



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:	Information campaign on land use changes
Country / region:	DE
Spatial level:	regional
Type:	Information, research
Subtype:	Public relation / awareness campaigns / information campaigns
Description:	Land use changes (agriculture, settlement, infrastructure) take place over long periods of time and often go unnoticed by the broad population. Awareness campaigns on the extent and increasing rapidness of these landscape changes, involving photographic time series, historic documents etc. can create awareness for this process and can provoke discussions among regional stakeholders and the population on what kind of landscape development is desirable. This again is the basis for local and regional policy decisions in regard to land use and land resource management.
General objectives:	Awareness raising, participation, regional strategies for land resource management
General Objectives keywords:	sustainable regional development ; land development ;
Responsible:	others
Responsible:	can be various actors
Stakeholder Involved:	Local authority/Municipal council
Stakeholder Involved:	District authority/District parliament
Stakeholder Involved:	Associations/interest groups
Stakeholder Involved:	Planners
Stakeholder Involved:	NGO
Stakeholder Involved:	Research
Stakeholder Involved:	Media
Reference:	Güthler, Andreas (2006): Landschaft im Wandel. Eberl-Verlag. Immenstadt.

General assessment of strength and weakness:	<p>Strength: Sensitive to local and regional situations that are at the core of everyday life for the population, Participation of population is part of this instrument, as they contribute photographs and documents, are interviewed on their experience and take part in future workshops. Instrument links past processes with potential future developments.</p> <p>Weakness: Requires professional input (GIS)</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:	<p>The implementation of the best practice project presented below was successfully initiating discussions in various municipalities on how to develop their landscape in the future.</p> <p>Monitoring can take place through photodocumentation at certain intervals.</p>
Type of monitoring:	other (see comment)
Preconditions for implementation:	Hardware (Photographic equipment) GIS (not necessarily)
Best practise example (1):	Landscape changes in Upper Allgäu and Tannheimer Tal (Landschaftswandel im oberen Allgäu und Tannheimer Tal)
Example Abstract (1):	<p>Commissioned by CIPRA Germany and with support from the Geographical Institute of the University of Erlangen, this project has carried out an assessment of landscape change in the respective region in the German and Austrian Alps. Diploma theses on the issue covered several municipalities and the landscape changes that took place over the last 100 years. Old photographs have been retaken from the same viewpoint, illustrating how reforestation on the slopes and settlement sprawl in the valleybottoms has dramatically changed the landscape aspect. Based on this assessment, future scenarios have been developed on local level.</p> <p>The results have been presented in the form of town meetings in every municipality, sparking a lively discussion among local residents. Furthermore, a website (www.landschaftswandel.com) and a publication (see references) are part of the project.</p>
Assessment	
Relevance	
Status:	strong direct relevance
Ranking:	5
Acceptance	
Status:	Municipal administration, local economy, NGOs, municipal residents, superordinate administrations
Ranking:	5
Implementation	
Status:	Pilot projects requiring substantial staff and budget input, but no application outside of project areas
Ranking:	2
Feasibility	
Status:	Budget, staff, participation/support

Ranking:	3
Effectiveness	
Status:	direction of effect, type of effect, acceptability, perpetuity
Ranking:	4