Settlement Planning and Urbanization: Theoretical Debates and Contested Issues

Mahendra Sapkota ⓘD

Yunnan University. PR China.
Email: sapkota.mahendra27@gmail.com

Abstract

When discussing specific fields of study within urban studies, it is essential to look at settlement planning and urbanisation, which carry significant theoretical controversies regarding their socio-economic, environmental, and governance aspects. Following a systematic review method, this paper explores conceptual/theoretical literature navigating scientific issues and debates in the context of settlement planning and urban management. Environmental factors add another layer to this picture because fast-paced urban development kills off many natural structures and ecosystems. The article discusses various scholarly controversies related to these subjects and underlines the need for integrated and participatory approaches to settlement planning. The major findings of the study include that settlement planning is a basic process, which ensures that sustainable urbanisation is achieved through the proper planning and networking of the settlement. The study suggests that modern planning theories must adapt to the evolving dynamics of urbanization. More importantly, building and strengthening the interaction between policymakers, urban planners, and local communities can create a better tomorrow for the cities. Therefore, this review paper aims to contribute to the current debate in urban studies about appropriate planning principles and policies.

Keywords: settlement planning, urbanization, planning theory, environmental sustainability, governance

Introduction

The two pertinent issues, 'urbanization' and 'settlement planning' are the major research problems that the present paper is based on. Settlements are spaces where humans establish communities with household units or professional workouts, ranging

from small rural areas to bustling urban centres, and serve as the foundation of human habitation. The planning of these settlements, known as settlement planning, involves a deliberate process of organizing and managing land use, infrastructure, and resources to meet diverse needs, such as housing, transportation, and economic activities. This planning is guided by principles of sustainability, aiming to create well-functioning, equitable, and livable environments that balance growth with environmental preservation. Urbanization, on the other hand, is the dynamic process where rural areas transition into urban centres, driven by population shifts, economic opportunities, and societal transformations. As urbanization intensifies, effective settlement planning becomes essential to manage the growing complexities of human settlements, ensuring their functionality and resilience. It must be understood that settlement planning is part of urbanization in that it sets out a pattern for the proper laying down of human settlements during the process of transition from rural areas to urban areas. Thus, optimum settlement planning facilitates the management of the dynamic environment changes instigated by the process of urbanization, vis-à-vis infrastructure development, resource mobilization, and environmental conservation.

Literature in urban studies reveals that classical models of urban management and settlement planning (such as the concentric zone model, sector model, multiple nuclei model, garden city movement, and differential urbanization model) have become contested and insufficient in contemporary societies (Knox & McCarthy, 2020). The concept of sustainable cities and viable settlement planning has evolved with the inception of global goals for sustainable development (SDGs). In this context, different kinds of socio-economic, political, economic and geographical impacts of urbanization call for strategic mitigation measures to achieve sustainable development and balance the distribution of essential resources, especially in the growing and densely populated poor and informal settlements (Scott, & Storper, 2015; UN-Habitat, 2020). Turok and McGranahan (2013) contend that the expansion of urban areas necessitates the incorporation of green and climate-resilient features to enhance the well-being of residents in cities with extreme population density. The central mechanism for this transformation is settlement planning which includes designing, planning, and regulating urban territories in a scientific, resilient and sustainable way.

Urbanization, coupled with modernization, has impacted ancient habitation patterns, resulting in alterations in population density, poor infrastructure, and environmental challenges in most growing urban centres (Adams & Potts, 2021). However, less studies have been done from a settlement planning perspective to evaluate their linkage and interrelationships in the changing context. Discussions concerning settlement planning in theoretical arenas revolve around economic development, social justice, equality, and

the environment. Analyzing these matters, this paper synthesizes leading theoretical discussions on settlement planning in the urbanization process.

Methods and Materials

Following a systematic review process with a synthesis approach, this paper reviews and integrates multidisciplinary works based on various theories and empirical studies, including urban studies, planning theory, and environmental sustainability. The sources were identified among the articles of peer-reviewed journals, books, and conference proceedings that explored the main topics about the emphasis of the review, which include the phenomena of the growth of cities without a plan and the processes of gentrification, sustainability, and governance. I conducted a purposive search in peer-reviewed academic databases, including Science Direct, Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and other relevant databases, using keywords like "urbanization," "settlement planning," "neoliberal urbanism," "gentrification," "environmental sustainability," and "governance."

