

A CRITICAL REVIEW ON URBAN PLANNING

Kr. Naved A. Ariyana, Assistant Professor, Department of Architecture, Galotias University

ABSTRACT

Modern times are characterised by urban growth. However, the existing urbanisation paradigm is altering the normal atmosphere, often diminishing biovariety, and eventually jeopardising human well-being. An ecological city development and strategy model should be considered for a additional melodious interaction. A thorough literary assessment of 57 works that may be the topic of this new paradigm led to the discovery of important themes and notions. Since 2013, academic interest in these topics has increased dramatically, as has the expansion of philosophies and concepts which are part of a more holistic, trans-disciplinary integration and research synthesis based socio-ecological planning and design approach. Environment facilities, socio-biological schemes, pliability, biovariety, landscapes, and integrated green infrastructure and methodologies are the seven key subjects covered in academic literature. Six may be grouped into a stream or a space stream, which serves as the basis for a new ecological urban design and development paradigm that employs spatial notions of sustainability. The third topic, comprehensive and integrated, incorporates themes that encapsulate the fundamental traits of this new paradigm, which may be dubbed "urban consonance."

Keywords: Socio Ecological System, Sustainability, City Planning.

INTRODUCTION

Metropolises are accountable for one forth of global warming-related greenhouse gas releases. Urban heat insulation is further aided by the creation of urban areas with more impermeable surfaces and less greenery, worsening thermal waves with serious public health consequences. By physically altering land-use patterns, fragmenting and degrading habitats, importing alien species, and natural hydrological modulations, energy flow, and nutrient recycling schemes, cities profoundly change the natural environment and jeopardise the diversity of species and ecosystems (Beckmann, 2002; Maheepala, 2010; Schlumprecht & Stubert, 1989). Urban sustainability has been the subject of much study since the UN Brundtland report on sustainable development in 1987. However, current urban development patterns are unsustainable, jeopardising human health and well-being while also putting global ecological boundaries in jeopardy.

In city design, the importance of landscape in combating climate change is often overlooked, and landscape aspects are generally considered only after the building is completed. The importance of urban landscapes in making cities liveable and sustainable is still debated. The landscape is the most sensitive area of human-environmental interaction, and it is here that ecosystems thrive and provide important services to humans. Water management, city restoration, air quality, food, storm and disease control, as well as leisure, aesthetics, spiritual, and psychological advantages, are all included

in these services. Green areas in cities may help mitigate the effects of climate change by providing flood protection, urban cooling plants, and biomass storage, among other things. For example, in Australian cities, a 10% increase in canopy coverage is expected to result in a 15% reduction in floor, wall, and roof surface temperatures.

The economic impact of proximity to natural and green regions may be measured in terms of higher property prices, tourism revenues, improved air quality, decreased energy usage, and lower infrastructural expenses. In Perth, for example, the presence of enormous leafy street trees resulted in a price rise of nearly AUD 17,000 on average (Australia). Natural resources were used to control stormwater in Portland, Oregon, which saved the city more than \$60 million. Landscapes may also be used to bring people closer to their surroundings. Location-oriented cities are more likely to reduce the environmental impact of local natural resources, have strong social capital networks and trust, and have prosperous urban economies.

At the same time as cities are becoming more aware of the significance of nature, people are becoming more aware of man's innate need to interact with it. Many studies have demonstrated the psychological and physiological benefits of natural proximity and green areas, including stress relief and anxiety, a decrease in aggressive behaviour or related crime, a higher rate of hospital patient healing, increased physical activity, increased social activity, and increased social interaction.

Ecology and Urban Planning

Urban planning and design are objective practises which incorporate social, cultural, environmental, technological and economic issues within a specific legal framework. Modernity is the dominant paradigm for urban planning, which is heavily driven by scientific rationality based on a mechanical, reductive worldview. Modernism's consequences include urban design as a distinct component; reliance on technology and infrastructure to support urban operations; information sharing; and duality between people and the environment (Kollyropoulos et al., 2017).

In the 1960s and 1970s, researchers and practitioners started recognising a green approach to urban planning as part of heightened attention on environmental challenges. Theoretical concepts, including ecosystem services, urban landscape development, urban ecology, landscape ecology, biophilic design, resilience planning and renewable design, have been especially interesting in this arena during the last thirty years. A number of tools, frameworks and techniques were also developed to assess ecological principles in building design, landscape architecture and urban development. An example is Landscape Sustainable Sites Initiative (SITES) (Cameron & Katzschner, 2017; Islam et al., 2017; Uchegbu, 2009).

