

ED02015

# Review of national and regional obligations for environmental management plans, environmental management systems and sustainable urban transport plans

Report prepared for the European Commission - Directorate General Environment

By S Kollamthodi, J Alanko, S Cross, J Cunningham, T Hazeldine, and L Middlemiss



21<sup>st</sup> April 2005

ED02015

<b>Title</b>	Review of National and Regional Obligations for Environmental Management Plans, Environmental Management Systems, and Sustainable Urban Transport Plans
<b>Customer</b>	European Commission – DG Environment
<b>Customer reference</b>	07.010401.00/2004/376977/MAR/B4
<b>Confidentiality, copyright and reproduction</b>	Copyright European Commission
<b>File reference</b>	AEAT/ED02015
<b>Report number</b>	AEAT/ED02015/R01
<b>Report status</b>	Final (Version E)

AEA Technology Environment  
154/1.04 Harwell  
Didcot  
Oxfordshire  
OX11 0QJ  
Telephone +44(0)870 190 6513  
Facsimile +44(0)870 190 6327

AEA Technology is the trading name of AEA Technology plc  
AEA Technology is certificated to BS EN ISO9001:(1994)

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Authors</b>	Sujith Kollamthodi, Jennifer Alanko, Sam Cross, Jack Cunningham, Tom Hazeldine, and Lucie Middlemiss		21 <sup>st</sup> April 2005
<b>Reviewed by</b>	Sujith Kollamthodi		21 <sup>st</sup> April 2005
<b>Approved by</b>	Paul Watkiss		21 <sup>st</sup> April 2005

## **Contents**

1	Introduction	1
2	Overview of national activities	4
3	Austria	7
4	Belgium	7
5	Cyprus	10
6	Czech Republic	11
7	Denmark	11
8	Estonia	13
9	Finland	13
10	France	15
11	Germany	17
12	Greece	18
13	Hungary	19
14	Ireland	20
15	Italy	21
16	Latvia	24
17	Lithuania	24
18	Luxembourg	25
19	Malta	25
20	Netherlands	25
21	Poland	26
22	Portugal	27
23	Slovakia	28
24	Slovenia	28
25	Spain	30
26	Sweden	30
27	United Kingdom	33

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Overview

This report is one of the outputs of the project “Assessing the Environmental, Social and Economic Impacts of the Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment”, which was undertaken for DG Environment by AEA Technology Environment and Eurocities. The primary aim of the research documented in this report has been to establish whether there are national or regional legal obligations for towns and cities across the EU25 to adopt environmental management plans, environmental management systems, and sustainable urban transport plans. It has also sought information on the nature of any obligations or voluntary initiatives.

## 1.2 Definitions used in this study

For the purposes of this work, the plans and systems were defined as follows:

### An **Environmental Management Plan (EMP)**:

- covers the whole town or city;
- links different environmental issues (such as energy consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, water use and treatment, waste, noise, air quality, nature and biodiversity, transport and mobility, design, natural and man-made risks, sustainable construction, related health issues, and quality of life as a whole) in an integrated and co-ordinated way; and
- provides information on the current environmental situation, sets targets for improvement, and actions to meet those targets.

### An **Environmental Management System (EMS)**:

- is a clear procedure to manage environmental goals and targets;
- is a system that includes target setting, consultation, review, auditing and reporting;
- defines the organisational structure, responsibilities, procedures, processes and practices needed to achieve environmental goals and targets;
- provides regular reports to the public;
- can be used to implement an Environmental Management Plan;
- can also be used to help improve a town or city authority’s own internal environmental performance.

Examples of EMSs include formal, accredited schemes such as ISO 14000 and EMAS, as well as informal schemes specifically developed for a town or city’s purposes.

### A **Sustainable Urban Transport Plan (SUTP)**:

- covers the whole town or city;
- covers all types of transport;
- deals with the environmental, social and economic aspects of transport;
- tries to promote public transport, cycling and walking;
- tries to serve all of the town or city’s citizens.

A SUTP is not simply a transport plan that aims to improve traffic flows within and around the city/town. A SUTP will include measures to ensure that the social and economic development of the town or city is balanced against managing the environmental impacts of transport.

The remainder of this report uses the acronyms EMP, EMS and SUTP for conciseness.

### **1.3 Study methodology**

The information for this report has come from four main sources:

1. A literature review of relevant studies such as reports from the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives
2. A review of national and regional web sites
3. E-mail contacts and telephone interviews with national ministries and other nominated experts. A full list of national and city authorities contacted is provided in Appendix 2.
4. Information collected directly from city authorities as part of a survey to identify the number of cities that already have EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs.

E-mail contacts and telephone interviews focused on 10 key questions:

1. Are there national/regional obligations or voluntary measures for towns/cities in your country to adopt Environmental Management Plans, Environmental Management Systems and/or Sustainable Urban Transport Plans?
2. If so, what are their names, when were they introduced, what form do they take (e.g. laws, regulations) and are they obligatory or voluntary?
3. If not, are there any plans to introduce such measures in the future and, if so, will they be obligatory or voluntary?
4. Do these plans have population thresholds and, if so, what are they?
5. Which towns/cities have Environmental Management Plans and what has the impact of these plans been?
6. Which environmental categories are covered (e.g. air quality, water use and treatment, waste disposal, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, nature/biodiversity, energy use, land quality, litter, urban sprawl, transport and mobility, sustainable construction)?
7. Which sectors are covered (e.g. domestic, commercial, government/public sector, industrial)?
8. How are the plans modified and enforced, and is there a requirement to revise them regularly (and, if so, how often)?
9. What funds are available for preparing plans?
10. Is there any guidance on the administrative costs and the benefits of implementing the plan?

In carrying out this research, careful checks were made to ensure that plans and systems in place in the different Member States matched the descriptions of EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs given at the beginning of this report.

In addition to the email contacts and telephone interviews, this research has been backed up with survey questionnaires that were sent to all cities in each Member State with more than 100,000 inhabitants. These questionnaires asked the relevant city authorities to provide information on whether they currently have EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs, and if not, whether they have considered them in the past or are planning to introduce them in the future. For each Member State, information collected from individual cities as part of this survey has

been used to complement the research on national/regional obligations and nationally supported voluntary schemes. The results of the survey research have proved to be quite important in building up a complete picture of the activities that are taking place in each Member State. Whilst in many countries there are no national or regional obligations for cities to prepare and adopt EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs, the results from the survey have indicated that a significant number of cities have either already implemented these plans and systems, or plan to do so in the future. More detailed results from this survey can be found in the accompanying report entitled "Collation of data on cities in the EU25 with Environmental Management Plans, Environmental Management Systems, and Sustainable Urban Transport Plans" (AEAT/ED02015/R02).

It has proved very difficult to source comprehensive information for this report. In particular, the contact points listed in Appendix 2 were not able to provide any data or information on the costs and benefits of their national or regional initiatives, even where these are legal obligations. The other elements of this study for the European Commission have sought to obtain data from other sources, but it is instructive to note that this information was not readily available from national authorities.

The limited time for this review and the e-mail and telephone research review methodology meant that difficulties were faced in obtaining information from the regional level and local level, and also from officials in different Ministries.

## 2 Overview of national activities

This section provides an overview of the national approaches taken by different EU25 Member States. Further details are provided in the country profiles (Sections 3 to 27) that follow.

### 2.1 Results from this study

A summary of the main findings from this study is shown in Table 1. This table shows whether each country has national or regional obligations for EMPs, EMSs and SUTPs, or whether such plans and systems are implemented on a voluntary basis with some national co-ordination and support. It also shows any future plans identified for establishing obligatory or voluntary EMPs, EMSs or SUTPs.

In Table 1, Member States are only considered to have obligations for EMPs, EMSs, or SUTPs if there is a legal requirement in the Member State for cities to prepare and adopt them. Where Member States do not have such obligations, but there are voluntary programmes in place, we have only included those programmes that involve some level of national government support or co-ordination. Other voluntary programmes or initiatives carried out by individual cities or groups of cities for implementing EMPs, EMSs, or SUTPs, but that are not supported by national government, have not been included.

If there are any future plans within a country for EMPs, EMSs or SUTPs (whether voluntary or obligatory) a “yes” is returned in the relevant column.

**The main conclusion from this table is that very few countries have obligations in place (six for EMPs, none for EMSs and two for SUTPs) while the number with nationally supported voluntary measures (eight for EMPs, four for EMSs and five for SUTPs) is also low. A few countries are planning to introduce measures in the future, mainly voluntary ones. This includes two of the new EU members – Cyprus and the Czech Republic.**

However, although very few Member States have obligations in place for cities to prepare and adopt EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs, it is clear from the research carried out for this study that many countries have introduced other legislation or other measures, meaning that a significant proportion of cities are already carrying out environmental management and sustainable transport planning activities. In many cases, cities may not have a single, overarching EMP or SUTP, but they are already carrying out a variety of activities that, taken together, would cover most or all of the activities typically included in an EMP or SUTP.

### 2.2 Results from previous studies

Two previous studies have examined national activities in the areas of Local Agenda 21 and Mobility Management, respectively:

- ◆ Local Authorities Self-Assessment of Local Agenda 21 (LASALA) – Accelerating Local Sustainability, co-ordinated by members of the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) in 2001.
- ◆ MOST – Mobility Management Strategies for the Next Decades, a research and demonstration project funded by the European Commission, DG TREN under the 5th Framework Programme.

The main findings from these studies are summarised in Appendix 1.

**Table 1: Summary of current national/regional obligations, voluntary implementations and future plans for national/regional obligations**

Country	National or Regional Obligations			Voluntary programmes supported by national or regional co-ordination or campaigns			Future Plans for obligations		
	EMPs	EMSs	SUTPs	EMPs	EMSs	SUTPs	EMPs	EMSs	SUTPs
Austria	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Belgium (Flanders)	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	No	No
Belgium (Walloon)	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Cyprus	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes <sup>1</sup>
Czech Republic	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes <sup>1</sup>
Denmark	Yes	No	No	-	No	No	-	No	No
Estonia	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes <sup>2</sup>	No
Finland	No	No	No	No	No	No	?	?	?
France	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	?	?	-
Germany	No	No	No	No	No	No	?	?	?
Greece	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Hungary	Yes	No	No	-	?	?	-	No	Yes <sup>3</sup>
Ireland	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	?	?	?
Italy	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	?	?	-
Latvia	No	No	No	?	?	?	?	?	?
Lithuania	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Luxembourg	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Malta	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Netherlands	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
Poland	Yes	No	No	-	No	No	-	?	?
Portugal	No	No	No	No	No	No	?	?	?
Slovakia	No	No	No	?	?	?	?	?	?
Slovenia	Yes	No	No	-	No	No	-	?	?
Spain	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	?	?	?
Sweden	No	No	No	Yes	?	?	No <sup>4</sup>	No <sup>4</sup>	No <sup>4</sup>
United Kingdom	No <sup>5</sup>	No	Yes	Yes <sup>5</sup>	No	Yes <sup>6</sup>	Yes <sup>7</sup>	No	-

Note: “?” indicates that the situation is unknown

<sup>1</sup> National schemes for EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs may be established on a voluntary rather than obligatory basis.

