

Social Planning and Social Sustainability in Megacities

Saeed Nasiri Majd^{1*}, Manoochehr Tabibian²

¹M.A. of Civil Planning, Department of Architecture and Urbanism, Qazvin Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran

² Full Professor, Department of Architecture and Urbanism, Qazvin Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran.

Received: December 12, 2014

Accepted: March 9, 2015

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed determination of social planning and social sustainability in the context of megacities. The purpose of social planning is to improve the living circumstances of people and societies through examination, commitment and accomplishment. Social planning can best be defined as the foundation of urban work. Social sustainability is associated with how people, societies and residents live with each other and appreciate the purposes of development models which they have chosen for themselves, also considering the physical boundaries of their places and planet earth in general. However, it seems necessary to provide a basis for integration of principles of social sustainability into practices of social planning. The present paper might provide a new perspective for city planners and city policy makers in order to make the existing cities and megacities more socially sustainable and design sustainable megacities in future.

KEYWORDS: Megacities, social planning, social sustainability, urban planning.

1- INTRODUCTION

Big cities have continuously showed diversity. They have continually been more than just compactly constructed places, centers of economic influence or concentrations of residents. They have similarly been market spaces and have involved currents of different people who have conventionally exchanged belongings and thoughts. These arrivals of outsiders have encouraged cities to become centers for the arts, for creativeness and for novelty. Today, yet, the city's diversity takes a new aspect, not least since it has been reduced to ethnic diversity. A number of improvements have contributed to this growth: globalization; political, economic and social reformation; and rescaling of authority. In addition, the current financial, economic and now social crisis should be considered (Vranken, 2014). The definition of megacity is clearly subjective because how population is focused has the final say to differentiate megacities from other urban zones which is subjected to change at different times. Although the ancient Rome was a megacity with its over one million population, London or Chicago, nowadays, can be regarded megacities while they fall below the ten million UN threshold (Bugliarello, 1999).

Megacities frequently appear owing to alliance of a few settlement points (for example Tokyo). A megacity can similarly be established from a single, rapidly-developing urban center. This can be regarded for the circumstances where clear kinds of growths are positioned at the boundary of the urban center. As other growths are persistently involved in the margin, the specific urban center grows resulting in development of a megacity (Labisi, 2012). Megacities provide extensive chances for occupation and investment. The accumulation of people similarly allows the probability for a well-organized and sustainable administration of capitals as a result of lower expenses per capita for e.g. the provision of piped water or the collection and disposal of garbage (Satterthwaite 1999; as cited in Heinrichs et al. 2007). Currently, international organizations and administrations identify that the prospect of cities, which accommodate high fractions of informal and poor districts, will be substantially determined by the effectiveness of social inclusion and advancement of strategies. Therefore, there is a growing cognizance that the scale and complication of the problems present in informal neighborhoods is a chief expansion matter which needs organized efforts of multidisciplinary approaches and unified activities at diverse scales (Lall and Lall, 2007; as cited in Calderon, 2012). In this order of concepts, participatory urban advancement schemes have become progressively supported as today's best practice (Imparato and Ruster, 2003; as cited in Calderon, 2012).

Urban planning needs a precise socialstructure, including the contributionof performers at diverse levels, with an actual delivery of tasks in order to accomplish urban strategies. Taken together, the present study was formulated in order to determine different aspects of social planning and social sustainability in megacities.

*Corresponding Author: Saeed Nasiri Majd, M.A. of Civil Planning, Department of Architecture and Urbanism, Qazvin Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran. E-mail: saeed_nasirimajd@yahoo.com

2- Social planning in megacities

Social planning is typically defined as the procedure by which a group or community chooses its objectives and plans concerning social matters, for instance features of the quality of life and the conditions of living in society. It concentrates on social externalities, rearrangement, and the equitable delivery of social welfare. This is not an activity restricted to administration, but comprises activities of the private sector, social activities, vocations and other administrations concentrated especially on social purposes. Social planning is approached in a widespread range of means because of diverse practices of the expressions “social” and “planning” (Hulchanski, 1999).

