

PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

Conceptual nexus of urban liveability and sustainability

To cite this article: Samuel Medayese *et al* 2021 *IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci.* **654** 012027

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

The 17th International Symposium on Solid Oxide Fuel Cells (SOFC-XVII)
DIGITAL MEETING • July 18-23, 2021

EXTENDED Abstract Submission Deadline: February 19, 2021



SUBMIT NOW →

Conceptual nexus of urban liveability and sustainability

Samuel Medayese, Hangwelani Magidimisha-Chipingu, and Lovemore Chipungu

SARChI Chair for Inclusive Cities, University of KwaZulu-Natal, School of Built Environment & Development Studies, College of Humanities, University of KwaZulu-Natal Mazisi Kuene Road, Durban, 4041

Abstract. The term "liveable cities" appeared in the literature during the 1980s in connection with the growing environmental concerns and the increasing competition among global cities to attract foreign investments and boost their economies. Also, the term sustainability emerged in the late 1980s as a warning to space and city users on the need to manage and regulate environmental resource consumption and utilization. While the concept of liveability seeks to utilize environmental resources for better living for urban dwellers, sustainable urban development on the converse tends to warn of the dangers of overuse and consumption of environmental resources. These concepts, much as they are closely related have also been adjudged to have certain intricate tensions in terms of their views on issues relating to utilization and consumption of environmental resources. This research, therefore, seeks to explore the conceptual relationships and tensions between urban liveability and sustainable development. The review of the literature reveals that, much as both concepts are related, they are critically diverse in their promotion of the use of environmental resources.

Keywords: Environmental Resources, City, Urban Liveability, Sustainable Urban Development, Urban Management, Urban Governance

1. Introduction

The origin of the sustainable development concept is traceable to the World Commission on Environment and Development of 1987 and since then it has taken the centre stage in the evaluation of development dimension in most cities of the world. The concept as the broad goal of achieving inter- and intra-generational equity. Sustainable development in principles advocates a balance in consideration of social, economic, and environmental issues while developing activities within space. It was however, observed, that, pursuing the objectives of sustainable development are laudable but elusive in practice. To bridge the gap between sustainable development in practice and principles, a global action plan "Agenda 21" was formulated at the Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. Agenda 21 expatiated the need for indicators and local initiatives to benchmark sustainability [58]. One important aspect of the agenda is the participation of the local authorities especially at the city level towards achieving global sustainable development.

Urban design and planning were also observed to offer an opportunity in guiding city development towards sustainability [53]. This is because most urban areas use planning to determine present and future use of space within the city precinct. It is therefore safe to conclude that a reliable way of



achieving sustainability within the city space by local authorities is through making their land use planning process sustainable [5]. As planning has a vital role in achieving sustainable urban development; the planning process and the outcome of planning should be guided by the principles of sustainable development. Thus, urban design conceptualizations should include a sustainable dimension in the design guidelines which hitherto refer to morphological, functional, social, and visual dimensions.

Sustainable cities constitute a critical factor on the development focus of nations, but of greater importance in developing countries because of the experience of burgeoning urbanization [67, 59]. The rapid urbanization often culminate into land-use practices that disregard future generations' needs and inevitably cause problems such as urban sprawl [8], haphazard development [28], and the collapse of public services [58], brownfields [8], and overcrowding [62]. This situation has led to sedimentation of watersheds [20], urban pollution [6], increase in natural and man-made risks [66], soil degradation [31] and damage to pristine natural landscapes [4; 58].

Sustainable development has however, been considered as a fuzzy concept [26; 64] encapsulated in the seminal definition by the Bruntland Commission as “Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” [62]. For urban land use to be sustainable it must meet the needs of the current as well as future urban citizens [65]. Accordingly, city officials must heed the call by today's citizens to alter land use without compromising the ability of future generations' needs. Sustainable development and urban land use planning are therefore noted as noble concepts [27], but the critical challenge is the way to operationalize these concept [22]. It is of great importance that they should be incorporated into a broad development decision framework to guide daily, personal, business, or policy decisions [27, 30]. But these grand intentions are difficult to monitor and implement given their complexity, vagueness, and, at times, immeasurable tenets [67]. Sustainability often remains a condition that can be used and abused by various stakeholders without clearly defining what sustainability implies in land use planning [26]. A model of sustainable development is required which accurately captures and allocates costs, such as environmental damage, pollution, and land consumption which hampers the liveability capacity of the City.

Oxford Advanced Learner Dictionary refers to ‘liveable’ as ‘fit to live in’. The term liveability is an umbrella to a variety of meanings which depends both on the objects of measurement and the perspective of those making the measurement [31]. Researchers have agreed that liveability refers to the environment from the perspective of the individual and includes a subjective evaluation of the quality of the place. Liveability is also defined as one of the aspects that could contribute to a high quality of living [17]. This is because the high quality of living will affect citizens' lifestyle and health condition within the built environment. Major city centres in the world have faced challenges in keeping the city safe and increase the residents' health condition, economic stability as well as providing excellent transportation systems and networks.

