, for most new environmental legislation there is little indication that the urban implications of proposed measures are being systematically considered by the Commission – despite the commitment made in the *Framework for Action* to do so.

The **lack of EU legislation directly related to land or soil** is worth commenting on, especially in view of the extent of contaminated land both within the EU and in accession countries. Other legislation which might be relevant is currently focused on preventing future pollution rather than cleaning up the past. Moreover, there is a view amongst practitioners that some EU Directives – such as those in the areas of waste and water – inhibit the ability to take forward land remediation and reclamation projects because they are seen as limiting the flexibility needed to assess and deal appropriately – and cost effectively – with individual sites.

In general, Member States believe that the establishment of specific Directives to deal with land contamination would not provide effective routes to problem solving. One view is that, because of the great diversity across Europe in the extent and nature of these problems, a common EU approach would be unworkable and of little added value. Where Member States already have policies and measures in place, a Directive could cut across them.

However:

- some Member States and candidate countries lack ‘rules of the game’ and would welcome EU action to promote the establishment of effective regimes; and
- more Community funding could be made available to support the re-use of urban brownfield land if specific legislation was in place.

Community legislation designed to regulate other areas of activity is on the whole seen as more problematic than any gaps in environmental law in terms of barriers to sustainable urban regeneration. This especially applies to the rules on **state aids**, the application of which is making it difficult for some Member States to achieve partnership working with the private sector, in particular on projects which require funding to make the re-use of previously-developed land economically viable.

10 Many other Community instruments need to be taken into account

We note especially:

- the serious lack of progress in developing an EU-level framework for the use of market-based or fiscal measures (such as carbon taxes), despite increasing use of such instruments by Member States;
- the relevance of a number of Community strategies with territorial implications (coasts, civil protection, bio-diversity) which are increasingly having an impact on the planning and development of land, with the **European Strategy for Integrated Coastal Zone Management** (CEC 2000a) and associated **Proposal for a European Parliament and Council Recommendation** in this area (CEC 2000b) providing useful models for integrated approaches to the management of different types of area;
- some particular issues related to transport infrastructure and urban development, which mainly need to be addressed in policy for the TENs, but which could also be tackled by expanding the Commission's provision of specialised technical guidance, for example regarding airports;
- the considerable support offered for research projects on the revitalisation of city centres and neighbourhoods (including the rehabilitation and re-use of contaminated or other brownfield sites) and on ways to reduce urban sprawl, especially through the integration of land use and transport planning, in the **Key Action 'City of Tomorrow and Cultural Heritage' within the 5th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development**, but the need, in future calls, for more attention to be given to open space and urban nature (including ways of re-using brownfield land for green space as well as for built uses); to how to maximise the adaptability/flexibility of urban infrastructure; and to gaining a better understanding of the forces driving and regulating urban development and land use; and
- the Commission's continuing support for networking, exchange of experience and awareness-raising in fields relevant to sustainable land use, with significant recent advances in specific measures for local level action, notably the **Community Framework for Cooperation to Promote Sustainable Urban Development**, the development of **European Common Indicators for Local Sustainability** and continuing efforts to build up the database on **Good Practice in Urban Management and Sustainability**.

11 The Framework for Action has had an impact

It is our impression that EU level instruments have been drivers of change in national systems of spatial planning and environmental protection, with environmental legislation and horizontal measures being especially significant, and that in the current policy climate this influence can only increase.

The Commission has worked to embed the messages of the *Framework for Action* into its various measures, mainly through the 24 Actions set out in the Communication, and the results of this are apparent both in ‘mainstream’ activities and in new measures specifically to promote urban sustainability at local and regional levels. But we find that:

- with some notable exceptions the Commission has so far made greater efforts to embed the policy messages of the *Framework for Action* into funding programmes than into legislative processes or new legislation;
- the current range of policy instruments insufficiently promotes the re-use of urban land and this suggests that more innovative approaches on soil and land may be needed; and
- in general in this field it is clear that EU instruments do not yet form a truly coherent package supporting comprehensive, well-defined policy goals.

12 Conclusions and recommendations for the Commission

Our recommendations refer to policy development, adjustments to instruments and to ways of improving integrated working within and outside the Commission.

Our comments are especially relevant for work currently in progress on the 6th Environmental Action Programme, the EU Strategy for Sustainable Development (in which spatial development is expected to be one of the key themes) and early consideration of the shape of the Structural Funds for the period from 2007.

