Place and Liveability

In Lima, Peru, a water park attracts children and adults improving social connectedness and people’s quality of life.

A collection of ideas

- Strategies to engage students in examining the liveability of places at a variety of scales
- Factors influencing the liveability of places – the selection is huge
- Influences on perceptions of liveability
- Strategies to enhance liveability – link to the factors you choose
- Ideas for incorporating skills, inquiry, fieldwork and ICT

It would be impossible to teach all of the ideas presented here – each slide could be the focus of several lessons and you only have 25 hours.

You have choices to make – choose to engage / choose for fun

Use texts as a source of ideas – there are fantastic resources out there
Liveability defined in the Australian Curriculum

“Liveability - an assessment of what a place is like to live in, using particular criteria, for example, environmental quality, crime and safety, education and health provision, access to shops and services, recreational facilities and cultural activities” (AC Glossary P.10).

Liveability – a new language ........but nothing new at all

Liveability is a human construct and it is not new. When we make judgements about places e.g. “I couldn’t live in this street”, “I wouldn’t mind living in this suburb” or “I wish there was a coffee shop close by” - we are assessing / evaluating liveability – we have just never called it that before

Liveability, sustainability, walkability, ‘quality of life’, ‘human well – being’ and many other concepts have become the new language of planning better places to live.

AC Content Descriptions

- The factors that influence the decisions people make about where to live and their perceptions of the liveability of places
- The influence of accessibility to services and facilities on the liveability of places
- The influence of environmental quality on the liveability of places
- The influence of social connectedness, community identity and perceptions of crime and safety on the liveability of places
- The strategies used to enhance the liveability of places, especially for young people, including examples from Australia and Europe.
Geographical concepts

- place
- space
- environment
- interconnection
- sustainability
- Scale
- change.

Cross curriculum priorities

- Sustainability
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures
- Asia and Australia’s engagement with Asia

They are the key ideas - integral to the development of geographical understanding and used to teach students to think geographically.

In Years 7–10, students further develop their understanding of place, space, environment, interconnection, sustainability and change and apply this understanding to a wide range of places and environments at the full range of scales, from local to global, and in a range of locations.
Geographical inquiry / skills

The aim of inquiry skills is to deepen geographical understanding. It involves individual or group investigations. The geographical skills are the techniques geographers use in their investigations in the classroom and in fieldwork.

Inquiry incorporates the tools / resources/ sources of information used by geographers to investigate people, places, environments and issues.

Geographical inquiry is not a set of compulsory steps but an interconnected framework – students will develop skills for each component or may complete an entire inquiry using all components.

Fieldwork is mandatory.
The Challenges

• **Choosing content** – just about anything can be a factor influencing perceptions of liveability

• **Integrating key concepts and cross curriculum priorities** within the examples we choose – make them integral

• **Using Geographical Inquiry** – particularly fieldwork

• **Programming to avoid repetition of content with topics in 7 – 10**
  e.g. water, landscapes, urban places, biomes, global connections, environmental change and wellbeing

• **Engaging 12-13 year olds** – use ICT and visual representations (maps, diagrams, photographs, infographics)
Introductory Activities

1. Opposites

- What don’t you want the place you live in to be like? – turn this into a list of factors that influencing liveability

- All places are liveable to some degree. Why do people live in places with low liveability characteristics? Use examples eg extreme climates, place prone to hazards, war zones, slums

Rather than begin with a definition of liveability and a discussion of factors influencing where people live ....

Brainstorm the things students do not want in the places they live eg noise, pollution, lots of traffic, crime, danger, drug dealers, emptiness, isolation, extreme heat or cold. Answers will depend on students location and experiences.

But people do live in places with these characteristics – Why? Examples - integrating geographical tools and skills eg. maps, graphs, tables.