Liveability and vibrancy of the built environment are discussed increasingly on a global scale, for example, the Centre for liveable Cities in Singapore opined that liveability can be viewed as 'city through good planning, provides a vibrant, attractive and secure environment for people to live, work and play and encompasses good governance, a competitive economy, high quality of living and environmental sustainability'. In view of the consensus on sustainable development's which is the fact that the three Es alone are not sufficient to guide best practices in contemporary land use planning without considering liveable community values, it is therefore important to consider the interactions amongst the various values. The linkages therefore are the interaction of the four primary values. At the prism's heart lies the elusive, perhaps utopian, perfectly realized sustainable and liveable urban area [22]. Not only does the prism remind us that land-use planning must deal with a three-dimensional spatial world, but it also offers a structure for dealing with value conflicts inherent in the different visions, which results gaps on the linkages of the various aspects of the concept. Tensions between liveability and economic growth result in the "growth management conflict," which arises from competing beliefs in the extent to which

unmanaged development can affect the extent to which high-quality living environments can be achieved [23].

“Tensions between liveability and ecology result in the “green cities conflict,” which arises from competing beliefs in the primacy of the natural versus the built environment [16]. Tensions between liveability and equity result in the “gentrification conflict,” which arises from competing beliefs in the preservation of poorer urban neighbourhoods for the benefit of their present populations versus their redevelopment and upgrading to attract middle- and upper-class populations back to the central. Looking at sustainability, New Urbanism, and Smart Growth through the prism reveals that none of them responds to all four goals nor attempts to resolve all six of the value conflicts to the same degree. While there is considerable variation in the plans produced under each of the three approaches, it can be inferred that some central tendencies from the published descriptions and critiques. Sustainable development values appear high for ecology, economy, and equity, but tend to be more focused on ecology and on resolving the resource conflict between economy and ecology”.

New Urbanism's highest value appears to be liveability, with a focus on resolving the growth management conflict. Smart Growth's highest value also is liveability, though it focuses on resolving both the growth management and the green city conflicts. While the differences in values tend to be matters of degree rather than absolutes, all these do influence planning and development values and the ensuing politics. For example, all the approaches oppose sprawl, the common enemy, but they call for different planning responses to it. Thus, sustainable development tends to see the environment as most threatened by sprawl resulting from economic growth and therefore most in need of government intervention to protect ecological systems. New Urbanism argues that attractive spaces for everyday life are the best defence against sprawl and that the remaining values will fall in line once a compact urban form and attractive public spaces are created through urban design.

2. Narrating the Tenets of Sustainable Urban Development and liveability Mix

“The concept of “liveability” has emerged alongside “sustainability” as a buzzword in public discourse and planning. City competitions and awards for both liveability and sustainability abound. Various development stakeholders have argued in favour of the concept of liveability and the rights of individuals to “liveable” spaces. This idea is most potent and more aggressively pursued in the context of cities, because these are the spaces where, majority of people reside, the engine room for economic activities and consumption; where human impacts on the environment are highly intense and, on the other hand environmental impacts on society are most significant, with respect to population density and economic assets at risk. Planners and policymakers concerned with creating or maintaining liveable cities have long invoked “liveability” as a guiding principle for the investment and decision-making that shape the urban social, economic, physical, and biological environment [28, 48, and 49].”

Their propositions for the creation of liveability presume that, liveability can be analysed by fundamental or immutable characteristics, many of which remain constant through time and across populations. These are considered the “First Principles” of liveability. The notion of a liveable city in the sense of “fit to live in” or “inhabitable” requires two elements to be, and remain, in agreement with each other. One of these concerns the attributes of the population that demands goods and services, such as shelter, energy, water and food, waste management and assimilation, health and public safety, education and entertainment, social engagement, economic contributions, creativity, and much more. In short, from this vantage point, liveability is adjudged through the lens of needs and wants of city inhabitants. And since these needs and wants are most apparent in areas and times of deteriorating infrastructures, declining economic prosperity, and rising social discontent, much attention has historically been given to those places where the provision of services has been inadequate [42, 64] and where, as a consequence, people have suffered.

“The second element of liveability comprises the city's environment, as defined by its physical and biological characteristics; the built infrastructures and ecosystems that provide the goods and services

on which lives and livelihoods in the city depend [5]. At a minimum, these ecosystem services stem from the green spaces and water bodies in and around cities that generate not only amenities, and the economic value, but also provide valuable contributions, examples amongst which include: to local climate regulation, air quality, and flood control. Although it is conceivable that high levels of liveability can be experienced temporarily while undermining ecosystem structure and function, over the long haul, liveability is intricately tied to environmental sustainability. The biophysical environment thus establishes the boundary constraints that affect the ability of urban populations to thrive, yet those constraints themselves are shaped in complex ways by the pressures that urban populations and urban growth exert on infrastructures and ecosystems [53].

Expedient therefore, is the need to give priority attention to urban liveability as a discourse that shapes development and planning activities by planners. Urban liveability provides an opening to discuss not just planning and city-building but the fundamental ability of different kinds of people to live in urban areas and their right to the city [42] for not just the homeless but the working class, the middle class, and the affluent; for people of colour, for immigrants, for women and other vulnerable groups. This opening enables interrogation of the ability and the people who require safety and protection within the city space. It is this point that, hence, give credence to the third leg of the development concept which is inclusiveness. A view of the city space that as highly liveable can create a sense of those that can live and how [51].

3. Contemporary discussions in Sustainable Urban Development

In 1987, the World Commission on Environment and Development [62] defined sustainable development as that which "meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". Sustainability within the urban context, puts it, as "the development of a city's physical structure and systems and its economic base in such a way as to enable it to provide a satisfactory human environment with minimal demands on resources and minimize adverse impacts on the environment" [14]. Within the framework of Africa's urban development, it implies addressing and satisfying the economic, environmental, social, and political concerns of urban residents.

