



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:	Building Land Development Fee
Country / region:	SI
Spatial level:	local
Type:	Economic instruments
Subtype:	Consumptive fees
Description:	The Building Land Development Fee is a fee to partly cover costs connected with equipping building land with local infrastructure. By paying, an owner or an investor who is liable for this fee receives access to local infrastructure. Liable are those who access public infrastructure for the first time or who by rebuilding increase connection power of already existing edifices. This fee does not include construction costs for infrastructure connection from public infrastructure to particular edifice.
General objectives:	Enabling municipalities to fund maintainance and upgrading of public infrastructure.
General Objectives keywords:	municipal infrastructure costs ; municipal budgets ; internalisation of external costs ;
Responsible:	Local authority/Municipal council
Stakeholder Involved:	Local authority/Municipal council
Reference:	This fee is based on: Spatial Planning Act, Construction Act,
General assessment of strength and weakness:	strength: weakness: - it differs much from municipality to municipality
Metadata:	Date of entry: 2007/05/07 Contact: Ifuplan, Schleißheimer Str. 156, 80797 München

Implementation

Legal status:	mandatory
Extension:	all municipalities
Type of monitoring:	none
Preconditions for implementation:	Each municipality has to adopt a respective decree.

Assessment

Relevance	
Status:	weak direct relevance
Ranking:	3
Remark:	as the fee does only partly cover the costs for equipping building land with local infrastructure its direct relevance is weak
Acceptance	
Ranking:	5
Implementation	
Ranking:	5
Feasibility	
Status:	Legislation, political will
Ranking:	4
Effectiveness	
Ranking:	0
Remark:	Difficult to assess.