12.1 On policy development, objectives, targets and indicators

Sustainable land use is a policy issue for all levels of government and a shared responsibility.

It is our general conclusion that EU policy supports action by the Member States and by regional and local authorities in tackling the major land-use challenges we have considered.

Broad policy directions and approaches are well-established at EU level, especially through the *Framework for Action* and the ESDP, in turn much influenced by previous exchanges of good practice at local and national levels. More now needs to be done to develop more detailed policy for the territory which is informed by ecosystems principles and which enables local diversity to be taken into account.

There is, in particular, **scope for the further development of specific Community objectives for the sustainable use of urban land and for the protection of soil as an environmental medium** to supplement those already adopted by Member States (in close co-operation with the Commission) in the ESDP and by the Commission in the *Framework for Action*.

In developing policy, the Commission especially needs to take account of the fact that the situation in the Member States is very diverse. Not all countries have large metropolitan areas; the problems of sprawl, land re-use and infrastructure provision are different in small and medium-sized towns. Some countries are developing finer-grain approaches to the question of brownfield and greenfield development – for example allowing some development on greenfields, but requiring the density, form and location of such development to be in line with sustainability principles. The large-scale re-use of brownfields for built development may not be the most sustainable solution for every city. The potential use of brownfield land as green space to support nature conservation, biodiversity and climate protection should be emphasised.

Both the 6th EAP and Sustainable Development Strategy should include objectives, quantifiable targets and measurable indicators. The adoption of shared objectives and targets is one way to achieve integration, and indicators are needed to measure progress towards them.

However it is the Expert Group's view that the use of targets and indicators cannot be a substitute for well-founded and properly implemented land-use planning policies, and we would expect to see the Member States continuing to develop and apply these, increasingly in the context of the European framework which has begun to be established through the ESDP.

Recommendation 1 Policy development, objectives, targets and indicators

We **recommend** that:

- the Commission further develops policy for the European territory in the context of the 6th Environmental Action Programme and the EU Sustainable Development Strategy, ensuring that urban land use is addressed in both strategies;
- in developing policy objectives for the 6th EAP and EU Sustainable Development Strategy the Commission should have regard to the objectives for urban areas already established in the *Framework for Action*;
- these existing objectives should be reviewed and augmented, taking account of the relevant policy principles and options set out in the European Sustainable Cities reports, and considering especially the ESDP;
- the Commission supports the development of targets in relation to all the policy objectives for urban areas set out in the *Framework for Action* (and any further objectives developed for the 6th EAP and EU Sustainable Development Strategy) including targets for the sustainable use of urban land. In particular, Member States and regional and local authorities should be encouraged (possibly through Council Recommendations) to set targets for the re-use of urban land;
- in view of an existing commitment in the *Framework for Action* the Commission examines the application of benchmarking in the area of sustainable land use;
- further work on indicators for sustainable land use is closely related to land-use objectives and takes place within the context of developing policy for land in the 6th EAP and in the EU Sustainable Development Strategy;
- any further such work on indicators should have regard to the lessons of the ESDP Study Programme, to the results and potential future extensions to the Urban Audit, to recent EEA initiatives (including on indicator-based reporting), and especially to the European Common Indicators for Local Sustainability, since these are explicitly linked to sustainability objectives and targets; and
- specifically in developing the proposed Thematic Strategy on Soil Protection – which we very much welcome - in the context of the 6th Environmental Action Programme the Commission addresses not only the protection but also the remediation of soil in urban areas.

12.2 Some adjustments to the ‘tool kit’ of EU instruments would be beneficial

The ESDP, adopted in 1999, has begun to make an impact. It has the potential to be very important in future as Member States increasingly embed its messages into

national systems of spatial planning and into programmes and projects funded by the EU.

Recommendation 2 Rapid implementation of the ESDP Action Programme

We **recommend** that :

- the Commission contributes appropriately to the speedy implementation of the various activities contained in the ESDP Action Programme, in which every opportunity should be used to address issues of the sustainable use of urban land.

Existing **funding programmes** offer considerable scope for effective practical action – especially to re-use brownfields and to upgrade urban infrastructure. The Member States need to take advantage of the potential they offer.

It is essential that measures which result in the more sustainable use of urban land come forward for Structural Funds support after 2007.