"Another strand of argument pointed out, "the crux of the debate on sustainable development in African cities is how you deal with poverty in these settlements; everything else is academic" [39]. It is further emphasized that any consideration of sustainable development in African cities must have an improvement in the housing, living, and working environments of poorer groups as a central focus [6]. The concept of "sustainable development" has revived discussion about the form of contemporary cities and has motivated scholars and practitioners in different disciplines to seek forms of human settlements that satisfy the requirements of sustainability [34]. In North America, new frameworks have been proposed and addressed at the regional, metropolitan, city, and community levels – smart growth, healthy cities, and new urbanism for redesigning and restructuring urban places to achieve sustainability [22, 23, 12, and 9]. Because city-building efforts in Africa have relied wholly on Western concepts and models, and because these Western-based urban development models are relatively expensive, and have been only partially successful, there is, therefore, the need to revisit Africa's urban past and examine her indigenous urban forms, architecture, and practices, and to adapt some of these practices which are appropriate to the contemporary African context.

4. Contemporary discussions in urban liveability

Liveability is perhaps best understood when juxtaposed against another popular, and similar, concept: sustainability. Sustainability is an elusive concept, hard to grasp by the individual, difficult to operationalize for the planner, and challenging to implement at local scales [10]. It refers to the long run and, by definition, assumes a global perspective because, in an increasingly interlinked world, adverse impacts on social and environmental issues outside a particular region of interest will likely come back to haunt the place of concern in the form of unforeseen, often unintended consequences. There are no clear guidelines established by law or practice for sustainability and its implementation, other than broad

principles that call, for example, for the use of non-renewable resources at rates low enough to allow for their eventual replacement through renewable resources, emissions of waste products within environmental assimilation capacities, and social and economic development that is fair and just [11, 13].

Liveability, in contrast, is about the "now" or "about to be." It also tends to be about the "here," with standards for liveability varying not only from country to country but from city to city. Liveability seems more immediate and tangible, and thus more achievable. Creating liveable communities, rather than sustainable ones, also lies within the purview of local agencies, planners, architects, and policy and investment makers, who shape the environment within which people's needs and aspirations unfold. In many instances, laws and regulations exist that help ensure the promotion and maintenance of safe buildings, reliable provision of water and energy, a clean environment, education, jobs, public health, and other elements of a liveable city. Because of established mandates, institutions and individuals can, at least in principle, be made responsible and held accountable for their lack of attention to liveability.

Once basic needs, such as food, shelter, and security are fulfilled, higher-level wants and aspirations move into the forefront of planning and decision making both at the individual and community level [26, 30]. However, as one moves from basic needs to other determinants of liveability, subjective judgments of what constitutes liveability are introduced. Recent discussions, particularly in the context of developed countries, have framed the notion of a "liveable city" akin to a "desirable city." This shift in emphasis from minimum requirements for liveability to lifestyle choices has brought with it a cottage industry of national and international rankings that compare cities based on material wellbeing, as well as social and environmental performance indicators. This shift is also the conceptual crack that allows the bogey of varying preferences to enter: we may agree, globally even, what minimum standards for liveability might be, but there will be confusion about what constitutes a desirable city.

5. Relationships and Conceptual Tensions between sustainable urban development and liveability

"Liveability" and "sustainability" are common concepts of urban planning and public discourse in general, primarily because of the values, priorities, and behaviours of many individuals and institutions. Generally, consumers should be entitled to "liveable" and "sustainable" communities that raise questions for planners and decision-makers about how to meet the needs and desires of present and future residents. However, the conceptual connections between liveability and sustainability are not fully understood, limiting the agreement to a policy to promote ideals and assessments [50, 49]. This section explains the conceptual tension between liveability and sustainability, differentiates them and combines them, and examines how they can be understood and complemented better. One major finding is that the independent application of concepts of liveability and sustainability of integrated design leaves both concepts ideal, good to understand but limited.

Sustainability is a difficult concept to achieve, and at the same time, it is less difficult to understand it in theory than to implement it in practice. After decades of discussions without agreement on the definition of sustainability, the most common is the Brundtland Commission: "Development meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs" [52, 62]. This definition is criticized since it is too extreme and focused on vague assumptions about the "needs" of current and future generations. More sustainable technical formulas have been proposed, emphasizing the attention of different outcomes, such as the environmental impacts of human activity [64], the economic effects of growth [13], and the effects of these outcomes on social justice [51], among many other things. Recently, scientists and urban researchers from the operational definition of sustainability viewed it as a balance within economic, environmental, and capital interests, with due consideration for intergenerational demands inherent in the Brundtland Commission definition [12, 36, and 10].

On the other hand, the necessary human habits provide the pragmatics required for a philosophical vision of sustainability. The adaptability of "now" and "here" focuses on immediate and concrete conditions and interventions, and therefore is interpreted as the most attainable [52]. Community programs and policies are increasingly emphasized to influence the experience of the place where people live, how they travel to work, and how they interact with each other and with their surroundings to make them more "applicable". "Despite the academic recognition that the ability to live is a subjective concept, there is a consensus that the appropriate community to live is providing diverse options and variety of services available.

