



SUITE The Housing Project

Environmental Sustainability in Housing in the Partner Cities of URBACT-SUITE

Thematic Report 'ENVI' working group



EUROPEAN
PROGRAMME
FOR
SUSTAINABLE
URBAN
DEVELOPMENT



By Heidrun Feigelfeld
Lead expert URBACT-SUITE
Contact: hf@srz-gmbh.com

March 2011

Table of contents

I. Introduction: Brief review of concepts, indicators and trends of housing and environmental sustainability in Europe	7
1.- Current status of the issue.....	7
2.- Kyoto and European Environmental Policy - the impact of housing.....	9
3.- Financial aspects of environmental sustainability and ERDF funding.....	9
4.- A synthesis of the focus and of the challenges in the partner cities of the SUITE network.....	10
II. The focus ‘Environmental sustainability in Housing’ - a preparatory survey	12
1.- The environmental standard of housing in the partner cities.....	12
2.- What type of action is going on and how; and furthermore: how is the impact?.....	14
<i>(including: Boxes on action in the nine cities/agglomerations)</i>	
III. The exchange on the Thematic Focus and the Hamburg Thematic Workshop	25
IV. Some final remarks: what have we learned about environmental sustainability in housing	28
Selected References	29
Annexes:	30
1.- Tables on the results of the survey among nine SUITE partners.....	30
2.- The questionnaire (TFS Thematic Fact Sheet ENVI / Environment).....	36
3.- Agenda Hamburg Meeting 26 and 27 May 2010.....	38
Credits	40



INTRODUCTION

Brief review of concepts, indicators and trends on housing and environmental sustainability in Europe

A high impact on the environment in many regards – land consumption, soil sealing, waste, water, gas, electricity consumption plus, above all, energy consumption from construction or refurbishment to heating - is related to where and how people live.

Thus, careful programming, funding, planning and managing in the housing field play a decisive role in the reduction of consumption and in the creation of a more sustainable future.

This is the background of the choice of nine European cities to include the issue of environmental sustainability in housing in their exchange on housing within the URBACT II SUITE network.

One of the first steps in the work programme was setting the stage for the exchange and designing the work concept with the help of a Baseline Study summing up the current situation, the state of the art and a synthesis of the questions raised. This review is partly based on the study. More detailed information on the situation in the cities involved can be found in the Partner Profiles (Part B of the Baseline Study) showing the environmental standards in housing (in the 'Local housing context') and specific housing policies regarding local environmental standards, actions and initiatives (in the 'State of Policy and Implementation').

1. Current status of the issue

The challenges posed by the increasing natural and man-made pressures on the environment and its resources require a **coordinated approach** at pan-European and international levels. Also in the housing field, we need to better understand and cope with issues such as climate change and identify environmentally friendly technologies in order to improve our management of both natural and man-made resources.

The issue is **high on the agenda**, although the most topical issues – the global financial crisis and its impact on the global economy and on the life of everyone – has cast and still cast a shadow on everything.

Compared to earlier days, more **professionalism** regarding housing management has entered the field. 'Facility management' instead of the former caretaker or 'concierge', digital (consumption) data-based transparency in technical management, a more developed large-scale infrastructure on the one hand (e.g. municipal heating / cooling systems) and broader scope for tailored solutions on the other help to increase well-being and to lower energy consumption.

Furthermore, stakeholders are aware that even the best standard of environmental quality in new construction could not sufficiently influence the necessary level of sustainability and saving. **Regeneration of the older housing stock**, which forms about 90% of the European stock, is crucial for success. However, although housing and neighbourhood regeneration has been an ongoing process in most European cities for decades and still consumes an increasing proportion of public funding, a holistic approach to an environmentally sustainable level has not always been chosen. Comprehensive need for renovation is still on our doorstep, particularly in the post WWII stock. Again, it is the question of sufficient return on investment when huge cubatures of social housing, inhabited by disadvantaged groups, have to be refurbished. Whilst the 19th to mid 20th century brick and mortar stock still provides a more flexible structure for upgrading, the regeneration of large-scale estates with prefabricated concrete slab constructions poses great challenges.

Especially **New Member States** suffer from a large 'legacy' of long-term neglected housing. This need for regeneration represents a big challenge in terms of financial, social and technical / environmentally sustainable requirements. However, this should not lead to a neglect of the integration of high environmental standards in a short-sighted approach.

Furthermore, the **ownership structure** of the housing stock presents a challenge. This background is extremely different in European cities and countries, also in the field of housing for lower income groups, and it broadly depends on historical developments and prevailing preferences or ideologies. Whilst regeneration of public or funded rental housing can be more directly planned and financed, for private landlords incentives have to be provided if the market mechanism does not work satisfactorily. This refers both to owner-occupied housing and to letting from a professional landlord. Also in this respect, especially in some New Member States, the large scale need for regeneration in now privately owned post-war housing stock is an urgent question. Large sections of home owners are over-challenged to cope with the most basic regeneration needs in financial and organisational respects, not to mention more advanced environmentally sustainable regeneration.

In any case, no part of the housing market for lower wage earners can be neglected if the objective is sustainable solutions.

However, in recent years a **broad movement** towards a more environmentally sensible approach to the built environment and especially to housing has developed. Programmes and funding schemes have been initiated, broad opinion forming and exchange of experience and good practice is on its way and a broad variety of institutions (such as 'energy agen-

cies'), accompanying, pushing and evaluating this process can be found. The level of action ranges from global to EU and local level, where many municipalities dare to be innovative and are willing to invest. Exchange and learning projects as in URBACT can profit from this pool.

There are EU regulations and relevant national regulations on construction and rehabilitation **standards** indicating upper limits for room heating. Recently, following an EU regulation, European countries stipulate Energy Performance Certificates for a broad range of buildings (which in the mid-term should influence consumers' choice and the markets). High-grade **programmes and podiums** on EU level are working (see also A.1.2).

CECODHAS has been active in this field of energy efficiency in social housing for some time and has held at least four informative conferences on the issue since 2007 which have brought together stakeholders, scientists and practitioners and provided a comprehensive view of the state of discussion. They also set up an 'Energy Experts Network' for the social housing field.

Also, in 2008, the UNECE Committee on Housing and Land Management most recently focused its session on 'an in-depth discussion on the issue of energy efficiency in housing in the UNECE region, addressing the obstacles'.

Sustainable management of the environment and its resources requires multi-disciplinary and **integrated measures**, the development of new environmental technologies, tools and services, but also an increased involvement and responsibility of the end-users, in our case the residents of the existing and the future housing stock.

In more and more countries and cities, the implementation of high environmental quality in housing has entered the **field of 'funded housing'** or 'social housing'. And it has even served as a testing ground for innovation. Public funding with its background of a more comprehensive understanding of interdependencies in the urban area and of urban programmes is proving to be a useful tool for progress.

'**Low energy level' construction**, based on EU guided regulations on targeted upper levels of consumption, e.g. of heating energy per square metre, is on its way to becoming the mainstream in new construction of 'subsidised housing'. Some countries, or cities/provinces have already reached this mainstream level and are moving forward towards more ambitious objectives such as passive house standard. (Examples: Austria, Germany). Several EU funded projects explicitly work on exchange of learning in the field, such as CONCERTO, to mention one, where partners of the SUITE network were involved

(see References). Furthermore, there is a broad exchange with New Member States on the regeneration of the prefabricated housing stock.

Of course, to reach the objective of high environmental quality, not only technical solutions have to be tackled, **spatial planning** also has a decisive impact on the desired results. Compact cities with good public transport, well-oriented construction and a good mix of use contribute to innovation. But to discuss this large field in more detail would also go beyond the scope of this study.

Publications, studies, conferences and workshops on the issue are already 'legion'. And a broad field of actors – from architects, town planners, building industry to environmental activists and users / residents are taking part in the discussion.

However, despite examples of good practice, we still need a more comprehensive discussion on the affordability of environmentally sustainable housing for all.

2. Kyoto and European Environmental Policy – the impact of housing

More than 40% of all CO₂ emissions within the EU derive from the building stock, 77% of it from housing – i.e. almost one third of total emissions. This data forms the background of programmes such as 'Intelligent Energy Europe'. Its mission statement: 'There are many untapped opportunities to save energy and encourage the use of renewable energy sources in Europe, but market conditions do not always help. The **Intelligent Energy - Europe** programme is the EU's tool for funding action to improve these conditions and move us towards a more energy intelligent Europe.' It is one of three operational programmes within the EU's Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP) from 2007 to 2013. It also forms the background for national programmes. The activities will address policy needs such as the sustainability impact assessments of EU policies and the follow up to the Kyoto and post-Kyoto actions on climate change.

The strategy for the implementation of the **Kyoto Protocol** foresaw a decisive reduction in CO₂-equivalents in heating, 75% of it in the housing stock, until 2010. Meanwhile an **EU directive** further increased the obligations of the member states. It is obvious that these objectives will not be achieved except by a combination of two principal strategies: on the one hand, conversion of the energy systems to renewable energy sources, on the other hand increased efficiency of energy use.

