

---

## Nineteenth International Seminar on Urban Form, Delft, The Netherlands, 16-19 October 2012

The School of Architecture and the Built Environment on the campus of Delft University of Technology (TU Delft) in The Netherlands provided the setting for ISUF 2012. Pre-conference strolls around the scenic medieval city of Delft revealed a distinct regional morphology defined by a network of canals and drawbridges. Portions of the city wall and east gate, 'Osstport', remain as some of the earliest urban elements among predominantly three-storey medieval layers. The cityscape is punctuated by cathedral spires. A large central market square contains Delft's Renaissance style City Hall, 'Stadius', and the 'Nieuwe Kerk' (new cathedral), completed in the late-fifteenth century. A few quarters of the city that were destroyed either in a seventeenth-century gunpowder explosion or during the Second World War have been significantly reconstructed during the post-war period. This newcomer to The Netherlands was impressed upon arrival at the railway station (as was ISUF President Michael Conzen), by prolific vertical racks of bicycles, Delft's preferred mode of transportation.

TU Delft's School of Architecture and the European Association of Architectural Education (EAAE) collaborated with ISUF to sponsor the conference, which addressed the overarching theme of 'New urban configurations'. Papers were solicited under the conference sub-themes of 'Innovation in building typology', 'Infrastructure and the city', 'Complex urban projects', 'Green spaces: the city and the territory', and, speaking most directly to the geographical context of the conference, 'Delta urbanism: living with water in the urban deltas'. Departing from ISUF conference tradition, submissions concerning morphological research were rejected if they did not directly subscribe to one of the themes. Presumably the organizers decided not to offer an open category in order to accommodate both the heavy subscription to conference sub-themes and an unusually full schedule of plenary speakers.

In tandem with the conference, the School of Architecture hosted an exhibition entitled 'Renewal of urban renewal', featuring significant urban design interventions in the cities of Leiden, The Hague, Rotterdam and Amsterdam. Exhibited works in the school's forum space addressed the topics of industrial inheritance, neighbourhood economy, traffic infrastructure and green infrastructure. The works also served as the focus

for panel presentations by design professionals and government planning officials during the entirety of the first afternoon of the conference. Invited plenary speakers Henk Engel, Julian Lewis, Paolo Fusi, Paul Veremeulen and Sotira Kornaopoulou offered perspectives concerning the renewal of urban renewal and urban design as well as processes for contemporary urban intervention. The School's unique 'forum' space, as retrofitted within the late-nineteenth-century building envelope, provided the context for the exhibition's official opening as well as several conference box lunches and evening receptions (Figure 1).

The ISUF portion of the conference opened with a symposium on the international heritage, scholarship, and research methodologies of Saverio Muratori (Figure 2). Speakers Nicola Marzot, Sylvain Malfroy, Ivor Samuels, and Pier Giorgio Gerosa contributed perspectives on Muratori's contributions to urban morphology as well as continuing concerns about the relative obscurity of his work outside of Italy. A common thread throughout the symposium presentations was the need for more direct access to Muratori's thoughts via a common language – whether metaphysical or literal in the form of more effective publications in English and other languages. Suggested strategies included further biographical research, systematic review of archival manuscripts and drawings, and critical translation. A concluding roundtable led by Giancarlo Cataldi, reflected on the need to transfer useful tools that can be derived from Muratori's work from the academy directly to contemporary practice in design and planning fields. Panelists agreed that in terms of what would be best for the city, Muratori's focus on 'collective intentionality' and interpretation of inherited fabric, in lieu of the individual designers' quest for novelty, would probably support a richer platform for collaborative, interdisciplinary research and contemporary urban practice. It would seem that the bulk of this year's conference participants, many of whom were design and planning practitioners and educators, could benefit from more direct and relevant access to Muratori's works. The challenge, as presented by Ivor Samuels, is to 'find avenues, above individual schools of thought, to bridge complexity and multiple disciplines, in order to disseminate morphology into practice'. In his keynote address, Jean Castex highlighted Muratori's reverence to



**Figure 1. A social gathering in the forum space.**



**Figure 2. The panel session on the work of Saverio Muratori.**

‘the city as the only model’ in his own design and planning of new interventions and architectural typologies. Such reverent practices appear to be lacking in most contemporary grand gesture

approaches to urban design intervention, including some of the case study projects presented at the conference.

