

Spatial temporal analysis of urban fringe land market construction essay

[Design](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

There is a widespread view that urbanization is the result of the constellation of modern human society. The nineteenth century, which assumed to be the epoch of modernisation all over the world, has experienced rapid urbanization. For example, urban population has increased from less than 14 per centum to more than 50 per centum of the world's population during 1900-2000 and if this growing continues, urban population in the world will get at 4.

72 -5. 00 billion in 2030 (addition of 48. 61-57. 84 per centum comparing to the current population) comparing to 6.

835-8. 135 billion (18. 71 per centum) addition in entire population and 3. 348-3. 267 billion (2. 42 per centum) lessening in rural population.

Nevertheless, the lag waste going state of affairs will be at the developing states, where the urban population growing is forecasted to be 74.

17 per centum in 2030 comparing to the current population (Zhang, 2008) . Interestingly, upper limit of this urban population agglomeration is in largest metropoliss, particularly megacities (Li, 2003) and these megacities are turning at an unprecedented rate. For illustration, in 1950 there were merely 4 megacities, which increase to 28 in 1980, 39 in 2002 ; and 59 in 2015 (UN 2002) . Then the inquiry arises which standards define the megacities. Some urban geographers tried to specify the megacities based on the planetary economic power or influence.

With the exclusion of Lo and Yeung ' s (1998) ' Globalization and the World of Large Cities ' , which includes Sao Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Cairo and

Johannesburg, and more late systematic work by Taylor (2000) , Lo and <https://assignbuster.com/spatial-temporal-analysis-of-urban-fringe-land-market-construction-essay/>

Marcotullio (2000) , Taylor and Walker (2001) and Shin and Timberlake (2000) much of these plants (Friedmann, 1986 ; Sassen, 2004) have either focused on the developed universe or simply mentioned ' megacities ' in the underdeveloped universe (Yulong and Hamnett, 2002) . However, an extended argument has still been traveling on the definition of megacities. United Nations categorize the megacities with population of 8 1000000s while Asian Development Bank extends the population bound to 10 million along with other features such as complex economic system and integrated conveyance system. Therefore, treatment takes into history the ' population greater than 10 1000000s ' as an index of megacities.

Harmonizing to the World Population Report 2001 by UNFPA, presently there are 19 megacities such as Tokyo (26. 4 1000000s) , Mexico City (18. 1 1000000s) , Mumbai (18.

1 1000000s) , S & A ; atilde ; o Paulo (17. 8 1000000s) , Shanghai (17 1000000s) , New York (16. 6 1000000s) , Lagos (13. 4 1000000s) , Los Angeles (13.

1 1000000s) , Calcutta (12. 9 1000000s) , Buenos Aires (12. 6 1000000s) , Dhaka (12. 3 1000000s) , Karachi (11. 8 1000000s) , New Delhi (11.

7 1000000s) , Jakarta (11 1000000s) , Osaka (11 1000000s) , Metro Manila (10. 9 1000000s) , Beijing (10. 6 1000000s) , Reo de Janeiro (10. 6 1000000s) and Cairo (10. 6 1000000s) . Still there is a contention about the geographical extent of these megacities.

Even some of these megacities are turning on organizing the urban corridors (Tokyo-Yokohama-Nagoya-Osaka-Kobe-Kyoto Shinkansen in Japan, Beijing-Tianjin-Tangshan in northeasterly China ; and the Mumbai-Pune development corridor in India) and urban mega-clusters (national capital Region of Delhi, Dhaka, and Metro Manila ; Karachi mega-urban part, Bangkok-Thonburi metropolitan part, and Jakarta-Bogor-Tangerang-Bekasi part) . This go oning growing of megacities is now the combustion research subject of the policy shapers every bit good as international communities (Renaud, 1981 ; UN, 1993) and different policies are already been applied to counterpart this rapid urbanizations in megacities such as China, Egypt, Brazil, Korea, Mexico, and China have promoted different promotional plans (e. g.

double path urban system) for sponsoring the medium size metropoliss in their several state degree (Henderson, 2002 ; Ades and Glaeser, 1995) . Still a comprehensive scheme demands to be initiated in order to counterpart the unprecedented rate of urbanization and urban agglomeration.