<sup>2</sup> May be a voluntary scheme rather than an obligation

<sup>3</sup> In March 2004, the Hungarian Parliament adopted a resolution on the Hungarian Transport Policy (2003-2015) which could lead to obligations for SUTPs

<sup>4</sup> Although no national obligations are expected to be introduced, Swedish municipalities may develop EMPs, EMSs and SUTPs, in line with fifteen environmental quality objectives and often as part of their comprehensive plans.

<sup>5</sup> Although there is no obligation for EMPs, local authorities in England and Wales are required to produce Community Strategies which promote social, economic, and environmental well-being of their areas. The scope of what is included in a Community Strategy is left to the discretion of the Local Authority. A comprehensive Community Strategy would be considered the equivalent of an EMP, but in practice very few would currently be considered to be comprehensive.

<sup>6</sup> Although there are obligations for SUTPs in the UK, there are additional voluntary programmes to support the take up of travel plans.

<sup>7</sup> The requirements of what is contained in a Community Strategy are likely to become more stringent in the near future.

**Table 2: Scope of Obligatory Environmental Management Plans**

Country	Region or authority concerned	Air Quality	Water Use and Treatment	Waste disposal	Greenhouse gas emissions	Noise	Nature/ Biodiversity	Energy usage	Land quality	Litter	Urban sprawl	Transport and mobility	Sustainable construction
Belgium (Flanders)	Municipality level	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓						
Denmark	Municipality level		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓
France	Urban areas + towns/communities situated less than 15 km from an urban area. Towns/communities with more than 50,000 inhabitants that are outside the 15 km limit are also affected	✓	✓						✓		✓		
Hungary	Municipality level	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓		✓	
Poland	Municipality level	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Slovenia	Municipality level	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	

**Table 3: Scope of Obligatory Sustainable Urban Transport Plans**

	Region or authority concerned	Increasing Public Transport use	Increasing Cycling	Increasing walking	Reducing car use	Increasing access to Public Transport	Reducing traffic accidents	Reducing traffic noise	Reducing transport emissions	Reducing traffic congestion	Reducing journey times	Reducing the need to travel	Employer/employee travel plans	School travel plans
France	Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
UK	Local transport authority	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

## 3 Austria

### 3.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 3.1.1 EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs

Whilst there are no national obligations or nationally supported voluntary schemes that encourage cities to adopt EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs, in practice a number of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants have already these plans and systems. Examples of cities that already have EMPs and EMSs, include Vienna (“PUMA”, which is a type of EMS), Graz (“Ökoprofit Graz”, which is a type of EMP) and Innsbruck. However, plans are handled quite differently from city to city and there is no common policy. Sustainable Urban Transport is a component of most EMPs in Austria.

The city of Vienna is working on an environmental plan for the city. There are other plans already available e.g. the Climate Protection Program, Waste Prevention Plan, Transport Master Plan, etc. All plans contain targets and activities, monitoring plans and responsibilities. The Viennese municipal council adopted the Transport Master Plan in 2003, and this can be considered as a type of SUTP. This plan, which sets the city’s transport strategy for the next 20 years, was developed in close co-operation with different stakeholders including the public.

In Austria there are seven cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants. Five of these cities responded to the questionnaire survey on EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs, and three of the responding cities (Graz, Innsbruck and Salzburg) indicated that they have already implemented EMPs, whilst four (Graz, Innsbruck, Salzburg and Vienna) already have SUTPs. Two cities (Graz and Salzburg) have EMSs in place.

Austria has no future plans to obligate cities and towns to have EMPs, EMSs or SUTPs.

## 4 Belgium

### 4.1 Flanders region

#### 4.1.1 Details of current and future activities

##### 4.1.1.1 EMPs

In the Flanders region, EMPs are obligatory and set at the city government level. All cities have plans and these are related to the regional EMPs, which provide framework for local EMPs. Efforts are being made to integrate EMPs better within each region, with a focus on exploiting synergies between local councils. The contents of EMPs aren’t strictly defined but tend to include noise, water, air pollution, waste, and nature. EMPs are known as Municipal Environmental Policy Plans. Although the scope of these plans is indicative, once the provisions of the plan are agreed with the municipal council, they become compulsory for the municipality. It should be noted however, that there is currently no set of obligatory topic themes to be covered by Municipal Environmental Policy Plans, and the typical themes covered are quite limited in number.

Local city authorities can also sign up to a Milieu Samenwerkingsovereenkomst, a regionally-supported voluntary agreement scheme introduced in 2002. This involves local councils committing to particularly stringent environmental targets in exchange for subsidies to

achieve those targets. The more stringent the targets, the higher the subsidy, so it is in local councils' financial interests to sign up to one of these agreements.

There are three cities in the Flanders region with more than 100,000 inhabitants (Antwerp, Bruges, and Gent); as part of the survey of local authorities carried out for this study, Antwerp and Gent both indicated that they already have EMPs in place. No response was received from the city of Bruges.

#### **4.1.1.2 EMSs**

Although there are no obligations for cities and towns to have EMSs in the Flanders region, the non-obligatory Milieu-Overleg Lokale Overheden (Milo) programme has been introduced to help local government integrate plans into regional and national environmental policy. In addition, the Milieu Management Informatiesysteem MMIS (Environmental Management Information System) was implemented in 2000 and is used by regional and local government.

From the survey responses received, the city of Antwerp has indicated that it has already implemented an EMS, whilst the city of Gent does not have an EMS and does not plan to introduce one in the future. There are no plans to introduce regional obligations that would require cities to implement EMSs.

#### **4.1.1.3 SUTPs**

Whilst there are no regional obligations for cities and towns to have SUTPs (and no plans to introduce such obligations in the future), as with the Milieu Samenwerkingsovereenkomst (see above), local councils can set voluntary targets for transport or 'Mobiliteit'. The Mobiliteitsconvenant (or voluntary agreement on mobility) involves the city making sustainable transport plans in exchange for agreed subsidies from the regional government.

In response to the survey, both Antwerp and Gent have indicated that they already have SUTPs in place.

## **4.2 Walloon region**

### **4.2.1 Details of current and future activities**

#### **4.2.1.1 EMPs**

There are no obligations for cities to prepare EMPs, but the Walloon region has the same kind of voluntary agreements as the Flanders region, where the City can sign up to targets for which they receive funding. These agreements are called Plans Communaux d'Environnement et de Developpement de la Nature (PCEDN - also known as Plans Communaux pour le Developpement Durable et de la Nature), and were first implemented in 1998. Many cities are made up of groups of communes that together formulate one of these PCEDNs. PCEDNs are part of the LA21 group and cover the following topic themes:

- Waste
- Water (including surface and ground)
- Noise
- Air and soil pollution
- Preservation and development of nature
- Public safety

The mother plan to these commune activities is the "Plan d'Environnement pour le Développement Durable" of the Walloon region.

There are three cities in the Walloon region with more than 100,000 inhabitants (Charleroi, Liège, and Namur); in response to the survey questions, representatives from Liège and Namur have indicated that neither city currently has an EMP, but Liège intends to introduce one in the future. No response was received from the city of Charleroi.

#### **4.2.1.2 EMSs**

There are no regional obligations or regionally-supported voluntary schemes for cities and towns to have EMSs. Liège and Namur, the two cities in the Walloon region that responded to the survey, have both indicated that they do not currently have EMSs in place, and that they do not plan to introduce them in the future.

#### **4.2.1.3 SUTPs**

The “Plan de Transport et de Mobilité en Wallonie” is a voluntary regional sustainable transport program which includes sustainable transport goals.

On 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004, the Walloon region adopted a decree to provide financial support to mobility plans prepared by communes. A new aspect is the development of urban mobility plans, which will examine the balance between the environmental, social, and economic impacts of transport developments in urban areas.

Based on responses to the survey questions, only the city of Liège has indicated that it currently has a SUTP, with Namur indicating that it does not have such a plan and that there are no plans to introduce one in the future. There are no future plans for changing the current system of EMPs, EMSs and SUTPs in the Walloon region.

### **4.3 Brussels Capital Region**

#### **4.3.1 Details of current and future activities**

Representatives from the Brussels Capital region administration, and from Brussels city authority were contacted to obtain information on whether there are regional obligations for EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs. However, it has not been possible to obtain any information on this topic. Information collected from Brussels city authority as part of the survey process has indicated that the city does not have an EMP, and EMS, or a SUTP, but plans to introduce an EMP in the future.

### **4.4 Further information**

#### **4.4.1 Environmental management activities**

Environmental management activities occur at all levels of government in Belgium: federal, regional and city. Most of the responsibilities for environmental planning are at the regional level, including water use, waste, noise, nature, litter, and transport. Federal responsibilities include greenhouse gas emissions, air quality, energy use, but all of these also involve some participation from the Flanders and Walloon regional authorities.

Belgium is considered to be one of the leading European countries in the development of mobility management concepts. It has been involved in encouraging pilot projects at company sites since the early 1990's. In an attempt to foster a more widespread application, the national government has started a policy initiative to promote the development of mobility plans for companies. As a first step, data collection on commuter travel behaviour has been made mandatory for all companies with more than 100 employees. The government has

also developed supporting fiscal policies such as removing taxation of employer public transport benefits and equal deduction of commuting expenses regardless of mode.

#### **4.4.2 Sustainable transport planning activities**

The Mobiliteitsconvenants (or mobility covenants) system has been written in law since 20 April 2001. It is a voluntary system, which involves a commitment from the local council to a framework agreement, and both financial and administrative support from central government. Mobility covenants apply in both rural and urban areas.

The unifying factor behind local mobility covenants is the mother covenant – a framework agreement on transport policy, which is signed by most participants in the voluntary agreement. The mother covenant includes the mission statements of the program: among which are reduction of car use, increase in use of other means of transport and reduction of impact of traffic on quality of life.

94% of local councils across the whole of Belgium have signed up to the mother covenant, and as such are now committed to setting up a sustainable mobility plan. 63% of local councils have already produced a Mobility plan. The plan is made up of modules, which are selected from those defined in the mother covenant. The different modules together contribute towards key targets stated in the plan.

