Asia Pacific Journal of Research in Business Management
Vol. 9, Issue 3, March 2018 Impact Factor: 5.16,ISSN: (2229-4104)
www.skirec.org Email Id: skirec.org@gmail.com

URBAN LANDSCAPE: SCOPES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Sunil Vyankatesh Samag

Assistant Professor, Head of the Department, Sociology,

Sant Ramdas College, Ghansawangi, Dist.-Jalna, PIN: 431209 (Maharashtra)

Email: svsamag@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The papers written over the past 16 years in Landscape and Urban Design provide useful perspectives into the way people engage with urban outdoor environments. This research investigates the full variety of human factors and problems or human needs. The needs of Nature are categorised in terms of interaction with nature, aesthetic desires, leisure and fun and are associated specifically with the physical features of the environment. In the Human-Interaction Group, the role of the environment is less immediate, which involves social interaction problems, citizen involvement and collective identity. More specifically, the articles affirm the significant role that natural ecosystem in human well-being play in the vicinity. Urban ecosystems that provide interaction with nature are important not only for themselves, but also to satisfy other needs in a way that is special to these natural environments. Furthermore, although discussed in various ways, there are interesting parallels about these six criteria in different cultures and political systems. Worldwide urban residents share a need for interaction with nature and others, for beautiful surroundings, for recreation and playgrounds, for anonymity, for a more involved role in designing their neighbourhood and for a sense of community identity. The research discussed here help to show that the nature of urban environments greatly affects consumers and neighbours' well-being and behaviour.

KEYWORDS: Nature contact; Preference; Social interaction; Citizen participation; Community identity; Recreation; Ecosystem services; Agriculture; Water; Urban; New Ecological Paradigm.

INTRODUCTION:

In last few years, urban greenways, as a landscape venture, have increased in great size. Many communities in the whole world have undertaken and undertaking projects to make the area greener. Now, this making green mission is more than beautification or hobby. They are counterbalancing the loss of natural landscape as a result of growing urbanization. With the change of time, theidea of greenways has changed to answer c newer necessities and challenges. Landscape and Urban Planning (LUP) has been a crucial source of insight into the importance of the human wellbeing in the natural environment [10]. This paper intends to recognise primary issues that cover a subset of these studies. More precisely, we have selected several empirical articles published by LUP from 1991 to 2006 that deal with the relationship between people and the urban world. An emphasis on addressing human needs in the urban context is important with the world becoming rapidly urbanised. As urbanisation challenges the supply of nature ever more, it is desperately important to concentrate on the critical role of nature in human well-being. The topics that emerge from this study are important mandates for the planning, architecture and decision-making of cities and the environment. These subjects play an important part in what LUP was about. The new

viewpoint on health assessment of environments (landscape or habitats) has been deeply concerned with monitoring and ecological processes within those components (e.g. mosaic, spatial patch structures, quality of water, material fluxes) of the spatial configuration and landscape elements (e.g. patches). [11]. In comparison, conventional understanding of the environmental resilience and potential of Fengshui philosophy underline the process-oriented view of the natural soil and its cultural repercussions. Biophysical entities thus combine with cultural and historical facets of the human world through the prism of scientific cultural experience to ensure holistically meaning survival. There is a new approach to bring about peace between people and nature. Fengshui philosophy is also an alternative method for environmental evaluation.

The advantages of nature and ecosystem services to human beings are both multi-faceted and nuanced, as evolved by the principles of ecosystem services [1], from a historical emphasis on economic valuation to more inclusive valuation approaches. Indeed, there are also clashes and agreement between organisations with varying beliefs and priorities in environmental arenas. The notion of numerous human values, which may not be adequate, is defined as value pluralism [2]. Pluralistic ideals are expressed unevenly by classes of preferences [3]. The IPBES advises the recognition of the set of values identified with the nature by evaluation teams who are responsible for conceptualising 'Many values of nature and its advantages like biodiversity, ecological connectivity and services.' Values can include beliefs, preferences, degrees of value and measurements such as quantity [4]. The importance of nature ascribes to its benefits gives a broad, non-economic value framework; many of the most valuable goods and relationships have low currency prices [5]. The challenge for policymakers and management of capital, who would want pluralism of worth to be part of the policy making process, is to produce or forecast the role of different resources in environments and how to tackle various rankings of importance. This study attempts to establish a functional output that recognises several values, illuminates the several ES values that exist in a specific location and connects these values to individual and geographic features that can help managers concentrate on and convey their work.