The latest model of the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines is the PRISMA 2020 statement, which updates and expands upon the original 2009 guidelines to enhance the reporting of systematic reviews (Page *et al.,* 2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement includes a 27-item checklist that addresses various aspects of systematic review reporting, including fundamental sections of introduction, methods, results, and discussion. Selection criteria stressed theoretical papers and empirical studies examining the relationship between urbanization and planning. Discussed are such theoretical discourses as neoliberal urbanism, Marxist views on the urbanization process, sustainable development perspectives for modern settlement, and governance systems. Emphasis was placed on scientific publications presenting current insights; all the sources reviewed were published between 2000 and 2024 (exceptional to some classic works) by quality journals/ publishers to include the current discourses on urbanization and settlement planning. This approach offered an evaluation of the contentious issues that relate to urbanization from the global perspective following these strategies:

1. **Records identification and viewing:** Initially, 120 records were identified through database searches or other sources, from where potentially relevant studies are noted.

2. **Records screening, assessing and downloading:** Out of 120 records, 90 records were assessed for eligibility based on the title and abstract screening, and then downloaded for further examination.

3. **Assessing for-text articles and ensuring eligibility and thematic review:** Finally, 60 articles were thoroughly reviewed using a thematic or detailed inclusion/exclusion criteria according to the relevance to settlement planning and urbanization.

Results

Overview of Settlement Planning and Urbanization Concepts

Various concepts of urbanization presented in urban studies have differently observed and explained the discourse and practice of settlement planning. They have diversely impacted the historical development of the planning of settlements based on land use, transportation, and conservation of the natural environment. In the past, designers designed cities to provide basic human needs with spatially contained solutions, and they encouraged intercommunication and resource utilization simultaneously. Nonetheless, contemporary planning practices encounter complex tasks related to low-density policies of energy and extensive infrastructure, such as urban sprawl. These trends amplify the need to redesign spatial organization. Thus, returning to Arnum, Germany, a scientific study examines its sustainable structure indicators to redesign urban interfaces (Ibesich *et al.,* 2006).

In this context, the way how urban facilities are managed scientifically seems to be a critical aspect of planning. Indeed, urban management and spatial planning work together to show how important it is to use integrated modelling to balance the competing spatial claims of different sectors, which makes people more resilient to changes in climate thereby making location choices (Zondag *et al.,* 2005). The integrated modelling system in the context of urban planning and management consists of spatial, economic, environmental and social models that provide a holistic approach to planner decision-making for sustainable development. The combination of the multiple databases and multiple simulation methods, allows the planning stakeholders to forecast, analyze and assess policy measures and urban development strategies. However, integration approaches and strategies vary in different contexts, including geo-location, spatial characteristics, land use patterns and socio-economic conditions.

Addressing these factors is critical for developing sustainable, and livable urban environments. To transform lives and the physical environment of a city for sustainable development, the formulation of land use and infrastructure placement is crucial (Citaristi, 2022). In their studies on the governance models of integrating settlements, Das and Dahiya (2020) recognize that effective integration necessitates addressing the need for economic development to achieve enhanced timeline viability, fairness, and sustainable development for habitation. This argument is also available in a study by

De (2023), where the author analyses the tenets of sustainability through infrastructure, governance, and planning. Neoliberal urbanism typically addresses a situation of differentiated availability of construction. Brenner and Theodore (2002) have postulated that neoliberal conditions have facilitated open borders for urbanization, resulting in open borders, unplanned and non-hierarchical planning and informal urbanism. Districting has been described in many developing world cities as the lens of neoliberalism', and Roy (2009) claims that informality is a 'structural' component of neoliberalism. Such uncontrolled expansion intensifies socio-economic inequality and creates significant challenges for urban designers expected to monitor and guide fast spatial development.

Theoretical Frameworks in Settlement Planning

However, a crucial starting point when considering settlement planning is the theoretical paradigms that form the bodies of knowledge that attempt to capture the complex nature of urbanization processes and formulate the ways to approach them. They can help systematically analyze assumptions that guide planning and the occurrence of discrete events. For instance, naming and scrutinizing ideology, as elaborated in the context of contemporary planning, could explore the relations between planning practices and socio-politics (Shepherd *et al.,* 2020).

