Urbanization’s environmental imprint: A review

Jyotsana Pandit
Department of Environmental Science, School of Sciences, P.P. Savani University, Surat, India.
Anish Kumar Sharma
Department of Biotechnology, School of Sciences, P.P. Savani University, Surat, India.

ARTICLE INFO

Received : 11 February 2022
Revised : 27 March 2022
Accepted : 04 April 2022
Available online: 26 July 2022

Key Words:
Air pollution
Ecological Footprint
Sustainability indicators
Urban stream syndrome

ABSTRACT

The urban population interact with their environment and change it through the consumption of resources. The changed condition may impact the wellbeing and life nature of the urban population. The uncontrollable growth of urbanization has been reported to be dangerous for mental health and sanity of many citizens. Urban areas whether small or megacities each generate an ecological footprint. The present day urbanization, consequently requires a sustainable development pattern and changes in present day styles of boom to cause them to be more equitable and more resource and energy efficient. As of now, urban administration is to a great extent concentrated on single issues, for example, water, transportation, or waste. A multi scale administration framework that expressly inscribes interconnected asset chains and interconnected spots is essential as a way to transition closer to sustainable urbanization which require, prevention of urban pollution, decreasing production capacity and supporting recycling, while discouraging non-profit development and fading poor and rich differences. Therefore, the present study was conducted to clarify the effect of urbanization on the environmental quality, resource use and sustainability. The study conducted throughout the globe indicated sustainable urbanization can be achieved by following concept of development wherein natural resources are restored and not replaced by technology.

Introduction

One of the greatest social changes of current time is urbanization. It is the segment procedure whereby most extreme portion of the national populace lives in urban settlements (Arouiet et al., 2014). Historically, it has been viewed as a crucial device for social turn of events. It is exceptionally viable for financial development, as it produces economies of scale for business, fosters an innovative environment and delivers higher wages and profits (Cohen, 2006). A 2.5 billion increment in urban populace is anticipated by 2050, with 90% of the expansion moved in Asia and Africa (Aguilar et al., 2022; UN, 2015). Quick and unregulated development of the world's urban areas is joined by a few externalities. As per reports by UNCHS (1987) 600 million urban tenants resides in dangerous situations because of poor sanitation and housing (Gelbardet et al., 1999). The detonating populations of the evolving world compound everlasting issues, for example, starvation, destitution and ecological debasement. The ecological ramifications of quick urbanization are extraordinary and wide extending, with the effects regularly outflanking the populace development. Quick endless suburbia is a significant variable influencing different natural issues since it straightforwardly influences the spatial grouping of individuals, vitality utilization, water use, industry, business, squander age, and other ecological stresses (Bartoncet et al., 1992). In China, India and Mexico City ubiquitous degrees of air contamination has been seen as of late. Municipal solid waste is a noteworthy issue for urban communities. Around, 3 billion urban inhabitants...
create 1.2 kg of waste a day - 1.3 billion tons for each year (World Bank, 2012). This brings different difficulties, for example, GHG from moving waste, deficiency of land for landfill destinations marine contamination from beach front urban areas, and wellbeing risks from casual dumps and untreated waste. The natural effect of city size is commonly viewed as negative. It is expected that, bigger the city, more prominent is the per capita ecological expenses or harms. Prudhomme(1994)expressed that what at last tallies isn't the manner by which contamination released, yet rather contamination released less contamination disposed of. The connections among urbanization and ecological crumbling are mind boggling, including interlinkages with the common and the constructed condition, just as different social, political and financial components.Hence, to maintain environmental sustainability, it is obligatory to understand the linkage between them and also how natural environment is being affected by urbanization. This article reviews first handknowledge linking environment and urbanization, emphasizing on variousaspects such as biodiversity, land use, air quality, water quality, solid waste generation and way forward for sustainable urbanization.