Despite these instances, ecological principles have not yet reached global urban design's mainstream. The gap between theory and its use in urban planning and design, where the key idea of sustainability rests, must be addressed.

System Thinking

A system view takes a holistic view of the environment, explores component-to-component interconnections and interactions, predicts behaviours, and seeks to build integrative solutions for desired results. Cities and urban landscapes are becoming increasingly recognised as a unique system of interconnected human nature. Viewing cities as socio-ecological systems provides urban development systems promise. For example, system thinking provides a basis for a holistic approach that considers urban surroundings, particularly cities, as complex living systems. A system approach challenge is to conceptualise the urban system such that sophisticated models are not necessary and that planners and key decision-makers can rapidly understand it.

Socio-Environmental Arrangements

SES notion relies heavily on other notions like system ecology, complex system theory, resilience theory and sustainability. For this discipline, certain ideas were key, including complexity, vulnerability and resilience, nonlinearity, feedback loops, imbalance dynamics, adaptability and human well-being. SES is an example of a complex, autonomous system that interacts dynamically with the capacity to adapt in non-linear interactions and in various sizes. Cities may be regarded a mixed human or social-ecological system (Hellier, 2015a, 2015b; Knieling & Fellmer, 2013; L., 1991; Lund et al., 1998; Paluska et al., 1988; Sen et al., 2015), emphasising human dependence on environmental services. While this shows an improvement from a different evaluation of social and ecological systems, it still offers a compartmentalised approach in terms of ecological or social replacement and compromise. Consider this a medium-sized stage on the route to a fully integrated natural and human system characterised by a mix of biophysical outside and interior, formed and experienced via thought processes and shared culture. Other towns are environment-like. Although biologically based, ecosystem application is more flexible in this context, emphasising that humans and their social, institutional, structural, and infrastructural components are part of ecosystem biocomponents and interconnections.

Modernist design philosophy aims to perceive cities as dynamic, autonomous entities. Today's urban planning and conceptualization advocates an idealised, balanced structure or system based on stability, efficiency and predictability ideals. However, SES theory compels urban planners and designers to use an intrinsically surprising idea of non-equilibrium established and updated on the basis of various non-linear interactions. Thus, their efforts may seek to influence or lead city development in a more environmentally friendly way based on urban ecological understanding and sustainable principles. This asserts that design or planning strategy, or optimal response for a particular issue, cannot be accepted for designers and designers. Instead, it demands flexibility and a range of approaches and solutions, so each project adapts in a unique way to its own physical, social and economic context. It also implies designs and plans are a chance to adapt, acquire and exchange knowledge via transdisciplinary interaction amongst stakeholders, rather than fixed solutions (Bichai & Smeets, 2015; Paton et al., 2009; Uchebgu, 2009)

Pliability

In urban planning and design, resilience is increasingly taken into account. Two definitions were employed in the urban environment. Earlier word refers to a system's capacity to restore balance following problems. This represents a modernist concept of system efficiency and predictability. The second, more recently characterised, involves massive adaptive unbalanced systems and emphasises resilience as the capacity of a system to absorb and adapt while maintaining its core structure and function. This idea of resilience applies to dynamic, complex, adaptable urban systems and has become a viable new planning paradigm in the last decade. Because cities are socio-ecological and unpredictable, system sustainability depends on its resilience. This will redirect urban planners' emphasis to how the city is organised to increase its adaptive resilience from building an idealised, sustainable urban plan. The effects of unforeseeable natural catastrophes such as hurricanes or climate change's long-term ramifications make urban resilience more vital. Note that this needs resilience that enhances knowledge of socio-ecological systems and systematically links spatial and ecological components to produce resilience. Attention: this must encompass all people and non-persons living in urban areas and may potentially diminish their resilience in an urban socio-ecological system when the primary emphasis is on human civilization resilience. People need to consider themselves as ecosystems and create virtual cycles or feedback loops that provide ecosystem services and other desired social and environmental advantages. Strategic system thinking is crucial for unprecedented planning and establishing sustainable urban development and resilience. These may be accomplished via an iterative, transdisciplinary method that monitors and analyses urban planning and lesson programmes that may be used to future endeavours. Novel practises and approaches are monitored and analysed based on ecological knowledge and design research. Holistic city development and plan are crucial to enhancing city resilience (Kim & Hopkins, 1996).