"Understanding how sustainability will be built will help planners overcome the current needs of the population with the long-term needs associated with sustainability when basic needs, such as food, shelter, and security, people usually focus on short-term issues, including life preferences [42, 17]. A conflict that arises from beliefs contradicts determining the priorities of natural environments compared to those built; and "conflict improvement" caused by conflicting beliefs in the preservation of neighbourhoods in favour of the current population against renovation to attract the upper-class population. This perspective is important because it provides an additional vision for sustainability discourse, which largely assumes the desired outcome for all. The coordinated realization of these conflicts and the recognition that population values and perceptions of housing affordability can overcome their concerns about sustainability over time can help to design sustainable cities that are also liveable.

While these significant differences between sustainability and liveability are bound by competing principles and the evaluation of different therapeutic remedies to guide the underlying fears, there is an important connection between the two concepts that can help the success of the other. Health interventions represent additional measures that collectively increase the chances of long-term progress toward sustainability. "Sustainable sustainability" has been discussed elsewhere because of urgent short-term meeting needs or desires of the community within a program for a perspective on large-scale and long-term sustainability [3, 32]. Sustainability is, therefore, sustained, but not directly correlated. Instead, sustainable results are produced over time using a series of existing results. Together, the conceptual connections between liveability and sustainability reveal tensions, but also complementarities that can help in the other application.

6. The scale of Measurement of Liveability and Sustainability

The greatest analytic difference is between liveability and sustainability in volume issues, where the initial differences in geography, time, and audience overlap. The numerical tensions between liveability and sustainability are better understood from the family definition of sustainable development: "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs" [62]. This accepted definition offers the global geographic application and examines multi-generational and long-term perspectives that are conceptualized through conversations and the spirit of the common global agenda. In contrast, the concept of residential vision has emerged that the environmental issues such as economic and capital need to be considered for the narrow spatial scale relevant to individuals, families, neighbourhoods, and individual communities in geographically smaller regions [45, 48, 49, 51, and 50]. To strengthen this idea, the 1992 UN Agenda for the Environment and Development agreed to "guide Agenda 21" in their efforts to exist by paying attention to the effects of local activities for the establishment, operation and maintenance of social and environmental infrastructure and supervision of planning and assistance activities in the implementation of national environmental policy [56 and 24].

7. Context of Urban Liveability and Sustainable Urban Development

Context is another organizational principle that reveals the links and differences between Sustainability and liveability, emphasizes how each model responds to the concept of values of interest and how to adapt to all circumstances or changing preferences. Taking housing as a critical infrastructure example, while there exists a constant vision from one of the economic and environmental values and capital, housing is dynamic and evolving in response to changing conditions and values [3, 11, and 2]. The

concept of liveability in the United States has changed over the past 50 years with changes in human values that provide theories and practices of development planning licensed events and 1960 civil rights movement legislation, and lawyers to meet the needs of traditionally marginalized groups [14] as a result.

The focus of the environmental movement of the early 1970s was to protect the natural environment and empowerment of citizens, which have been marginalized by US companies to protect their quality of life [35, 10]. The joint environmental justice movement created in the early 80s noted sustainable development as that development that combines social goals with economic and environmental concerns [54, 52], smart growth, construction, and new movements of living communities that live within an integrated design concept in the 1990s for housing [15, 19]. Now, the first decade of the 2000s saw an increase in values associated with a healthy diet community whose goal type appears in contrast to previous examples, the definitions of profitability have changed over time and geographically with the accompanying human values.

The tension between liveability and sustainability questions is whether the priority should be for "sustainability exists" or "sustainability exists", where there is a distinction between the two by identifying primary and secondary values to emphasize (for example health or existing) to develop a "viable" core value in existing visions, and assume that the ability to live is secondary [3, 29]. From a practical point of view, not taking a sustainable "good" decision always leads to achieving desired outcomes from all points of view (such as economic opportunities, affordability, and public health), especially if it is given little attention if people see these results as viable [24]. Instead, there is evidence that communities "live midwife" is often planned at the expense of existing, allowing preferences and local adaptability to overcome the visions of wide environmentalism [47, 33, 69].

8. Potentials of sustainable urban development and urban liveability

A category of a final organization for recognizing the links between liveability and sustainability is the "ability" to allow change through interventions. The strong local component of housing arises when the possibility of allowing change through planning policies and registries begins by classifying people according to the communities in which they are located [18,45], and the cost of living, the re-introduction of contemporary housing in urban planning discourse creates an opportunity to improve the political importance of political acceptance because of the ability to live divided by success indicators based on local political realities, in which opinion is calculated by local preferences [46]. In contrast to broad environmental visions, the application of housing preferences, such as neighbourhoods that can walk or in safe public spaces, is located within local agencies and planners that can "shape the environment in which needs and aspirations are evolving."

“The combination of these concepts is reflected in the fact that vision, such as integrated programs, is effective only if applied or inspiring. On the turn, there are massive goals that are not divided gradual steps through which to create support for the political and social significance, and therefore is not considered a practical solution, but was considered an ideal model cannot be implemented or achieved. Because the ability of life is reflected in the short term as a means to achieve long-term sustainability of the goal, and can these concepts as circles of positive feedback and promotion to ensure that their policy conditions are locally designed to remain in harmony with existing global goals and stages of the process translated goals towards existing sustainability strategies”.