3. Financial aspects of environmental sustainability

The most obvious highly-topical impact on housing and especially on its cost is the recent enormous rise in energy costs on the international energy markets. The whole dimension of the **increase of running costs** for the use of energy (electric energy, gas, fuel for heating) has not yet become clearly visible. Forecasts predict a 30, 40 or more percentage increase. Of course, **low wage earners** and the most disadvantaged are the **most affected** by this additional burden of running costs. UK policy discussion created the term 'fuel poverty' for being unable to heat the flat during the winter. This is just one more 'brick in the wall', together with the enormous rise in prices for food and the breakdown of housing markets in some countries (Spain, UK), endangered jobs and pensions and the credit crunch.

Currently **threats** of higher indebtedness, of eviction and housing loss are increasing dramatically and will affect much broader groups than a short time ago.

The most disadvantaged are also those living in housing stock with the lowest standard, also in terms of insulation and heating systems, thus also paying disproportionately more for basic running needs.

Benefits for lowering the load of housing costs mostly refer to the rent itself. But today running costs often exceed the cost of rent. Balancing these needs by **additional allowances or other subsidies** will again load the national, regional or local public budgets. And these will not change the causes, but will only show short-term effects and will be identified as short-sighted policy.

Thus, there might be **positive side-effects** of this big challenge. Investing in alternative energy research, production and provision will lead to better cost-effectiveness, more knowledge and probably more funding in the near future.

An earlier return on (primary) investment / amortisation of investment in a more advanced construction or renovation technology will be possible. The realisation of low energy consumption will be more attractive. A growing market for alternative products will again lead to lower costs.

More 'advanced' countries and cities already **support innovative measures** and succeed in lowering the costs by 'building up a market'. EU and national regulations on Low Energy Consumption underpin these efforts. Consumers are increasingly informed regarding adequate behaviour and motivated by incentives. All this could result could result in **decisive steps forward towards** environmentally sustainable housing linked with cost reduction.

On the other hand, still dealing with the consequences of the world-wide recession nobody dares to prophesy a sustainable future.

Funding by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)

Possibilities to receive ERDF funds for plans connected with housing have developed since the beginning of the project.

At the beginning of the project there was already one form of funding, the ERDF Programme 2007-2013 which provides the opportunity to include housing-related funding for regions in New Member States (the EU 12) up to an amount of 2% of the total ERDF allocation. In particular, this funding is intended to promote the refurbishment of the communal parts of residential buildings, measures to increase energy-efficiency and the transformation of buildings owned by non-profit or public bodies into affordable housing.

This means, from the beginning there was the opportunity to use Structural Funds, at least for New Member State partners. However, there was no or almost no experience in using this recent opportunity and no information on successful examples.

After the start of the Implementation Phase of the SUITE project in April 2009, triggered by the crisis in Europe and by discussion on Climate Change, a new form of funding was added, now for all Member States.

Expenditure on energy efficiency improvements and on the use of renewable energy in existing housing became eligible (up to an amount of 4%). The proposal was intended to pay special attention to the most vulnerable households who too often suffer from fuel poverty. However, this brought no new funds but it was conceived as a redistribution of existing resources.

It can be seen that both forms of structural funds can be drawn upon for the implementation of some aspects of SUITE's Local Action Plans (LAPs). They have also been discussed in the project and, as provided for in the structure of URBACT projects, efforts are being made to set up contact to the regional or national authorities managing these funds, the 'Managing Authorities'.

However, also after the Thematic Workshop in Hamburg in 2010, no access to application for such funds for LAPs could yet be established. There are attempts and negotiations from the Tallinn partners in Estonia. And also the Medway partner has had some contact with the responsible Managing Authority in the UK.

However, even if no definite European funding will be available for the implementation of the Local

Action Plans, the partners are convinced that this kind of funding is highly relevant for progress in environmental sustainability and should be maintained in the next Funding Period of the Structural Funds, from 2013. Demonstration of successful use in the current period is seen as a crucial point, thus we continue to look for these cases of good practice, also to encourage the partnership. Currently, the 'external expert' of the network, CECODHAS Housing Europe is active in collecting good practice examples in Europe and the Lead Expert is in permanent exchange with them.

4. A synthesis of the focus and of the challenges in the partner cities of the SUITE network

Based on the information provided by the partners in the 'Partner Profiles' (see Baseline Study Part B, collected prior to the implementation phase of the project, 2008) some statements can be made on the environmentally-related situation in housing. (These were then used for the preparation of the Thematic Workshop on Environmental Sustainability in Housing in 2010 through still more targeted questions in a partner survey. See chapter II).

Environment and energy costs

In the countries involved, **national regulations** on the protection of the environment and on energy saving are in use, complying with EU regulations and Kyoto objectives. However, mainly in New Member States, there are complaints from cities that the implementation of these kinds of regulations is often not backed by sufficient financial means and that there is a lack of regulated supervision of these regulations.

National **programmes** for high quality and energy efficiency in housing are common, but partly remain on a voluntary or general level. In some countries, broad and elaborated concepts exist and there are links to the (local) Agenda 21.

Cities in our network have proved to be **ambitious in topping national standards**. Some of them include those objectives in the Local Housing Plan (also for 'social' and/or 'affordable housing'). Standards refer to **new construction**, in rehabilitation such standards do not seem to be compulsory. However, some cities can show aspiring programmes on ecologically sustainable **refurbishment**, together with funding programmes. Again, there are differences in funding schemes for the social and the private sector.

All partners define the **linkage** of high environmental standard and affordability as a **very big challenge**.

High environmental quality

The ambitious objective to forge a close link between housing and environmental sustainability is strongly supported by the network partners. They acknowledge their **responsibility as public bodies** in both directions, on the one hand to provide a **liveable and healthy environment** for their residents, and on the other hand to respond to the common obligation to tackle the consequences of the **climate change**, and to lower the emission of greenhouse gases, following the Kyoto protocol. (See the discussion of the issue in chapter I.1.)

They have been keen to discuss better programming, funding, planning and managing in the housing field to meet these needs.

Thus, a thematic work group has focused on this exchange during the project and has organised a Thematic Workshop on this issue.

The various steps of preparation of this exchange brought several topics to the fore which have been taken into account in the design of the **preparatory survey** and the choice of contribution for the workshop (see chapter II).

Inclusion of a broad range of actors is supposed to be a good tool. Thus, the **more detailed issues** have also addressed different groups. On the one hand, how to promote **interaction and good governance** of local authorities, private sector organisations such as science, architects, the building industry, housing managers and the market etc., which should lead to a high standard of environmental quality. On the other hand, how to address **potential users and residents** (awareness raising, demand, daily life, participation...).

Generally, in the discussion on the environmental aspects, affordability should always be kept in the back of our minds. Some of the participating cities already support innovative measures and succeed in **lowering costs** by 'building up a market', underpinned by EU and national regulations. The network has also addressed this question. And via the various European thematic associations involved in the SUITE network (the 'Board of Counsellors'), we have also been able to integrate broader up-to-date information on innovative practice.

Thus, discussing **priorities for public investment** and funding as well as alternative models has also been another issue for this thematic work group.



Heidrun Feigelfeld
Lead Expert SUITE

independent research plus
SRZ urban+regional research
Vienna (Austria)
hf@srz-gmbh.com



II. The focus 'Environmental Sustainability in Housing' – a preparatory survey

As a basis for communication in the network related to each of the three main focuses of the Housing Project, each time the experts try to provide an overview of the situation and opinions in the partnership by carrying out a small survey.

Also for the third focus of the SUITE issue, after 'social sustainability / social mix', discussed in 2009 including a workshop in Nantes and in Rennes, and 'economic sustainability' / affordability', also discussed later in 2009, in Newcastle upon Tyne, a survey was organised.

The third and last focus discussion, with the Thematic Workshop in Hamburg in May 2010, aimed at rounding off the 'sustainability' discussion, leading directly to a more integrated, holistic view on action for housing.

This chapter provides a short overview on the answers to the survey. (Tables with the results per partner can be found in the annex.) Some examples of 'actions' are listed in boxes at the end of the chapter. The Lead Expert presented these results at the Thematic Workshop in Hamburg to fuel the discussion.

1. The environmental standard of housing in the partner cities

For an engaged discussion on new ways it is essential to know more about the starting points of the

partners: are they just at the beginning of putting an emphasis on environmental sustainability? Do they concentrate on general measures, on new construction and/or on refurbishment? Are they already testing their concepts using pilot projects, or is there already a 'main-stream policy'? Has there been a back-lash caused by the financial crisis?

We are well aware that our cities / agglomerations **start from very different starting points**. We have discussed this before and much information is documented in the base-line study fact sheets. However, as we have determined during the course of the project, **a better standard of the housing stock is crucial** – both in terms of taking care of the environment and improving the quality-cost ratio – and, not to forget, of respecting the social aspects.

Thus, the answers to these questions in the survey are interesting for all partners, even if their declared focus of interest in the project is not the environmental one. To bring to mind our main target: to arrive at 'integrated sustainability' providing a synthesis of the 'three pillars (social, economic, environmental)'.

In a headline:

"We are well on the way. We know about the needs, we started or are even advanced. We tackle the crisis more or less."

1. A majority reports that there are (already, at least) some pro-mising pilot projects in new

construction or refurbishment. Many of them are cities in competitive regions (OMS), but not only – also cities in convergence regions, such as Tallinn or Iasi, report the same.

2. Also a majority states 'that they are already implementing a feasible mainstream policy (in new construction or refurbishment)', and two take the lead – they also declare that their housing programmes are very advanced and ambitious (Hamburg, Santiago).
3. Two cities in the NMS (Krakow, Tallinn) confirm that there is still a lot to be done and that the economic crisis has worsened conditions.