Considering international cooperation in climate adaptation draws attention to the critical elements of design that support local endeavours to overcome challenges within an urban context. This interaction strengthens the primary assertion of this paper that planning theories need to be applied and have the proper context of the different countries and regions. This backs up Oberlack and Eisenack's (2012) claim that planning frameworks need to be flexible and not rigid. When used in such a manner and combination, another theoretical perspective postulates that planning should consider both quantified technical variables from pure engineering and the non-quantified variables (socio-cultural and economic) from social science. It then offers scientific tools for researchers and practitioners to develop novel solutions to problems associated with urbanization as well as the formulation of pro-inclusive and sustainable approaches to settlement planning. In recent years, the theories on urban development have been evolving in advanced manifestation, enhancing the handling of towns and cities in multifaceted dimensions. One such important idea is the integration of the concerns of land management and utilization of other natural resources (including water, minerals, forest, physical assets, waste management and environmental concerns) as propagated by current spatial planning principles.

These frameworks, therefore, support the linking of natural resource management to land use as a tool for enhancing sustainable urban development. According to recent

studies, the modelling tools that depict the interactions between the water sector and urban planning are vital for the spatial claims and risks of land use changes, as Zondag et al. (2005) discussed. While modelling tools are useful for linking the water sector with urban planning, their reliance on generalized assumptions often fails to capture the complexity and variability of local contexts. The physical development and infrastructural components are also equally important. Moreover, according to the diachronic approach of urban theorists, cultural and social aspects are considered significant, where socio-cultural practices and the informal economy sometimes may affect the planning process as well as the way of solutions. This perspective suggests that to create effective urban policies that address regional peculiarities and withstand the pressures of globalization tendencies, it is necessary to focus on local communities (Pace, 2002; Qian *et al.,* 2021). Therefore, the acknowledgement of these theories can go a long way in enhancing the provision of effective settlement planning and urbanization.

Impacts of Urbanization on Settlement Patterns

As observed and analyzed in various socioeconomic aspects, urbanization also fundamentally imposes changes in the configuration of the cities and their outskirts (Fainstein, 2014). The growth of cities creates a close relationship between personal everyday activities on the one hand and the space they occupy on the other hand, which in most cases leads to suburbanization or relocation of people from city centres to the outskirts. This transition results in higher territorial consumption within the suburban setting. To disperse the population, the situation in Hungary shows that, with more and more people moving to suburban areas, new problems come over to them, including transport problems and insufficient infrastructural provisions (Váradi & Kovács, 2011). Furthermore, the application of land and resource demand implies the demand by sector and space, such as the water sector, and the arguments for integrated modelling in the process of urban planning are put forward by Zondag *et al.,* (2005).

The growth of cities and towns is changing the spatial organization of human settlements that, in its totality, demands reconsiderations on sustainability, land management, and resource use and provides a crucial setting for developing innovative planning approaches. Urban development impacts the sociology and eco-physics of regions and brings problems that require multi-aspect settlement design. Urbanization taking root in the regional context of the Global South, especially in India, suggests that functions such as population density and infrastructure lead to the further formation of socioeconomic divides, as can be seen from various studies, including Jain (2023) and Qian *et al.* (2021). Usually, urbanization leads to the provision of substandard services, which exacerbates the challenges communities face in accessing basic needs, commodities, and other social amenities, thereby widening social disparities. Simultaneously, we witness

environmental impacts, including the overuse of natural resources, their competition with built-up areas, changes in land function due to city expansion, and an increase in pollution levels or changes in climatic conditions.

These interactions between urbanization and environmentally unrestrained processes necessitate a critical analysis of current and existing urbanization policies. Such is the compounding effects of rapid urbanization and climate change — rising temperatures, flooding and resource scarcity — that urban areas are turning into epicentres of crisis (Bulkeley & Stripple, 2021). In this context, the concept of a green city is found on the path to capitalizing on urban vulnerabilities by greening urban spaces to promote energy efficiency, increased urban biodiversity, and enhanced livability (Garcia-Lamarca *et al.,* 2021). Adapting to climate change with the green city concept, it is critical to make a scientific analysis of threats to future generations of human, animal, and plant life. To cope with these effects, urban planning should address the problem of incorporating socioeconomic privileges and responsibilities with environmental necessities to facilitate sustainable development for urban society(Anthony, 2024; Balaji, 2019). Empirically this has been highlighted and studied by different scholars of urban planning; for example, Zhou *et al.* (2020) in China, Joshi (2021) in the context of India, Bulkeley and Stripple (2021) in Sweden, and Alipour and Galal Ahmed (2021) in context of Dubai.