Urban land use and environmental impacts
In spite of the fact that lion's share of the total populace is controlled by urban communities, urban zones comprise under 1% of the World's property cover (Schneider et al., 2010). The effect of urban land use change is excessively huge when contrasted with the zone it possesses and these effects happen at a scope of scales, from nearby and territorial to worldwide, as an outcome of physical progressions of living and nonliving materials, and teleconnections of practical assets (Grimm et al., 2010). It shapes neighbour-hood and worldwide atmosphere by adding to altered rainfall an altered rainfall and heat island effects (Wang et al., 2004), drives international trade in agriculture and forestry (Meyfroidtet al., 2013) and alters local biodiversity and the environment (Aronsonet al., 2014). Urban focuses tend to agglomerate, framing urban groups or urban halls, along which transportation and different types of improvement regularly occur (Wang et al., 2004). Such spatial bunches can go about as hubs that impact land-use mosaics of whole regions (Seto et al., 2012). Older urban settlements tend to be compact with with slower growth rates, moderately unsurprising mosaic of focused development, while new urban settlements show significant and spatially complex development patterns (Ramalho and Hobbs, 2012). There are exchange offs that should be deliberately viewed as, for example, urban smallness may lessen non-renewable energy source use for transportation and energy consumption, however it reduces groundwater infiltration and enhances UHI (Jabareen, 2013). Huge harm to the environment is brought about by uncontrolled development, frequently named as “concrete jungles”. For example, energy needs causes resource depletion, expanding number of vehicles adds to extreme air contamination and untreated sewage causes water contamination.

The process of urbanization, and the related increase in impervious surfaces, affects other types of land use and land cover, triggering a series of effects on the environment, which results in it being the main cause of land degradation. The main effects consist of the loss of fertile soils, the adverse impact on water balance, the increase in surface water runoff and flood risk, the negative influence on local microclimates due to urban heat islands, landscape fragmentation, and the loss of biodiversity (Asennato et al., 2022).

In order to oblige the ever-developing populace spontaneous development has been completed, which generates dangers, aggravates hitherto problematic circumstances in urban communities, and makes them untenantable. The methodology of keen urban communities is picking up prominence with governments over the world, have fabulous designs to update existing urban communities by means of the combination of frameworks advances to expand efficiencies of utilization. Be that as it may, they have been studied, for the absence of law based interest of individuals in the arranging procedure, for the predominant pretended by outside private ventures, and for escalating urban ecological treacheries, as saw in various brilliant city ventures in India and across Africa (Watson, 2014).