Cohesive and inclusive

The basic assumption of the mechanical, reductionist worldview leading to a futuristic city scheduling model is that people are distinct and higher to flora. One of the consequence was a holistic-worth arrangement that takes the right to utilise natural resources to the maximum human advantage without restriction and affect ecological processes. Reassessing human dependency on the environment has encouraged the latter half of the 20th century to pay growing attention to the impact of human activities on the world's ecosystems and the detrimental impacts on people (Christophe & Tina, 2015; Gabe et al., 2009; Marotta et al., 2008; Schuetze & Chelleri, 2013). Paradoxically, this leads to a negative perception of human relationship to nature, a perspective that is like a virus attacking a healthy system and protecting human nature. This thinking insidiously helps alienate folks from their green homes, and hinders the capacity to recognise and make a positive movement towards sustainability.

To offset this, a more harmonious human-environmental relationship must be considered, reframing persons as an intrinsic part of and relying on the natural world. A new ecological paradigm is established

subject to a synthesis of prior ideologies and evidence-based discoveries of new ecological, physical, social, sustainability, and resilience research. This paradigm focuses on the whole system idea of social and ecological systems emphasising interconnections, interconnectedness, adaptation, co-creation and co-evolution, and the connection between nature and people.

The notion of biophilic urban planning may be dated back to the early 2000s, and tries to make natural day-to-day exposure feasible by incorporating natural components as deliberate architectural design components. The findings supports exposure's social, economic and environmental advantages, including stress reduction, enhanced physical and mental health, higher employee and student productivity, and enhanced urban environments. However, as the research observed, it remains significantly anthropogenic. For example, use their selected biophile services to directly relate advantages to the human welfare of biophile urban components. Biophile urbanism is also an example of the notion of integrating design or design in a prevailing erected milieu. Permaculture is a plan process more congruent with the ecological worldview (Oyebande, 1978). Regenerative design, a notion established by John Lyle in the 1990s, is another more environmentally consistent methodology. Rural landscapes become a unifying integrated metropolitan network of renewable energy, water treatment, and waste absorption services by harnessing natural ecosystems' self-organization and self-design capabilities.

China derived from a more current ecological knowledge idea. In 2014, China sponsored the inaugural International Symposium on Ecological Wisdom for Urban Sustainable promoting its use in landscape and urban design. Ecopoeia is characterised by a modernist approach that promotes a healthy human-environmental relationship based on human values' mixed nature and natural processes with ecological integrity. Urban planners and designers have three ethical responsibilities to implement ecological knowledge: protecting the well-being of each species and their habitat; preserving resources for future generations; and competently designing, selecting and implementing planning and design as a task for maintaining and enhancing quality of life. The process of project design and execution is as vital as this, with ample time to engage with the community, exchange skills and knowledge, and build human value as ecological integrity (Costa et al., 2012; Kandiah et al., 2016).

Conclusion

Urbanization is a distinctive element of today's man-made geological period. The present urban growth paradigm, however, dramatically alters the natural environment, diminishes biodiversity and degrades human well-being. Despite rising interest in utilising an eco-friendly tactic to city preparation and architecture, especially over the last thirty years, this is not becoming popular in practise and its negative effect continues. This was recommended because of an urban planning modernist viewpoint that sees people apart and superior to nature. This led to a system of human values that takes limitless use of natural resources and impacts on human ecological processes as well as the use of technology and planned infrastructure to deliver urban services and exchange information. A novel city scheduling and plan model is required based on human interaction with the environment, awareness of landscape and city value as complex, dynamic socio-ecological systems (Oyebande, 1978; van de Ven et al., 2011).

They were categorised as sustainability or space theme and so provided the basis for an town development and strategy model that uses sustainable notions in space. Fundamental features and principles were established in a holistic, socio-ecological fashion, emphasising multifunctional sceneries as the code of urban development and the importance of biodiversity and bionetwork facilities in hominoid well-being and city pliability. The primary aspects and ideas may be considered as part of the proposed new ecological paradigm for urban planning and design.