Aspects that must be covered in the Mobility plan are:

1. A description of the current traffic situation, and the current provision for all transport modes.
2. A future plan with proposals for:
  - Categorisation of roads, cycle and bus lanes, and related traffic plan for all modes.
  - Service plan for public transport
  - Parking plan related to the above service plan for public transport
  - Program of prioritised and concrete policy measures

## **5 Cyprus**

### **5.1 Details of current and future activities**

#### **5.1.1 EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs**

At this point in time, Cyprus has no national or regional obligations for cities and towns to have EMPs, EMSs or SUTPs. There are currently no nationally supported programmes to encourage the voluntary uptake of these plans and systems, but there are future plans for voluntary implementation of EMPs, EMSs and SUTPs in Cyprus. These plans are driven by membership of the EU, and the national government's perceived need to plan for the environment in order to meet various EC Directives. The process will not be obligatory but will be facilitated by the national government; the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment met with representatives from cities in Cyprus to offer them the possibility of starting EMSs, EMPs and SUTPs, and to offer advice and support in this area.

There are two cities in Cyprus with more than 100,000 inhabitants (Nicosia and Limassol), and information collected as part of the survey process has indicated that neither of these cities currently have EMPs, EMSs, or SUTPs in place, although the city of Limassol plans to introduce all of these in the future.

## 6 Czech Republic

### 6.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 6.1.1 EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs

The Czech Republic has no national or regional obligations for cities and towns to have EMPs, EMSs or SUTPs, and there are no nationally supported voluntary programmes for cities to have these plans and systems. There are four cities in the Czech Republic with more than 100,000 inhabitants (Brno, Olomouc, Plzen, and Prague), and all of these cities were sent the survey questionnaire to ascertain whether they currently have plans and systems in place. Only Plzen and Prague responded to the survey, with both cities indicating that they have already implemented EMPs and SUTPs. Neither city has yet introduced an EMS, but Plzen plans to do so in the future.

The Ministry of Environment is currently preparing a strategy for urban environment care at the national level, which will be in the form of non-obligatory recommendations and models of good practice. Hence it is likely that in the future there will be a national programme to support the voluntary uptake of EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs.

## 7 Denmark

### 7.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 7.1.1 EMPs

In Denmark there are requirements for cities to have EMPs through the national institutionalisation of Local Agenda 21. Counties and municipalities are required to report on their strategies for contributing to sustainable development through LA 21 strategies.

Danish counties' and municipalities' LA 21 strategies must include measures that contribute to:

- reduction of negative environmental impacts
- promotion of sustainable urban development and renewal
- promotion and protection of biodiversity
- inclusion of the citizens and the business life in the Agenda 21 work
- promotion of co-operation on decisions concerning the environment, traffic, social, health, education, culture and the economy.

The Environment Ministry reports to the Parliament on LA 21 work every four years; the first report of this nature was submitted on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2005.

Many municipalities have chosen to closely link the strategy for Local Agenda 21 with the strategy for municipal planning, which the municipalities are also required to publish within the first two years of the municipal elections. The Planning Strategy for a municipality includes an assessment of development and planning activities, a strategy for development including a vision and priority tasks, and a decision on the extent to which the municipal plan will be revised.

The Planning Act in Denmark (Consolidated Act No 763 11-09-02) is the legal basis for the municipal level plans. It provides a framework for local plans and includes:

- The distribution of construction
- Conserving settlements or urban environments
- Urban renewal
- Supply of public and private services
- Institutions, technical facilities, heat supply
- Recreational areas, allotments
- Transport services

The national obligation to prepare Local Agenda 21 strategies, and to report on progress means that all cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants should have EMPs in place. This has been borne out by the responses to the survey questionnaires; all four Danish cities with populations greater than 100,000 inhabitants have indicated that they have adopted EMPs.

### **7.1.2 EMSs**

There are no obligations for Danish cities and towns to adopt EMSs, and there are no plans to introduce such obligations in the future. However, based on the responses received to the survey questionnaire, three of the four cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants (Aalborg, Copenhagen, and Odense) have already implemented EMSs, and the fourth city (Århus) plans to introduce one in the future.

### **7.1.3 SUTPs**

As with EMSs, there are no current obligations requiring cities to adopt SUTPs, and no plans to oblige them to do so in the future. However, between 1992-1995 the Danish Ministry of Environment ran a project called "Citytraffic" and during this period many municipalities compiled transport plans. In addition, the Greater Copenhagen Authority (HUR) has also recently developed a transport plan (Trafikplan 2003) for the greater Copenhagen region. Trafikplan 2003 is the first comprehensive policy statement to cover all forms of transport throughout the Copenhagen region, including links with neighbouring communities in Sweden and Germany. It has a broad scope that includes the following topics:

- Increasing public transport
- Reducing car use
- Reducing the need to travel
- Reducing traffic accidents
- Improving air quality / reducing pollutant emissions
- Reducing greenhouse gas emissions

Whilst no quantitative data are available (a full evaluation of the Trafikplan has not yet been carried out), the benefits to the city as a whole have included a large reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured in traffic accidents, an increase in the number of employers with travel plans, and a small decrease in the number of households exposed to noise levels greater than 55dB(A).

Although there are no obligations to adopt SUTPs, based on responses to the survey, three of the four cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants already have a SUTP in place.

## 8 Estonia

### 8.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 8.1.1 EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs

There are two cities in Estonia that have populations greater than 100,000 (Tartu and Tallinn). There is no specific national legislation requiring these cities to introduce EMPs, EMSs, or SUTPs, but representatives from Tartu city authority have indicated that the city already has such a plan in place. Tallinn city authority has indicated that it will adopt such a plan for the city in the future. Neither city has adopted a full EMS or a SUTP, although Tallinn has indicated that it is planning to introduce both of these in the future.

The implementation of EMSs is voluntary in Estonia. The environment department of Tallinn's city authority has attempted to implement EMAS as a pilot project, as has the department of communal services of Viljandi (a town of 22,000 inhabitants), and an audit of the latter will be performed shortly. With the Ministry of Environment possibly taking action with regard to EMSs, Estonia has taken the first steps towards supporting the uptake of these systems by cities, although as yet neither of the cities with greater than 100,000 inhabitants has fully adopted such a system. The situation with regard to SUTPs is less clear; neither Tallinn nor Tartu has such a plan at the moment, and there are no future plans for national obligations.

### 8.2 Further information

At the national level, the Estonian Environment Information Centre of the Ministry of the Environment has been named as the competent authority for registration of organisations implementing EMSs and the Estonian Accreditation Centre performs accreditation. So far, 86 organisations have acquired the ISO 14001 certificate, none of them from the public sector.

The Estonian Association for Environmental Management was founded on April 21, 2003. This is a non-profit organisation that brings together enterprises, organisations and individuals who are interested in improving environmental performance related to corporate management.

## 9 Finland

### 9.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 9.1.1 EMPs

Whilst there is no specific legislation that requires towns and cities to prepare EMPs, in practice, the majority of them already do have such plans. There are five cities in Finland with more than 100,000 inhabitants (Helsinki, Lahti, Oulu, Tampere, and Turku). Four of these cities responded to the survey, and three out of these four (Helsinki, Lahti, and Turku) indicated that they already have EMPs in place. These voluntary EMPs are approved by the Municipal Council. There are no funds available from the national government for preparing these plans. The plans address the following themes:

- Air quality
- Water use and treatment
- Waste disposal
- Noise
- Nature/Biodiversity
- Land quality
- Litter

Additionally, each Finnish city is required to prepare a “Master Plan” (known in Finnish as “Yleiskaava”), a broad city development plan that is a legal requirement as set down by the Finnish National Government under town and country planning legislation. Master Plans encompass many of the elements that would be included in an EMP (although their scope is broader than that of an EMP). Master plans provide guidance for the community structure and land use of a municipality or part of a municipality. The specific topic themes that must be taken into account in a Master Plan are as follows:

- The functionality, economy, and ecological sustainability of the community structure
- Utilisation of the existing community structure
- Housing needs and availability of services
- Transport – in particular, measures concerning public transport, walking and cycling must be taken into account
- Energy supply, water supply and drainage, and waste management must all be dealt with in a manner which is sustainable in terms of environmental impacts, use of natural resources, and the economy
- Promoting a safe and healthy environment, with equal treatment for different socio-economic groups of the resident population
- Business conditions
- Reductions in environmental hazards
- Protection of the built environment, landscape, and natural resources
- Provision of sufficient recreation areas

The city of Helsinki has prepared an Environmental Programme, the fourth version of which is currently in development, and a Local Agenda 21 plan. Helsinki’s environmental programme includes air quality, water use and treatment, waste disposal, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, nature/biodiversity, energy use, land quality, litter, urban sprawl, transport and mobility, and sustainable construction. It also applies to all sectors.

### **9.1.2 EMSs**

There is no national legislation in place requiring cities in Finland to implement EMSs, and there are no nationally supported programmes that encourage cities to voluntarily adopt an EMS. However, two of the four cities that responded to the survey (Lahti and Turku) indicated that they already have EMSs in place, whilst the remaining two (Helsinki and Tampere) indicated that they plan to introduce EMSs in the future. It is not known whether Finland plans to introduce a national obligation requiring cities to implement EMSs in the future.

### **9.1.3 SUTPs**

Whilst there are no obligations for cities in Finland to have Sustainable Urban Transport Plans, the ten largest city regions have voluntarily prepared Transport System Plans (known as Pääkaupunkiseudun Liikennejärjestelmäsuunnitelma, or PLJs, in Finnish), which cover many of the themes that a SUTP would cover. PLJs are jointly prepared by municipal authorities, provincial federations, the Finnish Road Administration and the Finnish Rail

Administration. The main objective of these plans is to promote land use and transport solutions that support sustainable development. The following objectives are mentioned individually:

- Unbroken and compact community structure that minimises the need for mobility.
- Ensuring that densely populated areas are developed in a way that promotes the use of public transport, walking and cycling, and decreases the need for car use.
- Ensuring that all sections of the population have equal access to travel modes
- Developing employment and service locations in such a way that they are readily accessible by public transport, bicycle, or walking;
- Ensure that city centres remain compact (minimisation of urban sprawl), whilst remaining competitive for trade

There are no funds available from the national government for preparing PLJs.

The city of Helsinki has had a PLJ since 1994. PLJs are revised every four years, and the current plan dates from 2002. This transport plan includes environmental aspects as well as other transport aspects. Helsinki PLJ covers the four cities in the Helsinki Metropolitan area – Helsinki, Kauniainen, Vantaa and Espoo.

Based on responses to the survey, of the four Finnish cities that responded, only Helsinki and Turku already have SUTPs in place (it has been assumed that these are PLJs); Lahti plans to introduce one in the future, whilst there are no plans for Oulu to introduce a SUTP.

It is not known whether Finland plans to introduce obligations in the future that would require cities to prepare SUTPs.

## 9.2 Further information

The Government's 1998 Framework Policy on Sustainable Development promotes ecological sustainability (including biological diversity, climate change, environmental protection and renewable and non-renewable energy sources). The Finnish National Commission on Sustainable Development was established in 1993.

