

Urban Agenda for the EU - Sustainable Use of Land - **Draft Action 2**

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Draft Action 2: FINANCING MODELS FOR BROWNFIELD DEVELOPMENT



BOTTLENECKS

The main problem that this action deals with is the lack of comprehensive and up-to-date information for cities on how to receive EU-level funding and financing and on how to leverage private investment for brownfield redevelopment. Brownfield redevelopment presents a valuable opportunity to not only limit land take and prevent urban sprawl, but also to make cities more liveable and to apply nature-based solutions.

Private investors look at a project in terms of profitability and market potential. The cost - value gap (if the perceived future value of a site is less than anticipated redevelopment costs) prevents the redevelopment of those sites that are on the borderline of profitability ('B' sites) or are generally not profitable ('C' sites). This can only change if there are some means of creating a surplus of value over cost. This is particularly important in the early stages of brownfield redevelopment. While 'B' sites require only a modest

intervention (gap/bridge funding) from the public sector, 'C' sites require a more substantial intervention from the public sector to address upfront costs and make the project attractive for private investors.

While there are several networks and research projects that have explicitly dealt with the question of funding and financing (CLARINET, CABERNET, NICOLE, RESCUE, REVIT), this information is often either outdated, incomplete or too general to be of any use. The problem is also that cities are not always aware of the mechanisms/instruments that exist.

OBJECTIVE

The proposed action is to develop a comprehensive funding and financing Guide for cities planning a brownfield redevelopment project, which provides an up-to-date description, with concrete examples from across Europe, of relevant funding and financing mechanisms/instruments. The Guide would offer a perspective on how these funding sources and financing mechanisms can be combined or blended in a holistic approach, in order to overcome the above-mentioned bottlenecks and mainstream brownfield issues among urban stakeholders.

OUTPUT

The Guide would cover EU-level funding and financing mechanisms/instruments, as well as fiscal and regulatory mechanisms/instruments for leveraging private investment for all activities or phases of the redevelopment process:

- planning,
- site assessment,
- remediation, and
- redevelopment.

Structure

The Guide would consist of two major sections:

1. EU-level funding and financing mechanisms/instruments
2. Fiscal and regulatory mechanisms/instruments for leveraging private investment

An additional activity will be asking the European Court of Auditors to update their study "Have EU structural measures successfully supported the regeneration of industrial and military brownfield sites (2012)". This could also inform the programming for the 2021-2027 ESIF period. This Guide will be made available either in the form of a website/portal or an active PDF document.

NOTE: The actions are open for Public Feedback until Wednesday, 19 September 2018. The individual contributions to this Public Feedback will not be published on the Internet. You will be able to choose between providing your personal details or submitting your contribution anonymously. The results of the Public Feedback will be taken into consideration by the members of the Partnership for the preparation of the final version of the Action Plan and presented on DG meeting on Urban Matters in end-2018. Replies may preferably be submitted in English.

Read the [full draft Action Plan](#) for more detailed descriptions of all ten draft actions of the Sustainable Use of Land and Nature-Based Solutions Partnership.

Draft Action 2: FINANCING MODELS FOR BROWNFIELD DEVELOPMENT

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the weakest and 5 the strongest), to what extent do you find this issue crucial and why?

	1- Weakest	2- Weak	3- Regular	4- Strong	5- Strongest	N /A
* To what extent do you find this issue crucial?	<input type="radio"/>					

1.a. Please briefly justify your choice

* 2. Based on your experience, do you believe that this action would contribute to addressing the abovementioned bottlenecks?

- Mostly yes
- Partially yes
- No
- I do not know

2.a. Please briefly justify your choice

* 3. How do you think the bottleneck presented above could be better solved?

3.a. Which other actions do you think could tackle the above-mentioned bottleneck? Please briefly indicate which actors should be involved in its implementation.

* 4. Are you aware of initiatives or documentation developed at international, EU, national, regional or local level that could be relevant for this action?