The aim of social planning is to develop the living conditions of persons and societies via investigation, commitment and accomplishment. Social planning can best be defined as the basis for civic work. Societies themselves, and civic organizations, involve in social planning to choose what must be prepared, how it must be completed, and to involve and activate others. Over the last two decades, social planning has become less investigation-driven and more community-concentrated. Social planning has progressively begun to encompass societies outlining their objectives and visions, confirming that societies have the tools and capabilities to involve in such work, and that the result of social planning has some influence. As a result, more effort has been located on making argument, discussion and distribution of information, containing support for encouragement work. In recent years, the number of administrations and groups which straightly engage in social planning activities has extended considerably, chiefly with the development of single matter advocacy groups and systems, which often combine social investigation, community teaching and mobilization, and strategy and media support (Zizys et al. 2004).

Social factors are recognized as a vital component as a consequence of the influence they make to building vibrant and comprehensive societies. Six parts are recognized as significant supports for social and cultural life: a sense of community character and belonging; tolerance, respect and engagement with people from different cultures, background and beliefs; friendly, co-operative and helpful behavior in neighborhoods; opportunities for cultural, leisure, community, sport and other activities; low levels of crime and anti-social behavior with visible, effective and community-friendly policing; and chances for all people to be socially encompassed and have comparable life chances (Hall, 2012).

3- Social sustainability in megacities

Social sustainability is related to how persons, societies and citizens live with one another and set out to realize the aims of development models which they have selected for themselves, also taking into account the physical limitations of their places and planet earth all together. At a more functioning level, social sustainability stems from actions in key thematic areas, incorporating the social kingdom of persons and societies, which varies from capacity building and skills development to environmental and spatial dissimilarities. In this regard, social sustainability combines traditional social strategy areas and principles, for instance equity and health, with developing issues concerning participation, requirements, social wealth, the economy, the environment, and more lately, with the concepts of happiness, well-being and quality of life (Colantonio and Dixon, 2009).

In the concept of urban social sustainability, several important subjects recognized by many authors are summarized by Colantonio (2008a and 2008b), showing how basic needs and equity are constantly being held as fundamental pillars of social sustainability (cited in Mak and Peacock, 2011). The chronological investigation of social sustainability themes likewise specifies how these traditional themes, such as equity, poverty reduction and livelihood, are progressively been perfected or substituted by more intangible and less assessable perceptions such as character, sense of place and the benefits of social networks. In the past few years the idea of social sustainability has moved toward being seen as dependent on social networks, community influence, a sense of place, and community stability and security (Glasson and Wood, 2009; as cited in Mak and Peacock, 2011).

By reviewing related literature, Dixon and Woodcraft (2013) divided factors affecting social sustainability in cities (in our case, megacities) into two groups, namely non-physical factors and predominantly physical factors, as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Effective factors of social sustainability in cities (Dixon and Woodcraft, 2013)

non-physical factors	predominantly physical factors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Education and training ● Social justice – inter- and intra-generational ● Participation and local democracy ● Health, quality of life and wellbeing ● Social inclusion (and eradication of social exclusion) ● Social capital ● Community ● Safety ● Mixed tenure ● Fair distribution of income ● Social order ● Social cohesion ● Community cohesion (i.e. between and among different groups) ● Social networks ● Social interaction ● Sense of community and belonging ● Employment ● Residential stability (versus turnover) ● Active community organizations ● Cultural traditions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Urbanity ● Attractive public realm ● Decent housing ● Local environmental quality and amenity ● Accessibility (for example to local services and facilities/employment/green space) ● Sustainable urban design ● Neighborhood ● Walkable neighborhood – pedestrian-friendly