# 10 France

## 10.1 Details of current and future activities

### 10.1.1 EMPs

The revised French planning act from the year 2000 (loi de Solidarité et Renouveau – SRU) introduced a requirement for a new type of plan to be produced at the city/urban agglomeration level, known as the Schéma de Cohérence Territoriale (SCOT). A SCOT is a strategic planning document, which when developed by a city, enables it to put in place and co-ordinate the policies relating to town planning, the environment, economic development and commercial developments. The objectives of the SCOT are to:

- Ensure a balance between urban development
- Preserve agricultural space
- Protect green field sites
- Ensure consideration is given to the environmental impacts of developments

- Prevent and reduce pollution of all types.

The SCOT should provide a framework for detailed local planning and regulation. Every SCOT must be reviewed after a maximum of ten years. It is compulsory for cities/urban agglomeration to prepare a SCOT based on the framework laid down in the SRU law. Each SCOT is prepared by a “syndicat mixte”, which is a joint venture organisation, consisting of representatives from a variety of different types of public authority.

Based on the above information, it is thought that via the SRU law and its requirements for the preparation of SCOTs, France effectively already has in place legislation that requires cities to prepare a type of Environmental Management Plan, although it is not clear whether all cities have yet introduced a SCOT. Of the 57 cities in France with more than 100,000 inhabitants, twelve responded to the survey, with six of these cities indicating that they already have an EMP in place, and a further five indicating that they plan to introduce one in the future.

In addition, there are “Contrats de plan état-region”, which are agreements between the French state and the regions (not cities) on the financing of infrastructure changes which will improve the daily life of the inhabitants of the region. These include a sub-contract on agglomerations, which can have an environmental element detailing environmental activities and environmental policy.

Other initiatives include government support for local “Chartres pour l'Environnement”, which are voluntary agreements between the Minister of the Environment and local government organisations (including all towns and cities) on how the local environment and quality of life will be improved. These agreements are technical and financial contracts introduced in 1992, and they specify what the town/city needs to do in terms of environmental management and policy. They include an audit of the current situation, setting strategic objectives and formulating a plan of action for the future. There is also some integration with social and economic goals of the city included in an Agenda 21 type plan. The Minister of the Environment can finance up to 50% of the costs of the initial study and any resulting innovative activities, and the local government is supported with advice on implementation from central office.

Chartres pour l'Environnement can include the following topics:

- Social and Environmental policy
- Urban Planning and environment
- Economic development and environment
- Transport and environment
- Countryside and biodiversity
- Natural resources
- Pollution
- Natural and technological risk
- Public participation
- Financial Management
- Evaluation and planning of policy

### 10.1.2 EMSs

There are no obligations requiring French cities to implement EMSs, and of the twelve cities that responded to the survey, only Paris has implemented an EMS. Five of the other responding cities (Annecy, Bordeaux, Clermont-Ferrand, Dijon, and Saint-Etienne) plan to

introduce EMSs in the future. There are no cities in France that have adopted EMAS. It is not known whether France plans to introduce obligations that would oblige cities to implement EMSs.

### 10.1.3 SUTPs

There are national obligations in place that require cities to prepare a type of SUTP known as a Plan de Déplacements Urbains (PDU). PDUs are legal instruments that began as transport plans to reduce the traffic on the roads. A later law on air quality policy made PDUs obligatory for urban agglomerations with more than 100,000 inhabitants and refocused them towards sustainable transport. PDUs set out the principles governing the organisation of personal and freight transport, traffic flow, parking policies, urban roads management, Mobility Management, encouragement of public transport, car pooling, cycling and walking, and travel safety in an urban area. They are required to co-ordinate the use of all transport modes through appropriate use of the road network and promotion of less polluting and less energy intensive modes.

The urban transport authority prepares the PDU in collaboration with regional and municipal government. Another 15 smaller cities (smaller than 100,000) have opted for a voluntary PDU. Most PDUs have a related implementation and control plan. Reported problems with the PDU system include the fact that objectives set in the plan tend to be vague, and even when objectives are set they tend to involve growth in greenhouse gases and energy use from transport. Based on official statistics<sup>8</sup>, 47 of the 57 agglomerations with more than 100,000 inhabitants have so far adopted PDUs, with a further eight currently preparing their plans. From these figures, it is clear that the obligatory PDU system has been successful in encouraging cities to introduce SUTPs.

## 11 Germany

### 11.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 11.1.1 EMPs

Although there are no national/regional obligations for town/cities in Germany to adopt EMPs, and no voluntary programmes supported nationally or regionally to encourage their adoption, many German cities have implemented EMPs on a voluntary basis. These voluntary EMPs cover air quality, water use and treatment, waste disposal, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, nature/biodiversity, energy use, land quality, litter, urban sprawl, transport and mobility, and sustainable construction. There are 83 cities in Germany with more than 100,000 inhabitants, and 27 of these cities responded to the survey. Ten of these responding cities indicated that they already have EMPs in place, with a further four cities stating that they plan to introduce them in the future. It is not known whether Germany plans to oblige cities to prepare EMPs in the future.

In 2002, the German federal government adopted a Strategy for sustainable development, which includes 21 key indicators for sustainable development. The federal government aims to use these indicators for periodical "progress reports" and the first such progress report is planned for Summer 2004. The Strategy presents measures to achieve more sustainable development grouped in seven key topics:

---

<sup>8</sup> État d'avancement des plans de déplacements urbains obligatoires, Groupement des Autorités Responsables de Transport, 15 June 2004, <http://www.gart.org/tele/avancement.pdu.2004.pdf>

- ◆ efficient energy use,
- ◆ environment-friendly mobility,
- ◆ production of healthy food,
- ◆ accomplishment of the demographic change,
- ◆ renewal of the education system,
- ◆ economic innovation,
- ◆ reduction of urban sprawl and sustainable residential development.

This strategy will have an impact on future urban environmental planning activities.

### **11.1.2 EMSs**

There are no requirements for German cities to implement EMSs, although it is known that 14 cities have already introduced EMAS. Based on responses to the survey, an additional seven cities have introduced other types of EMS. It is not known whether there will, in future, be national obligations requiring cities to implement EMSs.

### **11.1.3 SUTPs**

While there are no national obligations for German towns or cities to adopt SUTPs, Mobility Management is increasingly promoted both directly and indirectly in government statements and documents (although there is still little direct activity yet at the national level). The main activity is research and several Federal Ministries are initiating programmes aimed at supporting thematic research. Their goal is to gain basic knowledge and practical tools for more sustainable mobility. The government has also recently published its first National Cycling Plan, which aims to achieve a higher share of cycling in the German modal split. The plan follows a system approach, stressing the responsibility of all levels of the Federal State and citizens, and organisations. Under the subsidiarity principle the Federal government sees its role as that of a catalyst, and in setting the right framework conditions. Measures include the doubling of funding for cycling infrastructure along Federal roads, improvements in the legal framework, co-ordination of a working group with the Federal States, monitoring, research, awareness-raising campaigns and establishing an Internet platform for dialogue with citizens.

- ◆ Of the 27 cities that responded to the survey, 13 have indicated that they already have a SUTP, with a further two cities planning to introduce plans of this nature in the future.

## **12 Greece**

### **12.1 Details of current and future activities**

#### **12.1.1 EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs**

Although Greece does not have any national/regional obligations for town/cities to adopt EMPs, EMSs or SUTPs, and has no future plans to introduce legal obligations, a voluntary pilot programme has been rolled out in sixty municipalities to apply the principles of Local Agenda 21 to social, economic and environmental issues in the cities concerned.

Athens has prepared an EMP, but none of the other cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants have introduced one, although Patras and Thessalonikis plan to do so in the future. Only the city of Patras has already adopted an EMS; two of the other cities plan to adopt EMSs in the future. Two cities (Athens and Larissas) have already adopted SUTPs, with one other city (Patras) indicating that they plan to implement one in the future.

## 13 Hungary

### 13.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 13.1.1 EMPs

There are national obligations in Hungary requiring cities to implement EMPs. An Act on the General Rules of Environmental Protection has been in force in Hungary since 1995, and according to this Act, the preparation of the National Environmental Programme (NEP) is mandatory. NEP is prepared for six-year periods by the Hungarian Government and adopted by the National Parliament. The Act contains rules for the preparation of local environmental programmes, which have to be in harmony with the goals and objectives in the NEP and the community's development plan. Local programmes are approved by the municipality.

Section 47 (1) of the Act defines the content of a local environmental programme as follows: "The municipal environmental program shall contain, in particular, the following tasks and regulations pertaining to the communities:

- a) cleanness of the community environment,
- b) drainage of storm water,
- c) treatment, collection, drainage and purification of municipal sewage,
- d) treatment of municipal wastes,
- e) protection against noise, vibration and air pollution generated by the public and public services (catering, operation of municipal facilities, retail trade),
- f) organization of local transport,
- g) drinking water supply,
- h) energy management,
- i) management of green areas;
- j) the prevention of presumably exceptional endangerment of the environment and the reduction of environmental damage."

There is no population threshold for the above-mentioned requirements.

Implementation of local environmental programmes is slow, primarily for financial reasons. Furthermore there is no deadline for the preparation of local environmental programmes, so there are a lot of towns and cities in Hungary, mainly the smaller ones, without approved programmes.

Local authorities can apply for financial support both for preparation of their environmental programme (to the Environmental and Water Fund managed by the Ministry for Environment and Water) and investments to be implemented as part of the programme (to different ministries depending on the nature of the investment).

Overall, it is clear that the General Rules on Environmental Protection Act facilitates, and provides guidelines for the preparation of local environmental programmes (which can be

considered as a type of EMP). Six out of nine cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants in Hungary have responded to the survey on EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs. Two cities (Gyor and Miskolc) already have EMPs, with the remaining four planning to introduce them in the future.

### **13.1.2 EMSs**

There are no national or regional obligations for cities and towns to have EMSs, and based on the results of the survey, only one of the responding cities (Miskolc) has so far implemented an EMS, although a further four plan to do so in the future.

### **13.1.3 SUTPs**

There are no national or regional obligations for cities and towns to have SUTPs, although a resolution on the Hungarian Transport Policy (2003-2015) adopted by the Hungarian Parliament in March 2004 could lead to obligations for cities to have SUTPs. Based on the results of the survey, only one of the six responding cities (Gyor) has so far prepared a SUTP. All five of the other cities that responded to the survey have indicated that they plan to prepare SUTPs in the future.

## **14 Ireland**

### **14.1 Details of current and future activities**

#### **14.1.1 EMPs**

While there are no national or regional obligations for EMPs, the National Spatial Strategy (NSS) 2002-2020 is now the starting point for integrated planning in Ireland. The primary vehicle for implementing the NSS in the individual regions is the adoption by the eight Regional Authorities of Regional Planning Guidelines (RPGs), which will give practical application to the NSS at a regional and local level. These Guidelines, in bringing together land use and transport dimensions within a consistent planning framework, will be the crucial influence on the development of the regions of Ireland over the next twenty years. Section 23(3) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 requires that RPGs contain information on the likely significant effects of the environment of implementing the Guidelines. The RPGs will be assessed against their impact on biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, climate factors, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape.

