

UL2L - UrbanLinks 2 Landscape

Summary of Working Group Meeting

9th - 10th January 2020
Cologne

www.interregeurope.eu/ul2l

An interregional cooperation project for
improving natural and cultural heritage policies.

Project Partners

Rhineland Regional Council (DE)

Schloss Dyck Foundation (DE)
Umbria Regional Authority (IT)
Kuldiga District Municipality (LV)
Silesia Park (PL)
Kristianstad Municipality (SE)
Surrey County Council (UK)



Environment &
resource
efficiency



1.00 M
ERDF



Jun 2018
May 2022



European Union
European Regional
Development Fund

On its 3rd meeting (Katowice, 30th September 2019) the International Steering Group decided to organise an extra meeting of the UL2L Working Group (based on an option mentioned in the Application Form).

Previous meetings of this group have shown the benefits of a joint evaluation of the workshops, the site visits and the studies. But the time given for such a debate has always been too short as the meetings have been pressed into the agenda of the project's workshops (and ISG-Meetings).

Thus, the members of this group (two per partner) have been invited to a specific working group meeting in Cologne, on the 9th and 10th January 2020.

All participants received a list of questions and topic that will be addressed during the meeting in advance. This list was prepared by the Advisory Partner (Schloss Dyck Foundation) and the Lead Partner (LVR).

The outcomes of the working group meeting, following the guideline handed out in advance, are reflected in this summary.

The Working Group also understands this as a further step towards the recommendations that the project is going to deliver. However, an additional meeting (during the workshop or study tour until May 2020), will be needed to finalize these recommendations or visions.

A | PERSONAL / PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

- What has been the **most impressive** thing about UL2L so far?

7 votes: **Good practice examples**

6 votes: **Good project team, dedication, and network of the project partners**

5 votes: **Interregional learning on:**

- Revitalisation of industrial heritage
- Social inclusion
- Educational aspects
- Health care

1 vote: **Environmental development**

- What was the **most important thing for my work?**

6 votes: Transfer of **knowledge**

4 votes: Transfer of **experience**

4 votes: **Raising profile of UL2L locally**

2 votes: **Successful cooperation**

2 votes: **Options of UL2L activities**

2 votes: Transfer of **approach**

1 vote: **Start implementation**

1 vote: **Start action plan**

- What was **different** in UL2L compared to my expectations?

Workshops:

- Problems of transferability
- Examples of thematic rather than spatial relevance
- Summing up session at the end of WS where missing

Stakeholders:

- Stakeholder inclusion difficult (their role/ their absence in discussions/ their commitment)
- Transporting the idea of UL2L to them was difficult

UL2L in general:

- Number of international Partners could be higher
- Use of media too low
- Active contribution of partners to communication weak
- Clear guideline for action plan missing
- Missing layer of government & management systems

Interreg in general:

- Timing of UL2L in relation of OP
- Expertise of JS for our topics seems is missing

B | PLANNING QUESTIONS

Is the transition zone between city and countryside (for my region) really an important spatial category? Does it already have, or does it need special planning or protection concepts?

	<i>Important category and for what reasons/uses</i>	<i>Has or needs planning or protection</i>
	<i>No or yes and why</i>	<i>Has/needs (and one reason)</i>
Italy	Peri-urban appeared only in the last few years, and cities understand it differently.	Clear definition of peri-urban (criteria). Drawing on the map. Definition to spend funding and to define the next OP: Greener Europe and more social Europe.
Sweden	Compare next tables	Compare next tables
Latvia	Important category due to developments in peri-urban territory, visually impacting historical rural landscape and soviet-time deformations. UL2L concepts of development of the Venta river valley will include the transition zone.	More detailed planning and protection measures are needed for cultural landscape (with single settlements – manors and farms). There is a strong building policy for the city, but not for the landscape and transition zones.
Poland	Transition zone is important category as well as green areas and they need protection against urbanization pressure.	Preservation of transition zones and green areas should be stronger and included in development plans.
Germany	All land is covered by plans/laws defining uses, done by municipalities and other planning levels. But transition zone is important and under pressure and conflicts, e.g. settlement and transport. Historic elements to be maintained with difficulties.	Normally not a zone of its own rights. Agricultural land waiting for use that is more profitable. Also important to protect the environment.
UK	Peri-urban increasingly recognized as an important area, but planning focusses on urban and landscape.	Not really, no regional plans (districts and boroughs). But planning definition of “green belts” from the 1950 or 1960 with the pressure and conflicts remaining. AONB have a stronger plan to preserve their beauty, but these are rather rural. London has a regional plan including green and blue infrastructure.

