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The aim of this study was to assess the sustainable development of Vilnius residential districts. To this end, a thorough analysis of scientific articles, specific databases and other information sources was made, different indicator systems for assessment of sustainable urban development were reviewed and a system of 22 indices defining the aspects of sustainability was compiled. Residential areas were evaluated for their facilities, residential and business environment. On the basis of the surveys performed by experts, the significance of the indices was determined. Application of the multipurpose evaluation method COPRAS (Complex Proportional Assessment) allowed to establish the rank of priorities of residential areas in respect of their sustainability. The results of such assessment may be helpful for city authorities in distributing resources among the wards in a more rational way.
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INTRODUCTION

A city is a complex physical and social phenomenon that is under constant development. Quantitative and qualitative changes take place there. For various reasons the number of cities’ inhabitants grew up from 3 to 50 per cent in the world. According to forecasts of the United Nations, in year 2030 the number of urban population will reach 60 per cent all over the world.

Cities concentrate manufacture, trade and service industries. Most people spend the larger part of their life in urban areas. Consequently, cities have become an integral part of modern civilization. They shape people’s social, economic and cultural lifestyle.

The welfare of the whole society depends on the sustainability of urban development. Urban sustainability can be characterized by social, economic, environmental and engineering-technical indicators. However, while assessing the sustainability of cities and their residential districts the question arises which characteristics of sustainability should be evaluated.

For instance, the objects of the research chosen by Nijkamp and Ursen (1998) are pollution of water and atmosphere, also consumption of energy in a sustainable city. Brenheny and Archer (1998) concern with urban density, the influence of local authorities on sustainable development, also on the problems of communication among the residential districts. Banister (1998) characterized obstacles that hinder sustainability in a city. Diepen and Voogd (2001) studied the peculiarities of urban transport planning in a sustainable city. Henn and Henning (2002) analysed the indicators of economic, social and environmental sustainability. According to authors, there is a need to improve the performance of such indicators. Dalhuisen et al. (2002), by comparing five European cities, compiled a solid structure for appraisals, estimated the level of sustainability and made suggestions on how to solve water supply problems in cities. Zhang et al. (2003) analysed sustainable urban development indicators. The research object chosen by Kountouris et al. (2005) is sustainable development of cities’ environment. Bagaeen (2006) examined the influence of military bases on urban sustainability. Turskis et al. (2006) developed a methodology that can help city planners to determine and localize problems of urban fabric density, to enhance the motivation and versatility of decisions. Melchert (2007) analysed building ecology and urban sustainability planning problems in developing countries.

Giving the multiplicity of sustainability characteristics, the problem of their inconsistence appears. To evaluate a great number of indicators it is necessary to apply multiple criteria optimization methods.

SYSTEMS OF INDICATORS OF URBAN SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT

Indices defining a sustainable city

In order to evaluate urban sustainability, system of indicators should be compiled. In the world, different indicator systems characterizing urban sustainability have been developed.

Based on the conceptual framework of the urban ecological economic system (Huang et al., 1998), 80 indicators have been selected through participation in non-government organizations (NGOs), which can be used as policy-making indicators for measuring Taipei’s urban sustainability. These are natural area, biodiversity, area productivity, population density, housing vacancy, fossil fuel use, per capita GDE, etc. The policy-making indicators have been further aggregated into ten general public indicators.
Atkisson (1996) describes the developing of indicators of sustainable community. At first, a total of 99 indicators had been recommended by the stakeholders. Since nearly everyone agreed that such number of indicators was too large a set for the public to digest, it was agreed to let a technical review group winnow the list down to a manageable number. This group, formed of members, met several times over the winter of 1992–93, eliminating indicators that were unmeasurable or difficult for a lay person to understand. The result was a final list of 40 indicators grouped into five categories: 1) Environment (biodiversity, soil erosion, air quality, etc.); 2) Population and Resources (population growth, residential water consumption, renewable and nonrenewable energy use, etc.); 3) Economy (real unemployment, distribution of personal income, health care expenditures, etc.); 4) Youth and Education (adult literacy, high school graduation, juvenile crime, etc.); 5) Health and Community (equity in justice, gardening activity, perceived quality of life, etc.).

The indicators to measure quality of life in Bristol (McMahon, 2002) were grouped under 14 sustainability topics such as waste management (total domestic waste, domestic waste recycled, etc.) energy (energy rating of council housing, average carbon dioxide emissions from council, etc.), transport (traffic flow, car ownership, etc.), environmental protection (days of moderate plus NOx and particulate matter emissions exceeding healthy levels, surface water quality, green areas per inhabitant, percentage of waste recycled).

Sustainable Measures (2005) develops indicators that measure progress toward a sustainable economy, society and environment. The indicators are grouped into the following categories: Economy, Education, Environment, Government, Health, Housing, Population, Public Safety, Recreation, Resource Use, Society, Transportation. For instance, Housing indicators have sub-categories such as Availability, Condition, Cost. Under the heading “Condition” stand: Floor area per person in housing, Low-income housing with severe physical problems, Percentage of dwellings in need of major repair, Housings that are inadequate, overcrowded, or cost over 30% of income.