This can lead to a discussion of the features they want in the places they live and the development of personal liveability criteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Features not wanted</strong></th>
<th><strong>Factors influencing liveability</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous, violence, crime, natural hazards, war, drugs</td>
<td>Safety from natural and human dangers eg natural hazards, war, crime, exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution, noise, old or run down buildings,</td>
<td>Environmental quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too hot, very cold, deserts/ lack of water</td>
<td>Environmental quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation / too far away / no Internet/ no TV / no phone connection /</td>
<td>Connectedness – to services and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slums</td>
<td>Environmental quality, services and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No places to meet, play or socialise, No recreational facilities, parks, cinemas</td>
<td>Social connectedness, services and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English not spoken, racist attitudes,</td>
<td>Cultural identity,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to examples

- Why people do live in these places
- What trends are apparent
- How are these places made more liveable
People live in dangerous and extreme places. Why?

War zones, near volcanoes & nuclear power stations.

Location factors
- Cultural – sea gypsies
- Environmental e.g. resources
- Economic - poverty, livelihood

Arid & cold climates

Sea gypsies

Indonesia

Pacific & Indian Oceans (Sea gypsies)

Japan, Fukushima

Afghanistan

Ethiopian highlands

http://www.flickr.com/photos/ramdiboy/4151693456/
http://www.volcanodiscovery.com/ethiopia/danakil/salt/photos0208/image11.html
http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/gallery/2011/mar/15/japan-nuclear-plant-fukushima/#?picture=372735447&index=16
**Example: Living in Indonesia’s volcanic zones**

Ash clouds, mudflows, poisonous gases, lava flows and tsunamis threaten lives, and livelihoods in Indonesia every year yet millions continue to live under volcanoes.

Poverty restricts people’s ability to move (economic factor)

Curriculum links

- The factors that influence the decisions people make about where to live and their perceptions of the liveability of places
- Influence of environmental quality e.g. danger vs. resources (economic)
- Influence of community identity & social connectedness – religious beliefs, family traditions and perceptions of safety
Example: Living in polar climates

**NUNAVUT** home of the Inuit who have occupied the arctic for over a thousand years living on environmental resources and developing a unique culture based on seasonal cycles of the land and sea.

Images
http://www.worldatlas.com/webimage/countrys/namerica/province/lgcolor/nucolor.htm
http://www.arcticphoto.co.uk/gallery2/arctic/peoples/inuitcan/ba9918-29.htm

Liveability **changes** over time – young people are leaving.

Technology can overcome remoteness & improve social connectedness

- (economic, environmental social & cultural factors impact on liveability)

**Curriculum links**

- The factors that influence the decisions people make about where to live and their perceptions of the liveability of places
- Influence of **environmental quality** - resources, climate change
- Influence of **accessibility to services and facilities**
- Influence of social connectedness & cultural identity
- The strategies used to enhance the liveability of places, especially for young people
2. Photo interpretation / ranking activity

- Use a variety of images and have students rank them according to their perceptions of liveability – or where they would like to live – from most to least. (e.g. Local streets, Australian towns, overseas places)

- Discuss / list the criteria they used to determine their rankings / compare perspectives of different students

- What features cannot be shown in an image that may be an important influence on liveability? (Tangible & intangible characteristics / quantitative & qualitative data)

At the end of the discussion students (individually or in groups) can be asked to **develop a set of liveability criteria** to apply to a local place. *(Choice of places to assess will depend on local sensitivities)*

---

**Curriculum links**

- The factors that influence the decisions people make about where to live and their perceptions of the liveability of places
- Influence of environmental quality
- Influence of community identity & social connectedness
- The strategies used to enhance the liveability of places
Great places to live

Any criteria developed by students should contain qualitative / quantitative / tangible and intangible attributes such as shown in this illustration.

Applying concepts

Assess liveability - which attributes in the diagram could apply to the *places* where students live?

Propose strategies - choose one missing attribute and propose change that would improve this aspect of liveability.

Challenge thinking - explain quotes

“The quality of our neighbourhoods, towns and cities have a significant impact on our daily lived experience”


Simplify diagram for lower ability students

http://davidbarrie.typepad.com/david_barrie/design/
3. Think of a Place: Assess liveability

**SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World</th>
<th>A simple activity easy to adapt to classroom use to “develop students’ ability to evaluate the liveability of their own place and to investigate whether it can be improved through planning”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What criteria were used? e.g. safety, access to services & facilities, *environment*, lifestyle, culture, community, family, employment.....