Differences between individual attitudes about the natural world and interactions between people confuse predicting opinions or principles relevant to natural resources issues[6]. However, few studies have taken this aspect adequately into account in models that forecast ES views[7][6]. In our forecast models, the NEP scale of eco-worldviews, we fix the holes by including what has become the most common science appraisal of natural environment beliefs [8]. The scale consists of a collection of statements concerning life in accordance with nature (biocentrism) or understanding of nature (anthropocentrism). One of the significant contributions in this paper is our use of the NEP to forecast ES values. Our analysis also helps to explain the importance and conceptualisation of ES by various communities in terms of their unique landscape[9].

FACTORS INFLUENCING PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF ES:

The topic of human experiences and opinions on ES is a growing literary institution. Important to our research, in interviews with British Columbia residents, for example, Klain, Satterfield, and Chan (2014) found that respondents spoke within a distinct package of cultural ecosystem resources – numerous IEs were related as an IE and heritage sites or as a creative IE. Other experiments have asked individuals to assess the value of various ESs. Martin-Lopez et al. (2014), for example, used survey results to question Spain about the

socio-cultural value of ES. It was found that water quality was seen as the most significant; whiteness in the list of resources included was food from agriculture and fishing. Australian farmers have consistently ranked water quality safety and maintenance as the major ES for their farms in a 2014 survey conducted by Smith and Sullivan. Quintas-Soriano et al (2018) monitored ES group many times, and found cultural environment services to be the most frequently discussed in all study sites in survey data from two US and one Spanish websites. Our survey asked participants to determine the value of the region's future benefits for them. The survey instrument divided the advantages into two categories: farming and natural resources, which match the main watershed, land use. In order to make sure that we have a conversation of more detailed discussions about ES provision and meaning, we have selected ES across all four categories (supply, legislation, culture and support). The particular ES was also chosen because of the significance of this research for the broader project, which influenced the trajectory of various ES in four potential scenarios. The ES also represented "hotspots" and "cold spots" for the provision and policy consideration of various utility services [12][13].

Ecological views, livelihoods, open-air sports, geography and demographics given by their area influence how people judge the value of different ESs. We were especially interested in the interaction between NEP and various classes of ES as we hypothesised that this socio-cultural behaviour would be most important in understanding the stereotypically bio centre (e.g., visiting a park) vs the anthropocentric worldview of the spectrum of significance in ES (e.g., agricultural products provision). As context- and issue-specific explanatory variables, other independent variables were picked. We asked whether the survival of a respondent relied on agriculture because many of the ES we asked during the survey referred to farm products, and we claimed that having a personal stake in farming would affect perceptions. The outdoor activities in the model - to visit parks and fishing - were chosen to reflect a range of activities that take place in the terrestrial and aquatic areas and are popular on our study grounds. The most common natural or semi-natural characteristics of ES with which residents communicated were the spatial variables – distance from water, percentage of adjacent agriculture and percentage of adjacent woodland. Gender, age and our demographic factors, have demonstrated that disparities in viewpoints and preferences are generated through a variety of problems like the environment.

AGRICULTURAL LIVELIHOOD:

In previous studies [14] livelihoods were used to forecast perceived ES values. Other studies have also related farm livelihoods to pro-environmental behaviour [15]. ES, such as agricultural products, is created by natural resources-based livelihoods and maintained by other ES such as flood control and water supply. Livelihoods are becoming increasingly important for the ES transfers, supplementing income for those with natural wealth by providing for the restoration of certain ES [16]. However, conservation in order to protect ES can often interfere with immediate needs, in particular for the livelihoods, but also for higher-income farm households. We still predicted a higher valuation for the agricultural supply ES to be correlated with dependence on agriculture for subsistence.

NATURE NEEDS:

The classification Nature requires implies the broad variety of forms that the natural world meets human necessities or intentions. This is an overall, powerful party. Many experiments may be listed in more than one of the three conditions of Design. Indeed, the studies are split evenly between studies that fall into a single category and studies that span several categories.

