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ABSTRACT

Recovery plans in Europe in the COVID-19 pandemic era have stimulated construction-led development, which has eclipsed nature-based agendas in terms of scale, size, and policy. One estimate is that only 0.3% of spending on urban infrastructure globally is directed towards various nature-based solutions and other ecosystem efforts supporting human well-being. In the future we will urgently need to employ nature-based approaches in crisis management for the power and potential of nature to be fully employed in pursuit of urban recovery. We strongly recommend that nature-based approaches be an explicit requirement to secure funding for future recovery plans.

1. Introduction

We are living in challenging times. For many, the certainties of yesteryear have faded away and a ‘toxic reality’ has emerged shaped by gross wealth imbalance, political and social unrest, violent conflicts, hostility towards migrants, species extinction, climate change, diminishing natural capital and a public health crisis. The COVID-19 pandemic, in primis, has challenged numerous expectations in terms of sustainable development, and many young people are now afraid for their future (Konle-Seidl and Picarella, 2021). The economic consequences of COVID-19 have been particularly severe and persistent. In Europe alone, employment and total hours worked have declined at the sharpest rates on record. In the Eurozone, 5.2 million fewer persons were employed in the second quarter of 2020 than at the end of 2019 (Anderton et al., 2020). The World Trade Organization estimates that global trade has dropped by about 27% during the period of the pandemic, whilst the global economic growth rate has decreased to 3% (Wang and Huang, 2021). Furthermore, a number of the United Nation’s Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have been negatively impacted by the pandemic (Wang and Huang, 2021). In keeping with the economic sector, for instance, SDG 8 – “Decent Work and Economic Growth” was negatively affected as described in “Economic growth derailed” (Wang and Huang, 2021).

Faced with these challenges, the European Union (EU) has responded with a package of initiatives, including the Recovery Plan for Europe (European Union, 2022), developed in collaboration with major European governments. The sums involved are truly enormous. On May 27, 2020, the European Commission (EC) proposed a massive package of EU financing to support this recovery in addition to the EUR 4.2 trillion advanced by the EU and Member States (European Union, 2021a). Furthermore, the European Council agreed on a total funding of EUR 1.8 trillion, bringing together the EUR 750 billion NextGenerationEU instrument and a revised EU budget of EUR 1.074 trillion for the 2021–2027 timeframe (European Union, 2021a). The leitmotif of this Recovery Plan for Europe is ‘emergency’ and the need for speedy recovery actions.

Concurrent with these announcements are policies on a range of ‘green’ issues. In 2020, the EC announced a transformative policy known as the European Green Deal (European Commission, 2019), which acknowledges the shift from a linear economy to a circular one and promotes changes in policy frames (Galanakis et al., 2022). This initiative consists of policies which aim to set Europe on the path toward a ‘green transition’. Notable actions include an extension of Europe’s Natura 2000 programme (European Commission, 2019), a network of protected areas covering valuable and threatened species and habitats, and a pledge that in delivering the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030 at least 3 billion additional trees will be planted in full respect of ecological principles (European Commission, 2021a). A further hopeful innovation is the arrival of various ‘nature-based approaches’ covering both products and services. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has specifically been advocating ‘Nature-based Solutions’ (NBS), calling them “…actions to protect, sustainably manage, and restore natural and modified ecosystems that address societal challenges effectively and adaptively, simultaneously providing human well-being...
and biodiversity benefits” (IUCN, 2020). In this perspective, the United Nations (UN) has advanced the concept of constructing sustainable and resilient buildings using local materials in an indicator for SDG 11, which aims to “Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable” (Sharma et al., 2021). Indeed, during the citizen-led discussions at the Conference on the Future of Europe, from April 2021 to May 2022, participants argued that an EU directive requiring urban development programmes to fulfil minimum standards should be enacted to ensure that new buildings and infrastructure are as green as possible (Lampe, 2022). In 2022, a global definition for NBS was approved at the fifth session of the United Nations Environment Assembly (United Nations, 2022) – the assembly “decides that nature-based solutions are actions to protect, conserve, restore, sustainably use and manage natural or modified terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine ecosystems which address social, economic and environmental challenges effectively and adaptively, while simultaneously providing human well-being, ecosystem services, resilience and biodiversity benefits.”