What have been the recent and most important developments for the city (e.g. density, housing, traffic, green-blue infrastructure) and how did they affect the core categories of UL2L: ecosystem services, urban farming, and outdoor healthcare services?

Sweden	Influence ecosystem	Urban farming	Healthcare
Densification and sprawl	Open space used for both	Increased interest	Less space requires better quality, more people = better safety

Germany	Influence ecosystem	Urban farming	Healthcare
Densification and sprawl, competition between uses	Pressure on existing ecosystems, definition of green spaces	People create their own tiny green spaces like a counterstrategy	Lack of space for such services, not enough fresh air
Climate change	Pressure, but also a possible contribution to better climate, biodiversity	Sustainability, biodiversity	Open, fresh places needed for people, cold air production
Traffic	Depends on the kind of traffic, energy production	Local produce requested, but condition (air, soil) not always ok	Biking is healthy

Latvia	Influence ecosystem	Urban farming	Healthcare
Densification and sprawl in Latvian metropolitan region (Riga agglomeration) suburbanization processes, shrinking trends in peripheral region, including Kuldiga.	Uneven pressure on ecosystem.	Decreasing from the Soviet times, but future trends demand evaluation and appropriate planning.	Potential of natural territories for healthcare services demands future planning.
Increasing visitor flow, anthropogenic load, insufficient infrastructure capacity and management.	Management and creation of facilities in order to reduce the anthropogenic load to habitats and preserved areas, incl. traffic flow.	No direct impact.	Potential for healthcare services and activities should be developed within the visitor flow management planning.
Water quality, draining systems of buildings and streets, effects of forestry, climate change	Pollution of river eco-system, groundwater, biodiversity, negative impacts of climate change. Overgrowing of the river and previously open landscape of riverbanks.	No direct impact.	Need of improved green-blue infrastructure.

UK	Influence ecosystem	Urban farming	Healthcare
Densification and sprawl, competition between uses	Green belt increases pressure on urban areas. Increasing awareness (also of greenwashing developers) and number of good practices	Increasing number of good practices, increased recognition of the values (allotments)	Housing development increasingly relates to green spaces. Awareness of the importance (i.e. Doctor's prescription to recreate in nature)
Transport (public, airports around London)	Balance of national grows vs. local demands	Farms will have to go (e.g. close to airports)	

Poland	Influence ecosystem	Urban farming	Healthcare
Air pollution	Caused by industry and transport	Not much experiences, not much space or interest for urban farming, allotment is old-fashioned	Increases the need for health care
a) Densification and b) shrinking cities without strong planning instruments (except of preserving valuable green areas)	Developers want to build close to or even inside green areas, need to preserve them, b) people moving to the bigger centres	Not much experiences, not much space or interest for urban farming, allotment is old-fashioned	Increases the need for health care
Traffic	Still increasing, commuters	Not much experiences, not much space or interest for urban farming, allotment is old-fashioned	Increases the need for health care

Italy	Influence ecosystem	Urban farming	Healthcare
Densification along the valley, less population on the historic cities on the hills	Less biodiversity, investments on the ecological connections, fragmentation of the area	Less green soil for farming, creation of abandoned areas,	Health spaces also for socialising, replacing the "piazza"
Creating links between the old cities and the new settlements, Problem of accessibility of historic city centres	Creating green (and blue) infrastructures to connect these parts	Urban farming using the new connections to develop local markets and as links for distribution	Green belts also for sports and leisure

What have been the recent and most important developments for the landscape (e.g. biodiversity, supply and disposal, nature conservation, recreation, agriculture) and how did they affect the core categories of UL2L: ecosystem services, urban farming, and outdoor healthcare services?