2. Overall purpose and aims

The overall purpose of the thesis is to find the economic value of land at the urban periphery of a megacity in developing state. Based on the purpose, the aims are categorised into two wide countries – theoretical aims and empirical aims.

Theoretical aims

To analyze the extent of influence of urbanization procedure, and land acquisition and guess, by both the populace and private sectors, on the kinetics of urban agglomeration or urban conurbation.

To analyze the altering urban spacial forms of the megacities due to sprawl and to explicate them within the model of different urban growing theories.

To analyze the nature, features, and kinetics of urban land and the land market within which land assembles, urban reclamation, gentrification and development has taken topographic point. To place different spatio-temporal econometric methods for finding land monetary value.

Empirical aims

To develop an economic instrument, sing both spacial and temporal facets of land, for understanding the kinetics of the land monetary value at urban periphery of a megacity in developing state To find the extent of influence of environmental properties on the monetary value of urban-rural interface lands.

3. Methodology

In order to achieve the aims, the research will be carried out by following the comprehensive methodological analysis, the construction of which is given below: The item of the methodological analysis and construction of the chapters to achieve the aims is given below:

Aims

Methodology

Organizati-on of chapters

Objective 1: Definition of urbanization and urban agglomeration ; grounds ; challenges ; tendency of urbanization in developed and developing states ; growing form of different hierarchy of urban colonies ; socio-economic, political and physical features of urban colonies ; economic, institutional, and political factors of rural-urban migration ; authorities policies and urban political relations in the context of urbanization and urban agglomeration ; construct, nature, features and kinetics of megacities ; spacial form of megacities ; instances and effects of rapid urbanization and urban infinite challenges particularly in megacities. Literature reappraisal of diary, books and studies of different administrations working on urbanization and urban agglomeration

Chapter 2 Objective 2: Urban land economic theories (such as classical theories, neo-classical theories, new economic geographic theories, and new institutional economic theories) in the context of urbanization and urban agglomeration Literature reappraisal of diary and books

Chapter 3 Objective 3: Dynamics of urban land market, urban land political relations, historians of urban land political relations, modern-day urban land regulative mechanisms and their acceptableness in different contexts, be aftering mechanisms for commanding land transition or development at the urban periphery, land acquisition procedure, authorities scheme for land ceiling criterion and land guess, historians commanding the land market, impact of land usage alteration on the wetlands and agricultural lands at urban periphery and challenges for achieving sustainability. Literature reappraisal

of diary, books, studies of different administrations, and authorities policies, strategic programs, regulations, and ordinances. Chapter 4 Objective 4:

Different types of spatio-temporal econometric methods for finding the land monetary value at urban periphery Literature reappraisal of diary and books.

Software for Spatio-temporal autoregressive analysis Chapter 5 Objective 5:

variables or properties explicating land market at urban periphery, compatible econometric instrument for pulling the equation of land market

at urban periphery Application of spatio-temporal econometric theoretical account for arrested development analysis Chapter 8 Objective 6: economic

rating of environmental properties and its influence on the land market at urban periphery

4. Theoretical model

Assorted factors are attributed to the urbanization in megacities such as rural-urban migration (Goldstein, 1990 ; Chan, 1994a, 1994b ; Rempel, 1996 ; Ma, 1999) , natural population addition and even the authorities policies (Lo, 1994 ; Sit, 1995 ; Lin, 2004 ; Bloom et al. , 2008) on foreign direct investing (Sit and Yang, 1997 ; Shen, 1999 ; Shen et al. , 2000) , enlargement of third industries (Lin, 2002) and economic passage (Gu and Wall, 2007) .

This subdivision explores the grounds behind the urbanization and urban agglomeration in megacities, and spacial forms of megacities.