CONTACT WITH NATURE:

This group demonstrates a number of approaches, including views on the world and/or experience in the studies, which involve interaction with nature, natural elements and the qualities of nature. The studies explored the question of interaction with nature in terms of emotional, mental and physical wellbeing, and the feeling that our social and physical climate is satisfied and sustainable. They demonstrate the vast variety of ways in which interaction with nature helps boost the quality of life, even though the meeting is just a short time to avoid the urban busyness. The interaction with the category nature involves more than two thirds (70 percent) of research covering natural needs. The significance of interaction with the natural world in a variety of urban environments is seen in these studies. This includes wide fields, including greenways [18], parks [17], wetlands and urban forests. Smaller areas are often protected by surveys, such as garden plots, roof garden areas, school playground areas with natural design features, and street landscapes with the inclusion of plants, which involve supporting living facilities or hospital gardens. The several advantages of natural touch are deranged landscapes overgrown with trees, naturalistic landscapes and more specifically built landscapes like botanic gardens [19].

AESTHETIC PREFERENCE:

A variety of issues relating to bases of choice, including questions such as beauty, the degree of cleanliness, and friendly sounds, are covered in this second category of natural necessity group. More than half (54 percent) of the studies covering the needs of nature in the database covered those elements. These studies offer strong support to the strong preference displayed by urban landscapes dominated by nature. Botanical gardens and parks, [20] greenways, street landscapes and neighbourhoods were among the many contexts for research exploring those interests. In addition, this preference is a critical element in recognition of the natural regeneration environment within the corporate campus by urban communities and regenerated brownfields and stream corridors [21].

RECREATION AND PLAY:

The third category that Nature needs is play and leisure. This group was used in 40% of research integrating Nature requires. These findings span a broad variety of events such as biking, jogging, cycling, walking, recreation and sports. As these findings demonstrate, leisure possibilities in many natural contexts can be met. In addition to parks, greenways and forests [23], significant areas for recreation and play are now reclaimed brown fields, neglected grounds [22], rooftop gardens, and regenerated water corridors. Consequently, both conventional and non-traditional natural environments may satisfy the need for outdoor activities. The studies indicate that resources like these are required around the age continuum, different socio-economic classes and nationalities. The findings are predicted.

HUMAN-INTERACTION NEEDS:

The group consists of needs that focus on human interactions promoted by the environments. Overall, the Human-interaction needs to be manifested themselves much less frequently than the Nature-based needs. Furthermore, the studies were more likely to fall into a single category of Human-interaction needs than in multiple categories.

SOCIAL INTERACTION AND PRIVACY:

The most regular research revealed social contact and needs for privacy — 58% of the studies dealing with needs for human relations. These researches demonstrated considerable hope that stronger social experiences can be encouraged by correctly built urban spaces. These changes include relations between youth, racial and ethnic groups [24], urban [25] and local community. In encouraging social connections, natural ecosystems often play a major role. The ecosystem contains hospital landscapes, community parks and greenway trails [25]. In addition, privacy standards can be fulfilled in urban woodlands, parks [25], and adjacent gardens [26] by supplying the public with a sanctuary from urban activities.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE DESIGN PROCESS:

In the Human interface community, almost half of the studies (46 percent) contained aspects in which people engaged in the design process. These studies demonstrate the importance of encouraging engagement by people to create a better design and encourage mutual support for urban landscapes. They also show that city planners, builders and analysts understand this need. They also provide evidence. This appreciation is interesting not only for more democratic countries like Brazil, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Italy, but also for the least-democratic countries, such as Jordan and Saudi Arabia, as well as for countries with more independence in the Netherlands and the United States. Public contributions are seen to contribute to a design that takes specific human interests into consideration, as well as local culture, faith and history of a certain area.

SENSE OF COMMUNITY IDENTITY:

38 percent of the research included in Table 3 included the current human engagement needs, the sense of group identity. Many of these articles have commonly recognised that residents of suburban neighbourhoods of large metropolitan areas are losing such a reputation worldwide. There are several reasons that are responsible for this failure, some of which are the exterior architecture features of such districts. Middle-eastern scientists, for instance, cited unsuitable principles that rely on economics in the city rather than needs of residents [10] and unequal applications of zoning rules [27] and usage of Western neighbourhood designs in other countries. Many scholars in the United States are working on losing landmarks and positioning the suburban environment's identification. These scientists claim that strengthening the physical environment's identification will improve the sense of group connection. Another research showed that public or semi-public outdoor venues cultivate the reputation of the city.