The indicator system (Šaparauskas, 2003) for three alternative future scenarios of Vilnius has been developed. The system consists of twelve social, economic and environmental indicators. For example, environmental indicators are: NOx and particulate matter emissions exceeding healthy levels, surface water quality, green areas per inhabitant, percentage of waste recycled.

Zavadskas et al. (2005) proposed an indicator system for sustainability evaluation of city neighborhoods. This system characterises business environment, quality of life and infrastructure.

Indices defining a sustainable residential area
Sustainable development is becoming a dominating principle in planning a new and compact format of a city residential area. Awareness of impossibility to live in such residential areas as we have now forces us to reconsider our present practice of city planning. Acceptance of new and innovative ideas in the process of city planning is a new challenge for development of sustainable landscape.

A sustainable district should satisfy the requirements of sustainable development, embracing ecological, social, construction and traffic aspects. Its facilities are coordinated and handy to all residents (The Sustainable Region Initiative, 2005).

Residential areas are defined by economic, ecologic, social, technical, engineering indices. These issues were discussed in a number of publications.

The initiative committee of a sustainable district points out the following indices defining a sustainable district (The Sustainable Region Initiative, 2005):

- water;
- land use / agriculture;
- transport;
- buildings / facilities;
- business / industry;
- composting / processing;
- community / education;
- parks / green areas.

The European Academy of Urban Environment provides a model of sustainable district development (European Academy of the Urban Environment, 2005):

- balance between work and leisure time;
- nature preservation;
- priorities for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport;
- economic operation of energy generation and heating systems;
- construction of energy saving houses;
- opening of district supermarkets to satisfy everyday needs;
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- opening of elementary schools and day centers;
- opening of public rest places in nature;
- diversity of forms of constructed buildings;
- arable land and agriculture
- balance among social groups.

In Lithuania, sustainable district projects have not been developed as much as abroad. Development of sustainable district projects requires a lot of efforts and means as well as financing by state institutions, nevertheless establishment of a sustainable district is beneficial to all residents of the district in ecological and social aspects. Life in harmony with nature, the environment and surrounding people is essential for each individual, therefore development of a sustainable district is a major project.

Woodcock emphasizes the major aspects of a sustainable city residential area (Woodcock, 2000) which is characterized by:

1. Excellent city development and architecture.
2. Privileges for the residents.
3. Consideration of local characteristics and needs.
4. The possibility to acclimatize and change.
5. Care of public space and new house projects.
7. Care of the design of such buildings for the benefit of society by seeking promotion from the private sector.

Thus, it is essential to develop the spirit of a location by enhancing the quality of life. This may be achieved by developing an effective public transport network, safe streets, city design, the retailing sector, landscaping (open space) network, local employment basis.

The concept of Kronsberg city development and landscape sustainable development (Hannover..., 2006) emphasizes the following aspects:

- description of large-scale social and ecological development concepts;
- overall development of the project and integrated planning process;
- innovatory structure of communications maintaining the process of development;
- education and curricula associated with sustainable development;
- participation planning processes by involving residents and other people.

There is no uniform system of a sustainable city residential area, therefore development of a system of indices of a sustainable city residential area shall consider the needs of the residents as well as the social, environmental and technical aspects.

VILNIUS CASE STUDY: ASSESSMENT OF SUSTAINABLE RESIDENTIAL AREA DEVELOPMENT

Selection of the study object

To analyze the sustainability of city residential areas, Vilnius was selected as the principal administrative center of Lithuania with the highest concentrated economic potential, the highest number of inhabitants and the leading political, economic, social and cultural centers.

Evaluation of the sustainability of Vilnius city residential areas was based on the RAIT survey of the Vilnius city (RAIT..., 2005).

Forty-one districts and parts of districts were intercompared. Vilnius residents aged 16–74 years took part in the survey. The survey was carried out by direct interviewing using questionnaire forms in which the interviewers recorded the respondents’ answers.

In total, 2575 permanent residents of Vilnius took part in the survey (RAIT..., 2005).

To determine the most sustainable Vilnius residential area, 29 residential areas (neighborhood areas) of Vilnius were selected from the RAIT survey (Figure): Centras I, Centras II, Žvérynas, Senamiestis, Naujamiestis, Šnipiškės, Žirmūnai, Žirmūnai II (Šiaurės miestelis), Antakalnis, Rasos, Naujininkai, Lazdynai, Karoliniškės, Viršuliškės, Šeškinė, Baltupiai, Santariškės, Verkiai, Paneriai, Naujoji Vilnia, Paneriai, Naujoji Vilnia.
The RAIT survey evaluates the Vilnius residential area by 22 indices that correspond to sustainability aspects (see Table 1): city center is close (points); safe (points); extensive supply of trade services (points); school is close (points); kindergarten is close (points); extensive supply of recreation (points); clean air (points); nice environment (points); good transport service with the center (points); good transport service to the work place (points); well attended environment (points); no noise (points); no drug-addicts (points); policlinic is close (points); drugstore is close (points); Good facilities for sports (points); many cultural institutions (points); no alcohol addicts are in sight (points); no derelicts are in sight (points); work place is close (points); nice architecture of buildings (points); well attended parks (points).