Social Inequity and Gentrification: Marxist Critiques

Social injustice in urbanization forms the central topical area in Marxist urban theory. Smith (2002) referred to gentrification as the process in which a city is progressively reconstructed into something that could only be handled by the affluent members. Concerning Marxist approaches, cities become scenes of spectacle and planning for capital gain rather than equality. This removes lower-income groups through an inherently unjust gentrification process, revealing how urbanization confirms class relations, thus posing fundamental questions about the role of settlement planning in constructing sustainable and livable cities.

Second, gentrification often involves the influx of wealthier residents into urban neighbourhoods, leading to rising property values and rents. As a result, low-income residents may be displaced due to the loss of affordable housing, destabilizing long-established communities. Harvey (2012) supports the view that spatial restructuring of the cities, wrought by capitalist interests, turns cities into consumer spaces for the elite while excluding the poor. This displacement, referred to by the authors as the "urbanization of injustice," demonstrates how planning human settlements negates the socioeconomic constituent needs of vulnerable populations. Therefore, gentrification exercises not only exaggerate class line distinctions but also magnify socio-spatial

disparity; thus, it is a vital subject of study required to be tackled by those into physical planning that aims to make cities more sensitive to social justice. The study of Zhang and Wu (2024) also confirms this kind of finding which articulates new dynamics of urban life in Chinese cities.

Environmental Sustainability: Debates on Urban Ecology

Environmental sustainability within the specificity of urbanization is another highly implicated issue, with concerns over increasing urban space at the expense of ecological space. Seto *et al.* (2012) have described various adverse environmental effects of urban sprawl, including reduced biological diversity, disturbed natural habitats and higher carbon emissions. Due to the increase in the physical area occupied by the cities, there are severe impacts on ecology, for example, poor space for greenery and pressure on a city's ecosystem. The problem for urban practitioners, therefore, lies in how the functional needs of cities can be met without compromising the integrity of the bio-systems (Robinson, 2022).

Controversies in ecological urbanism call for less destructive approaches to the organization of human settlements; for example, the compact city encourages denser housing and the integration of various uses. This supports the compact urban form in that it supports the notion that efficient land use leads to energy efficiency, penchant transport solutions, and conserves the natural landscape outside the city. Still, Swyngedouw (2010) states that such a sustainable kind of city is fixated on ecological urbanism enabled by consolidated techno-scientific rationality, which disguises new forms of elite urbanism. These elites could rely on environmentalism to guide the exclusion of some populations in their planning policies, such as green gentrification. Hence, the dilemma between economic and environmental sustainability on one hand and social sustainability on the other emerges clearly, as environmental goals are often achieved on the pretext of social exclusion, which leads to critical questions regarding the efficiency and ethicality of the sustainability strategies for cities.

Governance and Policy Inconsistencies: Fragmentation vs. Integration

There are debates regarding the importance of managing urban territories, mainly due to the failure of public policies. It largely implies either the formulation of fragmented policies or their duplications in terms of strategies, action plans and interventions. Due to poor governance systems in terms of service delivery and accountability, settlement planning leads to an ineffective combination of urban policies that cannot address complex issues scientifically, as Healey (2020) observed. These are evident when there are multiple layers of government and competing jurisdictions, as the alignment of priorities, interests, and activities fails to guarantee integrated and optimal solutions to

service delivery deficits, housing needs, and infrastructural problems. Therefore, the planning norms are turned into a post-occupation set of actions, which does not allow for a sufficient prognosis of population numbers or constant changes in urban settings (Gupta *et al.,* 2015).

Integrated urban governance theorists believe that effective coordination between the local, regional, and national tiers of governance is crucial to developing contented urban strategies. This kind of integration has the added advantage of putting policies that are not only more cost-effective but are also fair and sustainable, according to Allmendinger and Haughton (2010). Due to the connection between different ways of governance, integrated planning can broadly consider urban problems, including housing accessibility, environmental friendliness, and social justice. Integrated solutions make it possible to put sound solutions in place when considering current and future necessities and urban resilience-related issues when considering human settlements and urbanization. For this, sectoral policies need to be reevaluated and reassessed to coordinate solutions to enhance the rationality of urban development and resource management. Numerous sectoral agencies can work at different levels, but they should avoid overlapping responsibilities and contradicting mandates. For instance in flood management, coordination means that planning and regulating of urban environments must harmonize with water resource management regimes. Likewise in the creation of green cities, progressive transportation strategies for low-carbon mobility must be linked to eco-developmental energy strategies.