Urbanization and biodiversity
As the global urban population is poised to grow by 2.5 billion over the next 30 years, urban land
conversions are expected to be an increasingly prominent driver of habitat and biodiversity loss (Simkin et al., 2022). The interlinkage among urbanization and biodiversity is manifold and compound (McKinney, 2002). Urban development may prompt habitat fracture, bringing about segment or hereditary detachment of local species (Ricketts, 2001). It has both immediate and aberrant effects on biodiversity. Direct effects basically comprise of altered disturbance regimes, habitat degradation, changed soils and other physical changes brought about by the development of urban regions. Circuitous effects include increases in abiotic stressors, competition rivalry from non-local species, changes in water and supplement accessibility and changes in herbivory and predation rates (Pickett and Cadenasso, 2009). Biodiversity is influenced by both the size and spatial arrangement of urban areas (Tratalos, 2007). The composition of the landscape is changed by physical expansion and may modify or take out the conditions inside a living space that is required by species to endure. Urban extension influences local species through changes in living space arrangement and connectivity (Bierwagen, 2007). It additionally presents significant danger to endemic species because of expanded occurrence of colonization by presented species (McKinney, 2008). It decreases, fragments and confines common patches by modifying the shape estimate and interconnectivity of the regular terrain (Alberti, 2005). Anthropogenic activities exercises in urban communities can have a heap of falling impacts that impacts biodiversity, remembering changes for biogeochemistry (Grimm et al., 2008) neighborhood temperature (Arnfield, 2003), atmosphere change (Wilby and Perry, 2006) and hydrographic systems (Booth et al., 2004). Urban development delivers the absolute most noteworthy nearby eradication rates and as often as possible disposes of the vast larger part of local species (Marzluff, 2001). It replaces the local species with across the board "weedy" nonnative species bringing about diminished organic uniqueness of neighborhood ecosystems (Blair, 2001). Different urban slope contemplating uncovered that, for some taxa, for instance, plants (Kowarik, 1995) and flying creatures and butterflies (Blair and Launer, 1997) the number of local species diminishes toward focuses of urbanization, while non local species increments. The most minimal species decent varieties along the urban rustic inclination happen in the seriously "fabricated" situations of the urban center as revealed by numerous investigations. **Urbanization and air quality** Air pollution has become significant worry all through the world in both, advanced and advancing nations. Urban populace have brought about the predominance of the segment of private vehicles in urban transportation framework prompting serious air contamination influencing the encompassing environment (Gulia et al., 2015). Modern transformation presented the creation of tremendous amounts of toxins discharged into the air that are hurtful to condition, despite the fact that it was an extraordinary accomplishment regarding society, innovation and the arrangement of different administrations. Urbanization and industrialization are arriving at extraordinary and upsetting extents worldwide in our period. Anthropogenic air contamination represents around 9 million passings for each year and is one of the greatest general wellbeing perils around the world. The significant wellsprings of air contamination is the road transport division. It has been accounted for that more than 70–80% of air contamination in creating countries is attributed to vehicular emanations brought about by an enormous number of more seasoned vehicles combined with poor vehicle support, low fuel quality and insufficient street infrastructure (Badami, 2005). Re-suspension of street dust because of development of traffic and tire and brake wear likewise add to surrounding PM concentrations in urban areas (Amato et al., 2014). The non uniform appropriation of encompassing air contamination focuses in urban territories, make problem areas generally in focal business region, traffic crossing points and signalized roadways (Kandlikar, 2007). Air contamination predominantly influences those living in enormous urban regions, where street outflows contribute the most to the corruption of air quality (Manisalidis et al., 2020). Due to rapid urbanization cities are growing in terms of population and physical size, resulting in increased demand for travel and change in travel behavior (Chowdhury, 2013). Huge urban communities in Europe, Latin America and North America have better air quality, though those in India and China have the most exceedingly terrible air quality (Han
India's urban communities are under extensive hazard because of air contamination. Urban contamination as estimated by PM2.5 level is as of now about 40% over as far as possible across significant Indian urban communities, (for example, Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata, Pune and so on.) In India, there exists spatial heterogeneity as territories with various climatological conditions populace and training levels create distinctive indoor air characteristics, with higher PM2.5 observed in North Indian states (557–601 μg/m³) contrasted with the Southern States (183–214 μg/m³) (Saud et al., 2012).

**Urbanization and water quality**

With the emergence of urbanization the scope of necessities for water has expanded along with more noteworthy requests for better quality water. With development of an area, various water quality issues are created. According to UN WWAP (2003) each day, 2 million tons of sewage and business and agricultural waste are discharged into the world’s water. As per United nation’s estimation measure of wastewater created every year is around 1,500 km³, multiple times more water than exists in all the streams of the world. The ecosystem structure is altered because of the absence of adequate interest in foundation contrasted with the quick pace of urbanization, frequently prompting a diminished limit of biological system administrations, for example, water cleansing. Mallin et al. (2016) reported that urban territories have the most steady and universal impacts on water quality due noteworthy heap of pollutants from point and non-point sources and the expanded impenetrable surface spread. Direct overflow from urbanized surfaces has risen as a genuine danger to the biological estimations of water environments and arrangement of good quality water required for all financial functions (Brionet et al., 2015). Serious release of supplements and contaminants from urban regions prompts a predictable decrease in the wellbeing of urban amphibian biological systems, a condition for the most part alluded to as the urban stream disorder.

When rain water comes in contact with urban surfaces, it becomes contaminated with pollutants resulting in contamination of water bodies. Production industries boom as a result of urbanization, resulting into production of even more wastes than before. There is increase in the proportion of impervious surface with the growth of urban area resulting in reduced infiltration of water and lower water tables (Simwela, 2018). Populace development and increments in untreated sewage were the fundamental driver of water quality weakening in waterways in the Territory of Sao Paulo, Brazil (Groppo et al., 2008). Ma et al. (2009) stated that sharp increments in modern contamination and household release were the significant reasons for water quality weakening in the Shiyang Waterway, Northwest China. Zhang et al. (2015) revealed that ammonium fixations in urban streams were three to multiple times higher than in nonurban waterways. Extending masses, urbanization and developing interest from farming just as industry have brought India's water assets under pressure (Kurunthachalam, 2013). As per WHO half of India's grimness is water related (Murty and Kumar, 2011). Improper sewage disposal, unchecked industrial effluents entering the water sources, may be sometimes due to runoff phenomenon and the unprotected nature of natural water sources itself, is leading to poor water quality of surface water sources (Pandit and Bhardwaj, 2020).