Steps are needed to **ensure that Community rules and procedures relating to funding programmes are sufficiently flexible** to enable private sector stakeholders to play their part in sustainable urban regeneration.

Recommendation 3 Community Funding Programmes

We **recommend** :

- continuing financial support for demonstration projects which promote the sustainable use and re-use of urban land;
- that the Commission ensures that sufficient staff resources are in place to enable oversight of current programmes (especially Objective 2, URBAN II and INTERREG III) so as to encourage the Member States to make use of the opportunities set out in the programme Guidelines to pursue the more sustainable use of urban land;
- in the forthcoming Second Cohesion Report, explicit attention to policy objectives for sustainable urban land use in the context of broader objectives for the EU territory; and
- in future funding guidelines, more specific reference to objectives for sustainable land use (achieving the re-use of brownfield land (including for green areas), the protection of greenfield sites from development, the better use of urban infrastructure and the restraint and remediation of urban sprawl) and calls for practical measures to enable these objectives to be met.

As regards EU environmental **legislation**, there is a gap in the legislative framework regarding specific measures for land and soil. However, it is our view that further Directives would not be helpful. Rather a legal mechanism needs to be found to promote the establishment of effective national regimes to protect and remediate land and soil where these do not already exist and to enable substantial Community funding to be directed towards cleaning-up past contamination. This is especially relevant in relation to enlargement.

At the same time, steps need to be taken to improve implementation of existing environmental legislation, and to ensure that Community legislation in other policy fields does not impede the environmentally-sound regeneration of urban areas. In particular, in relation to state aids, the rules should allow for the payment of gap funding for urban development projects which would promote sustainable land use.

Recommendation 4 EU legislation

We **recommend** that:

- the Commission considers a ‘soft law’ measure, such as a Council Decision or Recommendation, in the area of sustainable land use, as is being developed for the Integrated Management of Coastal Zones;
- the Commission urgently puts in place a procedure to assess the urban implications (including impacts on urban land use) of new Community policy and instrumentation – in particular legislation – a commitment in the *Framework for Action*;
- consideration be given to producing further technical guidance – or adjustments to existing guidance – related to the implementation of relevant Directives; and
- the Commission provides **a statement of its position on the question of state aids and urban regeneration** as the first step in working towards a more flexible approach to the implementation of state aids rules so as to encourage partnership approaches to urban regeneration in the Member States. Adjustments to the Community Guidelines on State Aids for Environmental Protection may also be appropriate.

There is a lack of EU **market-based measures** to influence urban land markets, and further support could be given to the Member States to develop these kinds of tools. The Commission is in a far more powerful position to influence market forces than are individual cities and towns.

Recommendation 5 Provision of market-based instruments

We **recommend** that:

- the Commission explores the potential application of EMAS and use of voluntary agreements and tradeable permits in the area of urban land remediation and re-use and the possible application of Member State and local taxes to discourage green field development; and
- Member States are further encouraged to develop tools to influence the market, for example to reduce rates of VAT on land remediation and the renovation of property in urban areas, an issue which could be explored with DG Taxation and Customs Union.

Work on the 6th Environmental Action programme provides an important opportunity for the Commission to develop policy goals, along with **a package of measures, including both legislative and market-based tools** (in line with Recommendations 1, 2, 4 and 5 above) and also to ensure that environmental policy measures fully complement Structural Funds activities.

Recommendation 6 Build a package of measures in the 6th EAP

We **recommend** that:

- the Commission develops policy and measures relevant for sustainable urban land use in the context of a **proposed section of the 6th EAP on integrated approaches to territorial management** which should have a strong urban dimension This should cover the mapping and remediation of brownfield land, the provision and efficient use of environmentally-beneficial infrastructure, and soil protection, along with measures to prevent urban sprawl. The 6th EAP should seek to establish clear Community objectives, promote Member State action and ensure a legal basis for Community funding in these areas, especially for the remediation of contaminated land. Complementary market-based or fiscal measures should be included as a priority; and
- proposals for territorial approaches set out in the 6th EAP need to be in line with proposals for the application of territorial approaches in the administration of the Structural Funds after 2007.

Some adjustments are also appropriate for **transport-related measures**, though we would prefer to leave detailed consideration of these to the Working Group on Transport and the Environment which our work complements.