Given the above pronouncements, an important aspect to consider on a practical note is how NBS can actually assist in recovering from COVID-19’s devastating effects on society and the economy, and whether there are any general principles or guidelines for NBS recovery plans. Worthy of note are the updated guidelines established by the World Health Organization (World Health Organization, 2022) for data collection methods to identify and assess the value of NBS for human health and well-being. We also make reference to the EC, which has drafted a number of documents guiding the implementation of NBS throughout the European territory. For example, the 2030 Biodiversity Strategy, together with the European Green Deal mentioned earlier, are among the main pillars of Europe’s growth strategy (European Commission, 2020) by means of economic and environmental benefits and strengthening the territory’s resilience. The benefits of the EU Natura 2000 nature protection network, also mentioned, are valued at between EUR 200–300 billion per year. Investing in nature such as nature restoration, urban agriculture, and in green and blue infrastructure will generate as many as 500,000 additional jobs (European Commission, 2020).

In addition, several Horizon 2020 and Horizon Europe (R&I) projects have produced principles and guidelines for applying NBS to address socio-economic and environmental challenges. For instance, the ongoing CLEARING HOUSE project (2019–2024) seeks to analyse and develop the potential of urban forestry as a NBS to enhance the adaptive capacity and resilience of cities facing major ecological, socio-economic, public health and human well-being challenges across Europe and beyond (e.g., China), all achievable by developing guidelines and decision support tools (Davies et al., 2021; Laforteza and Sanesi, 2019). In the sphere of scientific publications, propositions for adopting NBS to assist in resisting environmental and societal challenges, like pandemics, are given in the studies by da Schio et al. (2021), Haase (2021), and Spano et al. (2021), to name a few.

The major focus of this communication is to invigorate the nature-based concept for the development of sustainable healthy cities and awaken the scientific and political communities by stimulating an energetic debate globally. We argue that to bring NBS to the frontline for sustainable urbanisation it is necessary for policymaking to urgently reverse the pandemic-driven, development-led trend and prioritize above others the policies, programmes and projects that have been previously instituted or are in the pipeline that deal with a range of nature-based issues. It is also of paramount importance to design recovery plans that incorporate NBS as a requirement of every urban development programme to offset the consequences of potential socio-economic crises and mounting climate change. Indeed, climate change associated with a lack of strategic environmental planning, through NBS, at this time of recovery could generate higher future costs than the emergency we are currently facing.

This communication, although focused on the European continent, is addressed to other parts of the world, since the issues presented are global and Europe is certainly not a unique case (Khatri, 2022; Chen and Chi, 2022; Cavoski, 2020; Zhongming et al., 2020). The construction-led planning system, for example, is a global trend, especially in emerging economies with greater income range and social inequalities (Chen and Chi, 2022; Khatri, 2022; Aalbers et al., 2020; Yang and Jin, 2011).

Amidst this backdrop, we illustrate the key example of Italy, which despite having received the largest portion of the EU recovery fund in the amount of EUR 191.5 billion (26.5%) (d’Alfonso, 2022) has not placed enough effort toward the adoption of a nature-based approach to contrast conventional urban construction-led development (Davies and Laforteza, 2017).

2. Construction-led development

Whilst the policy words on ‘green issues’ are encouraging, there is however an uncomfortable truth in that far from European governments using the COVID-19 recovery plans to move to a greener and more sustainable society, the reverse may actually be true. European Member State governments have seemingly reverted to tried and tested urban construction-led development to propagate employment, even with the private sector, throughout the grey infrastructure supply chain (European Union, 2021b; Zhongming et al., 2020). This is considered as leveraging economic activity in the politically volatile blue collar jobs sector and generates significant tax revenues. The latter is required to pay off the colossal budget deficits accrued through COVID-19 intervention measures and quantitative easing (Schwarz, 2022).