Of potentially equal importance to the current

generation of scholarship and practice in the design fields is the broadened effort to disseminate the seminal works of M.R.G. Conzen and to interpret their relevance for contemporary practice. Among other strategies, translations of his works are needed to extend their influence. Gian Luigi Maffei, Giuseppe Strappa and Giancarlo Cataldi discussed their recently released translation into Italian of *Alnwick, Northumberland: a study in town-plan analysis*. Their keynote panel reflected on the value of Conzen's work to 'analytical processes as applied to existing settings', as well as his contributions to 'understanding formative processes in the town plan'.

In his keynote address entitled 'cross-cultural urban morphology', Michael Conzen highlighted the value of interpreting and comparing 'plan units' as shaped by significantly different cultures throughout the world. Conzen posited that, as the Third World continues to undergo rapid urbanization, this new topic of cross comparison in morphological research is currently underserved. He treated us to the potentially rich forum that such collaborative research can offer by sharing initial findings from his own comparative research on Chinese cities and Italian cities in collaboration with ISUF Secretary-General Kai Gu. An interesting side note is that both scholars were about to head for Como, Italy, for a post-conference research trip. Their agenda included completion of field documentation activities, highlighting the continuing value of place-based research using Conzenian methodologies.

A number of TU Delft members presented their research and practice from varying disciplinary perspectives concerning topics as diverse as the 'second urban revolution', 'metabolic flows within urban configurations', 'complexity theory', 'the contemporary role of design in complex urban projects', and 'design challenges of rising sea levels facing delta regions'. Presenters on these topics included Juval Portugali, Dirk Sijmons, Kees Kahn and Han Meyer.

Parallel paper sessions subscribing to each conference sub-theme were sandwiched between keynote presentations throughout Days 2 and 3 of the conference. Given the unusual number of plenary speakers, time was compressed for paper sessions, allowing each presenter only 10 minutes. It was obviously impossible to attend all concurrent sessions or to provide a comprehensive review of them. Under the theme of 'Complex urban projects', several papers addressed strategies to regenerate public space in contexts as diverse as Lisbon, Barcelona, and Queensland. Many papers

offered unique frameworks and processes for analysing urban contexts using state-of-the-art technological tools for data acquisition and analysis. They demonstrated that applications of new computer technologies such as remote sensing for morphological research projects can enhance capacity to interpret an expanded areal extent. In contexts in which rapid urbanization and associated geographical expansion are being experienced, this becomes essential. In terms of the research process, emphasis in a majority of works presented was placed on novelty. Efforts to build on long-standing precedents for morphological analysis were lacking. Notable exceptions included a study on 'Rehabitat project in Barcelona' and a comparative study of greater Miami and Queensland. The paper sessions, which largely featured young scholars, left several established morphological researchers questioning whether the value of traditional analytical methods is being adequately communicated to the next generation.

Papers on the theme 'Green spaces: the city and the territory', featured collaborative morphological studies by Brazilian researchers of urban parks in Belo Horizonte and other Brazilian cities using Conzenian methods. Other notable papers addressed conversion of vacated land in shrinking cities, such as Detroit, and associated reuse for urban agriculture and incorporation of solar technology in urban environments.