Recommendation 7 Transport

We **recommend** that:

- EU transport policies, such as TENs, and funding programmes should:
 - be subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA);
 - avoid promoting car-dependent urban development outside existing urban areas, for example around motorway junctions or in ‘transport development corridors’;
 - encourage patterns of urban development based on urban public transport, such as new development at existing public transport nodes and along public transport corridors; and
 - encourage low-impact urban public transport, cycling and walking;
- the Commission should especially avoid financing transport developments which contribute to the unsustainable use of urban land – for example, projects resulting in the take-up of greenfield land on the edges of urban areas;
- the Commission should more actively promote the integration of land-use and transport planning in the Member States;
- the Commission continues to integrate its activities for environment, transport and energy, especially in the context of policies for territorial development, where there needs to be close co-operation between DG Environment and DG Transport and Energy; and
- the Commission, in conjunction with Member States, continues to work with the private sector providers of major transport infrastructure, where appropriate contributing to guidance which helps to secure EU policy goals regarding the sustainable use of urban land. (For example, the Commission could consider developing land-use guidance on urban development around airports in order to respect safe aircraft operations, to reduce the impacts of aircraft noise and the risk of accidents and to avoid contributing to urban sprawl.)

In **research programmes**, we welcome the emphasis given to sustainable land use issues in the 5th Framework Programme, especially in the Key Action ‘City of Tomorrow and Cultural Heritage’.

It is important that projects funded through the next calls reflect, and do not duplicate, research activity/studies going on elsewhere. In particular, relationships with the ESDP and its follow up Action Programme and Study Programme need to be clear. The Key Action will need to be developed in the context of the emerging priorities of the 6th EAP.

Recommendation 8

5th Framework Programme for Research

We **recommend** that:

- in future calls, there is more emphasis on land development processes supporting the environmentally-sound re-use of brownfields (especially on ways of engaging the private sector and on the application of fiscal measures in this area) and on ways in which cities might improve their use of existing infrastructure.
- in line with ecosystems principles, future calls address ways of measuring, managing and limiting the demand for land as well as its supply; and
- consideration be given to including measures like these in a **new Priority – the sustainable use (or re-use) of urban land**. Alternatively, a **Priority on the integrated management of the territory** would reflect current policy developments at EU level.

On **horizontal measures**, we recognise the value of awareness-raising, networking and the exchange of experience and the continuing demand for these to be supported but we note that much has already been done. New opportunities are being provided, for example, through the Community Initiatives, the 5th Framework Programme for RTD and the Community Framework for Cooperation to Promote Sustainable Urban Development.

There is particular scope for further work to raise awareness with property developers, especially house builders and the providers and managers of large-scale urban infrastructure, and with other private sector organisations involved in land use, on issues of sustainability, especially environmental sustainability. There is a real need to spread best practice to developers, builders and municipalities on how to achieve high-quality, high-density development designed around public transport, cycling and walking.

The Commission itself needs to develop much better awareness of the property development industry and of the concerns and possibilities of the banking and insurance sectors in supporting the re-use of urban land, especially in the area of environmental liability. However, it is essential that this takes the form of a well-conducted dialogue rather than a private sector lobby of the Commission. One way to achieve this might be through the Business Feedback Mechanism launched in April 2000.

Local authorities should be encouraged to provide more examples of good practice in ecologically-sound urban regeneration - emphasising the re-use of urban land, better use of infrastructure and restraint of urban sprawl – for the Database on Good Practice in Urban Management and Sustainability. The usefulness or otherwise of EU instruments in helping to remove blockages to re-use should be stressed in case studies.

In the longer term the Commission may wish to consider whether to further support Member States in making some elements of environmentally sustainable construction mandatory (for example, through building codes which require energy efficiency). This issue could be further considered by the Expert Group's proposed Working Group on Urban Design for Sustainability.

Recommendation 9 Awareness-raising, networking and the Exchange of experience

We **recommend** that:

- the Commission continues to support and develop networking and the exchange of experience, especially at local and regional levels and in accession countries but **on specific issues** in which good practice is lacking, in particular on how to achieve high-quality, high-density, public transport-oriented development with a small 'ecological footprint';
- the Commission further develops its dialogue with the property development industry and related private sector bodies;
- the Community Framework for Cooperation to Promote Sustainable Urban Development specifically promotes sustainable urban land use;
- in supporting further exchange of experience on sustainable urban regeneration through the Structural Funds, URBAN and INTERREG, the Commission takes account of existing networking activities in this policy area (for example, those within the framework of the European Sustainable Cities and Towns Campaign) and considers developing exchanges on specific issues, such as brownfield re-use and urban growth management;
- better ways should be found to measure and demonstrate the benefits of these 'horizontal' activities in terms of more sustainable outcomes 'on the ground'; and
- the Commission makes greater use of the opportunities for awareness-raising provided by the Europa website. (For example, DG Environment could do this by updating the page on urban environment activities.)

