



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: | Greenfield Development Charge (= Neuerschliessungsumlage) |
| Country / region: | DE |
| Spatial level: | national |
| Type: | Economic instruments |
| Subtype: | Steering taxes |
| Description: | <p>A charge is levied on greenfield development, whose revenues are being used for activating inner-urban brownfield potentials.</p> <p>Based on a delineation of built-up area and greenfield areas, every new development on the greenfield area is levied 25-50 EUR/squaremeter, which are collected in a regional fund for activation and rehabilitation of inner-urban brownfields. The tax is being levied from sellers/buyers independently from other costs that might accrue for greenfield development such as ecological compensation or levies for public infrastructure provision.</p> |
| General objectives: | funding and promoting brownfield redevelopment, containing urban sprawl |
| Responsible: | National authority |
| Stakeholder Involved: | Regional authority |
| Stakeholder Involved: | District authority/District parliament |
| Stakeholder Involved: | Planners |
| Stakeholder Involved: | Entrepreneurs/businessmen |
| Reference: | <p>Thomas Preuß/Uwe Ferber (2006): Circular Flow Land Use Management: New Strategic, Planning and Instrumental Approaches for Mobilisation of Brownfields => http://www.difu.de/index.shtml?/english/occasional/06-preuss_circular.shtml</p> |
| General assessment of strength and weakness: | <p>Strength: Effective tool to contain urban sprawl, activate brownfield potentials and to preserve open space. Advantage is that it tackles two issues at the same time, that of urban sprawl and that of financing of brownfield redevelopment costs.</p> <p>Weakness: Only feasible if implemented on supra-regional, national level. Otherwise, the instrument could put off potential investors.</p> |
| Metadata: | <p>Date of entry: 09/05/2007</p> <p>Contact: Ifuplan, Schleißheimer Str. 156, 80797 München</p> |
| Implementation | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Legal status: | mandatory for responsible body AND mandatory for end-user |
| Extension: | pilot status |
| Comment: | Not implemented, but part of the discussion in the context of the federal German sustainability strategy. |
| Type of monitoring: | Report basing on quantitative indicators |
| Preconditions for implementation: | Requires national legislation and administration of the fund for brownfield development. Specifically, the regional administration (municipality or city region) of the fund for activation and rehabilitation of brownfields needs to be laid down in the respective federal planning law. |
| Assessment | |
| Relevance | |
| Ranking: | 5 |
| Acceptance | |
| Status: | municipal administration, local residents, NGOs, superordinate authorities |
| Remark: | Acceptance by biggest share of local residents likely, however not from those that are charged the levy. |
| Implementation | |
| Ranking: | 0 |
| Remark: | No implementation so far. |
| Feasibility | |
| Status: | Legislation, political will, staff |
| Ranking: | 3 |
| Effectiveness | |
| Status: | direction of effect, type of effect, acceptability, perpetuity |
| Ranking: | 4 |