

Theme 3 – Liveability (community wellbeing, equity, social value of infrastructure)

Predict & provide. Can you anticipate infrastructure needs. Infrastructure creates jobs..a social value in itself. This can stimulate new demand (business and residential).

Green infrastructure – govt believing in decarbonisation? Stimulated new industry...but undermined by OFWAT retrospective changes in subsidy regime. Does decarbonisation create social value, and where...or is it our Apollo programme. Is it accompanied by behavioural change or is it driven by infrastructure efficiencies or changes in the power mix.

Government would say renewables cuts due to levy control framework, costing too much and disproportionately affecting the poor in society.

Ascribing values to social equity, social value, community wellbeing remains the holy grail..but this does not need to be the ecosystem services approach to equating all aspects to a financial value.

Retrospective definitions of success (metric, scales, who judges)

Does wellbeing equate to infrastructure, or does the absence of functional infrastructure (or lack of safety) cause a lack of wellbeing. Amorphous nature of ‘quality of place’.

Much infrastructure does not contribute to wellbeing, it is designed to transfer wealth from taxpayer to private entities (one view, and also NAO) OR it has been improved services and greater passenger numbers.

Challenges for delivering liveability

Can it be more easily delivered locally or nationally. Pull should come from local communities..the question is whether the scale of infrastructure and the legacy core functions (e.g. the grid) dictate an ultimately top down delivery. How do you gauge the needs of a community. Communities might suffer from lack of financial and people resource, a skills mismatch and a lack of strategic vision. But can markets really provide the answer?

Infrastructure is highly heterogeneous so there is some that can be almost commissioned and built to demand, others (e.g. nuclear, HS2) has a decade or more lead time..so we are back in the predict and provide.

Transport for the North – much is Manchester – Leeds – Sheffield. For tees valley v.little difference between TfN and DfT. Its about perception.

Social value re HS2. It should free up capacity but it will be more expensive..therefore it is socially regressive

Some social benefits are easier to judge - the binary factors (job v no job, bridge v no bridge)

Gaps in knowledge

How does infrastructure deliver wellbeing, liveability etc.. or how to quantify (whatever your scale)

Depends on perception..experience is highly uneven

Cannot know the future

Sheer complexity of systems of systems, interconnected nature of infrastructure