Discussion

Settlement planning, urbanization processes, and emergence are always topics of theoretical overtones as much as processes and emergence cause plenty of debates. Such discussions are based on factors such as spatial development and expansion, fairness, ecology, and partitions of authority. This section explores these issues further and provides further consideration of how different theoretical perspectives – predominantly Neoliberal urbanism, Marxism, and emerging ecological perspectives – offer both insights and challenges to current settlement planning (Elden, 2004; Peck & Tickell, 2002).

Neoliberal Urbanism: Implications and Critique

Neoliberal urbanism is a model for urbanization which is based on market and deregulation and which aims to minimize the intervention of the state in socio-economic life to increase the competitiveness of cities and their economy. It is very often associated with the reproduction of neo-liberalization processes, where urban spaces become commodified, socio-economic distinctions become widened and the private sector gains

more and more power over city environments and resource management. As Harvey (2003) maintains, neoliberal urbanism facilitates the growth of cities from unplanned informal structures, characterized by rudimentary structures like sanitation, electricity, and even social amenities; in effect, they create perpetual inequality and poverty traps.

It is essential to note that the most common criticism regarding neoliberal urbanism is the disregard for the welfare of inhabitants in the desire to accumulate more capital as Peck and Tickell (2002) have noted that neoliberalism features the process by which cities are reduced to marketable products where urban landscapes are reconstructed to suit the neoliberal system of attracting capital investment as opposed to catering the needs of cities residents. This commercialization of urban space is evident in policies that empower real estate developers at the city's expense and effectively create conditions that permit widespread urban slum formation and concentration of the disadvantaged and poor into remote urban periphery or fringes (Brenner & Theodore, 2002). This is especially so in the urban context of the Global South, where urban development is fraught with the absence of welfare strategies–relatively—pronounced weaknesses in state capacity, and incoherent governance systems (Pieterse, 2010).

Marxist Perspectives: The Commodification of Urban Space and Gentrification

The Marxist theory provides an adequate framework for understanding the nature of 'urban', especially concerning capital and class factors that inform urbanization processes. One of the most prominent concerns voiced in Marxist accounts of settlement planning is the commodification of space; land and housing become a spectacle produced and negotiated through market relations rather than being defined as inalienable rights or social entitlements. The most apparent form of such commodification is the gentrification process, where capital enters districts, alters the landscape of these areas and pushes out the poor.

As to Harvey (2012), gentrification is not self-evident or an organic process because capital migrates to look for new investment areas. With the upward surge of property value in these areas, the original occupants are booted out of their homes through the process known as social exclusion. This worsens class differences and spatial polarization since inhabitants in the redeveloped areas are primarily affluent. In contrast, the remainder of the population drifts to the city outskirts. There is qualitatively, therefore, the privatization of urban settings, especially the standard and cheap accommodation, to make them a preserve of the elite – gentrification (Smith, 2002).

Opponents of neoliberal urbanism, especially those with a Marxist bent, underscore how displacement emerging from the gentrification process is simply another facet

of capitalism's uneven development. Thus, urban places are represented not to cover capital needs but to cater to citizens evenly regarding resources and opportunities (Elden, 2004; Lefebvre, 2012). It suggests a departure from conventional strategies that inform urban development since they reinforce social injustice in the city and promote greater awareness of the need for progressive planning models and specific housing policies that benefit more people in the city (Purcell, 2002).

Environmental Sustainability and the Pitfalls of "Green" Urbanism

Over the last few decades, the environmental consequences of this process have become a primary concern for settlement planning, with environmentally sustainable development as the central discourse. According to several theorists, sustainable urbanization must consider high-density cities that integrate appropriate land usage and green infrastructure to meet users' demands while minimising carbon outputs, unlike spread cities (Calthorpe, 2015). An idea called "ecological urbanism" implies the environmental idea in urbanization and prescribes certain activities such as environmentally friendly building designs, environment-friendly transport systems, and environmentally friendly spaces such as parks.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that, according to the critical approach, and referring to what Checker (2011) calls 'greening' the cities,' it has been emphasised that the emphasis on sustainable developments is compatible with the neoliberal urban development processes. This happens, for example, when environmental projects like establishing parks, eco-districts, or Green Infrastructure get introduced and deployed in ways that benefit the well-off populations while sweeping the marginalised groups out of their origin. For instance, the provision of green spaces in areas previously with low cover may increase property prices, making housing costly to those who have lived there for years, according to Anguelovski (2023). Thus, the work on the unscientific measures in this regard may contribute not to equality but to its negation. This is precisely opposite to the goal that should be achieved due to sustainable development initiatives.