13 Further policy integration is required

In general, if more sustainable land use is to be achieved, there needs to be greater horizontal integration of policies and instruments at all levels of government and improved vertical integration to ensure that the good efforts of local and regional authorities, in particular, are not impeded by 'higher' levels.

In our view, there are currently some mismatches between Community policy and instruments in the area of sustainable land use. For example:

- Existing contamination is one of the largest ‘land problems’ in EU and accession countries, but current and planned legislation focuses on preventing future damage rather than requiring the clean-up of past pollution. This leads to a situation in which it is more difficult to direct Community funds towards land remediation than to, for example, the construction of waste water treatment plants, even where land clean up would have the most favourable environmental impacts.
- Urban policy increasingly calls for the involvement of the private sector in urban regeneration, including on brownfield land, especially in private/public partnerships, but their engagement is constrained by the rules on state aid, as noted above.

These mismatches are evidence of a continuing lack of integration of policies and action at Community level, not least within the European Commission.

Development of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy offers particular scope to achieve integrated approaches. Different policy sectors will need to demonstrate how their activities contribute to the achievement of a set of overall sustainability goals.

While development of an effective strategy is essential, it is also necessary to achieve the following:

13.1 Better understanding of the problems and of potential mechanisms for their solution

Urban sprawl is related to residential development in some countries but more to industrial development elsewhere; growth management is not an issue in all countries; land use issues are not the same in small and medium-sized towns as in the largest cities.

The problems of urban sprawl and the existence of extensive areas of brownfield land in urban areas are well known but poorly defined and mapped.

Recommendation 10 Measuring and mapping urban problems

We **recommend** that:

- the Commission requires the EEA to collect more systematic, comprehensive and comparable information at Community level on the extent and nature of land use changes – especially relating to urban sprawl and the extent of brownfield and greenfield land – using agreed standard EU definitions; and
- the Commission considers what other agency or mechanism should be involved in this type of activity – for example, whether the proposed European Network on Territorial Analysis to be funded through INTERREG IIIB, a possible alternative to the ESPON proposed in the ESDP, would have a part to play.

Better understanding of land development processes requires more than measurement and mapping, and for this we see the proposed research and private sector dialogue activities as especially relevant (Recommendations 8 and 9).

13.2 Better understanding of the impacts and outcomes of existing and proposed measures

In order to improve the Community ‘tool kit’, more systematic and comprehensive information is needed on the impacts of Community policies and instruments on urban land use.

It is especially important to understand **how the various instruments work in combination** – whether they are mutually supportive or contradictory – and how EU policy and instruments are mediated through national systems of spatial planning and environmental protection.

Recommendation 11 Policy impacts and outcomes

We recommend that:

- in assessing the likely impact of new initiatives which may affect urban areas, the impacts of such proposals on the objectives for sustainable land use are fully considered;
- the work on the impacts of current Community policies being carried out for DG Regional Policy and the development of a common framework for Territorial Impact Assessment in the context of the ESDP Action Programme reflect in more detail questions of the sustainable use of urban land;
- the Commission considers supplementing these with a study on the influence of EU policies on urban areas (or specifically on the re-use of urban land) similar to that previously commissioned for coastal areas (IEEP 1999);
- further consideration is given to how routinely and systematically to monitor and evaluate the impacts and outcomes (and not only outputs) of EU policy and instruments on the sustainable use of urban land. The Commission should also consider what agency or body should do this, having in mind, for example, the role of the EEA and its work carried out through EIONET and the European Topic Centres, notably the recently established ETC 'Terrestrial';
- the Commission proceeds with development of the in-house urban database network as a monitoring tool, as mentioned in the *Framework for Action*; and
- the development of sustainability assessment at EU level (previously recommended by the Expert Group) be pursued in the context of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy.

13.3 Improving administrative arrangements and links

We have considered arrangements within the Commission and between the Commission and various external bodies.