Many of those mentioning social sustainability draw upon the meaning of sustainable development presented in the Brundtland Report, *Our Common Future*: “*Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*” (WCED, 1987, as cited in Vallance et al. 2011). This meaning is extremely attractive since it holds the likelihood of integration people’s requirements with bio-physical environmental organization objectives via economic development. It includes the spirit of a much larger concept that tries to report both tangible and less tangible provisions for life which, in turn, was understood to rest on reviving development; altering the quality of development; meeting important requirements for jobs, food, energy, water, and sanitation; guaranteeing a sustainable level of population; preserving and improving the resource base; reorienting technology and managing risk; merging the environment and economics in decision-making; and reorienting international economic relations. The report obviously denotes that “*the distribution of power and influence within society lies at the heart of most development challenges*” (cited in Vallance et al. 2011). New scholarship has, though, emphasized methods where practice related to the idea has been unsuccessful to considerably advance the circumstances of the poor (Vallance et al. 2011).

One of the challenges of providing sustainable communities is the trouble of recognizing appropriate measures of accomplishment. Some these troubles are wellbeing and a sense of community and calls for government bodies to develop new approaches to gathering data. A set of social sustainability indices for determining the social scopes of urban regeneration has been proposed. It defines these metrics as different from traditional social indicators that deliver a static examination of statistical social data, with a key alteration being analysis of the priorities acknowledged and decided by local shareholders, and the procedures and elucidations that are applied instead of the statistical outcomes. The indicators include how connected inhabitants feel to one another, or the sense of place in the community, the delivery of and admission to services, green design features, proximity to businesses and occupation, cultural activities, and community participation (Hall, 2012).

A nearly infinite list of social conflicts exist in contemporary urbanization. The subjects that are the most significant in conserving social integration must be maintained, the factors that are appropriate for global assessment, in spite of local features. Urban zones include the most varied examples of social complications and their management; they propose a diversity of government levels, and demonstrate that public participation takes many procedures. Urban struggles cause social exclusion. Social exclusion characterizes the main hazard to social integration. When a part of the local society is excluded from urban social life, the labor market, satisfactory accommodation, education, etc., it may, in long term, challenges urban life in general. Some characteristically global urban social conflicts that are significant from the opinion of social integration include urban poverty, migration and minorities, housing and urban renewal, spatial segregation (Enyedi, 2004).

Basiago (1999) defined substrates of social sustainability in planning practice for Kerala, India. It seems that the substrates can be generalized for all cities, especially megacities. Table 2 depicts criteria and means of the social sustainability in urban planning.

Table 2: Substrates of social sustainability in planning practice (Basiago, 1999)

Element	Criteria	Means
Social sustainability	Equity	1. View natural resources as limited in nature
	Empowerment	2. Cultivate the lushness of the settlement area
	Accessibility	3. Stress equitable distribution over production
	Participation	4. Rely on information, not machinery
	Sharing	5. Establish deliberative decision process
	Cultural Identity	6. Value family/community over individuals
	Institutional Stability	7. Work for enjoyment rather than avoiding toil
		8. Cherish folk life rather than entertainment
		9. Reduce family size and resource use
		10. Eliminate divisions of clan, caste, class
		11. Practice gender-neutral opportunity policies
		12. Strive for universal education of population
		13. Address disparities in economic attainment
		14. Level the economic playing field for all
		15. Make all citizens economic stake-holders
		16. Sponsor land reform to give land to its tillers
		17. Subsidize food, health care, and education
		18. Work deliberately to use resources efficiently
		19. Address 'wellness needs' of the population
		20. Meet 'wellness needs' on an all-for-one basis

The notion of social sustainability is progressively being examined and considered both by researchers and experts. Although extensive definitions are frequently imprecise, a better understanding of the features that reinforce the notion inside diverse areas could simplify the understanding this multifaceted notion (Weingaertner and Moberg, 2014).

4- CONCLUSION

Development of megacities can be considered a recently-appearing phenomenon. Development of megacities are majorly based upon principles of urban planning. One of the most important principles of urban planning is social planning which is inseparable from principles of social sustainability. Social planning attempts to make social changes. That's why, social planning should try to create revolutions in order to follow a special purpose. One of the most important requirement of having socially sustainable megacities is social planning. However, not many research works have focused on determination of challenges, frameworks, and obstacles of taking principles of social sustainability into the context of social planning. It seems very necessary for city planners and policy makers to consider principles of social planning in their urban planning perspectives.