Based on the above premises, handling of the recovery from the pandemic crisis in Europe has facilitated an acceleration of inappropriate and unsustainable urban development (European Commission, 2022). Whether this is voluntary negligence, forgetfulness, or ignorance of the European green policies and initiatives focusing on NBS is one perspective. Another is to view this in light of the ‘Macchiavellian’ expression “The ends justify the means”, namely, that a speedy economic recovery from COVID-19 through leveraging and by using any means necessary is acceptable, even if the consequences include negative long-term environmental and social impacts.

A tangible example is the massive additional investment made in the world’s 8th largest economy, Italy (Global PEO Services, 2022), through its ‘Housing Plan’ where developers are pushing forward with rapid urban development (Fig. S1 and supplementary material for further details). The subterfuge is to use a plan such as ‘Piano Casa’, originally intended to overcome a deficit in social housing, for a ‘no-holds-barred’ development-led boom. In fact, according to the European Construction Industry Federation (FIEC), among the European heavyweights in the construction sector and generates significant tax revenues. The latter is required to pay off the colossal budget deficits accrued through COVID-19 intervention measures and quantitative easing (Schwarz, 2022).

Based on the above premises, handling of the recovery from the pandemic crisis in Europe has facilitated an acceleration of inappropriate and unsustainable urban development (European Commission, 2022). Whether this is voluntary negligence, forgetfulness, or ignorance of the European green policies and initiatives focusing on NBS is one perspective. Another is to view this in light of the ‘Macchiavellian’ expression “The ends justify the means”, namely, that a speedy economic recovery from COVID-19 through leveraging and by using any means necessary is acceptable, even if the consequences include negative long-term environmental and social impacts.

A tangible example is the massive additional investment made in the world’s 8th largest economy, Italy (Global PEO Services, 2022), through its ‘Housing Plan’ where developers are pushing forward with rapid urban development (Fig. S1 and supplementary material for further details). The subterfuge is to use a plan such as ‘Piano Casa’, originally intended to overcome a deficit in social housing, for a ‘no-holds-barred’ development-led boom. In fact, according to the European Construction Industry Federation (FIEC), among the European heavyweights in the housing construction sector Italy was recorded as one of the main drivers of growth at +12.05% behind France (+24.1%), in 2021, followed by Germany (+2.3%), and its investment in new housebuilding is expected to rise by more than 10% in 2022 (European Union, 2021b). The ‘green light’ for this construction-led development was given by the EU in response to the Italian government’s submission of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP) on April 30, 2021, by granting EUR 191.5 billion, i.e., a 26.5% share of the total EU Recovery and Resilience Facility (RRF) (d’Alfonso, 2022). Also, in June 2022, Italy’s grant allocation was revised slightly upwards of €69 billion (+0.2%). Through a mix of reforms and investments the NRRP is structured into six ‘Missions’. Of these, Mission 2 (Component 3) – ‘Energy efficiency and renovation of buildings’ – specifically invests 8.0% (i.e., EUR 15.4 billion) of the Plan’s budget. While other European countries are also benefiting from EU economic recovery funds pursuant to the COVID-19 pandemic crisis (e.g., Spain was allotted EUR 69.5 billion towards a low-carbon, climate-resilient economy and digital transition, Poland €35.4 billion to boost the economy, The Netherlands EUR 4.7 billion to invest in a greener, more digital and competitive economy (European Council, 2002)), Italy’s Recovery and Resilience Plan is the largest under the unprecedented EU response to the crisis triggered by the coronavirus.
pandemic. It is targeted toward economic and social resilience, and a digital and green transition (d’Alfonso, 2022; European Council, 2022). The latter is intended as energy efficiency in buildings, sustainable mobility, and development of renewable energies and the circular economy (European Council, 2022). Despite this largesse in EU recovery funding, little effort has been made by the Italian government to invest it in developing sustainable urban areas through NBS.