COMBINATIONS OF NEEDS CATEGORIES:

The several reminders of the significance of the combined care of these human needs represent a significant contribution of these studies. Particularly, urban areas with essential natural characteristics addressing the need for interaction with nature will serve other needs in a way that is specific to these more natural environments. Tables 2 and 3 contain numerous experiments demonstrating how contacts with nature will concurrently fulfil the two other types of needs of natural beings (aesthetic desire or leisure), and human activity

requirements. For instance, urban forests are regarded as having an advantage to those living near them, by offering opportunities to interact and improve their sense of connection to nature, leisure and privacy. Moreover, greenways in urban areas worldwide are becoming more popular. They are a solution to various urban disorders due to their use for leisure and social interactions [28], as well as to their aesthetic qualities and capacity for increasing the sense of belonging of society. The trend of the 90 studies indicates that the types of human activity always work along with the needs of the group nature. The sole objective of the research was social contact and data protection; rather, they were usually analysed together (90 percent of the studies protected by the category) with at least one category of nature. More than 2/3 of these experiments had one of the naturally occurring types of contact. In other words, communication settings with nature can provide valuable opportunities for social interaction and privacy. Obviously not all applicable analysis and secret alternatives can occur as part of the samples containing our databank. Nor will the underlying reasons for these relationships be revealed in these categories. The study is nevertheless the cornerstone for future inquiries.

IMPACT:

The effect of this study on management, policy makers and others is considerable. We find strong scores for many ES agriculture and natural resources, which are demographically of worldview and geographically diverse. Tradeoffs between water quality and agriculture development are well known but both are still very significant for people. Our findings might help promote fruitful dialogues on coping with trade-offs by illustrating commonalities in watershed values. Agreement is important to restate since so much emphasis is focused on controversy in the media and political dialogue. Second, understanding the key role played by ecological worldview in the environment values of communities will lead to stronger framework communications for asset managers or advocacy groups, encouraging or preserving. For example, in our research, a vocabulary that stresses the effects of human-cantered agricultural development or the protection of agricultural land is close to those who care more about these ESs. Third, our analysis is unique to our field of study, and it would be important for our comprehension of the spectrum of values in various types of ES to reflect pluralistic values in that country. In a different county or region, though, a value form looks different. We propose that context-specific experiments that consider worldviews should be carried out in order to integrate a broader conceptualization of meaning and appraisal in the environment evaluation, including the notion of "nature's human contribution."

CONCLUSIONS

As the urban landscape is the world in which the majority of people work now, an indicator may be used to assess whether the urban standard of life is good or poor. For the overall well-being of the population, economic, social and environmental metrics for measuring the quality of urban life are not often enough. A high landscape quality will improve people's productivity by creating a general satisfaction by mental stimulation. Assessing the condition of the urban landscape may reveal some unique problems for urban settlements as landscape reflects the quality and quantity of life projected for the area. The failure to design or administer the city poorly, the socioeconomic imbalances and low quality of life affect the quality of the landscape. The qualitative study of the urban environment is the foundation for more studies to enhance the city's continuous livelihood and economic growth.

REFERENCE:

1. Van Riper, C. J., & Kyle, G. T. (2014). Capturing multiple values of ecosystem services shaped by environmental worldviews: A spatial analysis. Journal of Environmental Management, 145, 374–384.
2. O'Neill, J. (1997). Value pluralism, incommensurability and institutions. In J. Foster (Ed.). Valuing Nature? Economics, ethics, and environment (pp. 87–100). London, UK: Routledge.
3. Rosenbaum, W. A. (2013). Environmental politics and policy. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
4. IPBES: International Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. 2015. Preliminary guide regarding diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits, including biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services (deliverable 3 (d)).
5. Heal, G. (2000). Valuing ecosystem services. Ecosystems, 3, 24–30.
6. Muhar, A., Raymond, C. M., van den Born, R. J. G., Bauer, N., Bock, K., Braito, M., ... Ives, C. D. (2018). A model integrating social-cultural concepts of nature into frameworks of interaction between social and natural systems. Journal of Environmental Planningand Management, 61, 756–777.
7. Flint, C. G., Kunze, I., Muhar, A., Yoshida, Y., &Penker, M. (2013). Exploring empirical typologies of human–nature relationships and linkages to the ecosystem services concept. Landscape and Urban Planning, 120, 208–217.
8. Dunlap, R. E. (2008). The new environmental paradigm scale: From marginality to worldwide use. The Journal of Environmental Education, 40, 3–18.
9. Bryan, B. A., Raymond, C. M., Crossman, N. D., & Macdonald, D. H. (2010). Targeting the
10. management of ecosystem services based on social values: Where, what, and how? Landscape and Urban Planning, 97, 111–122.
11. Abu-Ghazzeh, T.M., 1996. Reclaiming public space: the ecology of neighborhood open spaces in the town of Abu-Nuseir, Jordan. Landscape Urban Plan. 36, 197–216.
12. Buchecker, M., Hunziker, M., Kienast, F., 2003. Participatory landscape development: overcoming social barriers to public involvement. Landscape Urban Plan. 64, 29–46.
13. Qiu, J., & Turner, M. G. (2013). Spatial interactions among ecosystem services in an urbanizing agricultural watershed. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,110, 12149–12154
14. Qiu, J., Wardropper, C. B., Rissman, A. R., & Turner, M. G. (2016). Spatial fit betweenwater quality policies and hydrologic ecosystem services in an urbanizing agriculturallandscape. Landscape Ecology, 1–17.
15. Kari, S., &Korhonen-Kurki, K. (2013). Framing local outcomes of biodiversity conservation
16. through ecosystem services: A case study from Ranomafana, Madagascar. Ecosystem Services, 3, e32–e39.
17. Prokopy, L. S., Floress, K., Arbuckle, J. G., Church, S. P., Eanes, F. R., Gao, Y., ... Singh, A. S. (2019). Adoption of agricultural conservation practices in the United States: Evidence from 35 years of quantitative literature. Journal of Soil and WaterConservation, 74.
18. Zheng, H., Robinson, B. E., Liang, Y.-C., Polasky, S., Ma, D.-C., Wang, F.-C., ... Daily, G. C.(2013). Benefits, costs, and livelihood implications of a regional payment for

ecosystemservice program. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 110,16681–16686.

19. Chiesura, A., 2004. The role of urban parks for the sustainable city. Landscape Urban Plan. 68, 129–138

20. Gobster, P.H., 1995. Perception and use of a metropolitan greenway system for recreation. Landscape Urban Plan. 33, 401–413.

21. Ozg ¨ uner, H., Kendle, A.D., 2006. Public attitudes towards naturalistic versus ¨ designed landscapes in the city of Sheffield (UK). Landscape Urban Plan. 74, 139–157.

22. Jim, C.Y., Chen, W.Y., 2006b. Impacts of urban environmental elements on residential housing prices in Guangzhou (China). Landscape Urban Plan. 78, 422–434.

23. Hands, D.E., Brown, R.D., 2002. Enhancing visual preference of ecological rehabilitation sites. Landscape Urban Plan. 58, 57–70

24. Damigos, D., Kaliampakos, D., 2003. Assessing the benefits of reclaiming urban quarries: a CVM analysis. Landscape Urban Plan. 64, 249–258.

25. Fjørtoft, I., Sageie, J., 2000. The natural environment as a playground for children: landscape description and analyses of a natural playscape. Landscape Urban Plan. 48, 83–97.

26. Gobster, P.H., 1998. Urban parks as green walls or green magnets? Interracial relations in neighborhood boundary parks. Landscape Urban Plan. 41, 43–55.

27. Oguz, D., 2000. User surveys of Ankara's urban parks. Landscape Urban Plan. 52, 165–171.

28. Yuen, B., Hien, W.N., 2005. Resident perceptions and expectations of rooftop gardens in Singapore. Landscape Urban Plan. 73, 263–276.

29. Al-Hathloul, S., Mughal, M.A., 1999. Creating identity in new communities: case studies from Saudi Arabia. Landscape Urban Plan. 44, 199–218.

30. Shafer, C.S., Lee, B.K., Turner, S., 2000. A tale of three greenway trails: user perceptions related to quality of life. Landscape Urban Plan. 49, 163–178.