(See table 1/1, Current situation: Which of the following statements describes best the environmental standard of housing in your city?, in the annex.)

Seven out of nine partners declared 'raising the environmental standard' as a core policy defined in the housing programme. For two New Member State cities – Iasi and Kraków, this is not yet the case.

A **majority** of the cities and other partners in the SUITE network cities **implements** those aspects in **their housing programme by first action**, however not all of these already **get sufficient support** for rapid progress.

The survey confirms that our **holder of the pole position** seems to be **Hamburg**, but also the two **French** partners do not see big obstacles to a good mainstream environmental policy and implementation.

Interestingly, **Tallinn**, despite its difficult economic situation to date, is very active and successful. Thus, as the second member of the Thematic Focus group 'ENVI', they simultaneously provide useful input and are interested to learn.

Compared to other cities in their own countries, **no one** in the partnership sees themselves as the least active – this can be interpreted as being evident: cities (agglomerations) which participate in **European** projects are ambitious, active, and aware of the needs of today.

(See table 2/1, Is 'raising the environmental standard' a core policy defined in your housing programme?)

and table 1/2, Current situation: How does the environmental situation in housing in your city compare to other bigger cities in your country? both in the annex.)

Data would have been interesting to show the **quantitative effect**, the extent to which this **impacts** on the housing stock and on new construction.

There are so many hopes that improving housing on a larger scale would impact on CO2 emissions, for example, and on the running costs burdening the tenants or owners.

Providing data on the provision of low energy (or even better) standard housing in the respective city has not been easy for the partners, as the completed questionnaires show. Presumably, some reasons could be interpreted, and also these give hints on deficiencies and gaps to be filled:

1. **Short time:** looking for data is complicated, some may only be available in other municipal departments or outside the city administration. The questionnaires had to be completed in a short time.
2. **Competence:** again a question of access - in some of the partner municipalities, there are gaps in the link between those responsible for the URBACT project (housing department, European affairs department or similar) and those departments which provide data. This problem is inherent in the ambitious goal of the project – integrated thinking and planning including a broad range of actors. This will lead us to recommendations for better trans-disciplinary cooperation.
3. There is not yet feasible **monitoring** of the environmental situation and activities in the housing sector:

another hint towards a recommendation - to stimulate or start good monitoring and evaluation of data which could be used as promotion for informing policy makers and for advancing towards environmental sustainability. This could also be a direct impact of the SUITE project. Some partners could integrate this into their Local Action Plan. Partner Medway already provided drafts and a short cut paper on a Local Action Plan, which includes precisely this activity of data collection as a basis for targeted action in the city.

(Because of a lack of completeness and comparability, which will need more in-depth explanation, this report does without documentation of the material.)

(See table 1/3, Please fill in the following table regarding the provision of low energy (or better) housing in your city (No. of dwellings/homes, No. of dwellings per 1,000 inhabitants, approx. percentage of the respective stock; by type of landlord and rent/ownership; see the questionnaire in the annex.)

2. What type of action is going on and how; and furthermore: what is the impact?

A closer look at awareness of the urgency for more environmental sustainability, the impact of housing-related measures on the broader environment and at city action is crucial. It enables us to define the respective programmes, plans and implementation in a partner city in the context of the network and to find out interesting cases and examples of good practice but also gaps. Thus, the Lead Expert has asked for some more detailed information.

For an engaged discussion on new ways, it is essential to know more about the starting points of the partners: are they just at the beginning of putting an emphasis on environmental sustainability? Do they concentrate on general measures, on new construction and/or on refurbishment? Are they already testing their concepts using pilot projects or is there already a 'mainstream policy'? Has there been a backlash caused by the financial crisis?

Another general headline:

*First of all, the partners are convinced that there is a **positive impact on the quality of life** by action in the field of environmental standard of housing.*

*However, at the moment measures are still concentrated on **just some** of the possible effective actions – they are mainly concentrating on the need for heating: **raising energy efficiency by investing in thermal insulation is a priority among the actions.***

*The partners think that funding also **enables access for disadvantaged households**, not only for the middle class. For these purposes, there is a **wide variety of funding sources available.***

*Thus, all partners confirm **that low income groups profit from these funding measures**, they can access and can afford housing which is more environmentally sustainable than usual.*

More in detail:

- Regarding the **main fields of action** of the municipalities, in their plans and programmes for housing:

As mentioned - **energy efficiency** is clearly the main field of action (except in Kraków). Furthermore, it appears that the average standard of new construction in the cities approaches '**low energy standard**'.

A further priority (but obviously much less important) is **waste management**. (**Collection, separation and recycling** of waste has a strong connection

to housing, from the first measures (preparation of construction sites, especially when using contaminated land) to the construction work and finally to demolition, and of course mainly during 'lifetime': household waste, garden waste, clean space.) 'Green spaces' take up approximately the same position.

Fewer partners give a 'main priority' to **healthy buildings and the elimination of dangerous material**, which is a field with a really long-term impact and high importance for quality of life (to find out more: see the outputs from the URBACT II network BHC Building Healthy Communities. This network is a partner of SUITE in the URBACT Thematic Cluster Quality Sustainable Living, which animated cross-project cooperation on the URBACT programme level.

Also, as the network survey shows, Green Space is relevant just in some of the partner cities.

On the final position: water consumption and recycling and energy generation, storage and use. Taking into account the growing importance and decreasing availability of high quality water resources and of affordable energy from 'clean' production in a European perspective, a gap in local awareness and activity is clearly visible.

It requires a very **holistic view** to guarantee environmental sustainability. The SUITE survey results show that currently there are some **dominant** issues and some which are perhaps seen as **less relevant**, or still need to be **postponed** because of restricted funding and necessary targeting, focussing of policy and implementation.

Some measures in the more, let me say, 'neglected' fields would not be so costly, or are more a question of organisation, or rising awareness and citizens' engagement. Thus, the 'one after the other' principle **should be questioned. and/or an evaluation** of the policy so far and a **re-adjustment** of priorities should be on the agenda. This is even relevant in times of crisis and dramatically reduced municipal budgets. However, it could also be stated that evaluation is especially necessary under these circumstances.

However, there have also been designated examples of good practice among the partners: Hamburg will be European Green Capital in 2011, and Nantes, the core city of the Nantes Métropole authority, has won the European Green Capital 2013 competition (see References).

(See table 2/2, What are your main fields of action regarding housing / neighbourhoods? in the annex.)

- Regarding **financing, funding and affordability**:

There is a **wide variety** of funding sources and types of funding, in terms of levels and of combinations. No partner has access to all kinds of funding, in each case it is a 'special mix'.

The most common 'sets' combine public subsidies to housing associations (i.e. supply side measures) with allowances to households or individuals (i.e. demand side measures). Some provide funding for home owners – not surprisingly in countries with a strong focus on home ownership such as the UK and Estonia.

Related to the main focus of action (see above), funding is mainly concentrated on **energy efficiency** measures but there are also combined funding schemes.

Positively, in the partner cities, **low income groups benefit** from this funding, it **enables access** to environmentally sustainable housing for them too (some even state that the most disadvantaged also profit). For the partnership, this is a core quality as it is the 'conditio sine qua non' for succeeding in integrated sustainability, especially linking affordability and a good environment. Also regarding the climate effect, it is crucial to include the highest possible quantity of housing in environmental upgrading.

(See table 2/3 Financing and affordability, in the annex.)

The question whether this really leads to visible positive results can be answered by looking at the next point:

The clear answer is 'yes, all partners see positive effects'. First and foremost, the most important effect so far is - quite generally – **Increasing the quality of living conditions**.

Obviously, this is strongly connected with costs – **reduction of running costs**.

Less important but also relevant: More **demand** for this high quality housing. **As well – the Kyoto impact** - reduction of CO2 emission is ticked.

This can be interpreted as: **a direct positive impact for the individual and in parallel for nature and society**. And last but not least – **for the market**, quite necessary as a driver of change.

This is the optimistic view – on the other hand, only **a minority** among the partners seems to see a positive impact of good practice examples as '**models for others**'. And also only a minority is sure that this **increases user satisfaction**.

(See table 2/4, What are the most important effects so far? in the annex.)

- **Recently implemented action:**

In the answers to an earlier question, there was information on the main fields of action regarding plans and programmes. Also the **action** that the partners **recently implemented** reflects the visible priorities:

The mainstream of activities is '**thermal insulation**', this is carried out in all partner cities.

Furthermore, the majority includes aspects of energy production or pro-vision, **renewable energy** (e.g. solar panels, heat recovery, urban heating etc.) and of the choice of adequate construction **material**, infrastructure and design concepts.

There is another interesting and promising finding: many take into account **user** behaviour, information, and even empowerment.

However, in an overview, this shows a **strong concentration on the built environment**, on the building itself, the 'fabric'.

More comprehensive implementation, including aspects of "**Green** space and green buildings" is of minor importance for the partners (although various European cities already provide innovative examples, some of which were viewed during the Hamburg site visits).

Interestingly (and this is a point for discussion in the network) - **Urban concepts**: for example low land consumption, short distances, public transport, slow traffic and community infrastructure do **not** yet seem to be **in the centre of housing policies**. Is it a question of split competences between housing and urbanism? A more pragmatic view of what can be done? A question of priorities?