Although the literature is growing but detailed in what is called a living society and a viable society, less hybridization less. In this sense, the relationship between context and potential can be better reconciled and understood if they are attached to the practice. The next part relates to the number of connections between liveability and sustainability and places them in the context of the last federal society of sustainable societies in the United States. Besides, guidelines were given for the planning of sustainable liveability, and grants were given to applicants who would prove their intention to integrate them in directions in planning, to this end, comprehensive plans of the Fourteen Mississippi Gulf Coast

jurisdictions to determine the level of compliance were assessed on specific sustainability criteria of housing. The evaluation results are used to determine a low, medium, and high compliance program for deeper myths and integration of living conditions with sustainability analysis. There are housing guidelines that will act as community assessment tools and then guidance on planning and investment priorities [59] following guidelines are:

Providing transportation options: develop safe, reliable, and economical transportation options to reduce local transport costs, reduce our country's foreign oil dependence, improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote public health.

Promoting fair and affordable housing: Expand housing options and energy-saving space for people of all ages, incomes, and races to increase mobility and reduce costs along with housing and transportation.

Improving Economic Competitiveness: Competitiveness through rapid and reliable access to employment centres, educational opportunities, services, and other basic needs of employees, as well as market growth and development.

Support for existing community infrastructure: Direct federal funding towards existing communities through strategies such as transportation in the east, multi-use, and land rehabilitation to increase community renewal and the efficiency of public investment in working and protecting rural landscapes.

Against the coordination and exploitation of the investment policy at all levels: Alignment of national funding policy to removing barriers to action and leveraging funding and accountability for increase and efficiency at all levels of government to plan for future growth, including the selection of smart energy, such as renewable energy locally.

Potential Communities and Neighbourhoods Value: Improve the unique characteristics of all communities by investing in healthy and safe neighbourhoods and walking: in rural, urban, or suburban areas. It is important to remember that these principles are not achieved, but rather serve the goals of a broader definition of sustainability, which includes economic, environmental, and justice objectives at the national level. Regions must give the concept of accommodation themselves by implementing these six principles in an array of indicators reflecting regional needs [59].

“In literature, concepts of "liveability" and "sustainability" have often been used to develop academic research in urban planning and urban design. There is an important difference between "manageability" studies and "sustainability" studies, that control studies focus more on human and social factors than on sustainability studies. Not habit, as a concept, independent variable, to some extent, it depends on the existing "bottom three" model. Research on sustainability is based on variables that are easy to measure in the end and are directly related to measuring the built environment and performance criteria.”

An example of sustainability research [17] shows that these efforts can be limited primarily to physical measurements of the built environment. Although the Academy has stated that it exists based on economics, equity and the environment, "the three pillars of the medium" [9, 24, 65], the environmental pillar dominated many of the studies on the subject exists, for example, in their research, [9] a relative estimate of the amount of greenhouse gas emissions generated, the water consumption, the price of electricity and land required for a variety of renewable energy systems, without examining the degree of satisfaction with the housing. Measurement of end-use energy and basic quantitative studies is not necessarily based on location or existence since it does not examine the existence and impact of social and cultural responses in the design of houses and neighbourhoods. Housing feasibility studies are unique because they recognize that social factors are as important as economic and environmental factors in terms of information policy planning and the built environment.

This message describes housing as a critical component of sustainability, a part of the "lower triangle" model, which gives preference to human and social factors above the economic and equality pillars. In essence, studies of "housing" are closely related to people, places, and social capital. Health research attempts to measure in parallel the structured form, to examine and document the behaviour of the community and to determine the level of satisfaction with a specific urban environment. There is a lot of research on "housing" studies, especially on street design and public interaction in the squares. The

study of customs was originally inspired by the writings of Kevin Lynch, who believed that perceptions of the population of the city should teach future design processes.

Despite the definition of highly variable housing mobility in the literature, the definition used for this notice depends on the streets of the neighbourhood, as mentioned above. According to the authors, place of residence (or, as in the case, living street) has a balance of tenants and owners and is adapted to a variety of house sizes. Many people know their neighbours that they spend time abroad, on balconies or in front squares. In this sense, the theory of "eyes on the street" is important to understand the dimensions of the neighbourhood and Liveability [35].

9. Relationships and Conceptual Tensions between sustainable urban development and liveability

"Liveability" and "sustainability" are common concepts of urban planning and public discourse in general, primarily because of the values, priorities, and behaviours of many individuals and institutions. Consumers should be entitled to "liveable" and "sustainable" communities that raise questions for planners and decision-makers about how to meet the needs and desires of present and future residents. The conceptual connections between liveability and sustainability are not fully understood, limiting the agreement to a policy to promote ideals and assessments [51, 62]. One major finding is that the independent application of concepts of liveability and sustainability of integrated design leaves both concepts ideal, good to understand but limited. A conflict that arises from beliefs contradicts determining the priorities of natural environments compared to those built; And "conflict improvement" caused by conflicting beliefs in the preservation of neighbourhoods in favour of the current population against renovation to attract the upper-class population. The coordinated realization of these conflicts and the recognition that population values and perceptions of housing affordability can overcome their concerns about sustainability over time can help to design sustainable cities that are also liveable.