Recommendation 12 Invest in more effective horizontal working inside the Commission

We recommend :

- raising the profile of urban issues within the context of integrated approaches to the management of the territory;
- further integrated and cooperative working across Directorates General (DGs) on a formal basis, for example through re-launching the inter-service working group on urban issues as a **working group on territorial and urban issues** and the involvement in this of all relevant DGs, including DG Competition;
- within DGs, closer and more effective formal links between those units and officials responsible for various policies and instruments with a bearing on the use of urban land, with cross-DG working groups being a potential mechanism for this;
- improved coordination of the activities of the various expert working groups set up by the Commission to develop policy and measures in areas relevant for sustainable urban land use; and
- to facilitate both inter-service and cross-DG working, appropriate allocation of staff resources to these tasks, recognising that such activities should be a priority if the Commission is to achieve proper integration of its activities, including the integration of environmental concerns into all other Community policy, as the Treaty requires.

To facilitate the development of a more integrated approach to the territory, DG Environment could consider revising its administrative arrangements to establish a focal point for land (or territory), so as to achieve closer working links between the teams responsible for urban, rural and coastal areas, water management, transport and agriculture, for example.

As well as improving horizontal working internally, the Commission needs to improve dialogue with relevant EU agencies and to continue working with the Member States on urban issues, in order to secure common objectives. In this context, we are concerned that the Commission intends to reduce its support for the CSD and withdraw its support for the Urban Development Group. However, the incorporation of these bodies into the Committee for the Development and Conversion of the Regions (CDCR) ('the Structural Funds committee') may be beneficial as regards the orientation of Structural Funds spending, including ensuring a more sustainable pattern of urban land use. Establishing a sub committee of the

CDCR on territorial and urban issues (which could ‘mirror’ an inter-service working group within the Commission) would be one way to ensure continuing dialogue.

Recommendation 13 Improve cooperative working with other bodies

We recommend :

- more extensive cooperative working between relevant DGs of the Commission and other institutions, such as the EEA, on matters relevant to sustainable land use; and
- continued working links between the Commission (including DG Environment) and the Member States on policy responses to urban issues.

To enable more integrated approaches to the sustainable use of land, all EU measures – but in particular Directives – need to allow for diversity in local and regional conditions and some discretion as to how to devise and implement locally-appropriate solutions. Participation of local and regional authorities in policy development is an important commitment established in the *Framework for Action*.

The Commission needs to enhance the involvement of local and regional authorities in the adjustment and design of EU instruments relevant for sustainable land use in urban areas.

Recommendation 14 Dialogue with local and regional authorities

We recommend that :

- existing dialogue with local authorities, local government networks and the European Sustainable Cities and Towns Campaign is continued and developed; and
- closer working links are established between relevant parts of the Commission and the Committee of the Regions, especially Commission 4 which deals with Spatial Planning, Urban Issues, Energy and Environment, and also between Commission 4 and Member State civil servants responsible for urban policy, which would formerly have been through the CSD and UDG.

Finally, the Expert Group can assist in taking forward some of the issues identified as important during this project and in further developing some important themes, such as the extent to which quality of life in urban areas – essential if citizens are to favour urban life over a move to the suburbs or countryside – is dependent upon the way land is used.

Recommendation 15**Further work for the Expert Group**

We **recommend** that:

- the Commission arranges for the proposed Working Groups on the Integrated Implementation of Environmental Legislation and Urban Design for Sustainability begin work as soon as possible, enabling the Expert Group to fulfil its role of offering policy advice to the Commission.

Annex 1 European Sustainable Cities Project : examples of policy options for sustainable use of urban land based on ecosystems thinking

- Land is a finite resource; environmental limits require policy to be supply-driven rather than demand-led – plan for resource conservation and waste minimisation
- Manage flows- respect/create water and open space networks
- Increase urban densities around points of high accessibility to public transport, cycling and walking
- Diversity not mono-culture - promote the ecologically-sound mixed use of both built and open space
- Elegance – promote multi-purpose solutions
- Close resource loops – recycle previously-developed land and buildings and re-integrate these sites into the urban fabric
- Encourage remediation and sustainable re-use of contaminated land
- Apply ecological principles in both new development and renewal schemes
- Design for durability, adaptability and flexibility in buildings and neighbourhoods

Annex 2 European Spatial Development Perspective : Selected policy options relevant for sustainable land use (CSD 1999a)