In a late change to the programme a session was added on the art of teaching urban morphology. Peter Larkham discussed the paucity of publications about morphological pedagogy, the Eurocentric nature of those case studies currently available for use as teaching resources, and the absence of teaching as an ISUF conference focus since 2003 in Trani. Larkham proposed several strategies to improve the situation: for example, those teaching courses in urban morphology could post syllabi on ISUF's website, and a dialogue group could be formed to prepare case studies and other teaching materials that are relevant across multiple cultures and disciplines. In a related presentation, Terry Slater shared his use of a series of course related walking tours to introduce beginning college students to the history and physical elements of their surrounding built environment.

During the closing session, questions were raised for further contemplation about the relative value of partnering with other scholarly organizations for future ISUF meetings and specifically EAAE. In terms of urban morphology, the organizational liaisons between ISUF 2012 and the EAAE



**Figure 3. The Amsterdam excursion in progress.**

afforded a potentially rich forum for dialogue surrounding shared interests in the physical dimensions and characteristics of urban environments and developments. ISUF membership aspires to promote the value that urban morphology holds for urban practitioners. Such a liaison has the potential to enhance capacity for systematic interpretation of urban environments prior to design and planning of new urban interventions. Disappointingly, much of the conference dialogue drifted away from a focus on urban morphology and more directly into the realms of urban design and practice. Consequently, the new collaboration experienced some mismatched expectations. Regular ISUF participants suggested the need for stronger guidelines for abstract solicitation and submission to ensure that papers more directly address urban morphology. This participant would argue that while some clarity of purpose and focus of ISUF's mission was lost in translation, the exposure that new participants from the disciplines and practices of architecture and urban design

received to key streams of morphological thought was potentially worth the compromise ... this one time.

Two post-conference excursions explored the cities of Amsterdam and Rotterdam. I joined the Amsterdam group led by Meta Berghauer Pont, along with the Samuels, Gu, Conzen and the Whitehands, among others (Figure 3). We embarked on a 6 km walking tour of large urban projects in the form of new and adapted housing developments along the canal front. From strategic vista points we could observe shifts in scale and use along the working canal. We then circled back through largely medieval neighbourhoods towards the railway station and on to our destinations across the globe.

*Wendy R. McClure, Architecture Program, College of Art and Architecture, University of Idaho, PO Box 442451, Moscow, ID 83844-2451, USA. E-mail: wmcclure@uidaho.edu*

---

## ISUF business meetings, Delft, The Netherlands, October 2012

Meetings of the Council and Editorial Board of ISUF took place on Monday, 15 October 2012 in Delft, immediately before the ISUF 2012 conference held at Delft University of Technology. A General Meeting of ISUF took place during the conference. This report summarizes the principal matters covered in the three meetings.

### President's report

The President, Michael Conzen, reported on the Task Forces that had been set up as a result of discussions held during and after the conference held in Hamburg in 2010. Three of the Task Forces had completed their work and submitted their reports to Council. These concerned the website, the organization of conferences, and the journal. Recommendations had been made and were being implemented where possible. A fourth Task Force had been set up in 2011 and its remit was to develop a morphopedia. When completed this would be made available on the website and would be a development of the existing *Glossary*. The aim was to communicate the concepts and core structure of urban morphology and how they fitted together. Peter Larkham, co-ordinator for this Task Force, hoped to have a draft structure and content available in time for the conference in 2013.

A fifth Task Force had been set up to consider research and practice in urban morphology. The aim of this Task Force was to promote the concepts of urban morphology in practice. The chairman, Ivor Samuels, had submitted an interim report which contained a number of recommendations (this issue pp. 40-3). He welcomed participation by interested parties.

### Secretary-General's report

The Secretary-General reported on the need to improve communication between members. He recommended that firm proposals be implemented in early 2013.

### Treasurer's report

Michael Barke reported on the sound financial position. Conference income was an important contributor, as was the increasing number of

members. He asked members to encourage their libraries to take out subscriptions if they did not already subscribe. The sound financial position of ISUF made it possible to provide support for additional activities.