(To learn more about design and urban concepts, see also the final publication of the URBACT II Hopus – Housing Praxis for Urban Sustainability Working Group, in the References.)

(See table 2/5 Which of the following actions has your city recently implemented to improve environmental housing standards? in the annex.)

- **Standards of performance:**

As mentioned above, it seems that the average standard of new construction in housing approaches '**low energy standard**'.

(A comparison with a range of European cities shows that a certain number have been more ambitious and are advancing faster towards high standards).

A majority (four out of seven who answered) defines

the standard they mainly apply as $\leq 40/30$ kWh/sqm/y, this is a low energy standard. Three respondents indicated a less positive standard.

Just **one partner** (Rennes Métropole) also mentioned a **passive house** standard (which is below 15, half of the consumption above). Probably, there are pilot projects elsewhere but they have not been mentioned.

Medway Council, one of the British partners, provided information on the UK's more complex system of measuring – The Code for Sustainable Homes. (See the references.)

(See table 2/6, Regarding energy efficiency, what are the standards of performance you mainly apply? in the annex.)

The partners also provided **more detailed** information on **one action**. Logically, referring to the focus of activities, many of them describing measures of **thermal insulation**. You can find this information in the following 'boxes'.

(See question 2/7 Please select one of the actions mentioned above and describe it more in detail, see the questionnaire in the annex with more details regarding the questions.)

HAMBURG
<p>Action Increasing thermal insulation</p> <p>Name of the plan / programme: Project World Quarter Wilhelmsburg (Weimarer Platz), within the International Building Exhibition (IBA)</p>
<p>Starting date and planned duration: started in the 2nd half-year 2007, will be finalised at the end of 2010</p>
<p>Objectives and expected results: energy-efficient refurbishment of houses on a large housing estate, prevention of displacement (gentrification)</p>
<p>Beneficiaries / target group/s: current residents</p>
<p>Main tools: targeting funding, public allowances (rent stability is guaranteed)</p>
<p>Funding source/mechanism: subsidies from the municipal housing company SAGA GWG</p>
<p>Implementing body: City of Hamburg, municipal housing company SAGA GWG</p>
<p>Stakeholders included: City of Hamburg (Ministry for Urban Development and Environment), SAGA GWG, tenants</p>
<p>User participation and empowerment: participation of the tenants during the planning process, implementation of further participation processes by neighbourhood management</p>
<p>Monitoring and evaluation: finance controlling by managing housing company SAGA, evaluation of tenants' satisfaction by the project team of the International Construction Exhibition (IBA)</p>
<p>Results so far: The project is making good progress. A high percentage of the tenants who had to move to other quarters because of the refurbishment of their houses want to return. For more details see the presentation of the project at the Hamburg meeting.</p>

IASI	
<p>Action Increasing thermal insulation</p> <p>Name of the plan / programme: Programme of Housing Rehabilitation</p>	<p>Implementing body: municipality, housing association</p>
<p>Objectives and expected results: energy efficiency, increased thermal insulation</p>	<p>Stakeholders included: policy makers, construction industry, tenants/owners</p>
<p>Beneficiaries: citizens of Iasi</p>	<p>User participation and empowerment: tenants</p>
<p>Beneficiaries / target group/s: targeting funding</p>	<p>Monitoring and evaluation: technical performance</p>
<p>Main tools: targeting funding, public allowances (rent stability is guaranteed)</p>	<p>Results so far: In course of implementation</p>
<p>Funding source/mechanism: collective savings</p>	

KRAKOW	
<p>Action Increasing thermal insulation</p> <p>Name of the plan / programme: Thermal Insulation</p>	<p>Implementing body: municipality</p>
<p>Starting date and planned duration: current activities</p>	<p>stakeholders included : tenants</p>
<p>Beneficiaries: tenants and owners</p>	<p>User participation and empowerment: tenants</p>
<p>Main tools: targeting funding</p>	<p>Monitoring and evaluation: technical performance</p>
<p>Funding source/mechanism: state subsidies</p>	

MEDWAY
<p>Action Increasing thermal insulation</p>
<p>Name of the plan / programme: In Focus Project</p>
<p>Starting date and planned duration: 2009 5+ year duration</p>
<p>Objectives and expected results: See report (for the sake of brevity this report cannot be documented here. Please ask, if interested.)</p>
<p>Beneficiaries / target group/s: Vulnerable people within the project area. Also will contribute to neighbourhood renewal</p>
<p>Main tools: Brings together a range of tools, agencies and projects - see report</p>
<p>Funding source/mechanism: Local Authority, CLG, CESP, Regional Housing Board</p>
<p>Implementing body: Local Authority is the lead for the project</p>
<p>Stakeholders included: A range of agencies – see report - but links to be made with local community. Continued consultation is being undertaken with stakeholders in the area including members of the public</p>
<p>User participation and empowerment: Project will draw on local participation and engage with community groups</p>
<p>Monitoring and evaluation: Through the Private Sector Housing Strategy Monitoring Group and Strategic Housing Partnership Board</p>
<p>Results so far: See attached report for outcomes</p>
<p>Main enablers: The bringing together of agencies</p>

NANTES MÉTROPOLE
<p>Action Increasing thermal insulation</p>
<p>Name of the plan / programme: Energetic Performance</p>
<p>Starting date and planned duration: December 2006</p>
<p>Objectives and expected results: Funds from Nantes Métropole to finance “energetic performance” in social housing</p>
<p>Beneficiaries: Social landlords (public and private) who undertake works in the stock or for innovative projects</p>
<p>Main tools: Financial support</p>
<p>Funding source / mechanism: subsidies from Nantes Métropole</p>
<p>Implementing body: Social landlords</p>
<p>stakeholders included : Nantes Métropole and Social Landlords</p>
<p>User participation and empowerment: Tenants</p>
<p>Monitoring and evaluation: -</p>
<p>Results so far: Used by social landlords to renew their construction materials, their insulation and to increase solar panels. Becomes a subsidy for experimentation.</p>
<p>Main obstacles: Lack of funding</p>

NEWCASTLE Upon Tyne
Action Increasing thermal insulation
Name of the plan / programme: Warmzone
Starting date and planned duration: Start: April 2004 End: March 2011
Objectives and expected results: Eradicate fuel poverty in Newcastle as far as reasonably practicable and improve energy efficiency across all households in Newcastle
Beneficiaries: Residents of Newcastle upon Tyne
Main tools: Public-private partnership arrangement, financial assistance for cavity wall and loft insulation
Funding source / mechanism: Government funding and private sector funding
Implementing body: Newcastle City Council (Local Authority)
stakeholders included : Newcastle City Council, Your Homes Newcastle, tenants, residents, contractors, Registered Social Landlords, Private Landlords, utilities company
User participation and empowerment: Tenants, Landlords, Residents, contractors
Monitoring and evaluation: Monitored via Programme Board
Results so far: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 32,800 homes insulated • 73,400 home energy assessments completed • 305,000 low energy light bulbs provided • £6.4 million in new benefits income secured • £4.0 million in annual fuel bill savings for residents • 25,000 tonnes of CO2 emissions reduced each year
Main obstacles: Take up from residents
Main enablers: Comprehensive communication package including home visits, direct mailing, events and community engagement activities

RENNES MÉTROPOLE
Action Urban concept
Name of the plan / programme: Local Housing Programme (Programme Local de l’Habitat)
Starting date and planned duration: 2005-2014 (it has been extended by two years to face the economic crisis)
Objectives and expected results: Producing 4,500 dwellings per year with high quality standards
Beneficiaries: Low income households and young families
Main tools: Voluntary regulation and targeted funding
Funding source / mechanism: Local subsidies
Implementing body: Rennes Métropole
stakeholders included : Rennes Métropole, housing associations and the construction industry
User participation and empowerment: -
Monitoring and evaluation: reporting and steering committee
Results so far: Re-balancing social housing and ‘classical’ housing, with a slight decrease in purchase prices and rent levels
Main obstacles: Assure rapid implementation at operational level (delay between the cities’ commitments and the delivery of the dwellings)
Main enablers: Communication and the real work of contracting the number and the type of dwellings per city

SANTIAGO de Compostela
Action Green space
Name of the plan / programme: Plan Xeral de Ordenación Municipal (General Urban Development Plan) – The new residential area of “A Pulleira”
Starting date and planned duration: 2008-2024 (but the plan could be subject to review before)
Objectives and expected results: Designing of environmentally and socially sustainable green spaces for the community (within the comprehensive regeneration of the Old Town), urban parks, meeting places; solving noise problems, using small river beds for the creation of a future lake.
Beneficiaries: The Santiago population, the inhabitants of the new area
Main tools: Plan of reference, targeting funding, mixed participation: public, private; public exhibition (for feedback)
Funding source / mechanism: Private and public sector cooperation
Implementing body: Santiago Municipality, in some initiatives coordinated with regional and national administration
stakeholders included : Policy makers, experts in urban planning, citizens
User participation and empowerment: Citizens
Monitoring and evaluation: Continual monitoring and evaluation with the municipal elections; also with the public exhibition of the plan (period for comments, suggestions from citizens)
Results so far: Santiago, today not possible to plan a new residential area, or one for economic activities, without taking into account the green areas which are going to articulate them the same applies to suitable infrastructure and the services and equipment necessary (especially in new areas, but also in regeneration).
Main obstacles: Funding, the financial crisis, the crisis of the building sector in Spain
Main enablers: Funding from EU for low energy consumption construction and refurbishment of old buildings, especially focused on social housing and low income buildings; Low energy consumption measures successfully implemented in other cities and projects; Good practice examples

TALLINN
Action Increase alternative energy production or provision, renewable energy
Name of the plan / programme: Construction of ‘social houses’ and orphanages
Starting date and planned duration: 2009-2013
Objectives and expected results: Low energy consumption residential buildings with a high living standard
Beneficiaries: Low income households, orphans
Main tools: Targeting funding
Funding source / mechanism: ERDF/Municipal funding
Implementing body: Municipality
stakeholders included : Policy makers, tenants/owners
User participation and empowerment: Tenants, Owners
Monitoring and evaluation: On the basis of the realised project
Results so far: The planning process for the orphanage project with low energy consumption standards is completed; the planning of the ‘social houses’ is in the process.
Main obstacles: Possible problems with self-financing
Main enablers: Best practice, experts

Indeed, all these answers in the survey have provided a quite useful overview of the situation and the 'programming and planning culture' within the network, regarding the focus of 'environmental sustainability'.