Responses should demonstrate a **variety of social, cultural, environmental and economic factors impacting on or influencing liveability.**

http://www.good.is/posts/by-the-city-for-the-city-citizen-dream-up-solutions-for-new-york

http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/cities/improving-nyc-through-crowdsourced-urban-design/406
Open response: The kind of place I aspire to live in

Results – free associations

http://www.slideshare.net/UKCIP/arcc-20141bjoffesmithliveable-cities?related=3
4. Open question or hypothetical scenario: choose a location and justify choice

**Open question**: If you could live anywhere in the world, where would you like to live? Why?

**Give options or a hypothetical situation**: Provide selected information about 2 places for students to choose between e.g. maps (location), climate graphs, employment statistics, travel, recreational facilities, access to services and facilities, transport connections. Include things relevant to 12-13 year olds.

These activities can help students reflect on the features / factors they consider important for liveability.

This can lead to the development of a set of liveability criteria to apply to other places.
Assessing liveability – what’s out there?

### Quality of the constructed environment survey: Observation record sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Street:</th>
<th>Suburb/Town:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verandahs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front garden</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour code properties by type</th>
<th>Numerical score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue: Commercial structure</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Maintained to a high standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red: Residential structure</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Maintained to an acceptable standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green: Public structure (e.g., school, hospital, church)</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Reasonably well maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange: Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow: Neutral</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Evidence of neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lelangan: Poorly maintained</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Poorly maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red: Derelict/bandoned</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Derelict/bandoned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.geogspace.edu.au
Inquiry – The liveability of different places

Introduction
This report compares liveability in Kent Street and Lawley Place in Deakin, Canberra.

Lots of things affect what it is like to live in a street. This report looks at traffic, shops and schools, public transport, parks, litter, noise, how nice the houses are, trees and gardens, paths and lighting.

The location of Kent St and Lawley Place, Deakin, Canberra

Annotations
Identifies the geography
Which street is more liveable in the inquiry.

Represents the location on a map and adds geographical conventions (title, north arrow, key, scale).

Uses a range of graphics to represent study sites (example: point on a scale map).

Inquiry – The liveability of different places

Annotations
Locate and describe data from a range of primary and secondary sources.

Uses a range of graphics to present conclusions and findings.
Perceptions of liveability

Sydney


A variety of factors will influence our perceptions of the liveability of places e.g. age, income, wealth, employment, aspirations, interests, location
What influences our Perceptions?
Age, lifestage & lifestyle, income....

Perceptions change over time

http://www.cartoonstock.com/directory/a/ages.asp
Age influences perceptions of liveability in post Tsunami Japan

In post Tsunami Japan, after the clean up of the area and the removal of topsoil, people evacuated from eight municipalities around the Fukushima plant, will make a decision about whether to return.

In one survey the influence of age on perceptions of liveability in this part of Japan is clear.... An interesting discussion point

http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/dy/national/T111109005814.htm

Younger respondents were less likely to wish to return to their pre-crisis address. Why?

The survey was conducted by Fukushima University on all evacuees' households from the eight towns and villages in the Futaba-gun region of Fukushima Prefecture.
Lifestyle influences e.g. Amish

Where do the Amish live?

What are the places they live like?

How is their lifestyle different?

What are the influences on people’s perceptions of liveability in Amish communities.


Other lifestyle influences include seachange, treechange, vine-change
Perceptions vary spatially

A simple activity easy to adapt to classroom use to “develop students’ ability to evaluate the liveability of their own place and to investigate whether it can be improved through planning.

Why might people in different cities rank factors differently?
What influences their perceptions?

Assess and create

Ask students to create a pictogram for their “place” – their perception of the importance of different factors.

An 8-city perspective on health and well being
http://visual.ly/node/25942
Our perceptions of liveability and decisions made about where we live are affected by a combination of personal and location factors e.g. income, climate.

The importance of factors will vary between individuals and places and will change over time.

Some factors e.g. personal safety are important in all phases of our lives while in recent years environmental quality has become more important.
Instead of students producing a Wordle have them list factors that would be important to you but are missing from a Wordle you produce.