Economic development

There is an important positive correlativity between the economic development and urbanization (Henderson, 2003), which can better be explained by the hypothesis of Williamson (1965) (Hansen, 1990). Due to the economic development of the metropolis, the important sum of industries are concentrated within the metropolis nucleus and this upshots in development of cognition, accomplishments, and economic substructure which leads to development of physical constructions such as conveyance and communications. This physical development makes obligatory to the investors or makers to recalculate the cost-benefit analysis of the geographical locations of their industries taking into history the external and internal economic systems of scale- ensuing in urban enlargement or deconcentration of industries from the urban nucleus (El-Shakhs, 1972 ; Alonso, 1980 ; Wheaton and Shishido, 1981 ; Junius, 1999 ; Davis and Henderson, 2003 ; Barro and Sala-i-Martin, 1991, 1992 ; Kuznets, 1966 ; Abramovitz, 1989 ; Easterlin, 2000). This statement is vivid by reexamining different literatures on the economic growing and urbanization in megacities (Aguilar and Ward, 2003 ; Firman, 1997 ; Fanni, 2006). However, the basic premise of urbanization is the rural-urban migration. Harmonizing to the western economic experts, urbanisation/ rural-urban migration is the end point of addition in the productiveness of agricultural sector and the increasing demand for labor needed by an spreading industrial sector.

This economic theoretical account was adopted for the western economic sciences, which was subsequently tried to follow in the urbanization form of the 3rd universe states by Lewis (1994). However, the increasing rural-

<https://assignbuster.com/spatial-temporal-analysis-of-urban-fringe-land-market-construction-essay/>

urban migration, despite the high unemployment and underemployment state of affairs in urban countries of developing states, raises the inquiry of its cogency. Subsequently on, comparative rating of expected pay rates between urban and rural (by Harris-Todaro migration theoretical account) , and present value of expected benefits and costs (by Sjaasted migration theoretical account) were identified as the cardinal economic factors of urbanization procedure. Brueckner and Zenou (1999) and Brueckner and Kim (2001) have incorporate the effects of land monetary value escalation due to the migration within the Harris-Todaro theoretical account.

Furthermore, classical economic experts (e. g. (Gordon, 1975 ; Petty, 1683 ; Yang, 1991 ; Yang and Rice, 1994 ; Sun, 2000 ; Sun and Yang, 2002 ; Zhang and Zhao, 2004) and neo-classical economic experts (e.

g. Fujita-Krugman, 1995 ; Helpman, 1998 ; Lowry, 1966) attempt to project the ‘ division of labour and production ‘ , and ‘ economies of graduated table ‘ as the basic economic requirement of urbanization severally.

Government policies and urban political relations

After the economic development, the following important feature of urbanization in megacities is authorities intercessions or policies (Renaud, 1981 ; Ades and Glaeser, 1995 ; Moomaw and Shatter, 1996 ; Henderson and Becker, 2000 ; Davis and Henderson, 2003) by sometimes prioritising the megacities over other metropoliss during decisive policymaking (Fujita et al. , 1999) . This may do because of their political significance and involvement of the elites and administrative officials (such as in Bangkok, Mexico City, Jakarta, and Paris, S & A ; atilde ; o Paulo) . For advancing economic

development in the megacities, the authorities (either national or local) of concerned states sometime has taken publicity schemes such as in Shanghai, China (Cai, 1995 ; Han, 2000 ; Fu, 2001) ; Jakarta, Indonesia (Firman, 2000 ; Goldblum and Wong, 2000 ; Henderson and Kuncoro, 1996 ; Kaiser, 1999) ; Manila, Philippines (Kelly, 2003 ; Bankoff, 1996 ; Sidel, 1999) ; Mumbai and Delhi, India (Valerie, 1999) ; Cairo, Egypt (Sutton and Fahmi, 2001) ; and even in London, Paris and New York (Lever, 1997 ; Short and Kim, 1999 ; Tickell, 1998) .