- 7 Improvement of the economic basis, environment and service infrastructure of cities, particularly in economically less-favoured regions, in order to increase their attractiveness for mobile investment.
- 9 Promotion of integrated urban development strategies sensitive to social and functional diversity. Particular attention should be given to fighting social exclusion and the recycling and/or restructuring of underused or derelict urban sites and areas.
- 10 Promotion of a wise management of the urban ecosystem.
- 11 Promotion of better accessibility in cities and metropolitan regions through an appropriate location policy and land use planning that will stimulate mixing of urban functions and the use of public transport.
- 12 Support for effective methods of reducing uncontrolled urban expansion; reduction of excessive settlement pressure, particularly in coastal regions.
- 21 Integrating the countryside surrounding large cities in spatial development strategies for urban regions, aiming at more efficient land-use planning, paying special attention to the quality of life in the urban surroundings.
- 29 Introduction of territorial impact assessment as an instrument for spatial assessment of large infrastructure projects (especially in the transport sector).
- 30 Better coordination of spatial development policy and land-use planning with transport and telecommunications planning.
- 34 Coordinated and integrated infrastructure planning and management for avoiding inefficient investments (for example superfluous parallel development of transport infrastructure) and securing the most efficient use of existing transport infrastructure.
- 41 Integration of biodiversity considerations into sectoral policies (agriculture, regional policies, transport, fisheries etc) as included in the Community Biodiversity Strategy.
- 44 Promotion of energy-saving and traffic-reducing settlement structures, integrated resource-planning and increased use of renewable energies in order to reduce CO2 emissions.
- 45 Protection of the soil as the basis of life for human beings, fauna and flora, through the reduction of erosion, soil destruction and over-use of open spaces.

Annex 3: Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent (CEMAT 2000)

- Promoting territorial cohesion through a more balanced social and economic development of regions and improved competitiveness.
- Encouraging development generated by urban functions and improving the relationship between town and countryside
- Promoting more balanced accessibility
- Developing access to information and knowledge
- Reducing environmental damage
- Enhancing and protecting natural resources and cultural heritage
- Enhancing cultural heritage as a factor for development
- Developing energy resources while maintaining safety
- Encouraging high-quality, sustainable tourism
- Limiting the impacts of natural disasters

Measures proposed for achieving sustainable development in towns and cities include for example :

- Controlling the expansion of urban areas (urban sprawl); limiting trends towards suburbanisation by increasing the supply of building land in towns and cities, activation of gap sites and use of space-saving building methods, developing building land near transport nodes, promoting inner urban development, raising the quality of living and housing conditions in urban areas, which includes the conservation of existing ecosystems and the creation of new green areas and biotopes.
- Regenerating deprived neighbourhoods and producing a mix of activities and social groups within the urban structure, particularly in cities where areas of social exclusion are developing;
- Carefully managing the urban ecosystem, particularly with regard to open and green spaces, water, energy and waste;
- Establishing planning bodies across local authority boundaries between individual towns and communes to coordinate the planning and implementation of measures;
- Conservation and enhancement of the cultural heritage.

Examples of other relevant recommended measures :

- Regenerating the environment of areas damaged by industrially polluting activities;
- Regenerating town and cities in industrial regions, particularly by providing services, cleaning up contaminated industrial sites and improving the urban environment.

Annex 4 Member States' Urban Exchange Initiative : Tried and tested principles for the implementation of sustainable land use (UEI 1999)

- Promote mixed land use in order to limit the use of space (elsewhere 'consumption of land') for housing, industry and transport
- Favour inner urban development and recycling of derelict land rather than using greenfield sites (elsewhere 'recycling brownfield sites before greenfield development')
- Promote space-saving building practices and optimum use of urban density
- Secure open space and conservation of the landscape through the conservation and networking of ecologically-sound open spaces
- Cooperate between cities and their urban fringe areas
- Promote attractive urban design
- Promote balanced use of the instruments of local authority land management
- Develop geographical information systems and ensure that administrators and investors will have easy access to them.
- Form strategic partnerships between public and private entities to ensure the financing and implementation of projects to re-activate derelict sites
- Create flexible inter-sectoral administrative structures to remove bureaucratic obstacles within authorities
- Integrate land management into specialised sectoral plans of the municipality, in particular with respect to plans for economic promotion and housing construction, to ensure optimum use of the available space.
- Promote sensitive handling of existing building stocks when carrying out development measures and systematic exploitation of existing potentials taking account of evolved structures
- Organise development competitions to identify high-quality solutions
- Promote early and comprehensive participation of the citizens in development measures to gain acceptance and integrate residents' requirements
- Employ new models of citizen participation eg workshops or scenario models
- Use all opportunities to improve the town by promoting the protection of historic buildings
- Maintain and develop open spaces when developing urban areas
- Pursue active land development policies including innovative legal instruments to ensure sustainable land use.

