



Report from sue-MoT workshop2 (05 July 2004) At the Royal Statistical Society, London

1 Introduction

Sustainability has become an important paradigm in urban development. Integrated models and tools are therefore required to aid decision-makers in understanding the complex issues involved and in finding whole life solutions that adequately address the multidimensional effects of urban change.

In recognition of these issues and funded under the EPSRC Sustainable Urban Environment programme, a consortium comprising Dundee, Glasgow Caledonian and Loughborough Universities, WS Atkins, BRE and CIRIA, has been conducting a scoping study into the capabilities and shortcomings of existing *Metrics, Models and Toolkits for Whole Life Sustainable Urban Development*.

The primary aim of the scoping study has been to identify gaps in current knowledge, metrics and tools, with a view to formulating the contextual framework for a main programme which will overcome the gaps and develop inclusive, holistic, multidimensional models and toolkits for all decision makers and related stakeholders within a Sustainable Urban Development context.

1.1 Objectives of the workshop

Now nearing the end of scoping stage, the consortium is holding a workshop to:

- disseminate the outputs of the scoping study
- determine and promote the key emergent themes and priorities.
- confirm the strategic direction and priorities of the main programme



2 On the overall direction / vision

- In the vision the word “components” (of built environment sustainability) is used – is a better word systems or subsystems.
- Are we attempting to look at all components – the scope of the work should be defined and consideration should be given to focusing on some issues.
- A key issue in the assessment of sustainability is risk and change – how do we know what will be sustainable? Are lessons from the past usable given changing values?
- For whom is the urban environment to be sustainable for?

3 On the objectives

Objectives 1, 2

- Are we going to “develop” the toolkit? Words such as identify and integrate may be more appropriate.
- For whom are we developing the toolkit? Who are the end users / stakeholders
- With identified key issues consider links and overlaps with other SUE consortia / projects – there is value in alternative approaches to the same problem – integrate all approaches in an overall framework.
- Issues of fear and intimidation are worth exploring
- Must pay due consideration to both quantification and qualification methods

Objective 3

- We must correctly identify stakeholder values and insure we consider issues of diversity and inclusion.
- There is a difference between sustainable form and sustainable use.

Objective 4

- We may not need a common measure and it may not be desirable – 3 or 4 headline indicators could be more appropriate and more flexible.
- If we do go down the common currency route, the chosen candidate and associated conversion methodology should be completely transparent to users.

Objective 5

- This is very wide it should focus on the tools and also maybe on one barrier type in depth
- The legal system is a reflection of wider societal (behavioural) values

Objective 6



- Good objective
- Link this to the barriers work and suggest solutions
- Consider impact of PFI, WLC
- The output of this objective could be part used as a communications tool.
- The process will be dynamic

4 On the Methodology

- Tailor surveys, workshops etc in sympathy to the stakeholder type
- A big problem are multiple and similar studies contacting the same people
- Open questions are valuable
- Create a generic pool of stakeholders for reference
- Possibly use the internet – however not all have access
- Use action research methods
- A systems approach to the project appears appropriate

5 On the work-packages

- WP1 is very important
- How is 8 different from 1
- Links between WP need to be improved
- Broaden the issues of security (including fear and impact on quality of life), link it to health. Related indicators are within the scope of social capital
- Make clear why we are choosing these particular issues to focus upon
- Could WP11 be a core project?
- Common currency: The value of aggregated indicators needs to be demonstrated.
- Equity should be a cross cutting issue
- Education is important
- Issues of stakeholder representation within WP2 are important
- The choice of technical delivery system could be a barrier
- The system at present may be too high a level for “Joe public”