. However, the impact of dynamic authorities constabularies on urbanization and urban agglomeration is most acute in China such as ‘ Socialist Economic theory ‘ based urban-biased Hukou system during the ‘ pre-reform ‘ period (Oi, 1993 ; Naughton, 1996 ; Zhang and Zhao, 2004 ; Chan, 1994a, 1996 ; Gu and Shen, 2003 ; Sit, 1995 ; Harrison, 1972 ; Murphey, 1974 ; Ma, 1976 ; Nolan and White, 1984 ; Prybyla, 1987 ; Kirkby, 1985 ; Kang, 1993 ; Chan, 1994b ; Liu, 1999 ; Ma and Fan, 1994 ; Buck, 1981 ; Parish, 1987 ; Ofer, 1977 ; Konrad and Szelenyi, 1977 ; Ronnas and Sjoberg, 1993 ; Sjoberg, 1999 ; Kirkby, 1985 ; Kang, 1993 ; Chan, 1994b ; Solinger, 1999 ; Lieberthal, 1995 ; Fallenbuchl, 1977 ; Zhang and Zhao, 1998 ; National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2000 ; Konrad and Szelenyi, 1977 ; Ofer, 1977, 1980 ; Musil, 1980 ; Murray and Szelenyi, 1984) , particularly in China (Cell, 1979 ; Orleans, 1982 ; Whyte, 1983 ; Ran and Berry, 1989 ; Ebanks and Cheng, 1990 ; Yu, 1995 ; Tang, 1997 ; Song and Timberlake, 1996 ; Lin, 1998 ; Dong and Putterman, 2000) . Later on, ‘ post-reform policy ‘ besides boosted the urbanization by promoting the foreign and private investings in megacities (Banister and Taylor, 1989 ; Shen and Spence, 1995 ; Shen, 2002 ; Shen et

al. , 2006) . However, the national or local authorities is non entirely responsible for urbanization, urban development every bit good as urban enlargement. Then the inquiry is: Who runs the metropoliss? Government intercessions or policies in the urban strategic be aftering for political significance and involvement of the elites and administrative officials are proverbial in the metropoliss of both developed and underdeveloped universe (Renaud, 1981 ; Ades and Glaeser, 1995 ; Moomaw and Shatter, 1996 ; Henderson and Becker, 2000 ; Davis and Henderson, 2003) . This is why ; urban theoreticians are concentrating on urban political relations instead than on economic properties in explicating province policies for urban development (Sites, 1997 ; Cockburn, 1977 ; Castells, 1979 ; Stone, 1993 ; 1998) .

However, the influence of urban political relations in urban planning precedences in different parts of the universe is really complicated because urban political relations are viewed from different positions. State-centred position argued for cardinal function of authorities, liberty of the province or the local province and pre-eminence of political properties in strategic planning (Steinmo, 1989 ; King, 1995 ; Thornley, 1998 ; Evans et al. , 1985 ; Gurr and King, 1987) , while alliance political relations (Stone, 1987, 1989, 1993 ; Sites, 1997 ; Elkin, 1987 ; Harding, 1994 ; Gurr and King, 1987 ; Turner, 1992 ; DiGaetano and Klemanski, 1993 ; Orren and Skowronek, 1994) argued for public-private partnership for implementing planning schemes because either for the exposure of local authorities in inter-city economic competition or for the division of labor.

This is why ; assorted urban theoreticians (Park and Burgess, 1925 ; Dahl ; 1967 ; Wirth, 1969 ; Jacobs ; 1969 ; 1984 ; Saunders, 1983 ; Rae, 2004) , who tried to mire urban political relations within their ain theories, either failed or misinterpret the urban planning patterns. The basic contention of urban political relations prevarications within two distinguishable definitions of community power (Polsby, 1980 ; Harding, 1995 ; Judge, 1995) - power within communities and the power of communities (Harding, 1997) . The first is concerned with ' social production ' and ' power to ' while the latter on is with ' social control ' and ' power over ' (Stone, 1989) .

' Power within communities ' , besides known as ' urban government ' prompts integrating or political alliance of civic groups and public establishments (Dowding et al. 1999 ; Shefter, 1985 ; Elkin, 1987 ; Stone and Sanders, 1987 ; Mollenkopf, 1992 ; Turner, 1992 ; Di Gaetano and Klemanski, 1993 ; Davies 2001, 2003 ; Stone, 1989, 2002, 2005 ; Peck and Tickell, 1995) at different degrees of strength and lucidity (Stone, 2005) for economic development and physical regeneration or gentrification (Harding, 1997 ; Elkin, 1987 ; Stone and Sanders, 1987 ; Stone, 1989) and urban growing machines (Molotch, 1976, 1990 ; Logan and Molotch, 1987 ; Molotch and Logan, 1990) . On the other manus, ' power of communities ' is more concerned about the moving power of the histrions instead than alliances and is defined by elite and pluralist theories. Beyond the community power argument, another important factor of metropolis ' s strategic planning is the political relations of globalisation (Harding, 1997) , which strengthens subnational liberty and declines national importance (Ohmae, 1993) . This can be elucidated by measuring the function of