The Dublin region has been the subject of an air quality management plan since January 2000. The plan contains policies and strategies to improve the health and quality of life of the citizens of Dublin and to protect the environment, by the provision of a co-ordinated approach to the control of air pollution and to the sustainable development of the built environment and transportation within the region.

The two cities in Ireland with more than 100,000 inhabitants (Cork and Dublin) have both indicated via their survey responses that they have already implemented EMPs.

#### **14.1.2 EMSs**

There are no obligations for cities in Ireland to introduce EMSs, but the city of Cork has indicated that it already has an EMS, whilst Dublin plans to introduce one in the future.

### 14.1.3 SUTPs

Although there are no national or regional obligations for cities/towns to have SUTPs, under the National Development Plan, the Department of Transport is funding the rollout of a significant transport strategy for the Greater Dublin Area (GDA), in co-operation with the Dublin Transportation Office, which sets out a comprehensive integrated response to the transportation needs of the GDA in the period to 2016. Key elements of the strategy include:

- ◆ a radical transformation in the quality and quantity of public transport services;
- ◆ strategic, but limited, improvements to the road network;
- ◆ improved traffic management and control measures;
- ◆ development of a demand management policy to reduce the growth in travel while maintaining economic progress, and
- ◆ encouraging modal shift in favour of public transport, cycling and walking.

**14.2 A smaller scale but similar strategy is being implemented under the auspices of Cork City Council, through the Cork Area Strategic Plan. This Plan will address the issues of the anticipated growth in jobs, housing, and traffic expected over the next twenty years, but putting this into the context of a spatial development strategy that will enable the expected growth to be handled in a sustainable manner.**

Based on the survey responses received from the two cities, both Cork and Dublin have already implemented SUTPs.

## 15 Italy

### 15.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 15.1.1 EMPs

Although there is no obligation for Italian cities/towns to adopt EMPs, it is obligatory for all cities and towns with more than 100,000 inhabitants to produce a Noise Zoning Plan and an Environmental Energy Plan. All provinces have to produce an Area Waste Management Plan, and, shortly, an Area Water Management Plan.

A large number of local authorities in Italy have undertaken Local Agenda 21 processes, and in most cases, these cities and towns have benefited from national or regional funds. In many cases the Local Agenda 21 process has been developed further and has resulted in the formal adoption of an Action Plan, which contains elements that are similar to what an EMP should contain.

At the regional level, environmental management aspects are included in regional land planning legislation, but the extent to which this is covered is not consistent across all regions. For example, Emilia-Romagna has a new Land Planning Law that requires all Provincial or City Strategic Plans to include sustainability concepts and practices. The Plans have to be accompanied by a VALSAT (Valutazione di Sostenibilità Ambientale e Territoriale), the Italian regional equivalent of Strategic Environmental Assessment.

A proposal for legislation to introduce a financing programme for environmental accounts for municipalities is currently under discussion, but has not yet been presented to the Italian Parliament.

42 cities in Italy have more than 100,000 inhabitants. Eight of these cities responded to the survey, and four of the responding cities have stated that they already have EMPs in place, with a further three indicating that they plan to introduce EMPs in the future.

### **15.1.2 EMSs**

There is no obligation for Italian cities/towns to adopt EMSs, but some Italian cities and towns have introduced EMS on a voluntary basis, in some cases with the support of regional and national financing schemes. More than 60 Italian local public authorities (city authorities, associations of cities, and park authorities) have undertaken voluntary initiatives to establish EMS. As of May 2004, 54 Italian local authorities have obtained ISO14001 certification. These include 41 municipalities, six provinces, one mountain community, one region, and three natural parks. As of July 2004, eight bodies have received EMAS registration, including four municipalities, one province (Department of Environment), two natural parks, and one other. In most cases the certification addresses only specific sectors of the administration, whilst in 27 cases the whole city has been certified<sup>9</sup>.

Following the EU LIFE demonstration projects CLEAR, and European EcoBudget, a few dozen Italian local authorities are running their local environmental policies through a voluntary document called "Bilancio Ambientale" (Environmental Balance). Through this mechanism, local authorities' environmental policies and competencies are managed and reported through an environmental accountability system (the CLEAR system) and, eventually, sustainability goals are determined through an indicator-target system (the EcoBudget system).

In 2002 the Italian Government adopted the "Environmental Action Strategy for Sustainable Development in Italy", which deals with environmental impacts and quality of life in urban areas. The strategy underlines the importance of the development of Local Agenda 21 strategies and EMAS/ISO 14000 systems at the municipality level to reach Strategy goals.

At the regional level, some regions (e.g. Lombardia, Liguria, Emilia Romagna, and Puglia) have introduced financing programmes supporting local authorities in their adoption and certification of EMSs. In some of these regions, EU Structural Funds for Regions (Objective 1 and Objective 2 funding) have been used to co-finance the local authorities.

At the national level, in 2000 and 2002, the Ministry for the Environment and Territory introduced two financing programmes to support the adoption and implementation of LA21 sustainable development strategies. Almost 230 local authorities have benefited from ministerial funds. In the 2000 programme, one of the activities that was eligible for funding support was the introduction and certification of an EMS. Eight cities, two associations of neighbouring cities, two provinces, and three parks have benefited from ministerial funding to set up EMSs.

Of the cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that responded to the survey, four indicated that they have already introduced an EMS, and a further four cities are planning to introduce one in the future.

---

<sup>9</sup> As at March 2004

### 15.1.3 SUTPs

Italian legislation introduces the establishment of two types of transport plan:

- ◆ Urban Traffic Plan (Piano Urbano del Traffico – PUT)
- ◆ Urban Mobility Plan (Piano Urbano per la Mobilità – PUM)

#### ***Urban traffic plans (PUT)***

The PUT was introduced into Italian law in 1992 and is mandatory for towns with over 30,000 inhabitants and certain other towns. PUTs aim to improve traffic circulation and road safety, to reduce noise and air pollution, and to reduce energy use. They make provision for short-medium term management actions such as urban traffic control systems, traffic calming, car park charging measures, and areas with restricted traffic access. These plans are updated every two years and their effectiveness is monitored by measuring both traffic impacts (e.g. vehicle flows/speeds, the number of public transport passengers, number of accidents), and environmental impacts.

#### ***Urban mobility plans (PUM)***

The Piano Urbano per la Mobilità (PUM) was introduced in 2000 and is applicable to cities with over 100,000 inhabitants. Whilst it is not mandatory for cities to adopt a PUM, it is a prerequisite that cities that wish to have access to national funding for transport planning and provision, must prepare and adopt a PUM. The PUM is a more strategic document than the PUT, and it provides a medium to long-term planning framework of not more than 10 years. PUMs aim to:

- satisfy the need for mobility;
- reduce air and noise pollution;
- reduce energy consumption;
- increase transport safety;
- minimise the use of private cars;
- increase the use of public transport;
- encourage car sharing and;
- reduce congestion in urban areas.

PUMs can be considered as a type of SUTP. The PUM provides the basis for national funding allocations, which also require the establishment of a monitoring procedure.

The types of urban areas that can benefit from access to national funds, through the preparation and adoption of a PUM include:

- Single towns with more than 100,000 inhabitants
- Aggregations of neighbouring councils with a total population greater than 100,000 inhabitants
- Provinces adjacent to cities which have a population greater than 100,000

### **15.2 Implementation of PUMs is still in progress as the relevant legislation has not yet been approved. At this stage, a few cities have adopted and implemented PUMs on a voluntary basis.**

Of the eight cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that responded to the survey, four indicated that they already have SUTPs in place, and a further three are planning to introduce them in the future.

## 16 Latvia

### 16.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 16.1.1 EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs

Although there are currently no obligations for cities and towns in Latvia to adopt EMPs, EMSs, or SUTPs, some cities (e.g. the port of Ventspils) do have them. At the national level Latvia has adopted a Sustainable Development Strategy, which includes chapters on transport, construction etc, and also a National Programme for Transport Development, which has a section called "Towards a more environmentally friendly transport system". There is also a Law on Environmental Protection, which obliges state institutions and municipalities to prepare and publish reports on the state of the environment, as well as develop environmental policy plans and programmes. Another national law on Spatial Planning incorporates the principles of sustainability, public participation and the elimination of environmental risks. This law forbids state institutions from delegating their responsibilities to municipalities without allocating finances.

Two cities in Latvia have more than 100,000 inhabitants (Riga and Daugavpils) and both cities responded to the survey on EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs. Neither city currently has any of these plans or systems in place, but both cities have stated that they plan to introduce all of them in the future.

## 17 Lithuania

### 17.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 17.1.1 EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs

There are currently no obligations or nationally supported voluntary programmes for cities and towns in Lithuania to adopt EMPs, EMSs, or SUTPs *per se*, or plans to introduce obligations. Each city in Lithuania does, however, have an obligatory "Comprehensive Plan", which provides an overall plan for the city's development. The "Comprehensive Plan" is not a specific environmental plan as its focus is on planning issues in the city concerned. The comprehensive plan can include environmental aspects such as air, water and soil planning, physical disturbances, forests, landscape management, nature and cultural heritage and biological diversity. It also includes assessment of the impacts of other policies on the environment. Following the approval of these comprehensive plans, detailed plans are developed for specific issues, sometimes including environmental issues. Transport planning is incorporated in the infrastructure part of comprehensive planning, and includes environmental considerations where necessary.

Five cities in Lithuania have more than 100,000 inhabitants and two of these cities (Kaunas and Siauliai) have responded to the survey on EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs. Both cities have indicated that they do not currently have EMPs, EMSs, or SUTPs, but both have also indicated that they plan to adopt all of these plans and systems in the future.

## 18 Luxembourg

### 18.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 18.1.1 EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs

Luxembourg has no national or regional obligations for cities and towns to have EMPs, EMSs or SUTPs, and has no plans to introduce them. There are also no formal voluntary schemes for EMSs, EMPs or SUTPs in Luxembourg, although there are forms of co-operation that are unique to individual communes. The autonomy of communes is a very important aspect of government in Luxembourg and national sectoral plans are only made in very specific cases such as waste, mobile phone masts and nature plans. Mobiliteit.lu is a national sectoral plan for transport that affects all cities in Luxembourg and includes the promotion of public transport and public transport infrastructure projects. There are, however, no obligations for cities to be involved in this plan.

There are no cities in Luxembourg with more than 100,000 inhabitants. The capital, Luxembourg city, did not respond to the survey and hence it is not known whether the city has adopted an EMP, an EMS, or a SUTP.

