



# Documentation Regional development instruments

derived from DIAMONT Database [www.diamont-database.eu](http://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	
<b>Name of instrument:</b>	Cost-effective fees for technical infrastructure
<b>Country / region:</b>	AT
<b>Spatial level:</b>	local
<b>Type:</b>	Economic instruments
<b>Subtype:</b>	Access fees / supply fees
<b>Description:</b>	<p>Fees for access to technical infrastructure such as road access, drinking water, waste water treatment, electricity and communication infrastructure are currently identical for each individual user of these networks. Thus, a household in a densely populated residential area is paying the same price as the suburban household with significantly higher provision costs; the municipality as a whole is therefore subsidising ineffective settlement patterns.</p> <p>Research suggests that municipal costs for low-density settlements are 98% higher than those for high-density settlements (<a href="http://www.pronatura.ch/content/data/060516_Zersied_I.pdf">http://www.pronatura.ch/content/data/060516_Zersied_I.pdf</a>, S. 4).</p> <p>Fees that reflect the actual costs of technical infrastructure provision would thus encourage more cost-efficient residential areas. &amp;#65533; &amp;#65533;</p>
<b>General objectives:</b>	Cost-effective treatment of different settlement patterns
<b>General Objectives keywords:</b>	internalisation of external costs ; land development ; municipal infrastructure costs ;
<b>Responsible:</b>	Local authority/Municipal council
<b>Responsible:</b>	Public service providers
<b>Stakeholder Involved:</b>	Planners
<b>Stakeholder Involved:</b>	Private individuals
<b>Stakeholder Involved:</b>	Judicial branch
<b>Reference:</b>	<a href="http://www.staedtebund.at/de/oestb/archiv/service/steinlechner_oegz0109.html">http://www.staedtebund.at/de/oestb/archiv/service/steinlechner_oegz0109.html</a> <a href="http://www.pronatura.ch/content/data/060516_Zersied_I.pdf">http://www.pronatura.ch/content/data/060516_Zersied_I.pdf</a> (p.4ff). &#65533;
<b>General assessment of strength and weakness:</b>	<p>Strength: Lowers financial burdens for high-density commercial and residential areas. Eases burdens on municipal budget.</p> <p>Weakness: Potentially inconsistent with the law, particularly the principle of equality. &amp;#65533;</p>
<b>Metadata:</b>	<p>Date of entry: 31.01.2007</p> <p>Contact: Ifuplan, Schleißheimer Str. 156, 80797 München</p>

Implementation	
<b>Legal status:</b>	not-mandatory for responsible body, BUT mandatory for end-user
<b>Extension:</b>	pilot status
<b>Comment:</b>	<p>Cost-effective fees exist for certain services such as water and waste water access, while for other services such as road maintenance, postal or telephone services, equal fees apply for all users of these networks.</p> <p>Question of legal defensibility of different fees for different settlement patterns:</p> <p>Three-step assessment:</p> <p>1st step: Users of a network are to be considered as a collective =&gt; Is the level of service utilization identical with the level of fees charged?</p> <p>2nd step: Is a differentiation in fees objectively justifiable (e.g. as steering instrument)?</p> <p>3rd step: Do arguments of administrative efficiency justify unequal treatment?&amp;#65533;&amp;#65533;&amp;#65533;&amp;#65533;&amp;#65533;</p>
<b>Type of monitoring:</b>	none
<b>General comment:</b>	The same dilemma is true for social services (mobile care for elderly, child care, schooling, ambulance etc.).
Assessment	
Relevance	
<b>Status:</b>	strong indirect relevance
<b>Ranking:</b>	2
<b>Remark:</b>	-
Acceptance	
<b>Status:</b>	municipal administration, environmental NGOs, superordinate administrations
<b>Ranking:</b>	3
Implementation	
<b>Ranking:</b>	0
<b>Remark:</b>	difficult to assess, some fees are levied to cover costs (access to drinking and waste water), while for others standard fees apply (postal services, telephone).
Feasibility	
<b>Status:</b>	Legislation, political will
<b>Ranking:</b>	4
<b>Remark:</b>	-
Effectiveness	
<b>Status:</b>	Direction of effect, type of effect, acceptability, perpetuity
<b>Ranking:</b>	4
<b>Remark:</b>	-