<https://assignbuster.com/spatial-temporal-analysis-of-urban-fringe-land-market-construction-essay/>

concern sectors on the local civic life of US and European metropoliss. For case, business-sectors of US metropoliss are unusually organized, who have strong influence on land ownership and land usage planning, revenue enhancement and gross distribution, private recognition and public adoption (Stone, 2005) , election runs of local every bit good as national political leaders (Elkin, 1987) and ensuing in they are within the regulating system. Furthermore, the weaker capital investing by local authorities has persuaded for effectual government (Davis, 2003) . Encouraged by the successful history of urban government in US, Thatcher authorities took an ambitious enterprise to put in this United states policy within new dimension of urban regeneration partnerships in UK (Berger and Foster, 1982 ; Boyle, 1985 ; Ward, 1996 ; Wolman, 1992) without deciding three inquiries - What will be the function of development alliances in the metropolis political relations as a whole? What types of private-sector activities will take business-sector engagement in the alliances? How can the activity balance between public and private sector be achieved? (Harding, 1997) .

Furthermore, some urban bookmans attempted to work the government construct in the European contexts (Vicari and Molotch, 1990 ; Harding, 1994 ; Kantor et al. , 1997 ; Di Gaetano and Klemanski, 1999 ; Mossberger and Stoker, 2000 ; Zhang, 2002) . The United states policy was non possible to follow in the UK context because of the powerful function of cardinal authorities in the urban political relations (Thornley, 1998) , deficiency of dickering power of urban authorities, reluctance of local concern histrions in alliances (Peck and Tickell, 1995 ; Davis, 2003) . This is why ; the effort has been resulted in different collaborative mechanisms, which were explained <https://assignbuster.com/spatial-temporal-analysis-of-urban-fringe-land-market-construction-essay/>

by different theories such as Rhodes and Marsh (1992) theoretical account of policy web analysis by Stoker and Mossberger (1994) , integrating of ordinance and government theory by Harding (1994) and Lauria (1997) . Urban political relations in the context of developing states (e. g.

Brazil, Mexico, Nigeria, Egypt, Indonesia, Philippines, Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan) are about similar to the political relations of UK instead stronger function of national authorities and local authorities. Either military authorities or sovereign or tyrants reined most of these states throughout the major part of their history after independency and they have a close tie with the concern elites and administrative officials. Finally, the concern elites and administrative officials are act uponing the urban policy docket behind the scene. Nevertheless, the context of socialist China is rather complicated, which can be categorized within pre-reform epoch (before 1978) and post-reform epoch (from 1978 boulder clay today) . Urban political relations during the pre-reform period was entirely contracted by the national authorities. After the reform policy, the national authorities had deconcentrate their economic and political powers among the local authorities and influential histrions. However, the interesting thing is that ' a clever fox is concealing inside the reform policy ' by commanding the belongings ownership, go forthing the economic load to the local authorities, strongly associating the perpendicular tie at the authorities degree.

Locational economic systems of production and category segregation

The urbanization of a metropolis can be a effect of societal division of labor and industrial variegation (Harvey, 1973 ; Henderson, 2002 ; Scott, 1986 ; <https://assignbuster.com/spatial-temporal-analysis-of-urban-fringe-land-market-construction-essay/>

Weber, 1899 ; Haig, 1927 ; Allen, 1929 ; Perrin, 1937 ; Florence, 1948 ; Wise, 1949 ; Lampard, 1955 ; Hoover and Vernon, 1959 ; Hall, 1962 ; Tsuru, 1963 ; Sjoberg, 1965 ; Thiry, 1973 ; Webber, 1984) . This can better be conceptualized by sing perpendicular and horizontal integrating and decomposition of production and labour forces. In instance of perpendicular and horizontal decomposition, the industries or houses try to be concentrated within the nucleus part of a metropolis because assorted economic systems of graduated tables (Coase, 1937 ; Holmes, 1986 ; Richardson, 1972 ; Scott, 1983 ; Pye, 1977) and this was obvious at the earier phase of megacities of developed states such as New York, London and Paris. On the contrary, when the perpendicular and horizontal integrating of houses or merchandises is strong both in spatial and temporal facets, geographical enlargement of metropolis are more likely to be happened because of internal and external economic systems of graduated table (Scott, 1980 ; Brook et al.