For the network, **this helps** to see which aspects are well-known and which should be looked at more deeply, especially in **checking the Local Action Plans**. It will also **contribute to conclusions** and recommendations as a result of the SUITE exchange. This can help to define more clearly the positions of the respective partners in the European city context and to profit with more ambitious ideas for the Local Action Plan.

The presentation of these results and interpretations by the Lead Expert (who has the main content-related responsibility for the 'environmental focus' in providing input and animating the network) at the Hamburg workshop **served as a starter** for the discussion on benefits and traps, success and failure and on the integration of environmental sustainability into the Local Action Plans. In parallel, a range of papers, publications, web links etc. on

topic-related information, good practice examples and concepts on all levels were provided on a desk and via electronic messages by the Lead expert and by the convenor Hamburg (to find out more about the workshop, see the following pages).

Note on the survey interpretation:

All partners were interested in participating in the survey and responded in time. The Lead Expert, the analyst, tried to be cautious in the interpretation of the answers because the network is well aware that there are big differences in the background situation of the partner cities and, probably based on this, some-times there even seems to be differences in the understanding of some questions. We also admit that due to the compressed, abbreviated form of the questions, some of them might have been formulated too vaguely. This led to surprising results, which will be discussed before being taken as given at the end of and after the workshop. However, even these open questions led to some learning about the different points of view of the partners.



III. The exchange on the Thematic Focus and the Hamburg Thematic Workshop

Various methods were used to prepare a targeted and output-oriented session of exchange: the survey among the partners regarding the focus (the results are comprehensively shown in the chapters above and in the annex), informing partners by sending links to relevant website information, from European institutions (e.g. CECODHAS Housing Europe and its 'Sustainable Housing' links – Power House Europe, Energy Experts Network etc., see the References) and from national / local sources, and close cooperation in the Thematic Focus Working Group, mainly the leader and workshop convenor Hamburg and the Lead Expert.

This led to a broad and animating range of presentations and site-visits at the Hamburg Workshop on Environmental Sustainability in Housing.

Originally, the workshop had been planned for 20 and 21 April, but unfortunately it had to be postponed at the very last minute because of the consequences for air traffic of the volcanic ash from Iceland. Thus, it took place on 26 and 27 May 2010.

The 'bundle' of input comprised a broad picture of the Hamburg (and German) situation and activities, ranging from an overview of the City of Hamburg housing policy, a presentation of Hamburg's Framework Programme for Integrative City Development – RISE, an input of planning aspects for the energy efficient construction of residential buildings (providing interesting input on a 'history' of the development

of construction standards as a good basis for the understanding of retrofitting needs) to a contribution on 'Climate factor Metropolis – climate protection projects of the International Building Exhibition (IBA) in Hamburg Wilhelmsburg' (the agenda, including information on the presenters, can be seen in the annex.

On behalf of our member of the Board of Counselors, EUROCITIES Working Group Housing (now, 2011, 'Housing and Homelessness', after the merger of the two working groups), the former representative of EUROCITIES, Simon Guenther, provided insight into the activities of the network, examples and lessons of policy-related transnational learning and affordable housing and homelessness. This included recent and future activities regarding Climate Change.

(Another external expert associated with the SUITE project, Julien Dijol from CECODHAS Housing Europe, was sorry to have to cancel at the last minute and so could not participate and contribute on "How can the EU help cities to implement and manage an environmentally sustainable housing policy?".)

It was a lucky coincidence that while the SUITE conference was taking place the IBA (Internationale Bauausstellung / International Building Exhibition, until 2013) was in Hamburg (see: presentations). Therefore, the first stop of the **site visits** was the **IBA exhibition** centre in Wilhelmsburg, together with a

guided tour of the **'World Quarter'** ('Weltquartier', a big regeneration project) including the 'Energy Bunker' (re-use of a WW II bunker) and a neighbourhood activity (daycare service for disabled persons).

A second site visit took us to the cooperative housing project **'Greve's Garden'**, a **'building community initiative'** in Hamburg-Bergedorf. Direct contact with sitting tenants and a representative of the initiative gave insight into the very good 'integrated approach' of this project. It will be integrated into the Local Action Plan of the Hamburg partner.

(For those with some spare time left before departure, the Hamburg partner organised a guided tour, concentrated on environmental aspects, at the **'Hafen City'**, one of Europe's biggest inner-city brownfield regeneration projects, providing office buildings, housing, infrastructure, leisure facilities and the famous 'iconic' Elb-Philharmony, an opera and concert house conversion from an old warehouse on the bank of the River Elbe.)

The presentations were completed by a presentation of energy-efficient housing projects in **Tallinn**, Estonia, member of the Thematic Focus Group 'ENVI', which also gave first insight into the partner's Local Action Plan.

(This report is intended to remain brief so it is not possible to include more information on the content of the presentations and the interesting site visits. The presentations can be found on the project's website at www.urbact.eu.)

Based on these broad inputs, the network was keen to **discuss implications for the cities**. As a starter, the **Lead Expert** showed the **results of the survey** (see the chapter above). At the end she showed questions from partners addressed to the network.

In the questionnaire, which had been sent out as a preparation for the thematic workshop (for results see chapters above), there was a final question on which issues the partners mainly **expect information and inspiration** from the SUITE network.

There were some answers. And – quite understandably – they show a certain focus on **financial and technical aspects**: funding solutions, fast production and, more generally, avoiding rent increase. I.e.

maintaining access for low income groups and balancing upgrading effects.

Among the answers, there were **two** which **refer to the ENVIRONMENTAL focus**:

A more general one, which links technical questions to the 'access' question, from Tallinn: The experience of Hamburg partners in energy saving construction, especially in social housing?

And a second one raises a question which is currently **high on the agenda** of European and national discussion, especially in countries with an advanced technical standard:

What examples can SUITE partners provide Medway to demonstrate effective working with residents on the issue of energy efficient use of housing and housing stock improvements?

This means: the question of how to convince and how to integrate broader groups of residents into the whole field of responsibility for the built environment and saving, beyond a certain percentage of 'committed citizens' – **how to give the floor to users themselves as the most important actors**.

(Both partners, Tallinn and Medway, are planning to focus on environmental sustainability in housing in their Local Action Plans.)

Another quite important issue was touched by these questions - how to deal with the **modernisation of the stock**?

The newly built stock in housing is less than 10% of the whole provision. Thus, relevant positive effects (for the climate and for the resident) can only be achieved by working on the stock. In this field, even good technical solutions are still under-developed.

As another input to the discussion, the results of the survey also show that a much **broader view** of the issue, which also integrates questions of urbanism, regional policy, densification of settlements, mobility ('cities of short distances', an expression from the German debate), intelligent infrastructure etc. – **urban concepts should be integrated more broadly**.

Addendum 2011:

Further broad information on the ongoing debate in Europe on the very important role of environmental sustainability in housing was provided by a conference in Brussels on 'Sustainable housing – tool for social cohesion? The Environment as a tool for Social Cohesion for public Housing policies.' on 23 and 24 November 2010.

There were inputs and discussion on innovative projects or local policies, on national and European policies and on scientific contributions on housing exclusion and on indicators of well-being.

(also URBACT, the SUITE project and an interesting case from the Hamburg partner were brought to the fore by the participation of Philip Stein, the Thematic Pole Manager linked to SUITE, the Lead Expert, stressing the role of local political support for implementation, and Wolf-gang Kuehn from the Hamburg partner Lawaetz Foundation, presenting the good practice example 'Greve's Garden' in Hamburg. In the meantime, 'Greve's Garden' has been awarded the 'Building Community Award 2011' Baugemeinschaftspreis der Stadt Hamburg).

In the **Hamburg** workshop, a **session on 'Local Action Plans'** brought together information from the partners on the current status of their Local Action Plan drafts with a discussion of the relevance of environmental sustainability for those Local Action Plans and, more broadly, for innovative housing programmes.

As an overview, before the workshop, the partners had produced **one page 'short cuts'** on the framework of their Local Action Plans, organised by the Lead Expert, who had then analysed these short cuts by clustering them referring to their focus as a basis for a proposition for creating sub-groups, a 'clustering of partners around LAPs' ('duos' or 'trios') also assisting each other in the ongoing work on the LAPs.