Source: Macmillan, GeoWorld 7, Page 228
And then .....

The following examples show a variety of possibilities for more detailed study - as individual, small group or class based inquiry and learning activities about assessing liveability, influences on liveability and enhancing liveability
Measuring liveability: Global city rankings

Most liveable cities
General characteristics
In developed nations
Medium sized
Attractive
Safe
Clean
High level of service / facility provision

Comparing global cities
Global rankings
Economist Intelligence Unit
Mercer Quality of Living Survey
Monocle lifestyle magazine
** Select according to student ability – no need to do all

Least liveable cities
General characteristics
Low development
Conflict
Poor human rights
Poverty
Poor service / facility provision

Images by L Chaffer, Susan Bliss
Measuring liveability: Global scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Economist Intelligence Unit</th>
<th>Mercer Quality of Living Survey</th>
<th>Monocle lifestyle magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria: 127 cities covering stability, healthcare, culture, environment, education and infrastructure</td>
<td>Criteria: 221 cities based on 39 criteria such as housing, recreation, schools and natural environment</td>
<td>Criteria: 25 cities covering safety, international links, climate, public transport, environmental issues and urban design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>(01)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>(02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>(02)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>(01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>(04)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>(03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>(07)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>(06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>(06)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>(04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>(04)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>(05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>(07)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>(09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note
- The criteria used in these measurements are continually changing so keep up to date
- Latest measures include environmental characteristics eg EIU
- Some criteria are considered more important than others – criteria are given weightings

**EIU Spatially Adjusted Liveability Index (Considers environmental criteria)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Adjusted Liveability Index</th>
<th>Available green space</th>
<th>Lack of sprawl</th>
<th>Natural assets</th>
<th>Cultural Assets</th>
<th>Connectivity-links to world</th>
<th>Lack of isolation</th>
<th>Lack of pollution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Source of data: Macmillan Geoworld 7 Page 236
Population and liveability

Population size

“Every billion more people makes life more difficult for everybody — it’s as simple as that. Is it the end of the world? No. Can we feed 10 billion people? Probably. But we obviously would be better off with a smaller population.” John Bongaarts

Population structure eg ageing populations or extremely young populations


Liveable places for children

Where do most of the world’s children live?

What features of places are the most liveable for children? What makes Australia one of these places?

What criteria should be used to assess liveability of places for children e.g. “Rights of the child”

Children have no choice about where they live – what can be done to improve liveability of places for children in poor or dangerous countries?
Least liveable places for children

Looking for stimulating resources (e.g., posters and cartoons) to examine this issue:

Population density, housing density & liveability

Where are the most crowded countries?
Population density is the measure of the number of people per unit area, usually a square kilometre. Some countries have a high population density. This means that they have a large population in a small area. Others have a low population density with a small population in a large area. The tiny country of Monaco has the world’s highest population density—16,754 people per square kilometre. Mongolia, with a population density of 1.7 people per square kilometre, has the world’s lowest population density.

Monaco has 16,754 people per square kilometre.
Singapore has 6,336 people per square kilometre.
Australia has 2.8 people per square kilometre.
Mongolia has 1.7 people per square kilometre.

Which place is more liveable? Why?

Population profiles reflect liveability

**THE PYRAMIDS OF AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMALL RURAL COMMUNITY</th>
<th>COASTAL RETIREMENT TOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waikerie South Australia</td>
<td>Forster – Tuncurry New South Wales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Placements**

- Urban – large / small
- Rural
- Remote

**Links to access to services and facilities**

**Low Liveability**
- for young people due to lack of services, facilities and lifestyle.
- Low liveability of young people due to lack of higher education facilities and employment

**High Liveability**
- for older people “Sea changers”
- for young families evidenced by 20-39’s and under 4’s.

Population profiles

Compilation by L Chaffer for Macmillan Geoworld 7
Australian and Canadian cities rank highly on liveability indexes. They are
• socially inclusive, healthy and safe
• have attractive buildings and natural environments such as parks, rivers and harbours.