, 1973 ; Gilmour, 1971 ; Abernathy et al. , 1983 ; Piore and Sabel, 1984) .

Furthermore, urbanization in megacities is dependent on the type of merchandises such as gold and diamond in Rio de Janeiro, java in S & A ; atilde ; o Paulo, fabricating industries in Seoul, third activities in London, Beijing, Shanghai, Tokyo (Duranton and Puga, 2001 ; Waley, 2009 ; Mukherjee, 1990 ; Banerjee, 1985 ; Glaeser et al. , 1995 ; Lee and Kang, 1989 ; Lee et al. , 2007 ; Godfrey, 1999) .

Locational penchant

Most of the megacities are located at the coastal countries because of their strategic geographical location which offer the advantages of trade, communicating, and populating environment (Godfrey, 1995 ; Vance 1990) . Soon, 60 per centum (about 3 billion people) or half of the universe ' s population lives within 100 kilometers or 60km of the shoreline severally (Yeung, 2001 ; Hinrichsen, 1990) and it is estimated that this population will be doubled within the approaching 30 old ages among which coastal megacities will lend the king of beasts portion of population (Li, 2003) .

Furthermore, the figure of coastal megacities will be increased to 36 from the being 16 at the twelvemonth of 2015 of them 30 will be in developing states and 22 will be in Asia (Kullenberg, 1999) . Sometimes policy shapers prepare the economic development programs giving premier focal point on the coastal metropoliss (Yeung and Hu, 1992) because it is relatively less parlous to advance economic development programs in coastal metropoliss because of its good and inexpensive communicating and already established constructions and physical substructures. On the other manus, capital metropoliss get besides locational advantages because of the centre of establishments, organisations, information and civilization such as Beijing (Yulong and Hamnett, 2002) , Metro Manila (Cuervo and Hin, 1998) , Delhi, Dhaka, and Jakarta.

Colonial influence

Most of the megacities were under the different European settlements such as British, Spanish, Gallic and Lusitanian. Historically, European colonials

developed these megacities for their defensive and trade maps. For illustration, apprehensiveness about Gallic incursions, the Portuguese founded Rio de Janeiro in 1565 (Godfrey, 1999) ; before Spanish epoch (1521-1898) , Manila was the entry-port of Chinese, Indians and Arabian merchandisers (Cuervo and Hin, 1998) ; Bombay, Calcutta and Madras are trade oriented port metropoliss due to British colonial bequest ; New York was used as commercial centre by the Lusitanian colonial.

Land guess and existent estate development

Land transition is a normal portion of urban development in both developed and underdeveloped universe (Pierce, 1981 ; Lockeretz, 1989 ; Tsai, 1993 ; Winoto, 1996 ; Kustiwan, 1997 ; Yeh and Li, 1999 ; Grigg, 1995) .

Nevertheless, land guess by existent estate developers has been observed at an dismaying rate in Mexico City, Shanghai, Guangzhou, Jakarta, Metro Manila and megacities of developing states (Deng, et al. , 2008 ; Arcadis Euroconsult, 1999 ; Leaf, 1991, 1993 ; Akbar and Subroto, 1999 ; Firman, 2000 ; Bouteiller and Fouquier, 1995 ; Goldblum and Wong, 2000) .

Spatial form of urbanization in megacities

Megacities had grown to go primate metropoliss at the earlier phase of urbanization (Parai and Dutt, 1994 ; McGee and Greenberg, 1992) .

Megacities now present more polycentric spacial enlargement of urban centres and sub-centers following a web form that tends to sprawl along major main roads and/or railway lines radiating out from the urban nucleus (Aguilar and Ward, 2003) . However, megacities have passed over four phases of urbanization – urbanization, suburbanisation, counterurbanisation

and reurbanisation (Champion, 2001 ; Van der Berg et al. , 1982 ; Klaassen et al. , 1981 ; Schweitzer and Steinbrink, 1998) - ‘ cyclic theoretical account ‘ . In instance of ‘ urban centre hierarchy ‘ , the back-to-back stages of urbanization can be illustrated as a diffusing moving ridge of differential urbanization (Pacione, 2001 ; Geyer and Kontuly, 1993) (Figure 5) .