### Editor's report

The Editor, Jeremy Whitehand, reported that *Urban Morphology* was currently subscribed to by some 200 libraries worldwide. It was well-established in the main indexing and abstracting databases: for example, it had been indexed in the Web of Knowledge for 12 Years. Citations of articles had been increasing fairly steadily. He reported that the journal was genuinely international and multi-disciplinary, if judged by the locations and affiliations of authors. The number of submissions continued to rise. Nearly all the journal's referees were very prompt in submitting their reports and this enabled most decisions to authors to be communicated within 1 month. About one in every four full-length articles submitted was accepted for publication. The average time-lag between the receipt of the revised version of an article and its publication was just under 5 months. Distribution of the journal was now being undertaken by Henry Ling Ltd.

Takashi Ariga had retired from the Editorial Board and appreciation was expressed for his valuable contributions. He had been replaced by Feng Song.

### Webmaster's report

The webmaster, Richard Whitehand, reported that the restructured website was working well and updates had been incorporated promptly. All issues of the journal were now available online to subscribing libraries. Council had agreed that issues for the years 2002 and 2003 should be added to those that were already available on open access. The number of downloads of articles per month had increased significantly in 2012.

### Election of Council members

Wowo Ding, Nanjing University, was welcomed to the Council.

---

---

### Future conferences

Paul Sanders invited members to attend the 2013 conference, which would be held at Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia. The main theme of the conference was 'Urban form at the edge'. The University had an inner-city campus close to the CBD. A number of excursions were planned – in New Zealand before the conference and in Sydney and Melbourne after the conference.

The conference for 2014 would take place in

Porto, Portugal. The main theme would be 'Our common future in urban morphology'. Nominations were invited for the conference in 2015.

*Susan M. Whitehand, Urban Morphology Research Group, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK. E-mail: smwhitehand@hotmail.co.uk*

---

## ISUF Task Force on Research and Practice in Urban Morphology: an Interim Report

In January 2012, the President of ISUF invited me to chair a Task Force to report on ways in which ISUF could build 'better bridges between researchers in urban morphology and practitioners'. The Task Force would engage in 'a discussion of ways in which ISUF could provide leadership in this sphere and draw up a report with concrete suggestions for action'.

An interim report was submitted to the President and considered by the Council of ISUF at its meeting on 15 October 2012. This report and additional matters relating to it that were raised during the course of the Nineteenth International Seminar on Urban Form held in Delft, The Netherlands are summarized below.

### 1. The Task Force

Over a period of 7 months the Task Force engaged in an exchange of views, comments on drafts and transmissions of relevant documents. A great deal of material was drawn from work published in *Urban Morphology*. Contributions were made by Pedro Buraglia (Colombia), Maria Adriana Gebauer Munoz (Chile/Mexico), Karl Kropf (UK), Michael Lin (Taiwan), Teresa Marat Mendes (Portugal), Stephen Marshall (UK), Nicola Marzot (Italy), Art McCormack (Republic of Ireland), Vítor Oliveira (Portugal), Vicente del Rio (USA) and Jeremy Whitehand (UK). The work of the Task Force continues and will include further contributions from East Asian countries, Australasia and parts of Europe not yet represented on the Task Force

### 2. This report

Our exchanges have already ranged over a wide field. Some contributions have proposed additions to the body of knowledge represented in urban morphology, but this summary has been restricted to the body of urban morphology as it stands at present.

There are two intentions behind the following proposals which can be considered as two *interconnected* parts. The first is to increase the influence of urban morphology by better packaging and marketing. The second is to raise the level of understanding and application of urban morphology in a range of relevant professions through the channels of education and professional organizations.

### 3. The recommendations

The recommendations can be summarized under four heads: (A) the publication of a manifesto setting out the benefits of using urban morphology; (B) the compilation and publishing of relevant curricula in different countries; (C) the production of a good practice catalogue of how and where urban morphology is being used successfully; and (D) the creation of an urban morphology tool kit for understanding the past and planning the future of urban settlements.