Under 'Tried and tested principles for the implementation of a city-friendly transport policy' the following are also included :

- Build awareness for the value of urban public space and recover it for forms of use other than transport, hence improving the quality of life of the inhabitants and avoiding tendencies towards segregation and the exodus of the local population.
- Integrate regional and transport planning to avoid urban sprawl that leads to a further increase of traffic.

REFERENCES

CEC (1990) *Green Paper on the Urban Environment*

CEC (1998) *Sustainable Urban Development in the European Union : A Framework for Action* COM (98) 605

CEC (2000b) *Integrated Coastal Zone Management : A Strategy for Europe* COM (2000) 547 Sept

CEC (2000c) *Proposal for a European parliament and Council Recommendation concerning the implementation of Integrated Coastal Zone Management in Europe* COM (2000) 545 Final Sept

CEMAT (2000) Guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent prepared by the Committee of Senior Officials, European Conference of Ministers Responsible for Regional Planning (CEMAT). Hanover 7-8 September

Committee on Spatial Development (1999a) *European Spatial Development Perspective : Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union.*

Committee on Spatial Development (1999b) *European Cooperation in Spatial Planning 2000-2006. ESDP Action programme* Final version 22.9.99

COR (1999) The European Commission's Communication 'Sustainable Urban Development in the European Union : A Framework for Action' (Document CdR 115/99)

EEA (1998) *Europe's Environment: The Second Assessment* European Environment Agency, Copenhagen

EEA (1999) *Environment in the European Union at the Turn of the Century* European Environment Agency, Copenhagen

EEA (2000a) *Environmental Signals 2000* European Environment Agency, Copenhagen

EEA (2000b) *Recent developments in the use of environmental taxes in the European Union* Summary of a draft report. July 2000

ECOSOC (1999) Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee on 'Sustainable Urban Development in the European Union : A Framework for Action' 1999/C368/19
European Commission (1990) *Green paper on the Urban Environment* COM(90)218

European Commission (1998) *Sustainable Urban Development in the European Union: A Framework for Action* COM(98)605

Expert Group on the Urban Environment (1996) *European Sustainable Cities*

Hamell M. (1999) *Elements of existing and future soil protection activities within the European Union* Text of a speech by Head of Agricultural Sector, DG Env D1, to the European Soil Forum, Berlin 24-26 November

IEEP (1999) *The influence of EU policies on the evolution of coastal zones ICZM Demonstration Programme, Thematic Study E* (London, Institute of European Environmental Policy) November

Nadin V. (2000) 'A note on the SPECTRA project and recent findings' Sustainability, Development and Spatial Planning : An Examination of the Capacity of Spatial Planning Systems in Europe to develop and implement policy for Sustainability. ENV4-CT97 – 0644 (DG12). Prepared for the Working Group on Sustainable Land Use, March 2000

OECD (1998) *Urban Brownfields* Report to the Group on Urban Affairs DT/UA(98)8

OECD (1999) *Urban Sprawl and the role of Infrastructure* Report to the Working Party on Territorial Policy in Urban Areas DT/TDPC/URB(99)1

OECD (2000) *Managing Urban Growth*

Portugal (2000) *Towards an Urban Environment Policy : Contribution to the 6th Community Environmental and Sustainable Development Action Programme*. Paper prepared for the Informal Council of Environment Ministers, April

UEI (1999) *Urban Exchange Initiative II : Report on Elements of a sustainable urban development in the European Union – sustainable land use, city-friendly transport policy* Prepared for the meeting of the Ministers with responsibility for regional/spatial planning of the European Union, Potsdam 1999 by the German Association of Cities and Towns, Austrian Association of Cities and the City of Vienna, in cooperation with Europaforum Vienna, the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany and the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning, Germany

Working Group on Sustainable Land Use (2000) *Towards more Sustainable Urban Land Use* Interim report, October