**Urbanization and waste generation**

Solid waste has emerged as one of the most serious problem being faced by urban centres all over the world. Changing ways of life, insufficient strategies, and absence of mindfulness in creating nations may expand it exponentially throughout the following decade. Large economies like China, India, Japan, USA and France are seeing the unabated development in squander age and its effect on condition is developing quick which may exacerbate in future (Ray, 2008). As the reaction of urban lifestyle, the measure of urban solid waste is building up significantly speedier than the pace of urbanization. World waste creation is depended upon to associate with 27 billion tons for every year by 2050, 33% of which will start from Asia, with critical commitments from China and India (Modak et al., 2010). In urban locales waste generation of India will be 0.7 kg per individual consistently in 2025, roughly four to multiple times higher than in 1999 (Kumar et al., 2017). Urban populace generates 0.045 Kg methane per kg waste by solid waste disposal (IPCC, 1996). A great part
of the squanders produced around the world (57 to 85%) are every now and again arranged in landfills, including open and built landfills (Wilson, 2015). Leachate control varies throughout the landfills of the growing world and it poses a hazard to local surface and ground water systems (Alam and Ahmade, 2013). The IPCC evaluated that solid waste management represented roughly 3% of worldwide Green House Gases outflows in 2010 with the vast majority of that as an outcome of methane emanations from landfill sites (IPCC, 2013). However, current endeavors to "decouple the loss from the riches" has caused the lower period of waste per unit of Gross domestic product in certain nations, which shows the lucky opening for urban communities to discover higher responses for this basic open bearer of present day cities (UNEP, 2013).

II Resource use pattern of urban and rural population

In 1800 just around 2 percent of the total populace lived in urban zones. The only strategy urban zones kept up their reality till as of late was by the nonstop movement of provincial folks (Keyfitz, 1989). In precisely two hundred years, the world's urban populace has developed from 2 percent to about 50. The most putting instances of the urbanization of the arena are the megacities of 10 million or more people (UNDESAPD, 2004). A great deal of urban movement is pushed by method of country populaces' decision for the advantages that city territories offer (National Research Council, 2003). A lot of urban relocation is driven by rustic populaces' craving for the preferences that urban regions offer. Urban points of interest includes more possibilities to get hold of schooling, fitness care, and services inclusive of amusement. Urbanization of the world is probably going to slow populace development and concentrate a few environmental effects geographically. Individuals who remain in city territories have altogether different asset use designs than residents in rustic areas (Parikh, 1991). Urban populaces'devour far more food, energy, and goods that are durable as compared to rural populations (Taylor and Hardee, 1986). This expanded utilization is an element of urban work markets, wages, and family unit structure. The utilization of energy for power, transportation, cooking, and warming is far higher in urban zones than in rustic towns. Increased energy consumption is likely to have deleterious effects that are environmental. It makes urban warmth islands that can change nearby weather patterns and weather downwind from the warmth islands. The blend of the expanded energy distinction and utilization in albedo implies that urban communities are hotter than provincial areas (Goudie, 1997). These urban heat islands become traps for atmospheric pollutants. Urbanization also affects the broader environments that are regional. Locales downwind from huge mechanical buildings additionally observe increments in the measure of precipitation, air contamination, and thunderstorms. Urban areas affect weather patterns and the spillover designs for water. They for the most part create more downpour, however the water invasion is reduced thus lowering the water tables resulting in greater run off with greater peak flows. A large number of the effects of urban regions on the earth are not so much immediate. Bigger urban locales don't for the most part make progressively common issues and small urban territories can cause issues that are huge. The degree of the ecological effects is dictated by how the urban populaces carry on, their utilization and living examples, not exactly how enormous they are and little urban regions can cause gives that are colossal.