## 19 Malta

### 19.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 19.1.1 EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs

There are no obligations or voluntary programmes for cities and towns to have EMPs, EMSs or SUTPs in Malta. There are also no plans to introduce obligations for cities and towns to have EMSs, EMPs or SUTPs in the future. Malta has no large cities, and is administered regionally. Regional plans are required that cover areas such as land use and nature protection. These regional plans are co-ordinated by the national Structure Plan. There are also a number of regional transport plans.

Based on the survey responses received, Valetta, the capital city, does not currently have an EMP, EMS, or SUTP, but plans to introduce an EMP in the future.

## 20 Netherlands

### 20.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 20.1.1 EMPs

Cities in the Netherlands can adopt environmental management plans, but this is not obligatory, and there are no plans to introduce obligations in the future. In practice most cities do have plans, as the Dutch government has linked financial support to the adoption of environmental plans. The central government has issued guidance on planning in particular environmental areas; specifically for waste management, climate change and sustainability

planning. Each year the city council must establish an environment programme that includes a statement of activities in relation to their legal obligations to protect the environment, including a summary of the financial implications of these activities. There is also an obligation to provide a city sewage plan.

Of the 25 cities in the Netherlands with more than 100,000 inhabitants, 15 responded to the survey. 14 of these cities have already implemented EMPs, with the remaining one city planning to introduce one in the future.

### **20.1.2 EMSs**

Although there are no obligations for cities and towns to implement EMSs, local councils implement them on a voluntary basis. Ten of the fifteen cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that responded to the survey have already implemented EMSs, and a further two cities are planning to implement an EMS in the future. There are no future plans at the national level to obligate cities to adopt EMSs.

### **20.1.3 SUTPs**

There are no national obligations requiring cities to prepare SUTPs, but city authorities are responsible for the implementation of coherent and action-oriented traffic and transport policies that complement national, regional and neighbouring policy contexts, as well as environmental policy in the city and the country as a whole.

There is national environmental legislation (Wet milieubeheer) that gives provincial and local authorities the possibility to demand companies to have and implement travel plans. More and more authorities intend to follow the example of Amsterdam and demand such plans.

Nine of the fifteen cities that responded to the survey indicated that they already have SUTPs in place, and one of the remaining cities plans to introduce this type of plan in the future.

## **21 Poland**

### **21.1 Details of current and future activities**

#### **21.1.1 EMPs**

There are national obligations for Polish cities to prepare EMPs as part of the Environmental Code. The Code includes a provision for local authorities to prepare environmental protection plans; however, as yet not all cities have plans in place. These plans cover the following environmental aspects:

- Air quality
- Water use and treatment
- Waste disposal
- Greenhouse gas emissions
- Noise
- Nature/biodiversity
- Energy use
- Land quality
- Litter
- Urban sprawl
- Transport and mobility

- Sustainable construction

Environmental protection plans also cover all sectors – domestic, commercial, public and industrial.

There are forty cities in Poland with more than 100,000 inhabitants, and nineteen of these cities responded to the survey. Fourteen responding cities already have EMPs in place, and four of the remaining five cities plans to introduce EMPs in the future.

#### **21.1.2 EMSs**

There are no national obligations requiring cities to implement EMSs, and nor are there any nationally supported programmes to encourage the voluntary uptake of EMSs in Poland. Based on the survey responses, six of the nineteen responding cities have already implemented EMSs, with a further eleven cities planning to introduce an EMS in the future.

#### **21.1.3 SUTPs**

Poland has no national or regional obligations or voluntary programmes for cities and towns to adopt SUTPs. From the survey responses received, only three of the nineteen responding cities indicated that they already have SUTPs, with a further ten cities planning to introduce SUTPs in the future.

## **22 Portugal**

### **22.1 Details of current and future activities**

#### **22.1.1 EMPs**

There are no obligations or nationally or regionally supported voluntary programmes for Portuguese towns and cities to adopt EMPs. It is not known whether other voluntary programmes to support the uptake of plans exist.

Portuguese municipalities must, however, consider the environment in city planning and consult actors from various sectors including representatives of NGOs. The environmental categories that must be considered include:

- Air and water quality
- Noise (every urban plan has to have a noise map)
- Waste management
- Nature/biodiversity
- Energy
- Transport and mobility.

Only two Portuguese cities (Funchal and Porto) responded to the survey on EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs; both cities indicated that they have already implemented EMPs.

#### **22.1.2 EMSs:**

There are no national obligations for Portuguese cities to implement EMSs, and nor are there any nationally supported voluntary programmes to encourage their uptake. Based on the

survey responses, only the city of Porto has already implemented an EMS, although Funchal plans to do so in the future.

### **22.1.3 SUTPs**

There are no national obligations requiring cities to prepare SUTPs, and nor are there any nationally supported programmes to support the voluntary uptake of these types of plans. However, the national Basic Law of Environment makes reference to sustainable transport, stating that: “every facility, machinery or transport means must have adequate services or processes to prevent from pollutant substances”. The national level of government is primarily responsible for interurban and national transport infrastructure planning and implementation, while local authorities address transport and urban development issues within metropolitan areas.

In response to the survey on EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs, neither Funchal, nor Porto have introduced SUTPs, although Funchal plans to do so in the future.

## **23 Slovakia**

### **23.1 Details of current and future activities**

#### **23.1.1 EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs**

There are no national or regional obligations for cities and towns to adopt EMPs, EMSs or SUTPs in Slovakia. Some cities and companies did, however, initiate systems and plans at a local level about 3-4 years ago, supported by NGOs and other agencies. The funds to introduce EMAS and sustainable transport plans came mainly from different private foundations, USAID and other donors. In some cases funding was provided from city (municipal) budgets. Several guidance documents were prepared and made available for interested cities. Other voluntary schemes and future plans are unknown.

Two cities in Slovakia have more than 100,000 inhabitants, but neither city responded to the survey, and hence it is not known whether they currently have EMPs, EMSs, or SUTPs in place.

## **24 Slovenia**

### **24.1 Details of current and future activities**

#### **24.1.1 EMPs**

In the recently adopted Environmental Protection Act (which entered into force on May 7<sup>th</sup> 2004) there are some obligatory provisions for Environmental Management Plans that will affect municipalities:

- Article 38 obliges municipalities (of which there are ten in Slovenia) to adopt environmental protection programmes and environmental action programmes.
- Article 39 concerns environmental platforms, which provide a binding basis for preparation of plans, programmes and other acts in the fields of spatial planning, water and forest management, fisheries, hunting, mining, agriculture, energy, industry,

transport, tourism, waste and wastewater management, telecommunications and drinking water supply.

In October 2004, the Government adopted a new National Environmental Action Programme (2004-2008). This programme anticipates, among other things, the preparation of three national strategic guideline documents: one for the urban environment, one for sustainable mobility and one for sustainable construction.

With regard to urban design, the whole spatial planning regulation system has been revised with several new spatial planning documents. These include the Spatial Planning Act and Act on Construction and Engineering (2003), the Spatial Development Strategy of Slovenia (which came into force on 21st July 2004), and the State Spatial Order, which was adopted at the end of 2004. Additionally, municipalities and local communities are obliged to prepare all these new spatial planning documents.

At the city level, Ljubljana (the capital city) adopted a Sustainable Development Strategy in 2002, which includes the development of a regional project on integrated public transport. Ljubljana expects to prepare its environmental protection programme and action plan in the first part of 2005. Also the Maribor municipality produced a Local Agenda 21 plan in 2001.

Based on responses to the survey, Ljubljana (the only city in Slovenia with more than 100,000 inhabitants) does not currently have an EMP, although one is currently in preparation.

#### **24.1.2 EMSs**

There are no national or regional obligations for cities and towns to have EMSs or SUTPs. The new Environmental Protection Act, however, defines that organisations that obtain EMAS certification are entitled to receive certain incentives, such as reducing the frequency or scope of environmental monitoring and reporting. For the wider promotion of EMAS and eco-labelling schemes in general, the Ministry of the Environment, Spatial Planning, and Energy encouraged the establishment of a National Advisory Board that was set up in September 2004.

In response to the survey, Ljubljana city authority stated that it does not currently have an EMS, but is planning to adopt EMAS in the future. The Department of Environmental Protection will be the first department to introduce EMAS.

#### **24.1.3 SUTPs**

There are no national or regional obligations or voluntary programmes for cities and towns to have EMSs or SUTPs. The city of Ljubljana already has a SUTP, but due to the high levels of growth in the city, this is currently being revised; a new SUTP for Ljubljana will be published in 2007.

The Ministry of Environment, Spatial Planning and Energy has proposed to set up an Urban Consortium, in which representatives from Ljubljana, Maribor, the Urban Planning Institute of the Republic of Slovenia, the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport, the Ministry for Transport, etc, would formally cooperate in creating new policies for the urban development following the Strategy on Urban Environment and National Environmental Action Programme.

## 25 Spain

### 25.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 25.1.1 EMPs and EMSs

There are no current national or regional obligations for cities and towns in Spain to adopt EMPs or EMSs. Several cities have, however, voluntarily adopted some kind of EMS, often in the framework of Local Agenda 21, and the Environmental Ministry is committed to supporting municipalities in the development and implementation of their Local Agenda 21 plans. Of the 56 cities in Spain with more than 100,000 inhabitants, seven responded to the survey on EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs. Six of these cities indicated that they already have an EMP in place, with the remaining city planning to introduce an EMP in the future. With regard to EMSs, only one city (Barcelona) indicated that it has an EMS in place, although it is known that two other cities (Alicante and Valencia) have adopted EMAS.

Spain is currently preparing a “Spanish Strategy for Sustainable Development” (EEDS). An inter-ministerial commission has been created to prepare policy documents and encourage public and institutional participation. The EEDS will cover a period of 25 years and be updated every 5 years. The EEDS will address three aspects of sustainability – social cohesion, economic growth and environmental protection, and will have specific reference to urban issues of mobility, congestion, noise, resource consumption and urban waste.

#### 25.1.2 SUTPs

There are no national obligations requiring cities to introduce SUTPs, and Spain does not have a national sustainable transport strategy. However, some components of sustainable transport planning are included in different plans such as the National Plan for Greenhouse Gas Reduction and the Renewable Energy Plan.

One of the priorities of national policy is to invest in new transport infrastructure to increase road capacity and improve airports and harbours. As part of the Infrastructure Plan 2000-2007 it is also planned to invest in improvements to the suburban rail network including the promotion of integrated transport. Mobility management is promoted and implemented at local and regional levels. Traffic calming measures, pedestrian free zones and dedicated bus lanes are already established practice in many Spanish cities.

Two of the seven cities that responded to the survey (Barcelona and Elche) have stated that they already have SUTPs, with a further four cities planning to introduce them in the future.