All these indices were taken from the RAIT survey (RAIT..., 2005) in which the residents evaluated the desirability of a residential area in points (5 points – excellent, 4 points – very good, 3 points – good, 2 points – bad, 1 point – very bad).

### Determination of the residents’ opinion compatibility

To determine the significance of the criteria, the expert judgement method proposed by Kendall (1970) was used. Zavadskas et al. (1987) discussed the application of this method in the field of construction.

On determining the numerical values of the indices their insignificance (importance) is determined. The significances of the indices of sustainability of city residential areas are evaluated in numerical scale from 1 to 22: 1 – insignificant index, 22 – very significant index (Table 2).

Forty-five residents of Vilnius were interviewed to determine the significance of the project indices. The residents had sufficient information about their residential area and were most concerned persons in establishing the value of sustainability of a city residential area.

This expert judgement method was implemented by the following stages (Zavadskas, 1987):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Significance points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City center is close</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extensive supply of trade services</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>School is close</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kindergarten is close</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extensive supply of recreation</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clean air</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nice environment</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Good transport service with the center</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Good transport service with the work place</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Well attended environment</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No noise</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>No drug-addicts</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Policlinics is close</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Drugstore is close</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Good facilities for sports</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Many cultural institutions</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>No alcohol addicts are in sight</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>No derelicts are in sight</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Work place is close</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nice architecture of buildings</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Well attended parks</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation of city residential areas by the COPRAS method

This method assumes a direct and proportional dependence of the significance and priority of investigated versions on a system

---

**Table 1. Sustainable residential district data (fragment)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Unit of measure</th>
<th>Griškės</th>
<th>Žemaitės</th>
<th>Šilei</th>
<th>Naujoji Vilnia, Žemaičių</th>
<th>Šilo</th>
<th>Žemaičių</th>
<th>Antakalnis</th>
<th>Rasos</th>
<th>Kėdainiškės</th>
<th>Šnipiškės</th>
<th>Baltyjevičiai</th>
<th>Šateikiai</th>
<th>Pilaitė I</th>
<th>Pilaitė II</th>
<th>Valakampiai</th>
<th>Pilaitė I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City center is close</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extensive supply of trade services</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>School is close</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kindergarten is close</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of criteria adequately describing the alternatives and on the values and significance of the criteria.

Application of the multipurpose evaluation method COPRAS allowed to establish the rank of priorities of residential areas in respect of their sustainability.

The description of the COPRAS method and the possibilities of its application have been presented in a number of papers (Zavodskas and Vilutienė, 2004; Vilutienė and Zavodskas, 2003; Zavodskas et al., 2001; Zavodskas et al., 2004; Kaklauskas et al., 2005; Andruškevičius, 2005).

Determination of the significance and priority of alternatives is carried out in four stages (Zavodskas et al., 1999):
• the weighted normalized decision-making matrix is formed;
• the sums of weighted normalized indices describing the version are calculated. The versions are described by both minimizing and maximizing indices;
• the significance (efficiency) of comparative versions is determined on the basis of the positive (“pluses”) and negative (“minuses”) characteristics;
• priority determination of a residential area.


CONCLUSIONS

• There are a large number of indicators and indicator systems characterizing sustainable urban development in the world. The selection of indicators (indicator systems) used for assessment depends on the statistical data documented in a particular city.
• Using the multipurpose evaluation method COPRAS, the most sustainable residential area were determined and evaluated by 22 sustainability development indices.
• The ranking of priorities of Vilnius residential areas was as follows: Žvėrynas, Centras II, Baltupiai, Senamiestis, Pilaite I, Pilaite II, Santariškes, Naujamiestis, Pasilaiciai, Antakalnis, Valakampiai, Grigiškės, Rasos, Karoliniškės, Šnipiškės, Šeškinė, Fabijoniškės, Centras I, Lazdynai, Naujoji Vilnia, Justinės, Žirmūnai II, Viršuliškės, Naujininkai, Verkiai, Žemieji Paneriai, Žirmūnai, Aukštutinë Paneriai, Vilkapėdė.
• The proposed methodology allows assessing the development inequalities of particular residential areas, signalsizes about the neighbourhood to be managed better. The results of such assessment may be helpful for the city authorities in distributing resources among the wards in a more rational way.

Received 13 November 2006
Accepted 10 January 2007

References


Edmundas Zavadskas, Milda Viteikienė, Jonas Šaparauskas

MIESTŲ IR JŲ GYVENAMŲJŲ RAJONŲ DARNAUΣ VYSTYMOI ĮVERTINIMAS

S an t r a u k a


Raktažodžiai: darnus vystymasis, miesto gyvenamieji rajonai, rodikliai, COPRAS, įvertinimas