The critical reflection here is that sustainable development is desirable, but it has to be done equally and relatively to as many people as possible. Ecological urbanism is not a mere instrument in accumulation strategy or city marketing and promotion but a way of thinking towards and designing cities for sustainability and social justice (Swyngedouw & Kaika, 2014). This has entailed moving away from an obsession with and reliance on techno-rationalist concepts to kindle sustainable city development models that rely on scientific settlement planning and urban management with an eco-developmental perspective.

Urgency of Public Governance and Integrated Planning

From a governance perspective, another factor in settlement planning is the criticality of fragmented strategies in terms of sectoral planning, resulting in polymorphic and uncoordinated urban policies. As a result of such decentralized systems of urban administration, many cities, especially within developing nations, are currently facing issues of relatively poor public governance systems, which necessitate poor coordination between the various layers of government with equal or unequal authority: local, regional, and national and between the agencies of public and private sectors. All these split responsibilities create problems in developing sound and comprehensible conceptions of city planning and management strategies (Healey, 2020).

Public governance refers to the pro-people governance system which works strategically along with holistic policies but stands with the sectorial coordinated action plans. It is a new theoretical approach to contemporary settlement planning due to the challenges of rapid urbanization compounded by the inherent inefficiency of governance policies and structures. Various issues and dilemmas emerge, including invisibility, informal settlements, and lack of essential services. Promoting proper housing, sanitation, transport, and recreational services is equally important. However, fragmentation in governance can lead to aggravation of inequality because high-income zones can attract more investment and resources while low-income areas are ignored (Allmendinger & Haughton, 2010). Integrated planning and public governance emphasize the need for cohesive strategies that align development goals across central (federal), state, and local levels of governance. Achieving this requires both vertical coordination among different governance tiers and horizontal coordination across ministries and departments to ensure policy coherence, resource optimization, and effective implementation. This further entails developing structures to enhance the cooperation of higher government tiers and the participation of local stakeholders. Such techniques have been found to enhance safety, efficiency, and fairness in the management of urban space, hence enhancing accountability, transparency, social justice and inclusion in the governance of cities (Fainstein, 2017).

However, fundamental changes in the structure of urban policy production are necessary to reach integrated governance. The political and institutional aspects often hinder change by essentially needing more means to encourage actors' interconnection and remove bureaucratic and political interests. Therefore, attempts at achieving integrated planning are usually disconnected and do not adequately address the persistent problems of settlement planning and urban management (Albrechts, 2013).

Conclusion

The literature analysis regarding the planning of new settlements and the overall urbanization process evidences the highly contested nature of the processes. In the context of the conurbation, neoliberal urbanism has led to uncontrolled sprawl emanating from social space, social injustice, and environmental injustices. For Marxist critics, cities are spatial markets where spaces are commodified, and people are shoved out in the name of gentrification. In contrast, ecological thinkers focus on environmental responsibility—though they frequently neglect the social implications of their vision. In this process, governance fragmentation raises extra challenges for implementing sound urban policies in general and in the vast growing areas.

The recent trends in planning for settlements and urbanization reveal new thinking and practices oriented toward sustainability and resilience. Urban studies continue encouraging an integrated planning approach with a public governance system that would focus on physical as well as other aspects of urbanization, including social equity, environmental sustainability, and economic rationality in cities. This multiple-linked perspective encourages increased participation in planning so that the people will have an active voice and ownership which are essential for sustainable cities. To address these dynamic, interrelated issues, settlement planning requires a shift towards more progressive paradigms of growth that are socially objective and environmentally sound. This means moving from neoliberal policies oriented toward marketization of governance toward laws that focus on social equity, ecological sustainability, and democracy. Therefore, having synthesized various ideas offered through different theoretical approaches and using the most comprehensive approach in planning cities, policymakers should begin addressing some of the most critical points with modern-day urbanization. Further studies should employ contextual and cross-disciplinary approaches to investigating in the context of the sustainable development of the urban environment, preserving cultural and historical identity.