III Urban sustainability

Urban sustainability is defined as the process by which measurable long-term social development can be achieved through actions in the environment, economic and social magnitude. The use of sustainability indicators is increasingly needed to achieve sustainability (Pandit et al., 2021). It truly is a multiscale and multidimensional issue that centers around as well as rises above urban wards and which must be tended to by tough initiative, resident association, and territorial organizations alongside vertical collaborations among various legislative levels. There are four main principles to advance urban sustainability viz: Human and characteristic frameworks are soundly interlaced and met up in urban zones; Urban imbalance undermines supportability attempts; The planet has biophysical limits; Urban communities are astoundingly interconnected. A city or district can't be supportive if its standards and activities toward its own, neighborhood level supportability don't scale up to manageability all around. As the world quickly urbanizes, accomplishing sustainable
Urbanization in urban networks is quickly transforming into an overall concern (Newman and Jennings, 2008). Since the late 19th century, the problems resulted from modern urban development has appeared as different urban crisis in three dimensions of environment, social and economic, which has made these communities unsustainable and made experts think about other methods of urban development patterns. The issue of achieving urban sustainable development is in this manner a significant test (Moussiopoulos, 2010). With sustainability since the objective, the use of pointers for urban checking and guideline has gotten progressively more in demand (Repetti and Desthieux, 2006). Sustainability indicators are a strong base with regards to normal and long haul track of the advancement enlisted in the accomplishment of key goals of economical turn of events and furthermore the assessment of different regions of sustainability (Hernándezmoreno and Dehoyosmartínez, 2010). They provided the past and present trends of any particular issue and acts as a supporting tool for future decisions. There are three sustainability indicators namely economic, social and environment. Economic indicators emphasize on local financial resilience, Social indicators focus on participation in democratic process and Environment indicators highlight use of resources at sustainable rate (Kotharkar et al., 2011). Later and progressing research infers that human demands on our planet's systems are expanding, possibly beyond sustainable operating limits (Rockström et al., 2009). This suggests the need for systemic, crosscutting appraisals, which could address and look at the contending requests from the planet's limited biosphere. Ecological Footprint Accounting (Wackernagelet al., 2002) distinguishes a specific ecological budget – biocapacity- and the degree to which human demands for biocapacity surpass this budget – the Ecological Footprint. Ecological footprint is an example of a sustainability indicator with an environmental core interest. It evaluates the amount of space that an individual or a city utilizes in order to survive on an international level respectively worldwide (WackernagelandRees, 1996). It mirrors the urban lifestyle (Weiland, 2006). While urban areas can be focal points of advancement and multifaceted collaboration, the ecological footprint of the world's urban communities reaches out a long ways past these urban focuses' physical limits, and glaring financial inconsistencies exist inside and between cities (Keivani, 2010). From 1961 to 2010, accounts show that human interest for boundless resources and natural administrations extended by about 140% (from 7.6 to 18.1 billion worldwide hectares), showing up at a point where the planet's bioproductive region (extended from 9.9 to 12 billion worldwide hectares) isn't any more extended adequate to help the contending demands (Galliet al., 2014). Today, the World's human people is about 7.62 billion and the environmental impression of the planet is high so much, that it will take for all intents and purposes 1.7 Earths to satisfy the requests of this populace. India has an ecological footprint of 1.12 global hectares (gha) per individual and a biocapacity of 0.45 gha per individual which implies it is a 'biocapacity debtor' or an 'ecologically deficit country' with there being a 148 per cent more interest than flexibly on its normal resources (NFA, 2014).

**Conclusion**

Urbanization has been, and will keep on being, one of the greatest cultural changes. While urban zones can be habitats for social and financial portability they are beset by growing problems of environmental deterioration. Numerous types of development disintegrate deteriorate the natural assets whereupon they ought to be based, and ecological debasement can sabotage financial turn of events. As opposed to fear "the unavoidable," we have to figure out how to relieve the environmental imprints of urbanization. Unquestionably, urban sustainability is the need of great importance. Urban areas carry out their activities With the advent of energy efficient innovation, an agreeable connection between environment and development is feasible. It is time that every single one of us receive a 'energy proficient and green' mentality and utilize the natural assets accessible impartially, wisely and spare them for our people in the future, as the most ideal approach to anticipate future is to make it.
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