Again, the 'synergy self-assignment' of the network, the goal to include at least small components of each pillar of sustainability very early, parallel to the respective focus chosen, was stressed. In the discussion, useful lessons learnt were identified and hints on good ideas that could be integrated into

some LAPs. For quick progress in the LAP drafts, partners tried to identify dominant gaps and ideas on how and by whom these gaps could be filled. The findings from this focus are proposed to be used as a sort of check list for the local work.

In the various rounds of discussion on both days of the Hamburg workshop, the partners and the invited contributors raised a whole range of critical questions and worked intensively on 'digging out' the most essential finding, plus those which are easily transferable and potentially applicable in the short term. The next chapter summarises a selection of these points.

The very fruitful, rich exchange at this workshop is due to the co-action of the network and the external contributors, the targeted preparation, and especially the excellent preparation and performance of the workshop by the convener, the Hamburg partner Lawaetz Foundation, on behalf of the City of Hamburg.

IV. Some final remarks: what have we learned about environmental sustainability in housing

The Hamburg workshop clearly showed that there is a strong sense of great responsibility towards the environment in the network. It is acknowledged that housing plays a great role in this field and that the need for action is urgent, also for cities' policy and administration.

However, a great challenge is to balance the need for affordable housing with the financial needs for good environmental quality. The workshop findings encourage progress because a whole range of integrated solutions could be shown.

Some of the key lessons learnt:

- Environmental sustainability is **holistic**, it includes more than energy efficiency, i.e. a wide array of technical, urban and social measures.
- Higher **initial investment can 'pay off'**; monitoring and evaluation show positive effects.
- Some countries/cities are already **mainstreaming high-grade** solutions. There are numerous **information platforms**.
- To be user-friendly innovative solutions must be accepted by residents. **Early residents' involvement** and easy descriptions are crucial.
- High-level new construction is easier. However, even **modest solutions in the old stock** have the biggest overall impact (renovation, running costs; residents' information and training.)

A selection of some more points, raised in the discussion:

- Integrate housing-related plans into the urban context of a 'green city', large-scale new construction projects, big inner-city brown-field regeneration, and the regeneration of housing estates but also into all small-scale projects
- There are two different ways to organise projects – top-down and bottom-up (both shown in Hamburg). Both are feasible but a sensible choice has to be made depending on the scale of the project and the stakeholders involved. Participation of those affected must be integrated in both versions (neighbourhood initiatives, residents' empowerment).
- There is a whole range of 'tools' to build 'inclusive projects' (quarter management, neighbourhood scouts, community champions, etc., etc.). Interest in grass-roots community-based projects depends on national / local culture but also on legal regulations and funding.
- Link local employment projects to area development schemes, use innovative environmental techniques applied in construction and retrofitting to create jobs and training opportunities.

- Plan a good mix of long-term measures with short-term visible action, also to raise acceptance.
- Try to take into account the broad picture of the impact of measures in the housing field (from the early production process to recycling), although global impact is difficult to measure.
- Cities in new member states are confronted with a large-scale need for housing provision, a lack of finance, high impact of the crisis, and great social challenges. However, the European community should strongly support their attempts including towards integrated good environmental standards.
- Use the opportunities provided by events such as a 'Bauausstellung' (building exhibition), a 'Green Capital Award' etc. to promote high environmental quality in housing and to accelerate projects (see example 'World Quarter' / Weltquartier Hamburg).
- Big developments (housing, offices, mixed use) need a post 'responsible for environmental sustainability' (see example Hamburg 'Hafen City').
- Find creative solutions for 'green infrastructure' (see example 'Energy Bunker' (Energiebunker) in Hamburg).

We have only one planet.

Selected references:

Best Practices Hub, Vienna (2009); Sustainable Housing - Best Practice Examples. www.bestpractices.at

Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Innovation und Technologie bmvit (Austrian Federal Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology) (2007); Haus der Zukunft, Building of Tomorrow, Austrian demonstration projects within the research programme 'Building of tomorrow'. Vienna. www.NachhaltigWirtschaften.at

CECODHAS housing Europe (10-2010); A mid-term review of the use of structural funds for energy efficiency and renewable energy measures in existing housing. Brussels. www.housingeurope.eu/news/1649

CECODHAS Housing Europe; sustainable housing (policy and action), www.housingeurope.eu/policy-actions/sustainable-housing

Concerto -act2 project 2006-2010. Actions of cities to mainstream energy efficient building and renewable energy systems across Europe. (co-funded by the EU). www.concerto-act2.eu and www.concertoplus.eu

Department for Communities and Local Government, UK (2006); The Code for Sustainable Homes. A step-change in sustainable home building practice. London. www.planningportal.gov.uk/uploads/code_for_sustainable_homes_techguide.pdf

Ecolish energy exploitation and performance contracting for low income and social housing. www.ecolish.com

fee UNECE financing energy efficiency investments for climate change mitigation. www.ee-21.net

Feigelfeld, Heidrun (2008); SUITE Baseline Study. http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/Suite/documents_media/SUITE_baseline_study.pdf

Greenbuilding – Nachhaltig planen, bauen und betreiben. Newsletter. www.greenbuilding-planning.de

Hamburg European Green Capital 2011. <http://hamburggreencapital.eu>

IFHP International Federation for Housing and Planning World Congress 2009, urban technology for urban sustainability: climate change and energy efficiency. Berlin. www.ifhp.org/node/174

IG Passivhaus Österreich (2009); Innovative Passivhausprojekte. Wien/Vienna.

Laurent Ghékière, Représentant de l'Union sociale pour l'habitat auprès de l'Union européenne (2010); Bilan à mi-parcours de l'utilisation du FEDER pour l'efficacité énergétique des logements, European Parliament (9-10 décembre 2010), in cooperation with URBANlogement, www.housingeurope.eu/event/1648

Nantes European Green Capital 2013, <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/europeangreencapital/winning-cities/2013-nantes/index.html>

Pass net establishment of a co-operation network of Passivhaus Promoters. www.oegut.at/en/index.php, www.pass-net.net

Passive house database www.passivehousedatabase.eu

Power House Europe, the big green housing exchange. www.powerhouseeurope.eu

SUITE network (2010); Presentations from the Hamburg Thematic Workshop 'Environmental sustainability in housing' <http://urbact.eu/en/projects/quality-sustainable-living/suite/our-outputs/>

UNECE United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (2009); Green Homes, towards energy-efficient housing in the region. New York, Geneva.

UNECE United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (2010); Action Plan for Energy-Efficient Housing in the UNECE Region. www.unece.org/press/pr2011/11env_p17e.htm

URBACT II Hopus Housing Praxis for Urban Sustainability Working Group (2010) "Housing for Europe: Strategies for Quality in Urban Space, Excellence in Design, Performance in Building". Final publication. <http://urbact.eu/en/projects/quality-sustainable-living/hopus/homepage/>

World Sustainable Energy Days 2010, conference Wels / Austria (also 2011) www.wsed.at

ANNEX 1

TABLES on the results of the survey among nine SUITE partners

Legend: x Positive answer from the partner
0 Not filled by the partner

TABLE I / 1:
Which of the following statements describes best the environmental standard of housing in your city?

	1. Hamburg	2. Iasi	3. Krakow	4. Medway	5. Nantes	6. Newcastle	7. Rennes	8. Santiago	9. Tallinn
1.1. There is still a lot to be done.		X						X	X
1.2. The economic crisis worsened the conditions.		X							X
1.3. There are some promising pilot project in new construction and/or in refurbishment.		X			X	X	X		X
1.4. We are already implementing a feasible mainstream policy in new construction and/or in refurbishment.	X	X		X				X	X

TABLE I / 2:
How does the environmental situation in housing in your city compare to other bigger cities in your country?

	1. Hamburg	2. Iasi	3. Krakow	4. Medway	5. Nantes	6. Newcastle	7. Rennes	8. Santiago	9. Tallinn
2.1. My city is one of the least advanced in the country.				0					
2.2. Measures are part of our local housing programs, first action is taking place.		X	X	0	X	X			X
2.3. There is sufficient support and we advance quickly.				0	X		X		X
2.4. Compared to other cities, our housing program is very advanced and ambitious.	X			0				X	

TABLE I / 3:
Offer of low energy (or better) housing in your city

	1. Hamburg	2. Iasi	3. Krakow	4. Medway	5. Nantes	6. Newcastle	7. Rennes	8. Santiago	9. Tallinn
Number of dwellings / homes (for rent/owned): total among them: municipality.....	n. d.	n. d.	23 ⁽¹⁾	n. d.		9.547 ⁽³⁾		n. d.	n. d.
Not-for-profit / housing association. Cooperative.....			6 ⁽¹⁾ 102 ⁽¹⁾		2.500 ⁽²⁾	3.843 ⁽³⁾	30.000 ⁽⁴⁾		
private developer, owner.....			180 ⁽¹⁾			31.583 ⁽³⁾			
Nr. of dwellings per 1000 inhabitants (r/o):	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.		n. d.		n. d.	n. d.
municipality					4,1		77		
Not-for-profit / housing association									
Cooperative									
private developer, owner									
Approx. percentage of the respective stock:	n. d.	n. d.		n. d.	n. d.		n. d.	n. d.	n. d.
municipality			7,4%			32%			
Not-for-profit / housing association			1,9%			55%			
Cooperative			32,8%						
private developer, owner			57,9%			37%			

n.d. no data provided.