Sweden	Influence ecosystem	Urban farming	Healthcare
Protection around the cities to keep the green areas of the landscape			

Germany	Influence ecosystem	Urban farming	Healthcare
People moving out to suburban areas	No real gardens, but stones etc., negative influence on the climate	No UF in suburban settlements individualism vs. community	Heating of the area (discussion to regulate the design of gardens, more gardens)
Energy production	Wind energy mills, but keeping them away from housing (by regulations)		Raising concern of side effects "Not in my backyard mentality"

Latvia	Influence ecosystem	Urban farming	Healthcare
Processes of river banks	Trees are growing instead of open landscape, coastal slope erosion process	Some urban farming territories impacted by slope erosion	No direct impact
Energy production	Restrictions close to Kuldiga	No direct impact	No direct impact
Cultural Potato Field	No direct impact	More social area and a stage for educational and cultural activities than farming	Indirect impact: common activities, including potential for healthcare activities
Project "Reduction of anthropogenic load in the nature reserve "Ventas valley" by creating a high-quality network of tourism and nature research infrastructure".	The infrastructure that reduces the anthropogenic load was created within the project, thus positively affecting the area of habitats.	No direct impact	Health route is created within this project

UK	Influence ecosystem	Urban farming	Healthcare
Rural towns as commuter cities	People away from the landscape, towns and villages for a lot of time	Landscapes were products of farming. How will landscape change?	Strong link between landscape and public health services in the cities

Trees	"Solution" to every environmental problem.		
-------	--	--	--

Poland	Influence ecosystem	Urban farming	Healthcare
Agriculture is no longer profitable and an attractive activity	People move to the urban areas, leave the land behind, commuting, economic and social problems	See above	See above

Italy	Influence ecosystem	Urban farming	Healthcare
Sensibility projects on landscape for economy, tourism and the inhabitants of the landscape	Development of project by the municipalities by EU funding	Farmers realize the produce from quality landscape is more valuable. Such as the olive oil from Trevi with its landscape quality	A healthy landscape is important for the inhabitants
Slow Mobility and environmental requalification of landscapes	Green infrastructures along the bike routes.	Production along the bike routes is a kind of promotion.	Slow way of living is a healthy way of living = slow landscapes

Based on the above matrixes how do we predict the future use of the transition zone, in relation to the UL2L core questions?

A) URBAN DEVELOPMENT

- Urbanization will continue. Transit areas will increase, and we have a chance to make things better here.
- Instead of cities to continue growing why not creating new cities or satellites?
- Catchment areas management will be of increasing importance.
- How to reuse (of historical or new) abandoned landscapes, good future use.
- Shrinking cities are a different challenge but are offering options to create something good.
- Disruptions offers options for new ways of thinking and acting

B) PERI-URBAN AREA

- We have to define protected zones, for the biodiversity, but even more for the people.
 - a. Accessibility , public transport, accessibility for different target groups
 - b. Design leading into transition zones, creating areas for activities among neighbors
 - c. Stay quality
- Increased multifunctional use of landscapes.
- Missing budget for the areas between urban and landscapes, medium zones where most people (in Italy) live. How to reuse these areas?
- Innovative concepts in the transition zones as an image factor.
- Technology changes will be important too.

C) GREEN AREAS

- Leave areas untouched by people, no access.
- Green areas will be connected better in the future.
- Green qualities are getting more important. We have taken it away from the landscape but need to include it into the urban area.
- Greener, more social, and connected Europe
- Technology changes will be important too.

D) CLIMATE CHANGE

- Adopting to climate change.
- Different approaches to face climate change and how to interact.
- Disruptions offers options for new ways of thinking and acting

E) QUESTIONS OF IMPLEMENTATION

- Long term plans and policies are needed to define the best use of open areas.
- Private and public working together and how to manage it in time?
- Bringing people together.

- Supporters and stakeholders

- The Stakeholders have a view from outside on the project, at the same time their knowledge, expertise and needs are vital in the conception of Interreg.
- The variety of different Stakeholder is in theory a great source for a multiple perspective and interdisciplinary approach. Alas, to match up, communicate and bind together their different aims, mind-sets and demands is challenging.
- Stakeholders are occupied in their “proper” jobs and sometimes lack time or motivation to participate.
- Access to funds and money seems to be the trigger for some of the Stakeholders. Especially political commitment is gained when funds for realisation is available. They have no interest in an academic discussion.
- NGO are keen to meet the decision maker to bring ideas and project on the way.
- On the other hand, the partners also had stakeholders with an intrinsic motivation to the topic.
- In Italy, the inclusion of schools and local people is regarded as very desirable, because topics like Urban farming can only develop bottom to top if long-term effect is aimed for.