The Scale of Measurement of Liveability and Sustainability have numerical tensions between both concepts better understood for the family definition of sustainable development: "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs" [64]. The concept of residential vision has emerged that the environmental issues economic and capital need to be considered for the narrow spatial scale relevant to individuals, families, neighbourhoods, and individual communities in geographically smaller regions [48, 49, and 50]. Current politics surrounding housing has exposed tensions between liveability and sustainability, highlighting the lack of consensus determining the benefits of these complementary concepts, realization, and application at various levels traditionally.

In assessing these tensions, size is a major determinant of land-use problems and stakeholders vary considerably between regional, urban, and district levels [25]. While, the context of Urban Liveability and Sustainable Urban Development focuses on the environmental movement of the early 1970s to protect the natural environment and empowerment of citizens, which have been marginalized by to protect their quality of life [10, 35]. In the context presented, the tension between liveability and existing questions is whether the priority should be for "sustainability exists" or "sustainability exists", where there is a distinction between the two by identifying primary and secondary values to emphasize (for example health or existing) to develop a "viable" core value in existing visions, and assume that the ability to live is secondary [3, 30]. There is evidence that communities "live midwife" is often planned at the expense of existing, allowing preferences and local adaptability to overcome the visions of wide environmentalism [45, 47].

Varied levels of Potentials of sustainable urban development and urban liveability are presented and categories of a final organization for recognizing the links between liveability and sustainability are the "ability" to allow change through interventions. The combination of these concepts is reflected in the fact that vision, such as integrated programs, is effective only if applied or inspiring. On the turn, there are massive goals which are not divided gradual steps through which to create support for the political and social significance, and therefore is not considered a practical solution, but was considered an ideal

model. Although the literature is growing, but detailed in what is called a living society and a viable society, less hybridization in this sense, the relationship between context and potential can be better reconciled and understood if they are attached to the practice. It is on the strength of this argument the integrated concept which encloses sustainable urban development and urban liveability which can encourage inclusive urban development is required both in practice and theory.”

10. Conclusions

As urbanization and globalization lead to ever more diverse populations in cities; their living conditions more rapidly shaped by the emergence of new technologies and new environmental challenges, and their needs want, and aspirations evolve, it is becoming increasingly challenging to provide generally acceptable and applicable definitions of urban liveability and urban sustainable development within the ambit of responsible consumption pattern. Without a clear understanding of the basic elements that define the concepts, their use in planning and policymaking is becoming increasingly curtailed.

In narrating the tenets of sustainable urban development and liveability mix, one of these concerns the characteristics of the population that demands those goods and services, such as shelter, energy, water and food, waste management and assimilation, health and public safety, education and entertainment, social engagement, economic contributions, creativity, and much more. Liveability is judged through the lens of the needs and wants of those who do or may live in cities. The second element of liveability comprises the city's environment, as defined by its physical and biological characteristics the built infrastructures and ecosystems that provide the goods and services on which lives and livelihoods in the city depend. At a minimum, these ecosystem services stem from the green spaces and water bodies in and around cities that generate not only amenities, and the economic value, but also provide valuable contributions, for example, to local climate regulation, air quality, and flood control. According to [64], “there is widespread agreement on basic elements that make cities and towns liveable a healthy environment, decent housing, safe public places, uncongested roads, parks and recreational opportunities, vibrant social interaction, and so on”.

“Articulating the features of liveable urban space [35], highlighting sidewalks and active retail spaces mixed with dense residential spaces. For example, [21] reflects on the Clinton–Gore Liveability Initiative "Building liveable Communities for the 21st Century" which was launched in 1999 to strengthen the government's role in building "liveable communities". She argues that a liveable community should have "safe streets, good schools, and public and private space that help foster a spirit of community" [3]. Liveable spaces, then, should provide opportunities for urban dwellers to participate in the community. While the community itself is fraught with ambiguity [44, 43], it suggests that there is a complicated social dimension to liveable urban space, a social dimension that geographers need to problematize.

The Contemporary discussions in Sustainable Urban Development; emphasize that the crux of the debate on sustainable development in African cities is how you deal with poverty in these settlements; everything else is academic". It is worthy of note, that in the consideration of sustainable development in African cities, there must be an improvement in the housing, living, and working environments of poorer groups as a central focus [15]. The concept of "sustainable development" has revived discussion about the form of contemporary cities and has motivated scholars and practitioners in different disciplines to seek forms of human settlements that satisfy the requirements of sustainability [34, 37, and 39]. New frameworks have been proposed and addressed at the regional, metropolitan, city, and community levels – smart growth, healthy cities, and new urbanism for redesigning and restructuring urban places to achieve sustainability [23, 22, and 15].

Contemporary discussions in urban liveability are perhaps best understood when juxtaposed against another popular, and similar, concept: sustainability. Sustainability is an elusive concept, hard to grasp by the individual, difficult to operationalize for the planner, and challenging to implement at local scales.

It refers to the long run and, by definition, assumes a global perspective because, in an increasingly connected world, adverse impacts on social and environmental issues outside a particular region or time frame of interest will likely come back to haunt the place of concern in the form of unforeseen, often unintended consequences. Liveability, in contrast, is about the "now" or "about to be." It also tends to be about the "here," with standards for liveability varying not only from country to country but from city to city. Liveability seems more immediate and tangible, and thus more achievable. Creating liveable communities, rather than sustainable ones, also lies within the purview of local agencies, planners, architects, and policy and investment makers, who shape the environment within which people's needs and aspirations unfold. This shift in emphasis from minimum requirements for sustainability to lifestyle choices has brought with it a cottage industry of national and international rankings that compare cities based on material wellbeing, as well as social and environmental performance indicators."