REFERENCES:

1. Beckmann, M. (2002). Creating a planning tool for sustainable urban water resources management. In H. W. C. Strecker E.W. (Ed.), *Global Solutions for Urban Drainage* (pp. 1–9). ASCE - American Society of Civil Engineers. [https://doi.org/10.1061/40644\(2002\)146](https://doi.org/10.1061/40644(2002)146)
2. Bichai, F., & Smeets, P. W. M. H. (2015). Integrating Water Quality into Urban Water Management and Planning While Addressing the Challenge of Water Security. *Global Issues in Water Policy*, 15, 135–154. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9801-3_6
3. Calero, S. S. (2017). Comprehensive urban planning: Implications for water management in Pima County (Arizona). In *Water Bankruptcy in the Land of Plenty*. CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/b21583>
4. Cameron, R., & Katzschner, T. (2017). Every last drop: the role of spatial planning in enhancing integrated urban water management in the City of Cape Town. *South African Geographical Journal*, 99(2), 196–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03736245.2016.1231622>
5. Christophe, B., & Tina, R. (2015). Integrating water resource management and land-use planning at the rural-urban interface: Insights from a political economy approach. *Water Resources and Economics*, 9, 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wre.2014.11.005>
6. Costa, H., Costa, G., Nascimento, N., Dias, J., Welter, M., & Nunes, T. (2012). Urban water management and planning: Urban sanitation policies and an emerging institutional structure. *International Journal of Water*, 6(3–4), 250–269. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJW.2012.049499>
7. Gabe, J., Trowsdale, S., & Vale, R. (2009). Achieving integrated urban water management: Planning top-down or bottom-up? *Water Science and Technology*, 59(10), 1999–2008. <https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2009.196>
8. Hellier, E. (2015a). Rainwater harvesting as an alternative water management: Territorial aspects and current issues in urban planning [La récupération domestique des EAUx de pluie comme mode alternatif de gestion de l'EAU: Dimensions territoriales et enjeux urbanistiques actuels]. *Territoire En Mouvement*, 25–26, 3–18. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84982161585&partnerID=40&md5=8869864c33f934b90ff878b783735121>
9. Hellier, E. (2015b). Rainwater harvesting as an alternative water management: Territorial aspects and current issues in urban planning [La récupération domestique des EAUx de pluie comme mode alternatif de gestion de l'EAU: Dimensions territoriales et enjeux urbanistiques actuels].

- Territoire En Mouvement*, 25–26. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84973154468&partnerID=40&md5=9e2c2b2d47d0875f90b24e2cdae546cc>
10. Islam, S. N., Reinstädler, S., & Ferdaush, J. (2017). Challenges of climate change impacts on urban water quality management and planning in coastal towns of Bangladesh. *International Journal of Environment and Sustainable Development*, 16(3), 228–256. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESD.2017.085058>
 11. Kandiah, V. K., Berglund, E. Z., & Binder, A. R. (2016). Cellular automata modeling framework for urban water reuse planning and management. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 142(12). [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)WR.1943-5452.0000696](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000696)
 12. Kim, H.-B., & Hopkins, L. D. (1996). Capacity expansion modeling of water supply in a planning support system for urban growth management. *URISA Journal*, 8(1), 58–66. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-0030445246&partnerID=40&md5=c07ecc4bc96014c78f4589cf4131d9b9>
 13. Knieling, J., & Fellmer, M. (2013). Climate Adaptation in Metropolis Hamburg: Paradigm Shift in Urban Planning and Water Management towards “Living with Water”? In *Climate Change Adaptation in Practice: From strategy development to implementation*. John Wiley and Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118548165.ch7>
 14. Kollyropoulos, K., Georma, F., Saranti, F., Mamassis, N., & Kalavrouziotis, I. K. (2017). Urban planning and water management in ancient Aetolian Makynia, Western Greece. *Water Science and Technology: Water Supply*, 17(3), 621–631. <https://doi.org/10.2166/ws.2016.145>
 15. König, K. W. (2015). Water-oriented urban planning ensures cooling, quality of life and small-scale water cycles: Rainwater management expert forum examines carefully novel filter gutters for the treatment of rainwater drainage from traffic areas [Wasserorientierte Stadtplanung sorgt für Kühlung, Lebensqualität und kleinräumige Wasserkreisläufe: Fachforum Regenwassermanagement nimmt neuartige Filterrinnen zum Behandeln des Regenabflusses von Verkehrsflächen unter die Lupe]. *GWF, Wasser - Abwasser*, 156(1), 22–24. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84952305454&partnerID=40&md5=06a72483e0512b3a9f0d4a56a3f9d321>
 16. L., A. J. (Ed.). (1991). *Water Resources Planning and Management and Urban Water Resources*. In *Water Resources Planning and Management and Urban Water Resources*. Publ by ASCE, New York, NY, United States. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-0025899902&partnerID=40&md5=899677b7b7ed2899f81a10ba357e9ac1>
 17. Lund, J. R., Jenkins, M., & Kalman, O. (1998). Integrated planning and management for urban water supplies considering multiple uncertainties. *Contribution - University of California, Water Resources Center*, 205, X–94. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-11544271018&partnerID=40&md5=151414bf4659dfe0fcd015f0f15552e0>
 18. Maheepala, S. (2010). Towards the adoption of integrated urban water management for planning. *Modelling for Environment's Sake: Proceedings of the 5th Biennial Conference of the*