- Yes
- No

4.a. If yes, thank you for providing relevant details

Respondent's profile

* 1.a. Which country are you from?

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Austria | <input type="radio"/> Germany | <input type="radio"/> Poland |
| <input type="radio"/> Belgium | <input type="radio"/> Greece | <input type="radio"/> Portugal |
| <input type="radio"/> Bulgaria | <input type="radio"/> Hungary | <input type="radio"/> Romania |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia | <input type="radio"/> Ireland | <input type="radio"/> Slovak Republic |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus | <input type="radio"/> Italy | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia |
| <input type="radio"/> Czech Republic | <input type="radio"/> Latvia | <input type="radio"/> Spain |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Sweden |
| <input type="radio"/> Estonia | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom |
| <input type="radio"/> Finland | <input type="radio"/> Malta | <input type="radio"/> Other (Please specify) |
| <input type="radio"/> France | <input type="radio"/> Netherlands | |

Please specify

* 2. Are you a public, private or non-governmental organisation?

- Public
- Private
- NGO
- Other

Please specify

* Please specify the level of your public organisation:

- Local
- Regional
- National
- EU
- International

* 2.b. In which country is your organisation based?

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Austria | <input type="radio"/> Germany | <input type="radio"/> Poland |
| <input type="radio"/> Belgium | <input type="radio"/> Greece | <input type="radio"/> Portugal |
| <input type="radio"/> Bulgaria | <input type="radio"/> Hungary | <input type="radio"/> Romania |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia | <input type="radio"/> Ireland | <input type="radio"/> Slovak Republic |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus | <input type="radio"/> Italy | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia |
| <input type="radio"/> Czech Republic | <input type="radio"/> Latvia | <input type="radio"/> Spain |

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Sweden |
| <input type="radio"/> Estonia | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom |
| <input type="radio"/> Finland | <input type="radio"/> Malta | <input type="radio"/> Other (Please specify) |
| <input type="radio"/> France | <input type="radio"/> Netherlands | |

Please specify

3. Name, surname and position of the respondent

4. Name of the institution

5. Email

* How did you learn about the Public Feedback?

- Via Futurium
- Via the Urban Agenda for the EU newsletter
- Via Twitter
- Through a member of your network
- Other (Please specify)

Please specify

Thank you for participating in the Public Feedback! **More information:**

Read the [full draft Action Plan](#) and contribute to other actions of the Sustainable Use of Land and Nature-Based Solutions Partnership.

- [Draft Action 1](#): INCLUDING LAND TAKE IN IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES
- [Draft Action 3](#): IDENTIFYING AND MANAGING UNDER-USED LAND
- [Draft Action 4](#): INDICATORS OF LAND TAKE
- [Draft Action 5](#): PROMOTING FUA COOPERATION AS A TOOL TO MITIGATE URBAN SPRAWL
- [Draft Action 6](#): BETTER REGULATION TO BOOST NBS AT EUROPEAN, NATIONAL AND LOCAL LEVELS
- [Draft Action 7.1](#): BETTER FINANCING ON NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS - PREPARE AN NBS FUNDING GUIDE TO ASSIST CITIES IN ACCESSING FUNDING FOR NBS PROJECTS

- [Draft Action 7.2](#): BETTER FINANCING ON NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS - OVERCOMING THE BIAS FOR EXISTING SOLUTIONS THROUGH NBS FINANCIAL INCENTIVES MAINSTREAMING
- [Draft Action 8](#): AWARENESS RAISING IN THE AREAS OF NBS AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF LAND (URBAN SPRAWL)
- [Draft Action 9](#): DEVELOPING COMMON STANDARDS AND INDICATORS - AGREEING ON COMMON TARGETS AND INDICATORS FOR NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS, URBAN GREEN STRUCTURE, BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES IN CITIES

[About the Public Feedback - Disclaimer](#)