Four general considerations relevant to all these items emerged as a result of discussion during the ISUF 2012 conference in Delft:

---

- It is important that the outcomes of the various activities of the Task Force are relevant to the dynamic and rapidly urbanizing contexts of Africa, Asia and Latin America, as well as North America and Europe.
- The utility of the electronic and imaging tools now available must be recognized and incorporated in the outcomes.
- Urban morphology must be shown to be relevant to concerns about environmental performance.
- The results of the deliberations need to be useful at different scales, including those of the city region, both for environmental reasons and because of the practicalities of the way in which labour and housing markets operate.

### A. The ISUF manifesto

In the environmental professions there is a strong tradition of ideas being promoted through charters or manifestos, some of which have had enormous influence and have been very effective means of promoting ideas – for example, those of CIAM, New Urbanism and the Futurists. The ISUF manifesto, however, would not advocate a style but an approach to understanding. Its preparation would be an important step in moving urban morphology from the academy to the studio.

Given the diversity of ISUF, a manifesto will be more likely to achieve consensus if it is articulated after common ground has been established based on agreed principles. It should be prepared, with professional advice, by a relatively small team over a short period.

### B. Urban morphology in the curriculum

Since most urban morphologists acquire a good many of their approaches and techniques during formal training, it is important that the contents of urban morphology are communicated in higher education institutions, professional courses, continuous professional development and secondary schools.

Given that a majority of ISUF members have academic affiliations, it should be practicable to obtain basic information on urban morphology within formal curricula through the ISUF membership, though of course it will be necessary to undertake translations. The results could be published on the ISUF website, and used to demonstrate the extent of the incorporation of urban morphological concepts in education and to

persuade others to adopt them.

### C. The good practice catalogue of how and where urban morphology is being used successfully

This recommendation is closely connected to recommendation D and would directly feed into it. Drawing on the expertise developed by a range of disciplines, urban morphology has been used across the whole spectrum of professional activity from the description of the historical evolution and character of places to prescribing future changes through design guidance, codes and plans at different scales.

The most valuable contribution urban morphology can make is to an objective understanding of urban form and how it has evolved. It is therefore most valuable in the descriptive/analytical part of the spectrum of professional activity – before the introduction of sets of values, which must be implicit if not explicit in any form of prescription. It should be used to underpin the normative processes involved in planning and design.

A good practice catalogue therefore forms a tool kit from which practitioners can select those tools that are most appropriate to their current problems and which can be adapted to fit different economic, political, cultural and social contexts.

The catalogue would be a catholic compilation of projects that have successfully used aspects of urban morphology at different scales and in different contexts, ranging from characterization / historical studies through regulatory tools to the design and implementation of projects.

However, as the science of urban form, urban morphology, like other sciences, must be subject to evaluation and testing. This is particularly important if its utility and effectiveness are to be demonstrated to sceptical practitioners. This is a complex issue, but systematic evaluation is fundamental if the scientific credibility of ISUF and the high academic reputation of *Urban Morphology* are to be maintained. The catalogue should focus on the way urban morphology has contributed to the success of projects. Commentaries on the projects should offer guidance on the instruments that would be successful in particular contexts (legal system/planning system/development industry/professional structure) and in given conditions, thus avoiding the trap of ‘policy tourism’.

The important series in *Urban Morphology* on the study of urban form in different countries has

not on the whole been concerned with the application of urban morphological concepts in practice. This series needs to be extended to cover successful applications of urban morphology in practice.

A further extension of this strand of activity would be to establish a practitioner network to exchange experiences and establish a register of professionals in the field.

#### **D. The urban morphology manual**

Urban morphology as the science of urban form can offer a range of tools to a number of groups:

1. Those concerned with describing and analysing urban form (urban historians, geographers, heritage professionals).
2. Environmental design professionals concerned with prescribing the future (architects, planners, urban designers, landscape architects).
3. The clients or employers of both these groups, notably public authorities and developers.

