



Documentation Regional development instruments

derived from DIAMONT Database www.diamont-database.eu



This project has received
European Regional
Development Funding
through the INTERREG III B
Community Initiative



Federal Ministry for the
Environment, Nature Conservation
and Nuclear Safety



Bavarian State
Ministry of the
Environment,
Public Health
and Consumer
Protection

Interreg III B

General Data	
Name of instrument:	De-sealing concepts and programmes (= Entsiegelungsprojekte und -programme)
Country / region:	DE
Spatial level:	local
Type:	Economic instruments
Subtype:	Subsidies and local business development
Description:	<p>De-sealing concepts and programmes mostly require municipal access to plots in terms of decision making. Therefore, they are mainly carried out on municipal property, e.g. in the form of the ecological compensation measure (cp. specific entry in database).</p> <p>Other concepts include public subsidies for private soil de-sealing as financial incentives as well as the legal requirement of brownfield de-sealing/de-sealing of installations that are no longer in use according to §179 BauGB (Federal Building Code on Construction). The legal requirement of de-sealing (= Rückbaugesuch), however, is not broadly being implemented as it involves financial compensation for the respective land owners.</p>
General objectives:	Reducing share of sealed surface, reducing surface runoff and consequently municipal costs
General Objectives keywords:	municipal infrastructure costs ;
Responsible:	Local authority/Municipal council
Stakeholder Involved:	Private individuals
Stakeholder Involved:	Entrepreneurs/businessmen
Reference:	http://www.xfaweb.baden-wuerttemberg.de/bofaweb/berichte/bs08/bs080042.html
General assessment of strength and weakness:	<p>Strength: Voluntary approach that rewards private initiative</p> <p>Weakness: No broad effect as it is voluntary and financial incentives are rather neglectable</p>
Metadata:	<p>Date of entry: 09/05/2007</p> <p>Contact: Ifuplan, Schleißheimer Str. 156, 80797 München</p>
Implementation	
Legal status:	not-mandatory for responsible body AND not-mandatory for end-user
Extension:	rarely (< 25%)

Comment:	Legal status concerns voluntary concepts, mandatory deconstruction or desealing would be mandatory for responsible body and for end user
Type of monitoring:	none
Preconditions for implementation:	Budgets and political will Legislation in the case of mandatory requirement
Best practise example (1):	Municipal contest for de-sealing and urban greening of industrial areas and private backyards / Municipality of Karlsruhe (DE)
Example Abstract (1):	The municipality of Karlsruhe is carrying out contests for de-sealing and urban greening of industrial areas and private backyards.
General comment:	Beyond the two mentioned concepts, de-sealing aspects can also be part of local land use planning, local development planning and other planning instruments.
Assessment	
Relevance	
Ranking:	4
Acceptance	
Status:	Municipal administration, local economy, NGOs, municipal residents, superordinate administrations
Ranking:	5
Remark:	Lower acceptance in the case of mandatory de-sealing and deconstruction
Implementation	
Ranking:	2
Feasibility	
Status:	budget, political will, (legislation)
Ranking:	4
Remark:	Legislation only in the case of mandatory de-sealing
Effectiveness	
Status:	direction of effect, type of effect, acceptability, perpetuity
Ranking:	4