References

- [1] Agarwal, S. and Divekar, A. 2014. "Smart Cities or Wiretap Ones?" Business Standard.
- [2] Agyeman, J. and McLaren D., 2014 'Smart Cities' Should Mean 'Sharing Cities'," Time.
- [3] Allen, T. F. H. 2010. "Making Liveable Sustainable Systems Unremarkable." *Systems Research and Behavioural Science* 27(5): 469–79.
- [4] Barredo, J. I., & Demicheli, L. 2003. Urban sustainability in developing countries' megacities: Modelling and predicting future urban growth in Lagos. *Cities*, 20(5), 297–310.
- [5] Berke, P.R. 2002. "Does Sustainable Development Offer a New Direction for Planning? Challenges for the Twenty-First Century." *Journal of Planning Literature* 17 (2): 262–331
- [6] Brandes, U., MacCleery, R., Peterson, J., & Johnston, M. 2010. *Land use and driving: The role compact development can play in reducing greenhouse gas emissions*. Washington, DC: Urban Land Institute.
- [7] Breheny, P., & Batey, P. W. J. (Eds.). 1992. *Sustainable development and urban form* (2nd ed. London: Pion Limited.
- [8] Burton E. 2000. *The Compact City: Just or Just Compact? A Preliminary Analysis*. *Urban Studies* 37(11): 1969–2001.
- [9] Campbell, S. 1996. "Green Cities, Growing Cities, Just Cities? Urban Planning and the Contradictions of Sustainable Development." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 62 (3): 296–312.
- [10] Carson, R. 2003. *Silent Spring*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- [11] Chazal, J. 2010. "A Systems Approach to Liveability and Sustainability: Defining Terms and Mapping Relationships to Link Desires with Ecological Opportunities and Constraints." *Systems Research and Behavioural Science* 27 (5): 585–97.
- [12] Chifos, C. 2007. "The Sustainable Communities Experiment in the United States." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 26 (4): 435–49. City of Biloxi. 2009. *City of Biloxi Comprehensive Plan*. Biloxi, Mississippi.
- [13] Daly, H.E. 1990. "Toward Some Operational Principles of Sustainable Development." *Ecological Economics* 2 (1): 1–6.
- [14] Davidoff, P. 1965. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31 (4): 331–38.
- [15] Duany, A. Plater-Zyberk, E. & Jeff, S. 2000. *Suburban Nation. The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of Nation*. New York: North Point Press.
- [16] Duany, A., Speck, J. and Lydon, M., 2010. *The Smart Growth Manual* (New York: McGraw Hill,).
- [17] Evans-Cowley, J.S. & Zimmerman, M. 2009. "Evaluating New Urbanist Plans in Post-Katrina Mississippi". *Journal of Urban Design* 14 (4): 439–61.
- [18] Faggian, Al., Olfert, M.R. & Partridge, M.D. 2012. "Inferring Regional Well-Being from Individual Revealed Preferences: The 'Voting with Your Feet' Approach." *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 5 (1): 163–80.
- [19] Fainstein, S.S. 2000. "New Directions in Planning Theory." *Urban Affairs Review* 35 (4): 451–78.
- [20] Farrow, A., & Winograd, W. M. 2001. *Land use modelling at the regional scale: An input into rural sustainability indicators in Central America. Agriculture, Ecosystems, and Environment*, 85, 249–269.