REFERENCES

- Basiago, A.D. (1999). Economic, Social, and Environmental Sustainability in Development Theory and Urban Planning Practice. *The Environmentalist*, 19: 145-161.
- Bugliarello, G. (1999). Megacities and the developing world; *The Bridge*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 19-26.
- Calderon, C. (2012). Social Urbanism - Integrated and Participatory Urban Upgrading in Medellin, Colombia. In Lawrence, Yildiz&Kellett (ed.) "Requalifying the Built Environment: Challenges and Responses". Hogrefe Publishing, Göttingen.
- Colantonio, A. (2008a). *Social Sustainability: Linking Research to Policy and Practice*. Headington, Oxford Brookes University.
- Colantonio, A. (2008b). *Traditional and Emerging Prospects in Social Sustainability. Measuring Social Sustainability: Best Practice from Urban Renewal in the EU*. Headington, Oxford Brookes University: Oxford Institute for Sustainable Development (OISD) - International Land Markets Group.
- Colantonio, A., Dixon, T. (2009). *Measuring Socially Sustainable Urban Regeneration in Europe*. Oxford Institute for Sustainable Development (OISD), School of the Built Environment, Oxford Brookes University.
- Dixon, T., Woodcraft, S. (2013). *Creating Strong Communities – Measuring Social Sustainability in New Housing Development*. University of Reading.

- Enyedi, G. (2004). Public participation in socially sustainable urban development, Published in 2004, with the support of UNESCO/MOST Program and Centre for Regional Studies (Hungarian Academy of Sciences) with the co-operation of MTANITA Foundation (Budapest, Hungary) and the Hungarian MOST Liason Committee.
- Glasson, J., Wood, G. (2009). Urban Regeneration and Impact Assessment for Social Sustainability. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 27, 4, 283-290.
- Hall, P. (2012). *Design for Social Sustainability*, Published by Young foundation, 2nd Edition.
- Heinrichs, D., Nuissl, H., Stelzer, V. (2007). Risk Habitat Megacity - Strategies for Sustainable Development in Megacities and Urban Agglomerations; Forum DKKV/CEDIM: Disaster Reduction in Climate Change, Karlsruhe University.
- Hulchanski, J.D. (1999). *Social Planning Approaches & Issues: Social Planning in Social Welfare*. Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto.
- Imparato, I., Ruster, J. (2003). *Slum Upgrading and Participation: Lessons from Latin America*. Washington: World Bank.
- Labisi, A. (2012). Lagos megacity or mega-slum? Towards a sustainable Lagos megacity development: some basic planning considerations; *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, Vol. 14, No. 6, pp. 145-159.
- Lall, V.D., Lall, S.V. (2007). Improving Lives of Slum Dwellers: Challenges and Strategies. In Munier, N. (Ed.) *Handbook on Urban Sustainability*. The Netherlands: Springer.
- Mak, M., Peacock, C. (2011). *Social Sustainability: A Comparison of Case Studies in UK, USA and Australia*, 17th Pacific Rim Real Estate Society Conference, Gold Coast.
- Satterthwaite, D. (1999). *The Earthscan Reader in Sustainable Cities*. London: Earthscan.
- Vranken, J. (2014). *Social Challenges of Cities of Tomorrow*. Centre OASeS – University of Antwerp (Belgium).
- Vallance, S., Perkins, H.C., Dixon, J.E. (2011). What is social sustainability? A clarification of concepts, *Geoforum* 42: 342–348.
- Weingaertner, C., Moberg, A. (2014). Exploring Social Sustainability: Learning from perspectives on Urban Development and Companies and Products, *Sustainable Development*, 22 (2): 122–133.
- Zizys, T., Kosny, M., Bonnell, J. (2004). *A Review of Social Planning Activities in the City of Toronto*. Social Development and Administration Division Community and Neighborhood Services Department City of Toronto.