Comments from the partners and from the LE on the data:

- (1) Probably data on buildings („houses“).
- (2) Only data for ‘social housing’ available, filled in in ‘not-for-profit / housing association’.
- (3) Based on a SAP rating of 70 or more.
- (4) Probably no data on private housing available.

II. ACTIONS (PLANS, PROGRAMMES) IN THE FIELD OF ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARD OF HOUSING

TABLE II / 1
Is 'rising the environmental standard' a core policy defined in your housing programme?

	1. Hamburg	2. Iasi	3. Krakow	4. Medway	5. Nantes	6. Newcastle	7. Rennes	8. Santiago	9. Tallinn
YES	X			X	X	X	X	X	X

TABLE II / 2:
Which are your main fields of action (regarding housing/neighbourhoods)?
(main, secondary, no)

	1. Hamburg	2. Iasi	3. Krakow	4. Medway	5. Nantes	6. Newcastle	7. Rennes	8. Santiago	9. Tallinn
2.1. Energy efficiency	main	main	no	main	main	main	main	second	main
2.2. energy generation, storage and use	second	no	no	no	second	second	second	second	second
2.3. Water consumption and recycling	second	no	no	main	no	second	second	second	no
2.4 Waste collection, separation and recycling	second	second	second	main	second	main	main	second	second
2.5. Green spaces	second	second	second	second	no	main	main	main	second
2.6. Healthy buildings and the elimination of dangerous material	main	second	no	second	second	main	second	second	second

TABLE II / 3:
Financing and affordability

	1. Hamburg	2. Iasi	3. Krakow	4. Medway	5. Nantes	6. Newcastle	7. Rennes	8. Santiago	9. Tallinn
3.1. Main funding sources:									
EU	X				X	X			X
national	X		X	X	X	X		X	
regional					X	X		X	
local			X		X	X	X		X
other						X			
mixed		X				X			
3.2. Funding enables access for...									
middle class households	X					X	X	X	
low income households	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
disadvantaged households		X	X	X		X	X	X	X
3.3. Types of funding:									
public subsidies to housing providers	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
allowances to tenants			X	X				X	X
credit, loans to home-owners, providers	X			X		X		X	X
other						X			
4. Funding mainly for..									
energy efficiency	X		0	X	X	X			X
other					X			X	
combined						X	X		X

TABLE II / 4:
Which are the most important effects so far?

	1. Hamburg	2. Iasi	3. Krakow	4. Medway	5. Nantes	6. Newcastle	7. Rennes	8. Santiago	9. Tallinn
Reduction of CO2 emission	X		X	X	X	X	X		
Reduction of running costs		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Increasing quality of living conditions	X	X			X	X	X		X
Rising user satisfaction			X			X			X
Good practice example – model for others					X	X	X	X	X

TABLE II / 5:
Which of the following ACTIONS has your city recently implemented, to improve environmental housing standards?

	1. Hamburg	2. Iasi	3. Krakow	4. Medway	5. Nantes	6. Newcastle	7. Rennes	8. Santiago	9. Tallinn
1. Increase Thermal insulation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2. Energy production or provision, renewable energy (e.g. solar panels, heat recovery, urban heating etc.)	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
3. Choice of adequate construction material, infrastructure, and design concept	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
4. Green space and green buildings					X		X	X	X
5. Urban concept: e.g. low land consumption, short distances, public transport and slow traffic, community infrastructure					X	X	X		
6. User behavior, information, empowerment	X			X	X	X	X		X
7. Other measures				X					

There have been many comments by various partners, which for the sake of brevity cannot be documented here.

TABLE II / 6:
Regarding energy efficiency, which are the standards of performance you mainly apply?

	1. Hamburg	2. Iasi	3. Krakow	4. Medway	5. Nantes	6. Newcastle	7. Rennes	8. Santiago	9. Tallinn
≤ 100 kWh/sqm/y (basic)		0	X					X	
≤ 60/ 50 kWh/sqm/y (low energy)	X	0		(X) ⁽¹⁾		X	X		X
≤ 15/10 kWh/ sqm/y (lowest energy, passive house)		0					X		
≤ 0 kWh/sqm/y (ZEB Net Zero Emissions Building / Zero Carbon)		0							
< 0 kWh/sqm/y (positive energy building)		0							
(for the details; see the boxes in chapter II.2.)									

(1) Different standard: ‚sustainable homes‘

TABLE II / 7:
Please select one of the above ACTIONS (No 5) and describe it more in DETAIL below : (from which you think we can learn about mistakes & achievements)

	1. Hamburg	2. Iasi	3. Krakow	4. Medway	5. Nantes	6. Newcastle	7. Rennes	8. Santiago	9. Tallinn
5.1. Increase Thermal insulation 5.2. Energy production or provision, renewable energy 5.4. Green space and green buildings 5.5. Urban concept: low land consumption	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X

Thematic fact sheet: Environmentally sustainable housing

EUROPEAN UNION European Regional Development Fund

PARTNER CITY: _____ **NAME & POSITION OF RESPONDENT:** _____ **DATE:** ___/___/2010

I. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE HOUSING IN YOUR CITY: CURRENT SITUATION

1. Which of the following statements describes best the environmental standard of housing in your city?

1.1. There is still a lot to be done. 1.2. The economic crisis worsened the conditions. 1.3. There are some promising pilot projects in new construction / in refurbishment (green new). 1.4. We are already implementing a feasible mainstream policy in new construction / in refurbishment (green built).

2. How does the environmental situation in housing in your city compare to other bigger cities in your country? - (tick as many boxes as necessary)

2.1. My city is one of the most advanced in the country. Measures are part of our local housing programs, first action is taking place. Compared to other cities, our housing programs is very advanced and ambitious.

2.2. There is sufficient support and no advice quickly. Compared to other cities, our housing programs is very advanced and ambitious.

3. Please fill in the following table regarding the offer of low energy (or better) housing in your city ⁽¹⁾:

Type of landlord:	Municipality	rent / ownership	Not-for-profit / housing association	rent / own	Cooperative	rent / own	private (developer, owner)	rent / own
Nr. of dwellings / homes:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Nr. of dwellings per 1000 inhabitants:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approx. percentage of the respective stock:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

II. ACTIONS (PLANS, PROGRAMMES) IN THE FIELD OF ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARD OF HOUSING

1. Is 'raising the environmental standard' a core policy defined in your housing programme? ⁽¹⁾ YES NO

2. Which are your main fields of action (regarding housing/ neighbourhoods)?

2.1. Energy efficiency <input type="checkbox"/> main <input type="checkbox"/> secondary <input type="checkbox"/> no	2.2. energy generation, storage and use <input type="checkbox"/> main <input type="checkbox"/> secondary <input type="checkbox"/> no	2.3. Water consumption and recycling <input type="checkbox"/> main <input type="checkbox"/> secondary <input type="checkbox"/> no	2.4. Waste collection, separation and recycling <input type="checkbox"/> main <input type="checkbox"/> secondary <input type="checkbox"/> no	2.5. Green spaces <input type="checkbox"/> main <input type="checkbox"/> secondary <input type="checkbox"/> no	2.6. Healthy buildings and the elimination of dangerous material <input type="checkbox"/> main <input type="checkbox"/> secondary <input type="checkbox"/> no
--	---	--	---	---	--

Thematic fact sheet: Environmentally sustainable housing

EUROPEAN UNION European Regional Development Fund

7. Please select **one** of the above ACTIONS (No 5) and describe it more in DETAIL below ⁽¹⁾:

(from which you think we can learn about possible achievements)

Action (tick one box to identify the selected action): 5.1. 5.2. 5.3. 5.4. 5.5. 5.6. 5.7.

Name of the plan / programme: _____

7.1. Starting date and planned duration: _____

7.2. Objectives and expected results: _____

7.3. Beneficiaries (target groups): _____

7.4. Main tools (e.g. zoning or voluntary regulations / targeting funding / conditions for competitions / allowances, incentives etc.): _____

7.5. Funding source/mechanism (state subsidies, cross-subsidies, bank loans, PPPs, collective savings, etc.): _____

7.6. Implementing body (e.g. Municipality, housing association, private landlord, etc.): _____

7.7. Stakeholders included (e.g. policy makers, construction industry and SME, research, stakeholders ...): _____

7.8. User participation and empowerment (tenants, owners, neighborhood): _____

7.9. Monitoring and evaluation (technical performance, costs, user satisfaction ...): _____

7.10. Results so far (what worked well, what didn't work): _____

7.11. Main obstacles: _____

7.12. Main enablers (what helped achieve success): _____

8. We expect information and inspiration by the SUITE network mainly on:

Please, don't forget to rename the filled questionnaire before sending back - indicating the name of the city / metropolitan area.

Thank you very much for your patience and your input!