References

Acheampong, R. A., & Acheampong, R. A. (2019). Urbanization and settlement growth management. *Spatial planning in Ghana: Origins, contemporary reforms and practices, and new perspectives*, 171-203. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02011-8_9

Albrechts, L. (2013). Reframing strategic spatial planning by using a coproduction perspective. *Planning Theory*, *12*(1), 46-63. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095212452722

Alipour, S. H., & Galal Ahmed, K. (2021). Assessing the effect of urban form on social sustainability: A proposed integrated measuring tools method for urban neighborhoods in Dubai. *City, Territory and Architecture*, *8*(1), 1.

Allmendinger, P., & Haughton, G. (2010). Spatial planning, devolution, and new planning spaces. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, *28*(5), 803-818. https://doi.org/10.1068/c09163

Anguelovski, I. (2023). (In)justice in urban greening and green gentrification. In *The Barcelona School of Ecological Economics and Political Ecology: A Companion in Honour of Joan Martinez-Alier.* Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 235-247. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-22566-6_20

Anguelovski, I., Connolly, J. J., Garcia-Lamarca, M., Cole, H., & Pearsall, H. (2019). New scholarly pathways on green gentrification: What does the urban 'green turn' mean and where is it going? *Progress in human geography*, *43*(6), 1064-1086. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132518803799

Anthony Jr, B. (2024). The role of community engagement in urban innovation towards the co-creation of smart sustainable cities. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, *15*(1), 1592-1624.

Balaji, B. P. (2019). Domain analysis of 'Urban' in library classification schemes. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, (2814). https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/228203551.pdf

Brenner, N., & Theodore, N. (2002). Cities and the geographies of "actually existing neoliberalism". *Antipode, 34*(3), 349-379. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00246

Bulkeley, H., & Stripple, J. (2021). Climate smart city: New cultural political economies in the making in Malmö, Sweden. *New Political Economy*, *26*(6), 937-950. https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2020.1810219

Calthorpe, P. (2015). Urbanism in the age of climate change. In *The City Reader.* Routledge, pp. 555-568. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315748504-71/urbanism-age-climate-change-peter-calthorpe. Accessed: 10.11.2024

Checker, M. (2011). Wiped out by the "greenwave": Environmental gentrification and the paradoxical politics of urban sustainability. *City & Society*, *23*(2), 210-229. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-744X.2011.01063.x

Citaristi, I. (2022). United Nations Human Settlements Programme—UN-Habitat. In *The Europa Directory of International Organizations 2022*. Routledge, pp. 240-243. .

Das, A., & Dahiya, B. (2020). Towards inclusive urban governance and planning: Emerging trends and future trajectories. In Dahiya, B., Das, A. (eds.), *New Urban Agenda in Asia-Pacific. Advances in 21st Century Human Settlements, 353-384*. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6709-0_13

Elden, S. (2004). Between Marx and Heidegger: Politics, philosophy and Lefebvre's the production of space. *Antipode*, *36*(1), 86-105. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2004.00383.x

Fainstein, S. S. (2014). The just city. *International journal of urban Sciences*, *18*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/12265934.2013.834643

Fainstein, S. S. (2017). Urban planning and social justice. *In:* G. Young & S. Carr (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Planning Theory.* Routledge, pp. 130–142. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315749576

Garcia-Lamarca, M., Anguelovski, I., Cole, H., Connolly, J. J., Argüelles, L., Baró, F., & Shokry, G. (2021). Urban green boosterism and city affordability: For whom is the 'branded' green city? *Urban studies*, *58*(1), 90-112.

Gupta, J., Pfeffer, K., Verrest, H., & Ros-Tonen, M. (2015). Geographies of urban governance. *An inclusive development perspective on the geographies of urban governance*, 217-228. Springer, Cham (Switzerland).

Harvey, D. (2003). The right to the city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *27*(4), 939-941. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0309-1317.2003.00492.x

Harvey, D. (2012). The right to the city. *In:* J. Lin & C. Mele (eds.), *The Urban Sociology Reader.* Routledge, pp. 429–432.

Healey, P. (2020). *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Ibesich, N., Wunderl, R., & Schurz, J. (2006). The role of settlement structures within the concept of sustainability-the Arnum West case study. *46th Congress of the European Regional Science Association*, August 30th - September 3rd, 2006, Volos, Greece. https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/118351/1/ERSA2006_364.pdf. Accessed: 05.11.2024.