- [21] Flyvbjerg, B. 2001. *Making social science matter – Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [22] Freeman, C. 2004. Sustainable development from rhetoric to practice? A New Zealand perspective. *International Planning Studies*, 9, 307–326.
- [23] Gasparatos, A., El-Haram, M. & Horner, M. 2009. “The Argument against a Reductionist Approach for Measuring Sustainable Development Performance and the Need for Methodological Pluralism.” *Accounting Forum* 33 (3): 245–56.
- [24] Godschalk, D.R. 2004. “Land Use Planning Challenges: Coping with Conflicts in Visions of Sustainable Development and Livable Communities.” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70 (1): 5–13.
- [25] Godschalk, D.R. 2004. “Land Use Planning Challenges: Coping with Conflicts in Visions of Sustainable Development and Livable Communities.” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70 (1): 5–13.
- [26] Gunder, M., 2006. Sustainability: Planning savings grace or road to perdition. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 20, 208–221.
- [27] Hall, W. P., 2010. Decision consequence analysis: A paradigm for decision making. In K. Brown & W. L. Hall (Eds.), *Sustainable land development and restoration: Decision consequence analysis* (pp. 75–85). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- [28] Hicken, E., 2009. *The application of GIS at a local governmental level as a facilitation tool for sustainable development in rural Africa*, master’s thesis. London: Kingston University.
- [29] Holden M and Scerri A (2013). More than this: Liveable Melbourne meets liveable Vancouver. *Cities* 31: 444–453.
- [30] Holden, M., & Scerri, A. 2013. “More Than This: Liveable Melbourne Meets Liveable Vancouver.” *Cities* 31 (0): 444–53.
- [31] Holden, M. 2012. “Is Integrated Planning Any More Than the Sum of Its Parts: Considerations for Planning Sustainable Cities.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 32 (3):305–18.
- [32] Holden, M., 2008. The tough-minded and the tender-minded: A pragmatic turn for sustainable development planning and policy. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 9, 475–496.
- [33] Howley, P., Scott, M. & Redmond, D. 2009. “Sustainability versus Liveability: An Investigation of Neighbourhood Satisfaction.” *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 52 (6): 847–64.
- [34] Jabereen, R. Y., 2006. Sustainable urban forms: Their typologies, models, and concepts. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 26, 38–52.
- [35] Jacobs J., 1961. *The death and life of great American cities*. Random House, New York
- [36] Jepson, E.J. 2004. “The Adoption of Sustainable Development Policies and Techniques in U.S. Cities: How Wide, How Deep, and What Role for Planners?” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 23 (3): 229–41.
- [37] Ley, A. & Newton, P. 2010. “Creating and Sustaining Liveable Cities.” In *Developing Living Cities: From Analysis to Action*. Singapore: World Scientific.
- [38] Litman, T. 2007. “Developing indicators for Comprehensive and Transport Planning.” *Transportation Research Record* 2017, 10–15.
- [39] Litman, T. 2011. *Sustainability and Liveability: Summary of Definitions, Goals, Objectives, and Performance Indicators*. Victoria, Canada: Victoria Transport Policy Institute.
- [40] Lynch, K. 1960. *The Image of the City*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- [41] Marshall, Wesley E. 2013. “An Evaluation of Liveability in Creating Transit-Enriched Communities for Improved Regional Benefits.” *Research in Transportation Business & Management* 7: 54–68.
- [42] Maslow, A.H. 1998. *Toward a Psychology of Being*, 3rd edition. New York: John Wiley.
- [43] Matthias, R. & Franklin, R.S. 2013. “Liveability for All? Conceptual Limits and Practical Implications.” *Applied Geography* 49:18–23.
- [44] Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [45] Miller, H.J., Witlox, F. & Tribby, C.P. 2013. “Developing Context-Sensitive Liveability Indicators for Transportation Planning: A Measurement Framework.” *Journal of Transport Geography* 26: 51–64.
- [46] Myers, D. 1988. “Building Knowledge about Quality of Life for Urban Planning.” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 54 (3): 347–58.

- [47] Newton, P.W. 2012. "Liveable and Sustainable? Socio-technical Challenges for Twenty-First-Century Cities." *Journal of Urban Technology* 19 (1): 81–102.
- [48] Pacione, M. 1990. "Urban Liveability: A Review." *Urban Geography* 11 (1): 1–30.
- [49] Pacione, M. 2003. "Urban Environmental Quality and Human Wellbeing—A Social Geographical Perspective." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 65 (1): 19–30.
- [50] Portney, K. 2005. "Civic Engagement and Sustainable Cities in the United States." *Public Administration Review* 65 (5):579–91.
- [51] Portney, K. 2013. *Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously: Economic Development, the Environment, and Quality of Life in American Cities*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- [52] Rees, W. E. 1995. "Achieving Sustainability: Reform or transformation?" *Journal of Planning Literature* 9:343–61.
- [53] Roo, G. & Miller, D. 2000. *Compact Cities and Sustainable Urban Development: A Critical Assessment of Policies and Plans from an International Perspective*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.
- [54] Roseland, M. 2012. *Toward Sustainable Communities: Solutions for Citizens and Their Government*. Canada: New Society Publishers.
- [55] U.S. Coordination Centre for the UN Conference on Environment and Development. 1992.
- [56] UNCED, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, June 1992: General Information. Washington, DC: U.S. Coordination Centre for the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development.
- [57] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2008. "Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)
- [58] HUD's Fiscal Year 2011 Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program." Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- [59] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2010. *Partnership for Sustainable Communities: An Interagency Partnership of HUD, DOT, & EPA*. Washington, DC.
- [60] UN-HABITAT, 2002. *Sustainable urbanization: Achieving Agenda 21*, UN-HABITAT Nairobi.
- [61] UN-HABITAT, 2009. *Habitat partner university network*.
- [62] van Kamp, I., Leidelmeijer, K., Marsman, G. & de Hollander, A. 2003. "Urban Environmental Quality and Human Well-Being." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 65 (1–2): 5–18.
- [63] Wackernagel, M. & Rees, W.E. 1997. "Perceptual and Structural Barriers to Investing in Natural Capital: Economics from an Ecological Footprint Perspective." *Ecological Economics* 20 (1): 3–24.
- [64] WCED (World Commission on Environment and Development).1987. *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [65] Wheeler, Stephen. 2013. *Planning for Sustainability: Creating Liveable, Equitable, and Ecological Communities*. New York: Routledge.
- [66] Winograd, M., Farrow, A. 2007. *Sustainable development indicators for decision making: Concepts, definition*.
- [67] Wolf, T., & Meyer, B. C., 2010. *Suburban scenario development based on multiple landscape assessments*. *Ecological Indicators*, 10, 74–86.
- [68] World Bank, 1994. *Making development sustainable*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [69] Zhang, X., Wu, Y., & Shen, L., 2011. *An evaluation framework for the sustainability of urban land use: A study of capital cities and municipalities in China*. *Habitat International*, 35, 141–149.

Acknowledgements

I hereby acknowledge the financial support of SARChI Chair for Inclusive Cities, School of Built Environment & Development Studies, College of Humanities, University of KwaZulu-Natal Mazisi Kuene Road, Durban, 4041.