What environmental characteristics reduce liveability?
Interconnections – liveability and resources
Change over time – when resources run out

Resources attract people to places – particularly evident in poorer countries

Think about resource rich places in Australia generally considered unliveable

Ghost towns such as Bodie, USA develop when resources run out

Where are Australia’s ghost towns – why did they become unliveable?

Trash picking – developing world cities
Ship breaking – India
Salt mining – Ethiopia

Images
http://www.bodie.com/
http://www.newint.org/features/2005/05/01/keynote/
http://www.volcanodiscovery.com/ethiopia/danakil/salt/photos0208/image11.html
http://www.flickr.com/photos/idlir/84766942/
Medellin’s liveability transformation

http://www.designother90.org/cities/solutions/medellin-metrocable-and-northeast-integral-urban-project

Syllabus Content Descriptions

The influence of social connectedness, community identity and perceptions of crime and safety on the liveability of places
Liveability, culture & indigenous peoples

Examine diagrams such as the Quality of Life Tree for Canada’s first nations or images of indigenous communities (global examples)

Identify features that apply to liveability of places students live and those that do not.

Explain the differences.

Centre for Indigenous Environmental Resources
1. http://www.yourcier.org

Liveability changes in the Sahel

Natural and human impacts bring environmental, political and social change

Once prosperous areas of the Sahel in Africa impacted by droughts, military coups, and locust plagues are now unliveable due to famine and conflict – refugee exodus

http://buckley6thgradehistory.pbworks.com/w/page/9303583/CharlotteWiki

http://infographics.idlelist.com/sahel-nutrition-crisis/
Climate change and liveability

“Unlike some people displaced by conflict or persecution who may one day return home, those displaced by the chronic impacts of climate change will require permanent resettlement.”

“For the first time in history, you could actually lose countries off the face of the globe.”

“Being small in area and low-lying, inhabitants will have nowhere to retreat to as the seas inundate their coastlines.”

Image: Oxfam Australia
**Enhancing Liveability**

- Why? Improving the quality of people’s lives
- How? There is no single strategy
- How? Most strategies have multiple purposes and benefits
- Benefits: New liveable & sustainable places are created
- Benefits: Improvements are made to existing places
- Why? Governments, organisations, businesses and individuals
Programming 7 – 10 Geography

Enhancing liveability is connected to sustainability – economic, social and environmental

In changing Nations in Year 8 students will look at strategies to make urban places more sustainable and liveable (addressing consequences of urbanisation)

Program Year 7 to avoid repeating strategies that are more appropriate to urbanisation in Year 8 – focus on perceptions of liveability for your students.

Program to engage interest in electives by linking influences to future Units or topics (9 & 10)
Strategies to enhance liveability

Global to local scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Suburb/Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto Protocol</td>
<td>MDG’s</td>
<td>RIO +20</td>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Liveable Cities Program</td>
<td>Creating Places for People: The Australian Urban Design Protocol</td>
<td>National Broadband Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Global scale example

ONE PLANET LIVING
Examine the 10 criteria and link to influences on liveability (syllabus CD’s)

http://www.oneplanetliving.net/what-is-one-planet-living/the-ten-principles/
"If we steal the ground for a building we can give it back to nature on the roof"

- Discuss the meaning of this quote (GeoWorld 7p.365)
- Connect the quote and strategy to liveability
Liveable streets

A simple activity easy to adapt to classroom use to develop students’ ability to evaluate the liveability of their own place and to investigate whether it can be improved through planning.