## 26 Sweden

### 26.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 26.1.1 EMPs

There are no legal obligations for Swedish cities and towns to adopt EMPs, although nationally supported voluntary programmes exist. Voluntary programmes are mostly developed at the local level by the municipalities. The main national support consists of:

- Economic support for two large programmes; the local investment programme (LIP), which ran from 1998 to 2003 (SEK 6,200 million) and the climate investment programme (KLIMP), which has been in operation since 2003 (SEK 800 million, 2003-2004)
- Information and guidance. The Swedish Institute for Ecological Sustainability (IEH), has been commissioned by the national government to follow and evaluate the local investment programmes, to collect and convey good examples of sustainable development, and to inspire new initiatives of ecological sustainability by turning research findings and ideas of sustainability into practice.

There is a requirement for Swedish cities and towns to consider environmental issues in city/town planning. As part of the environmental programmes and environmental sustainability work carried out in Sweden, there are fifteen environmental quality objectives that have been adopted and set at the national level in 1999. These objectives must be considered by Swedish municipalities as part of their broader city/town planning, and include:

- Reduced Climate Impact;
- Clean Air;
- Natural Acidification Only;
- A Non-Toxic Environment;
- A Protective Ozone Layer;
- A Safe Radiation Environment;
- Zero Eutrophication;
- Flourishing Lakes and Streams;
- Good-Quality Groundwater;
- A Balanced Marine Environment;
- Flourishing Coastal Areas and Archipelagos;
- Thriving Wetlands; Sustainable Forests;
- A Varied Agricultural Landscape;
- A Magnificent Mountain Landscape, and;
- A Good Built Environment.

The size of a city/town's population does not have any impact on these requirements.

The parliament has set 71 interim targets for the objectives. The key measures are to be implemented by 2020 (except for climate change, for which the deadline is 2050) in an attempt to solve Sweden's main environmental problems within a generation. The Environmental Objectives Council, which was established in 2002, writes an annual progress report. Every fourth year it undertakes an in-depth evaluation of progress and proposes further measures. The Council includes representatives from local authorities and county administration boards, as well as sectoral agencies, NGOs, and the Confederation of Swedish Enterprise. While county administrative boards are responsible for implementing goals at the regional level, municipal authorities are responsible for securing support for, developing, and implementing the environmental objectives process. Municipalities work in dialogue with stakeholders and the local community.

The fifteenth objective, A Good Built Environment, is particularly closely related to the proposed Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment (including sustainable urban transport). The objective is as follows:

*"Cities, towns and other built-up areas must provide a good, healthy living environment. Natural and cultural assets must be protected and developed. Buildings and amenities must be located and designed in accordance with sound environmental principles and in such a way as to promote sustainable management of land, water and other resources".*

The main tool that municipalities use to manage their land and water areas is the comprehensive plan, which serves as a guide for decisions on land and water usage and (according to legislation) must be up-to-date. All municipalities are legally required to have such plans, which have three purposes:

- to provide a vision of the municipality's future development;
- to act as an instrument to make the daily decisions of the municipality easier; and
- to serve as a tool for dialogue between national and municipal interests.

There are no population thresholds for these requirements.

Although no national obligations are expected to be introduced in the future, Swedish municipalities will continue to develop EMPs in line with the fifteen environmental quality objectives and often as part of their comprehensive plans.

Most Swedish municipalities have EMPs, which are used as a basis in planning and decision-making. There are five cities in Sweden with a population greater than 100,000, and four of these cities responded to the survey on EMPs, EMSs, and SUTPs. Two of the four cities stated that they already have EMPs in place, with one of the other cities planning to introduce one in the future. All Swedish municipalities have worked with Local Agenda 21, although not all have adopted programmes. Many municipalities work with local environmental action plans/programmes – including transport issues. 107 of the 290 municipalities have, as part of the system of Climate Investment Programmes (KLIMP) prepared general Greenhouse Gas emissions strategies and action programme proposals for their local areas. A further ten to fifteen County Councils and other regional bodies are also involved in the activities of Climate Investment Programmes. The most cost effective programmes have been subsidised by the government (via a competition where local and regional bodies and business enterprise can apply).

### **26.1.2 EMSs**

There are no national obligations requiring cities to implement EMSs, although some cities have introduced EMSs in their own organisations. Most common is to adopt EMS in technical and environmental departments and in municipal companies (e.g. energy companies and waste collecting companies). The EMS is always used with the organisation as the base not the geographical unit. There are no future plans at the national level that would oblige cities to implement EMSs.

Based on the four survey responses received from cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants, two Swedish cities (Stockholm and Malmö) have already implemented an EMS, and a third city (Västerås) plans to introduce one in the future.

### **26.1.3 SUTPs**

There are no national obligations requiring Swedish cities to prepare and adopt SUTPs, and there are no future plans to introduce such obligations. However, on a voluntary basis, most municipalities have introduced some sort of traffic plan ("net plan"). The long-time objectives of these have developed over the years. Today they often deal with safety, noise, emissions, urban life quality and sustainable development. Some cities, such as Malmö and Lund, have developed transport strategies that include targets, actions and monitoring/evaluation – something closer to a SUTP. Even other cities and municipalities have started work in different manners or shown interest to start. One part of the objective "A Good Built Environment" relates to environmentally friendly transport. Monitoring of this sub-objective in 2003 revealed that 59 out of 260 responding municipalities have current

programmes/strategies to decrease car usage and/or increase possibilities for environmentally friendly or energy efficient transport, with a further 54 plans in development. At the regional level, county administrations (government or regional bodies) together with the Swedish Road Administration, prepare long term transport plans, primarily for the purpose of planning how state funds will be used for infrastructure investment and maintenances. The objectives of these plans cover the same issues as the national objectives for road transport policy, i.e. environmental impact, road traffic safety, accessibility, level of service, efficiency and contributions to regional balance and gender equality. Regional bodies in all counties prepare public transport plans. The County Council of Stockholm has a regional development plan (known as RUF5). All modes of transport are included in this plan. Other County Councils have also made plans or programmes, but these only cover the operations of their own organisations. Some ten to fifteen County Councils and other regional bodies are also involved in the activities of Climate investment programmes (KLIMP) and have made general greenhouse gas emitting strategies and action programme proposals for the regional area.

The results of the survey have indicated that Stockholm is the only city with a population greater than 100,000 that considers that it already has a SUTP in place, although the city of Malmö plans to introduce a SUTP in the future.

## 27 United Kingdom

### 27.1 Details of current and future activities

#### 27.1.1 EMPs

There are no national obligations for cities and towns in the UK to prepare Environmental Management Plans. There is however, an obligation (under the Local Government Act 2000) on local authorities in England and Wales to prepare Community Strategies, which promote or improve the economic, social, and environmental well-being of their areas. The Act also states that local authorities are to “have the power to do anything which they consider is likely to achieve...the promotion or improvement of the environmental well-being of their area”. In effect, the scope of what local authorities include within their Community Strategies has been left to the discretion of the individual authorities themselves, although guidance on preparing Community Strategies has been developed by the UK Government.

Those authorities that wish to develop a Community Strategy that is the equivalent of a full EMP can do so by strictly following the Government guidance, whilst others may choose to produce much less comprehensive strategies that only address environmental issues in a very minor way. Whilst there is an obligation for all local authorities to produce a Community Strategy, not every Community Strategy would be considered as being the equivalent of an Environmental Management Plan. No national funding is available for the development of Community Strategies, and Community Strategies are not assessed by Central Government before implementation. There are no requirements for Community Strategies in Scotland, although they may be considered in the future. There is a statutory duty for all public bodies in Northern Ireland to “have regard” to the Northern Ireland Regional Development Strategy, which includes environmental aspects, but again, there is no obligation to produce an EMP. The introduction of Local Development Frameworks is likely to mean that in the near future, the requirements of what is included in a Community Strategy will become more stringent.

The Local Agenda 21 initiative was established in 1993 by five UK local authority associations. In 1997, the Prime Minister expressed his goal for all UK municipalities to have

Local Agenda 21 strategies in place, and by 2001 more than 90% of municipalities had done so.

National planning policies are principally set out in 25 Planning Policy Guidance notes (PPGs) and 15 Mineral Planning Guidance notes (MPGs). In addition, there are numerous circulars, policy statements, and good practice guidance documents, as well as advice on procedures and other material, such as cross-references to other relevant policies. Planning authorities must take national policy into account when preparing local plans or regional planning policy. Planning guidance specifically relating to the environment includes: PPG7 The Countryside: environmental quality and economic and social development; PPG9 Nature Conservation; PPG10 Planning and Waste Management; PPG13 Transport; PPG19 Outdoor Advertisement Control; PPG20 Coastal Planning; PPG22 Renewable Energy; PPG23 Planning and Pollution Control; and PPG24 Planning and Noise. All PPGs and MPGs are currently being reviewed.

There are 69 urban areas in the UK with more than 100,000 inhabitants. Information on whether or not EMPs are in place has been made available for 23 urban areas. Six of these twenty-three urban areas already have an EMP in place; a further three are planning to introduce them in the future. With the legislation in place that obligates local authorities to prepare community strategies, a foundation is in place for the widespread uptake of EMPs, although as highlighted earlier, not all community strategies are equivalent to an EMP.

#### **27.1.2 EMSs**

Local Authorities are not required to adopt EMSs in any of the countries of the UK, although a small number of English Local Authorities (about 15-20) have adopted EMAS I, and others have adopted ISO14001. Nine of the twenty-three urban areas that responded to the survey already have an EMS in place, with a further four planning to introduce one in the future.

#### **27.1.3 SUTPs**

The Transport Act 2000 requires all Local Transport Authorities in England (excluding those in London) and Wales to produce a Local Transport Plan (LTP); all authorities have met this requirement. The requirement to produce an LTP extends to both urban and rural transport authorities, and hence sustainable urban transport plans should be considered as sub-category of LTPs, with a narrower focus. LTPs are required to follow the principle of the relevant Regional Transport Strategies. LTPs were first submitted in 2000 and cover the five year period from 2001/2002 to 2005/2006, after which new LTPs must be prepared. Each LTP contains objectives consistent with national objectives for transport (to improve safety, promote accessibility, contribute to an efficient economy, promote integration and protect the environment), an analysis of problems and opportunities, a long-term strategy to tackle the problems and deliver the LTP objectives, a costed and affordable 5-year implementation programme of schemes and policy measures, and a set of targets and performance indicators and other outputs which can be used to assess whether the plan is delivering its objectives.

LTPs cover all transport modes and the integration of modes. They include measures to manage traffic and restrain demand (e.g. intelligent transport systems), to integrate modes (e.g. park and ride), to ensure the availability of transport in rural areas, and to encourage sustainable goods distribution. In Scotland, there is an analogous Local Transport Strategy process.

**27.2 The UK Government aims to encourage widespread voluntary take-up of travel plans by leading by example - over 1000 government buildings have now developed travel plans. The Government is also looking to local authorities to promote them through the LTP process. It has awarded grants to local authorities to employ 111 travel plan advisors across the country to help schools, businesses and other organizations in their area. The government also established the School Travel Advisory Group (STAG) in 1998 to spread best practice and to identify practical ways of reducing car use whilst at the same time improving safety on the journey to school. There is a Government-funded programme that offers free site-specific advice and information and guidance is offered through the transport ministry website.**

With regard to the number of urban areas that have Local Transport Plans, official UK Government figures on LTPs has been used. It is known that 66 of the 69 urban areas in the UK with more than 100,000 inhabitants already have LTPs in place.