Asking about the involvement of the Stakeholders the partner’s experiences differed.

4 votes: **Involvement differs** from Stakeholder to Stakeholder.

2 votes: Stakeholders were in generally **pretty involved**.

2 votes: **Stakeholders gave input** for the action plan.

2 votes: Stakeholders **involvement depending** on partner too

1 vote: Stakeholder (Politicians) are **not attending** the meetings

1 vote: Stakeholders **didn’t understand** the UL2L Project

C | ACTION PLANS

What experiences from UL2L's partner regions will the partners refer to in their Action Plans?

	The AP will refer to:
Italy	AP will define clearly, which areas in Umbria are regarded Urban/Rural and most important for further funding: Peri-urban. Umbria wants to address the problem of involving people, also administration and management the projects. Therefore, their focus is more on methods and procedure, instead of specific projects. Of the good practice examples, Reg. Umbria likes to adapt the Health garden in Kristianstad.
Sweden	Initiated by the experience of UL2L Kristianstad will develop a guideline of the whole of Sweden. Kristianstads municipality will focus on the industrial areas (inspired by Germany: Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord, Duisburg? and Poland: Katowice Culture Zone?) the City (Italy: which?) and the culture heritage (GB: which?/Kuldiga: which?)
Latvia	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Social inclusion (The Kristianstad Health Garden, Sweden, The Vegetable Gardens of St. Peter (Perugia-Italy)). 2. Education (Education center "GEOsphere" in Poland) and maintenance of heritage sites (i.e. industrial) in the landscape. 3. Photography for monitoring long-term developments and changes (participatory photography method has taken place at the Ciuffelli Institute of Agriculture; photomonitoring practices in Surrey – to be learned).
Poland	Main topic of AP will be how to adopt new functions for old post-industrial areas, green areas or open spaces and focused on the blue-green infrastructure and innovation. The Krinova Park, therapy garden (Sweden: Alnarp therapy garden) and the revitalisation of industrial site (Germany: Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord, Duisburg).
Germany	Climate Laboratory Garzweiler combines Ideas from Sweden (naturum vattenriket: Educational Center/ Alnarp landscape laboratory: Testing on diff. plants) and Italy (participatory photography workshop: Involving local groups)
UK	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land management (Flock of sheep) 2. Connecting People/Health: Italy(participatory photography workshop / Polen: GEOspera Jaworzno?) 3. Natural Capital: How to make this more concrete, more expertise to be commissioned on Nature/environment/business/social

Is there a lack of good practices in one area or topic?

- Health and social value of greenspaces (Surrey: Gap between the social and health benefit of green spaces and the recognition of its economic value)
- Natural capital/ future funding
- Use natural resources to achieve economic benefits (Poland: economic benefit and earning money is necessary trigger for future investment)
- Actions to preserve and re-use natural and cultural heritage, creating new services at urban margins
- Urban gardening
 - Agricultural sector (Farmers) as most important land users (Lead partner: Farmers as most important land users could/should be additional partners or stakeholders)
 - Accessibility project to historic Centres
 - Lack of dealing with climate change in heritage Landscapes and gardens (Dyck: Lacking awareness of climate change impact on garden heritage)
 - Public awareness/engagement in greenspace issues (Surrey: there is a global but not local awareness/engagement)
 - Examples of new housing areas with high sustainable approach (i.e. Netherlands)
 - Ecological connection
 - Green infrastructure
 - No references to ecosystem services (Project manager: ecosystem services related to urban grows need guidelines to be implemented and monitoring the process)
 - Hotspot biodiversity (new nature)
 - Photo monitoring of landscape dynamics (Latvia: Tools are necessary to evaluate the consequences of the action and be able to learn, adjust and improve)
 - Methodology for action impact
 - Guidelines for green planning in the diff. partners Countries

How will your voting and agreement on the regional action plan be organised?