The 'map' of urban morphology published by Gauthier and Gilliland (2006) can offer a framework for defining the extent of the field. Methods such as those of space syntax and New Urbanism, which are included on the map, have already been effectively packaged and marketed. There is a need, however, to discuss how the various schools of thought in urban morphology are related.

Currently the work of planners and heritage professionals seems to be dominated by procedural matters – certainly in the UK and international agencies such as UNESCO. This seems to be a more serious problem than in other professions. The way other professions, such as medical practitioners, disseminate the results of research and oblige their members to keep abreast of relevant research may offer possible models. It is important that professionals feel obliged, and see it as in their interests, to keep up to date.

Given that even the terminology of urban morphology is often understood by only a few, it is important to offer the practitioner and the student a manual that covers in a synthetic and comparative way the whole field of urban morphology and does not seek to promote a particular school of thought. To date the only work that attempts to be fairly comprehensive is *Morphologie urbaine* (Allain, 2004). We therefore recommend to ISUF that this gap in knowledge be filled by the production of a publication that synthesizes in an accessible form the whole scope of urban morphology. An

important source of material for this publication would be *Urban Morphology*.

The publication must include:

1. Copious illustrations – all the most influential design publications (at least those in English) have been highly illustrated.
2. Connections made with other techniques at the edge of the Gauthier/Gilliland spectrum.
3. Comparisons of different methods so that the practitioner can select the most appropriate.
4. Consideration of non-traditional built form.
5. Cases that demonstrate the utility of urban morphology through specific applications that can be transferred to other contexts.
6. Clear instructions for the explanation of the historical evolution of places as a powerful way of involving non-professionals in a locality and its future.

This ambitious document should be realized as a collaboration between institutions, and include the participation of professional bodies.

#### **Next steps**

Given the size of the Task Force and the interest it has already generated from potential new members, two administrative steps should be noted here:

1. Because of the range of tasks and the various interests, experience and expertise of the Task Force members, a structure is being considered that allocates responsibilities to groups of members according to their interests and relevant experience. As a first step members could express their particular interest in contributing to the items identified in this report. This would not preclude members contributing to all the tasks if they wish.
2. A 'Dropbox' has been established to expedite the effective circulation of materials.

#### **End note**

Given the trepidation with which the majority of practitioners approach urban morphology and the demonstrable ignorance of even those professionals apparently familiar with it, in the words of André Gide:

Everything has been said before, but since nobody listens we have to keep going back and beginning all over again.

---

**References**

- Allain, R. (2004) *Morphologie urbaine: géographie, aménagement et architecture de la ville* (Armand Colin, Paris).
- Gauthier, P. and Gilliland, J. (2006) 'Mapping urban morphology: a classification scheme for interpreting contributions to the study of urban form', *Urban*

*Morphology* 10, 51-66.

Ivor Samuels, *Urban Morphology Research Group, School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK. E-mail: ivor.samuels@googlemail.com*

---

## Assembly for Comparative Urbanisation and the Material Environment, Leeds, UK, 12-13 December 2012

A group of scholars conferred over 2 days at an international workshop on the comparative social study of urban landscape development and urban society across time and space. Subtitled 'Digital methodologies for social research on processes of urban landscape development', this workshop of the Assembly for Comparative Urbanisation and the Material Environment (ACUMEN) was hosted by the Centre for Spatial Analysis and Policy of the School of Geography, University of Leeds. It was funded by the Digital Social Science Scheme of the ESRC and supported by the Talisman node of the National Centre for Research Methods. It aimed to establish common ground on an emergent topic that cuts across many disciplines. Being the first workshop of its kind, it informed non-users of the potential of digital methods and spatial technology, and promoted the exchange of ideas among those knowledgeable about such techniques with a view to stimulating further development and collaboration.