International Environmental Modelling and Software Society, IEMSS 2010, 1, 104–111.

[https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-](https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84858653246&partnerID=40&md5=9d2434435eb22397e636461db22ce2ce)

[84858653246&partnerID=40&md5=9d2434435eb22397e636461db22ce2ce](https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84858653246&partnerID=40&md5=9d2434435eb22397e636461db22ce2ce)

19. Marotta, H., dos Santos, R. O., & Prast, A. E. (2008). Limnological assessment: A tool for water conservation in the environmental-urban planning and management [Monitoramento limnológico: Um instrumento para conservação dos recursos hídricos no planejamento e na gestão urbano-ambientais]. *Ambiente e Sociedade, 11*(1), 67–79. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1414-753x2008000100006>
20. Oyebande, L. (1978). Urban water supply planning and management in Nigeria. *GeoJournal, 2*(5), 403–412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00156217>
21. Paluska, A., Pietsch, J., Berlekamp, L.-R., & Pranzas, N. (1988). Effects of urban soil sealing and soil modification on the ground- and soil-water budget and their management by planning. In H. J.C. (Ed.), *Urban water 88. Hydrological processes and water management in urban areas. Proc., Duisburg, 1988*. Unesco IHP National Committee, Zoetermeer; available CHO-TNO, 2501 BD The Hague. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-0024160463&partnerID=40&md5=8888e730bef29be6c6df3e00334dbec3>
22. Paton, F. L., Baulis, J. P., Staniford, B. S., Maier, H. R., & Dandy, G. C. (2009). Considering sustainability in the planning and management of regional urban water supply systems: A case study of Adelaide's Southern system. In N. L. T. H. Anderssen R.S. Braddock R.D. (Ed.), *18th World IMACS Congress and MODSIM 2009 - International Congress on Modelling and Simulation: Interfacing Modelling and Simulation with Mathematical and Computational Sciences, Proceedings* (pp. 3357–3363). Modelling and Simulation Society of Australia and New Zealand Inc. (MSSANZ). <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85086223191&partnerID=40&md5=6232bf89523e409144a0fd51ceb33169>
23. Schlumprecht, H., & Stubert, I. (1989). Protection measures and management planning for the conservation of stagnant water bodies in the urban area of Bayreuth [Schutzmassnahmen und Entwicklungskonzepte für den Stillgewässerschutz im Stadtgebiet Bayreuth]. *Landschaft Und Stadt, 21*(3), 93–99. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-0024880732&partnerID=40&md5=1e00f8c768e82130ed4e584fc0b9604c>
24. Schuetze, T., & Chelleri, L. (2013). Integrating decentralized rainwater management in urban planning and design: Flood resilient and sustainable water management using the example of coastal cities in The Netherlands and Taiwan. *Water (Switzerland), 5*(2), 593–616. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w5020593>
25. Sen, D., Baker, E., Drury, E., Vandenberg, R., & Moore, M. (2015). Addressing challenges in integrated water resources, watershed planning and asset management in developing sustainable solutions for streams in urban watersheds. *88th Annual Water Environment Federation Technical Exhibition and Conference, WEFTEC 2015, 5, 5142–5151*. <https://doi.org/10.2175/193864715819540487>

26. Uchegbu, S. N. (2009). Effective planning and management as critical factors in urban water supply and management in Umuahia and Aba, Abia State, Nigeria. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth*, 34(1–2), 23–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pce.2008.08.004>
27. van de Ven, F. H. M., Gersonius, B., de Graaf, R., Luijendijk, E., & Zevenbergen, C. (2011). Creating water robust urban environments in the Netherlands: Linking spatial planning, design and asset management using a three-step approach. *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, 4(4), 273–280. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1753-318X.2011.01109.x>