- Discussion/Consensus/Agreement/Preposition
- Agree on common definition/Define most of the impact topics/Ideal?
- Discussion with stakeholder
- Related to planning of new EU funds policy owner
- Still exploring ideas/ will try to have it so all can agree on the plan
- Partner & main stakeholder agreed in the process about development of the AP

What is your experience of working with stakeholders? Has the concept proved its worth?

In addition to the above statements, partners defined common trends and gave votes:

3 votes: Stakeholders did not always recognize the benefit

3 votes: Time commitment

3 votes: Different priorities

2 votes: Lack of engagement

2 votes: most stakeholders are interested in participating
1 vote: Communication with stakeholders difficult, because of different prof. language

D | COMMUNICATION

What are your plans for additional publicity measures? What will happen with your existing budgets for publications?

The partners were informed, that the application form and the budget allow smaller publications and that they should consider how to use that.

Umbria is preparing a summarizing paper for the Umbrian stakeholders (in Italian, to inform about the project, internationally and regionally)

Do we want to formulate a joint statement based on the action plans, studies, good practices, results of this working group etc? Where and when to present such a statement?

No decision was made here. If such a statement will be written (by the LP) it should be presented (and endorsed) during the final conference

Would a video (with a maximum of 5,000 euros in funding) make a difference here? What should be covered and how? How can this be disseminated?

The funding should be spent for a video for the Final Conference. May be to support the joint statement.

What else would be good and feasible in the field of communication?

The partners should feel free to recommend a good example either from what they have seen during the workshops or any other project they find worth communicating through the Website.

Maria Carbone pointed out the www.paysmed.net Website as a good example to communicate and share information (organized by topics i.e. Studies and Research, Plans Programmes Projects, Regulation but also Videos and Books concerning the general subject of Landscape planning and development)

E | FINAL CONFERENCE

GENERAL CONCEPT:

The Final Conference has to be held in June 2021 to November 2021. The majority of partners are in favour for a date in early October 2021. There will be 2 days for the Conference. We expect the UL2L Partners and their stakeholders to attend the conference.

Furthermore, we expect people from the Interreg Secretary, representatives from science and civil service to come to the conference. The Lead partner gave a first estimation of 100-150 participants, but the partners stressed out due to the budget only a limited number from the different countries will be able to attend and therefore the esteemed number of participants should be reconsidered.

A simultaneous translation of the conference is necessary. We should consider the possibility of streaming the conference.

Sweden will have an additional conference on the action plan in May joined by representatives of all municipalities in Sweden.

What content should be included into the final conference?

- A starting video is planned financed by the funds which could be transferred from Phase 1 to Phase 2 of UL2L.
- Agglomeration
- Structural Change
- Green infrastructure
- Conflicts of demanded use for the peri-urban area

How will partners get involved?

Every partner presents his results in a short presentation

We should cluster some of the activities the partners refer to in advance to be able to formulate headlines which will give structure or guidelines for the conference content.

Are there any proposals for external speakers for the event? Should it be people who can help us with the content or prepare a new project?

- Who will decide on the Speakers?
- EU Level should be involved EU Commission of green infrastructure
- Journalists as speakers to add an outside view on UL2L

F | WHAT COMES AFTER UL2L?

What would be good questions for a future joint project?

POLAND: Mobility and renewal energy

DYCK: Influence of Climate Change on historic Landscape/ Raising awareness for historic Landscapes and their ecological, sociological economical potential. The EGHN Idea is still very attractive and has much potential to build on. Recent development shows a raising completion in that field (Spain garden network, Garden awards)

UK: Climate change, technological change, demographic change and how do these have an impact on the forming of landscapes. How to tackle these issues

Which partners would like to be involved in a project development?

ITALY: Would join

POLAND: Is open for new ideas

LATVIA: Waiting how UL2L goes, but open in general for new project

SWEDEN: Had positive reactions from the Stakeholder and therefore keeps the door open for upcoming projects

UK: probably not possible in future (Brexit)

Who else could/should be involved?

POLAND: Eastern Partners perhaps outside the EU

ITALY: Partners from the Mediterranean Area

Project Manager: 8 partners are a good number; more than 10 Partners are hard to manage. The Involvement of stakeholders might be dismissed in future. Topic of environment will become more prominent in INTERREG due to discussion on climate change