Have students take or select a streetscape and using tablet / phone Apps such as SKITCH to show changes that will improve liveability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Pedestrian Street Lamps</th>
<th>B. Street Trees and Plantings</th>
<th>C. Vendors help make streets into destinations rather than places to be driven through</th>
<th>D. Bollards prevent motorists parking on pavements and can be used to stop cars entering streets</th>
<th>E. Dedicated bus lanes get buses out of traffic and make trips faster and predictable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lighting shouldn’t be just for cars</td>
<td>2. Shade and oxygen, make the street look nicer, increase traffic safety, improve business</td>
<td>3. Make streets into destinations rather than places to be driven through</td>
<td>4. Prevent motorists parking on pavements and can be used to stop cars entering streets</td>
<td>5. Get buses out of traffic and make trips faster and predictable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Curb extensions</td>
<td>G. Speed bumps</td>
<td>H. Separated bike lanes</td>
<td>I. Traffic lights</td>
<td>J. Raised, textured crosswalks create natural speed bumps and make pedestrians more visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Make streets safer by reducing crossing distances and by narrowing the street they reduce drivers speeds.</td>
<td>7. Slow traffic.</td>
<td>8. Dedicated lanes provide physical protection and encourage bike use.</td>
<td>9. With a leading pedestrian interval gives pedestrians time to cross before cars turn corners.</td>
<td>10. Create natural speed bumps and make pedestrians more visible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


http://www.good.is/posts/the-street-of-the-future-is-a-livable-street/

Macmillan GeoWorld 7 page 352
Small changes can improve liveability

What Paris did -


SKITCH – App for tablets
Liveable streets & communities

The nature of the street we live on can influence our quality of life.
In the Australian Urban Design Protocol a liveable community is comfortable, vibrant, safe and walkable.

“Liveable streets are comfortable, welcoming and safe places where people can live, play, socialise, travel and shop. These streets bring people together and foster a strong sense of community.”

GeoWorld 7 p 352

“A livable street is a roadway designed to accommodate the needs of all users - drivers, transit vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians of all kinds (disabled, elderly, children, and lingerers).”

http://streetswiki.wikispaces.com/Livable+Streets

Lots of concepts for students to investigate – ways to enhance the liveability of neighbourhoods.
Ask geographical questions about strategies: How? Why? Who? What will it be like in the future?

Images L Chaffer
Learning from Europe

- Compact cities
- Urban Agriculture
- Public places
- Walkable streets
- Mass transit
- Green spaces
- Medium density
- Narrow streets
- Retrofit for energy
- Retrofit for water

Image L Chaffer

http://sloanreview.mit.edu/feature/sustainability-strategy-leadership/
“Placemaking is a strategy that focuses on improving people’s quality of life and creating places where every person can enjoy every day”. GeoWorld 7
Green and public space per person generally declines as places grow in size.

Strategies are being introduced to reverse the trend.

The benefits of trees, parks, gardens and open public spaces is internationally recognised

Today
• green infrastructure is considered as important as hard infrastructure eg transport for quality of life
• Urban development projects incorporate green spaces and open places to enhance liveability

Interconnection – liveability & sustainability

Singapore is a world leader in greening urban places
SUSTAINABILITY for FUTURE LIVEABILITY

BUILDINGS
- Retrofitting for water & energy efficiency
- Green design standards e.g. BASIX
- Living things

NEIGHBOURHOODS
- Renewable energy e.g. Malmo
- Cycleways & footpaths
- Landscaping & recycling

CITIES
- Ecocities e.g. Masdar
- Urban design for sustainability & liveability
- Australia – Urban Design Protocol

FROM “take, make, waste” TO “reduce, reuse, recycle”
Development improves liveability

The **Millennium Development Goals** focused on reducing global poverty by improving the health of the poorest people by 2015... success & failure / latest goals focus on sustainable development.

Each improvement has made communities healthier and safer to live in therefore more liveable.

Use ICT to compare liveability based on development and access to services and facilities.

**Worldshapin** – compare countries using six criteria.

Remember the global perspective.
Strategies for the developing world

The “girl effect” – educating girls enhances liveability by reducing population pressure and reducing poverty

Social changes improves liveability

Technology: Mobile phones enhance liveability eg. dairy farmers use iCow Apps and mobile trading

Communication and transport technologies improve liveability

Microcredit allows the poorest people to buy things they need to increase their income by starting a small business or improving farm output

Economic change improves liveability


Diagram L Chaffer


http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/picture/2011/nov/24/climate-change-kenya-masai-farmer-oxfam
Scoop.it

My curated articles related to Place and Liveability

Updated weekly

Site can be used by students to collect resources

http://www.scoop.it/t/year-7-place-and-liveability
The power of images / what an image does NOT tell you about liveability