Drawing from this example, the critical question facing European and global policy makers is, “Can the momentum towards nature-based approaches to infrastructure, including new housing, be reasserted at the end of the pandemic construction-led recovery?” A positive answer lies in re-establishing the considerable efforts made by the EC as featured in a number of documents, funding programmes (i.e., Work Programmes from 2014 to 2020 related to NBS thematic goals) and Horizon 2020 (R&I) projects, e.g., NATURVATION - 2016–2020, Nature4Cities - 2016–2020, NAIAID - 2016–2020, and CLEARING HOUSE - 2019–2024 (see Davies et al., 2021). In truth, that momentum was never lost but has simply been eclipsed by the vastness of COVID-19’s impacts and responses. It only took 2–3 years, the time of the pandemic bubble (2020–2022), to take us back in time in urban development policy, as the governments in EU countries have prioritised recovery by stimulating urban development (see, e.g., European Commission, 2022; Nijkamp and Perrels, 2018). There is no reason, however, why the reverse cannot be equally true if the political and policy will exist at the continental, national and city level. Should this be the case, then what has happened was a ‘blip’, not a ‘trend’. Certainly, there is no shortage of evidence to support the benefits of various nature-based approaches (e.g., Seddon, 2022; Hekrley, 2022; European Commission, 2021b; Cárdenas et al., 2021; Bayulkelen et al., 2021; Hobbie and Grimm, 2020), particularly in the context of large and densely populated urban areas where the functional role of trees is critical (Khatri, 2022; O’Brien et al., 2022; McDonald et al., 2021; Bush, 2020; Jim et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2018; Sanesi et al., 2007).

However, there is far to go. According to one estimate, only 0.3% of urban infrastructure expenditure globally is directed toward a diversity of NBS and ecosystem efforts to mitigate pollution, reduce flood risk and storms and provide healthy air (Khatri, 2022). The same imbalance has been found with respect to carbon net zero (Andrijevic et al., 2020). However, in a more recent study (Falco et al., 2022), protective public health measures in view of pandemic risk were endorsed including strong governmental commitment of reforestation and air pollution reduction. For those willing to inquire, the importance of NBS was clearly understood during the lockdown period of 2020–2021 (see, e.g., Derks et al., 2020). Indeed, a national study demonstrated that green elements even in the home environment during the COVID-19 lockdown constitute a means to promote mental health and well-being (Spano et al., 2021). In their various guises, NBS should be wholly integrated with urban development, whilst contributing to the creation of green jobs and more sustainable and livable urban environments.

3. Discussion and conclusion

It is unreasonable to expect that governments will not respond to crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic in ways that keep the economy thriving, but they should become aware that nature-based approaches allow them to do so more sustainably, whilst encouraging a growth in ‘green’ jobs and increasing urban resilience. We recommend that a starting point be partly a linguistic one: replacing terms such as ‘green recoveries’ with ‘nature-based recoveries’; the latter term explicitly implies employing the properties that nature offers through normal biotic processes. A nature-based recovery requires new ways of doing business, and candidly there will be losers as well as gainers from this change process. Fund managers, in particular, should see this sooner rather than later, as without a switch their investments will be made worthless through the combined impact of climate change and a social equality backlash. Perhaps delving further into the future students of business should present on their CVs qualifications in ecology and sustainability as well as normative ones in financial management and investment. Hence, knowledge of NBS should be a priority in professional training (e.g., apprenticeship schemes) as well.

According to a recent post by the European Commission (2022), built-up areas are expected to expand across most of the EU by 2030. Italy will see the largest absolute increase (+144,000 ha). In this sense, our contribution, particularly through the example of the Italian ‘Piano casa’ construction-led scheme, has the ambition and immediacy to prove this current trend. We acknowledge that although the example we illustrate is not generalizable to all countries of the European Union, it still represents a timely testimony of construction-led policy.

Our purpose is to stimulate a debate in Europe and globally in favour of the nature-based concept for the development of sustainable healthy cities in the face of emergency responses. Whatever the reason, recovery plan funding should be conditional on a nature-based approach, one which equally enables co-design with local communities. If COVID-19 recovery plans have derailed nature-based approaches leading us away from nature, then we must get back on track as soon as possible.

Keeping the spotlight on nature-based approaches, whether they be NBS, plans, services, or other, to restore and rejuvenate cities facing socio-economic and sustainable development issues is not an option but a necessity. Otherwise, the end result will be a nature-depleted urban reality.
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