The TF Environment Team

Thematic fact sheet: Environmentally sustainable housing

EUROPEAN UNION European Regional Development Fund

3. Financing and affordability (tick as many boxes as necessary)

3.1. Main funding sources <input type="checkbox"/> EU <input type="checkbox"/> national <input type="checkbox"/> regional <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain below)	3.2. Funding enables access for... <input type="checkbox"/> local <input type="checkbox"/> middle class households <input type="checkbox"/> low income households <input type="checkbox"/> disadvantaged households	3.3. Types of funding <input type="checkbox"/> public subsidies to housing providers <input type="checkbox"/> allowances to tenants <input type="checkbox"/> credit, loans to lease-owners, providers <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain below)	3.4. Funding mainly for... <input type="checkbox"/> energy efficiency <input type="checkbox"/> other <input type="checkbox"/> combined (explain below)
--	---	--	---

Comments, details: _____

4. Which are the most important effects so far?

Reduction of CO2 emission <input type="checkbox"/>	More demand for this high quality housing <input type="checkbox"/>
Reduction of running costs <input type="checkbox"/>	Rising user satisfaction <input type="checkbox"/>
Increasing quality of living conditions <input type="checkbox"/>	Good practice example - model for others <input type="checkbox"/>

5. Which of the following ACTIONS has your city recently implemented, to improve environmental housing standards? (tick as many boxes as necessary)

<input type="checkbox"/> 5.1. Increase thermal insulation	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.2. Increase alternative energy production or provision, renewable energy (e.g. solar panels, heat recovery, urban heating etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3. Choice of materials, construction materials, infrastructure and design concept	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4. Green spaces and green buildings	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.5. Urban concept: e.g. less land consumption, short distances, public transport and slow traffic, community infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.6. User behavior, information, empowerment	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.7. Other measures (please describe briefly below)
---	--	--	--	---	---	--

Comments, details: _____

6. Regarding energy efficiency, which are the standards of performance you mainly apply? ⁽¹⁾

≤ 100 kWh/sqm/y basic <input type="checkbox"/>	≤ 0 kWh/sqm/y ZEB Net Zero Emissions Building / Zero Carbon ⁽¹⁾ <input type="checkbox"/>
≤ 60 / 50 kWh/sqm/y low energy <input type="checkbox"/>	≤ 0 kWh/sqm/y ZEB Net Energy Neutral Building ⁽¹⁾ <input type="checkbox"/>
≤ 40 / 30 kWh/sqm/y low energy <input type="checkbox"/>	< 0 kWh/sqm/y positive energy building <input type="checkbox"/>
≤ 15/ 10 kWh/ sqm/y lowest energy, passive house <input type="checkbox"/>	

Thematic fact sheet: Environmentally sustainable housing

EUROPEAN UNION European Regional Development Fund

Annex - Footnotes:

⁽¹⁾ We know, this question is quite 'technical'. In case the provision of these data needs some time, and given the close Hamburg meeting, please send a first draft version of the filled questionnaire without these data. Finalise later, but before the Hamburg meeting, please try, at least some estimated figures, if possible.

⁽²⁾ Please, control the fact sheet you provided for the baseline study in 2008. Questions II.3 housing context / E. Environmental standards in housing - main issues, challenges, and III.3. Specific housing policies regarding local environmental standards, actions and initiatives. (download baseline study pdf from our network mini-site / documents at www.urbsuit.eu).

⁽³⁾ Simplified, there are numerous more complex definitions. Compilation of several national standards.

⁽⁴⁾ Net Zero Energy Buildings (ZEB): A Net Energy Neutral Building produces at least as much energy as it uses in a year.

⁽⁵⁾ Net Zero Energy Buildings (ZEB): A Net Zero Emissions Building produces at least as much emission-free renewable energy as it uses from emissions-producing energy sources (in other words, a Zero Carbon Building). (Lujanen, Hatti) (Finnish Ministry of the Environment); Apartment buildings, presentation in Tallinn., 23 April 2009.

⁽⁶⁾ This is a very important and interesting part of the questionnaire, especially for identifying good practice cases. However, in case filling question 7 needs some time, and given the close Hamburg meeting, please send a first draft version of the filled questionnaire without this information. Finalise later, but before the Hamburg meeting, please.

ANNEX 3

Agenda for URBACT-SUITE Meeting “Environmental sustainability in housing“. Hamburg, 26 and 27 May 2010

PROGRAMME, DAY 1 Wednesday, 26. May 2010		
TIME	VENUE	DESCRIPTION
8:45	Lawaetz Foundation	Arrival and Welcome, Tea and Coffee
9:00	Lawaetz Foundation	Short welcome by the LP and the TFEnv lead (HH)
9:10	Lawaetz Foundation	Introduction: The housing policy of the City of Hamburg and the European perspective of the SUITE network <i>Dr. Thomas Mirbach & LE</i>
9:30	Lawaetz Foundation	Welcoming speech by the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg <i>Peter Hoffmann-Wick, Ministry for Social and Family Affairs, Health and Consumer Protection</i>
9:40	Lawaetz Foundation	Presentation of Hamburgs Framework Programme for Integrative City Development (RISE) <i>Claudius Lieven, Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg, Ministry of Urban Development and Environment</i>
10:10	Lawaetz Foundation	Break – Tea and Coffee
11:00	Lawaetz Foundation	Affordable housing, homelessness and social inclusion - Activities and results of the EUROCITIES network in the housing sector <i>Simon Güntner, HAW / Eurocities, (Neil Munslow, Newcastle u.T.)</i>
11:35	Lawaetz Foundation	Presentation of energy-efficient housing projects in Tallinn <i>Natalie Neill & Ilmar Puskar, Tallinn City Property Department</i>
12:10	Lawaetz Foundation	Panel and discussion on the learning from the morning contributions
13:00	Lawaetz Foundation	Lunch-Bufferet, including coffee/tea
14:00	Lawaetz Foundation	Climate factor Metropolis – climate protection projects of the International Building Exhibition (IBA) in Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg <i>Sabine de Buhr, IBA Hamburg GmbH</i>
14:30	Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg, Bergedorf	Guided bus tour: Selected construction- and refurbishment projects (World Quarter, Greves Garden)
15:00	Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg, Bergedorf	Departure from the Lawaetz Foundation
16:15	Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg, Bergedorf	Arrival at Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg, guided tour of the World Quarter incl. Energy Bunker
16:45	Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg, Bergedorf	Break – Tea and Coffee
17:30	Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg, Bergedorf	Departure from Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg
18:30	Hamburg-Wilhelmsburg, Bergedorf	Arrival at Hamburg-Bergedorf, site visit of the cooperative housing project „Greve’s Garden“ Departure to the hotel

PROGRAMME, DAY 2 Thursday, 27. May 2010		
TIME	VENUE	DESCRIPTION
9:00	Lawaetz Foundation	Arrival, Tea and Coffee
9:15	Lawaetz Foundation	How can the EU help cities to implement and manage an environmentally sustainable housing policy? <i>Julien Dijol, Policy Coordinator of CECODHAS</i>
9:45	Lawaetz Foundation	Summary of the previous day, implications for the cities of the SUITE network
10:15	Lawaetz Foundation	Input of the LE on the Focus ENV – Environmental sustainability (results of the TFS ENV)
10:30		Break – Tea and Coffee
10:45	Lawaetz Foundation	Short round of inputs on the status of the Local Action Plans; questions on the focus ‘environmental sustainability’...
11:45	Lawaetz Foundation	Wrap-up – Relevance of environmental sustainability for innovative housing programmes and Local Action Plans Environmental sustainability in social housing in the SUITE partner cities (wrap-up workshop)
13:15	Lawaetz Foundation	Steering Committee meeting
13:45		Final remarks (LP, TFENV lead (Hamburg), LE)
14:00	Lawaetz Foundation	Lunch
15:00		End
16:00		Optional: guided tour of the HafenCity

CREDITS

Coordination of the publication:

Belén Mendoza and Andrés García - SUITE coordinators

Text & Pictures:

Heidrun Feigelfeld
Lead Expert SUITE

**Edited & Published by Santiago de Compostela City Council & SUITE Project
Finished in April 2011**

CONTACTS:

For the SOC and ECO Reports:

Darinka Czischke, URBACT Thematic Expert, Brussels, d.k.czischke@tudelft.nl

For the ENVI Report:

Heidrun Feigelfeld, URBACT Lead Expert, Vienna, hf@srz-gmbh.com

For SUITE network:

Heidrun Feigelfeld, URBACT Lead Expert, Vienna, hf@srz-gmbh.com
Belén Mendoza, Lead Partner, Santiago de Compostela City Council,
bmendozac@santiagodecompostela.org

MORE INFO ON THE PROJECT:

www.urbact.eu/suite

Facebook: SUITE URBACT

Photographs (pages):

All photographs taken by Heidrun Feigelfeld in the framework of the activities of SUITE The Housing Project, during the Third Thematic Meeting, (City of Hamburg in May 2010), partner visits and other visits.

Cover: Hamburg-Bergedorf, Greve's Garden (building community initiative), Germany.

Page 7: Nantes field visit 2009, France.

Page 12: Rome URBACT visit 2010, Italy.

Page 25: Hamburg Thematic Meeting 2010, Germany.

Page 28: Hamburg-Bergedorf. Greve's Garden (building community initiative), Germany.

AN URBACT II PROJECT

URBACT is a European exchange and learning programme promoting sustainable urban development.

It enables cities to work together to develop solutions to major urban challenges, reaffirming the key role they play in facing increasingly complex societal challenges. It helps them to develop pragmatic solutions that are new and sustainable, and that integrate economic, social and environmental dimensions. It enables cities to share good practices and lessons learned with all professionals involved in urban policy throughout Europe. URBACT is 181 cities, 29 countries, and 5,000 active participants.

URBACT is co-financed by the ERDF Funds and the Member States.

www.urbact.eu/suite



EUROPEAN
PROGRAMME
FOR
SUSTAINABLE
URBAN
DEVELOPMENT