## Appendix 1: Results from previous studies

Below are details of two previous studies, which have examined national activities in the areas of Local Agenda 21 and Mobility Management , respectively:

- Local Authorities Self-Assessment of Local Agenda 21 (LASALA) – Accelerating Local Sustainability, co-ordinated by members of the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) in 2001.
- MOST – Mobility Management Strategies for the Next Decades, a research and demonstration project funded by the European Commission, DG TREN under the 5th Framework Programme.

### Local Agenda 21

In 1992, at the UN Conference on Environment and Development, world leaders adopted Agenda 21, a global action plan for sustainable development. This called on local governments to develop their own agenda and priorities. Much of the activity across Europe in the field of EMAS, EMP and Sustainable Transport Planning is linked into the Local Agenda 21 process. The five key activity areas for Local Agenda 21 are Air Quality, Water Resources Management, Energy Management, Transportation and Natural Resource Management.

In December 2001, the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) undertook a global survey of Local Agenda 21 processes to identify in which countries there were national campaigns, and how many municipalities had integrated the Local Agenda 21 process into their planning and reporting systems. The following table outlines the number of municipalities identified in the survey in the EU countries actively promoting the Local 21 Agenda.

**Table A: Number of municipalities in each Member State with Local Agenda 21 processes (as identified by ICLEI)**

Country	No. municipalities	Country	No. municipalities
Austria	64	Latvia	5
Belgium	106	Lithuania	14
Cyprus	1	Luxembourg	69
Czech Republic	42	Netherlands	100
Denmark	216	Poland	70
Estonia	29	Portugal	27
Finland	303	Slovakia	30
France	69	Slovenia	3
Germany	2042	Spain	359
Greece	39	Sweden	289
Hungary	9	UK	425
Ireland	29		
Italy	429		

The ICLEI survey found that six Countries within the EU operate national campaigns on Local Agenda 21: Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Sweden, and United Kingdom. Governments or other national bodies run these national campaigns, which reach out to all local government within the given country and provide direct financial support or resources such as publications, workshops, information sharing etc. The presence of a national campaign was found to correlate directly with high numbers of participating local authorities.

Those involved in implementing Local Agenda 21, however, reported significant barriers, not least a lack of financial support and assistance from national and federal governments.

Although Member States may have implemented national programmes to support the take up of Local Agenda 21, it should be noted that based on the results of the research we have carried out, there is no real correlation between this finding and whether or not the Member State has put on obligation on cities to prepare Environmental Management Plans. Of the six countries that have national LA21 campaigns, only one (Denmark) has introduced an obligation that cities should prepare EMPs, and this has been achieved through the national institutionalisation of the Local Agenda 21 process.

### **Mobility Management**

Mobility Management is an important aspect of sustainable urban transport, typically dealing with “softer” measures such as road pricing and travel plans rather than infrastructure provision. The MOST study found a large degree of variation with regard to the objectives and policies of national authorities dealing with Mobility Management. The study team distinguished three groups of countries according to their national policies:

1. Countries where Mobility Management is included visibly in policy statements (e.g. the Netherlands, Belgium and the United Kingdom). For example, the Netherlands government was an early supporter of mobility plans (travel plans) for companies and in Belgium companies are required to collect data on commuter travel.
2. Countries where supporting policy on a national level is more indirect (e.g. Italy, Sweden, France, Germany and Austria). These countries have national policy elements that can be considered as supportive of Mobility Management e.g. support programmes for public transport or the objective of modal integration, but no direct reference to, or responsibility for, Mobility Management
3. Countries with an absence of any policy statement or specific activity on Mobility Management (e.g. Spain, Portugal and the Czech Republic). These countries have other transport policy priorities, mainly infrastructure development. The national authorities in many of such countries are in favour of sustainable transport but this has not (yet) resulted in any policy support for Mobility Management.

There is no clear linkage between having direct policy statements on Mobility Management, and obligations for SUTPs. Of the three countries with visible Mobility Management policy statements, only the United Kingdom has obligations for cities and towns to have SUTPs.

## Appendix 2: National authorities and experts contacted during this study

The following people have kindly provided information by telephone and/or e-mail for this study. We are grateful for their support.

### Austria:

Gordana Janak, Department for Environment and Nature Protection, Ebendorferstrasse 4, A-1010 Wien, Austria, email: [jan@m22.magwien.gv.at](mailto:jan@m22.magwien.gv.at)

### Belgium:

Frank Meeusen, Kabinet van de Vlaamse Minister van Leefmilieu, 0032 2 553 2781  
Mr. J. F. Rivet, Direction générale des Ressources naturelles et de l'Environnement, Tel: +32 81 33 50 50, email: [jf.rivetz@mrw.wallonie.be](mailto:jf.rivetz@mrw.wallonie.be)

### Czech Republic

Mrs. Martina Pásková, Ministry of the Environment, Vršovická 65, 100 10 Prague, Czech Republic, Tel: +420 267 122150, email: [martina\\_paskova@env.cz](mailto:martina_paskova@env.cz)

### Cyprus:

Georgiou Herodotos, Head of Environmental and European department, and Nadia Karayiammi, Lemesos Municipality, Cyprus, Tel: +357 25 342 330

### Denmark

Britt Vorgod Pedersen, Ministry of environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Spatial Planning Department, Haraldsgade 53, DK-2100, Copenhagen, Denmark, [bvp@sns.dk](mailto:bvp@sns.dk)

### Estonia

Maila Kuusik, Ministry of the Environment, Department of Spatial Planning, Toompuiestee 24, 15172 Tallinn, Estonia, Tel: +372 6273 046, email: [maila.kuusik@ekm.envir.ee](mailto:maila.kuusik@ekm.envir.ee)

### Finland

Matti Vatiilo, Ministry of the Environment, Land Use Department, P.O.Box 35 FIN-00023 Valtioneuvosto, Finland, Tel: +358 9 160 39560, email: [matti.vatilo@ymparisto.fi](mailto:matti.vatilo@ymparisto.fi)

### France:

Stephanie Antoine (+33 1 42 19 18 67) from the Ministère de l'Ecologie et du développement  
Phillipe Senna (+33 1 42 19 19 42) from the Ministère de l'Ecologie et du développement,  
email: [philippe.senna@ecologie.gouv.fr](mailto:philippe.senna@ecologie.gouv.fr)

### Germany

Jens Libbe, German Institute of Urban Affairs, Ernst-Reuter-Haus, Straße des 17. Juni 112, D-10623 Berlin, Germany, Tel: +49 30 39001-115, email: [libbe@difu.de](mailto:libbe@difu.de)

### Greece

Mrs Panagiota Kaperoni, Ministry for the Environment, Spatial Planning & Public Works, Kifisias av. 125-127, 115 24 Athens, Greece

### Hungary

Mrs. Kálmánné Búzás, Deputy Head of Department, Ministry for Environment and Water, 44-50, Fő u.1011 Budapest, Hungary

### **Ireland**

Mr. Liam WHELAN, Principal Officer, Department of the Environment and Local Government, Custom House, Dublin 1, Ireland, Tel + 353 (1) 8882433, F : + 353 (1) 8882286, email : [liam\\_whelan@environ.ie](mailto:liam_whelan@environ.ie)

### **Italy:**

Diego Giuliani and Silvia Vaghi, Ministry for Environment and Territory, T: +39 06 57228212, [diego.giuliani@svs.minambiente.it](mailto:diego.giuliani@svs.minambiente.it), [silvia.vaghi@tfambiente.it](mailto:silvia.vaghi@tfambiente.it)

### **Latvia**

Kristine Slesere, Senior official, EU-affairs division, Latvian Ministry of Environment, Peldu Street 25, Riga, LV 1494, Latvia, Tel: +371 7026541, email: [kristine.slesere@vidm.gov.lv](mailto:kristine.slesere@vidm.gov.lv)

### **Lithuania:**

Mr Alexander Gordevicius, Head of Spatial Planning, Ministry of the Environment, T: +370 52 663 609, [a.gordevicius@am.lt](mailto:a.gordevicius@am.lt)

### **Luxembourg:**

Mr Claude Origer and Mr Claude Franck, Ministry of Environment, 18, Montée de la Pétrusse 2918 Luxembourg, Luxembourg, [claudoriger@mev.etat.lu](mailto:claudoriger@mev.etat.lu) +352 478 68 26 and +352 478 6824

### **Malta:**

Vincent Gauci, Malta Environment and Planning Authority, Tel: +356 22901515, email: [vincent.gauci@mepa.org.mt](mailto:vincent.gauci@mepa.org.mt)

### **Netherlands:**

Jan Jaap de Boer from VROM (Netherlands Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment) +31 70 339 2620

### **Poland**

Radislaw Kucharski, Institute of Environmental Protection, Poznanska str. 14 apt. 44, 00-680 Warsaw, Poland, Tel: +48 22 83 23 966, email: [rkucharski@ios.edu.pl](mailto:rkucharski@ios.edu.pl)

### **Portugal**

Mrs Maria José Festas, Direcção Geral do Ordenamento do Território e do Desenvolvimento Urbano, Campo Grande, 50, 1749-014 Lisboa, Portugal, T : +351 (.21) .793.3908, [gabdg@dgotdu.pt](mailto:gabdg@dgotdu.pt)

### **Spain**

Marta García Nart, Consejera Técnica de Relaciones Internacionales, Ministerio de Vivienda, Paseo de la Castellana 67, 28071, Madrid, Spain, Tel: +34 (91) 5977572

### **Slovakia**

Gejza Legen, National Network Co-ordinator, Association of Healthy Cities in Slovakia, email: [azms@changenet.sk](mailto:azms@changenet.sk)

### **Slovenia**

Alenka Burja, Undersecretary, Ministry of the Environment, Spatial Planning and Energy, Dunajska 48, 1000 Ljubljana, Tel. +386 1 4787 383, Fax: + 386 1 4787 425, Mail: [alenka.burja@gov.si](mailto:alenka.burja@gov.si)

**Sweden**

Mrs. Gunnel Jonsson, National Board on Housing, Building and Planning, Drottninggatan 18,  
Box 534, 371 23 Karlskrona, Sweden, Tel +46 455 353 193, email:

[gunnel.jonsson@boverket.se](mailto:gunnel.jonsson@boverket.se)

**United Kingdom**

Chloe Meacher, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 26 Whitehall, London, SW1A 2WH,  
United Kingdom, Tel: +44 207 944 8918 E: [chloe.meacher@odpm.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:chloe.meacher@odpm.gsi.gov.uk)