Jain, M. (2023). *Assessment of spatial disparities in India: A contribution to advancing urban research methods in rapid growth contexts.* https://doi.org/10.26084/fmdd-fm28

Joshi, S. (2021). Key Determinants of urbanization in India: Evidence from state-level data. *Urban growth and environmental issues in India*, 55-67. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-4273-9_4

Knox, P. L., & McCarthy, L. (2020). *Urbanization: An introduction to urban geography* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Lefebvre, H. (2012). From the production of space. *In:* J. Collins & A. Nisbet (eds.), *Theatre and performance design.* Routledge, pp. 81-84.

Oberlack, C., & Eisenack, K. (2012). Overcoming barriers to urban adaptation through international cooperation? Modes and design properties under the UNFCCC (No. 03-2012). *The Constitutional Economics Network Working Papers.* https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/68459/1/733979041.pdf. Accessed: 05.11.2024.

Pace, G. (2002). Ways of thinking and looking at the Mediterranean city. Institute of Studies on Mediterranean Societies (ISSM-CNR), Naples. https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/10511/1/MPRA_paper_10511.pdf. Accessed: 05.11.2024.

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ, 372*. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Peck, J., & Tickell, A. (2002). Neoliberalizing space. *Antipode, 34*(3), 380-404.

Pieterse, E. (2010). Cityness and African urban development. *Urban Forum*, *21*(3), 205-219. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12132-010-9092-7

Purcell, M. (2002). Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant. *Geojournal*, *58*(2), 99-108. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:GEJO.0000010829.62237.8f

Qian, J., Ling, J., & He, S. (2021). Making cities and regions in globalising East Asia. *Companion to urban and regional studies*, 21-42. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119316916.ch2

Robinson, J. (2022). *The city on display: architecture festivals and the urban commons*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429468773

Roy, A. (2009). Why India cannot plan its cities: Informality, insurgence and the idiom of urbanization. *Planning Theory*, *8*(1), 76-87. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095208099299

Scott, A. J., & Storper, M. (2015). The nature of cities: The scope and limits of urban theory. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *39*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12134

Seto, K. C., Güneralp, B., & Hutyra, L. R. (2012). Global forecasts of urban expansion to 2030 and direct impacts on biodiversity and carbon pools. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *109*(40), 16083-16088. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211658109

Shepherd, E., Inch, A., & Marshall, T. (2020). Narratives of power: Bringing ideology to the fore of planning analysis. *Planning Theory*, *19*(1), 3-16. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095219898865

Smith, N. (2002). New globalism, new urbanism: Gentrification as a global urban strategy. *Antipode*, *34*(3), 427-450. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00249

Swyngedouw, E. (2010). Apocalypse forever? Post-political populism and the spectre of climate change. *Theory, Culture & Society, 27*(2-3), 213-232. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409358728

Turok, I., & McGranahan, G. (2013). Urbanization and economic growth: The arguments and evidence for Africa and Asia. *Environment and urbanization*, *25*(2), 465-482. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247813490908

UN-Habitat. (2020). *World Cities Report 2020: The value of sustainable urbanization*. United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

Váradi, Z., & Kovács, S. (2011). *Territorial consumption models – Urban sprawl – (Un)sustainability: Time for anti-sprawl?* European Regional Science Association (ERSA), Louvain-la-Neuve. https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/120326/1/ERSA2011_1657.pdf. Accessed: 05.11.2024.

Zhang, J., & Wu, L. (2024). Gentrification outcomes of greening in different urbanization stages: A longitudinal analysis of Chinese cities, 2012–2020. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 23998083241258683. https://doi.org/10.1177/23998083241258683

Zhou, L., Zhou, C., Che, L., & Wang, B. (2020). Spatio-temporal evolution and influencing factors of urban green development efficiency in China. *Journal of Geographical Sciences*, *30*, 724-742. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11442-020-1752-5

Zondag, B., & Pieters, M. (2005). Influence of accessibility on residential location choice. *Transportation Research Record*, *1902*(1), 63-70. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361198105190200108

Zondag, B., Grashoff, P., & Verhaeghe, R. J. (2005). Integrated planning of water and land use. *45th Congress of the European Regional Science Association*, 23-27 August 2005, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/117581/1/ERSA2005_338.pdf. Accessed: 06.11.2024.