The workshop's scope was broad yet focused. The main uniting themes of social scientific purpose, digital methods, and the material environment attracted the participation of urban researchers from archaeology, human geography, historical geography, history, architecture and planning. The necessity and utility of finding common ground in support of current research projects and future developments was agreed by all participants. ACUMEN addressed a methodological gap that affects all social scientific and humanities disciplines related to urban research.

The workshop was an indirect continuation of two previous events: an advanced seminar on approaches to comparative archaeology convened by Michael E. Smith in October 2007 (Smith, 2012), and the workshop, Spatial Technologies for

the Medieval City (STeMCity) in March 2010 reported on in this journal by Keith Lilley (2011) and the basis for the volume of *Post-Classical Archaeologies* for 2012. Smith and Lilley both contributed to ACUMEN, alongside six other invited speakers.

The speakers discussed the difficulties and opportunities of conducting comparative urbanism research (Smith, Lilley), the strengths of GIS in integrating disparate historical datasets, including textual and artistic sources (Ian Gregory, James Tice), the use of GIS in modelling historical processes (Alan Wilson), GIS supported morphological analyses and the collation of geospatial historical data (Eric Grosso), the potential and limitations of using space syntax for social and historical research (Sam Griffiths), and the scope for theory to advance digitally supported investigation of urban materialities (Stephen Read). Urban morphological interests formed a shared theme, especially represented by the contributions of Karl Kropf and Keith Lilley.

The heart of the workshop was an innovative presentation format, called a PechaKucha. This comprised a series of twelve 6-minute presentations in quick succession, and informed two extensive discussion sessions.

For these discussions participants were divided into three groups (Figure 1), focusing on the research process from the perspective of 'data acquisition, management and digital compilation', 'methodologies for social and temporal analyses of urban landscape data', and 'social scientific purposes for the study of urban landscape development'. Attention was given to how collaborative research could be sustained. It was agreed that ACUMEN had brought together researchers in a way that promoted debate and

---



**Figure 1. One of the discussion sessions in progress. Photograph by Denise Terpstra.**

mutual understanding. However, for a field of comparative social research on urbanism through time there were notable absences. Anthropology, ethnology, sociology, human and urban ecology, landscape architecture, and virtual reality in historical studies had little or no representation. Participants acknowledged that accessibility of data (including readability), compilation, data standards (including those for metadata), and sharing and collaborative work on spatial data are essential for the future success of work in this field. It was recognized that virtually all our work starts with good mapping of the empirical characteristics of urban built environments.

Despite the participants' shared interest in urban form and its role in the relationship between human beings and the environment, there was an evident lack of integration of both data and analytical methods. To overcome the fragmentation of work and facilitate comparative research, ACUMEN will continue in the form of a website (<http://www.acumengroup.org>), serving as a gateway to research projects, methods and tools, welcoming contri-

butions, and offering access to the proceedings of the workshop. A JISC mailing list has been set up (<https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/groups/>). The newly-formed group aims to make workshops of this kind a more regular occurrence with a view to collaboration in future research.

### References

- Lilley, K. D. (2011) 'Spatial technologies and the medieval city: seminar and workshop, Padova, Italy, 24 March 2011', *Urban Morphology* 15, 153-4.
- Smith, M. E. (ed.) (2012) *The comparative archaeology of complex societies* (Cambridge University Press, New York).

*Benjamin N. Vis, Centre for Spatial Analysis and Policy, School of Geography, University of Leeds, University Road, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK. E-mail: B.N.Vis10@leeds.ac.uk*

---

## Elections to the Council of ISUF

In accordance with the Constitution of ISUF, elections to the Council will take place at the Conference of ISUF in Brisbane, Australia, 17 to 20 July 2013. There will be three vacancies to fill. Nominations should be forwarded to Dr Kai Gu,

Secretary-General, ISUF, School of Architecture and Planning, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland, New Zealand (e-mail: [k.gu@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:k.gu@auckland.ac.nz) by 1 June 2013).

---