Figure 4: Cyclic theoretical account

The first stage (U) explains the concentration of population in the cardinal metropolis due to rapid rural-urban migration, while the 2nd stage (S) shows an increasing population at its urban fringe and diminishing population at the cardinal metropolis.

Third stage (D) shows diminishing of population both in cardinal metropolis and urban fringe and the concluding phase shows increasing of population at both locations.

Figure 5: Diffusing theoretical account

The first stage (U) explains increasing population in Primary metropolis and intermediate metropolis but diminishing population in the little metropoliss.

In the 2nd stage of counterurbanisation (C) , reversal state of affairs of first stage is going after a certain clip. In the concluding, altering rate of net migration is falling down in instance of all size of metropoliss. However, the population of primary metropolis will go on to growing for a certain clip thereafter it will fall. On the other manus, the population of intermediate metropolis will make to the optimal degree while population of little metropoliss are still turning.

Megacities in Latin America – Mexico City, Buenos Aires, Santiago, and São Paulo – are in suburbanisation phase because of the continuance of heavy concentration of production activities and population in the urban nucleus and spread outing towards sub-urban countries or periphery countries (Far & A ; iacute ; a 1989 ; Sassen 1994 ; Pereira 1967 ; Caldeira 1996 ; Aguilar and Ward, 2003 ; Gwynne, 1985 ; UNCHS, 1996 ; Aguilar, 1999a and 1999b ; Campolina 1994 ; Parnreiter, 2002 ; Ward, 1998 ; Vance, 1990) . There is different statement about the urbanization phase of Latin American megacities such as Townroe and Keene (1984) and Gilbert (1993) claim that megacities of Latin America are in counterurbanisation phase as the secondary metropolis growing is afoot with a polycentric urban signifier suggestive of polarisation reversal with the growing of intermediate sized metropoliss taking to a more balanced national urban construction. Megacities of Southeast Asian are besides in suburbanisation phase because of the merger of urban and rural maps that is a mix of rural and urban activities in peri-urban countries and known as drawn-out metropolitan part (desakota) (Gingsburg et al. , 1991 ; McGee and Robinson, 1995 ; Firman, 1996 ; Forbes, 1997 ; Murakami et al. , 2005) .

However, Beijing is still rather monocentric, and its CBD continues to incorporate a big portion of the metropolitan country ' s entire employment, mostly because of the centrality of assorted urban comfortss, and because of the concentration of authorities activities in Beijing (Zheng and Kahn, 2008) . On the other manus, other megacities of China – Shanghai and Guangzhou – are switching their urban spacial form from monocentric signifier to polycentric signifier. Lagos of Nigeria is still in urbanisation phase and there

are no grounds of meta-urban or peri-urban development (Briggs and Mwamfupe, 2000 ; Yeboah, 2000) instead metropolis growing is contained within clearly defined boundaries. Megacities in Western Europe and United States are the phase of reurbanisation (Antrop, 2000, 2004) such as Paris (Sallez and Burgi, 2004 ; Cavailhes et al. , 2004) , New York (Godfrey, 1995 ; Preston and McLafferty, 1993) , and London (Bendixson, 2004) .

5.

Research Timeframe for initial 9 months

Activity agenda

Time Frame

Oct- 09

Nov- 09

Dec- 09

Jan- 10

Feb-10

Mar-10

Apr-10

May-10

June-10

Conceptualization Discussion on the context, cardinal characteristics and material beginnings of the research Chapter 1: Theoretical model on the contextual nomenclatures on urbanization and agglomeration Chapter 1: Arrested development of purposes and aims, and development of

methodological analysis and research construction
Preparation and presentation of 100-days orals
Chapter 2: (nonsubjective 1) Literature reappraisal
Chapter 3: (nonsubjective 2) Literature reappraisal

6. Research Timeframe for 3 old ages

Activity agenda

Time Frame

2009

2010

2011

2012

Q4

Q1

Q2

Q3

Q4

Q1

Q2

Q3

Q4

Q1

Q2

Q3

Conceptualization Discussion on the context, cardinal characteristics and material beginnings of the research

Literature Review phase

Chapter 1Chapter 2Chapter 3Chapter 4Chapter 5

Empirical phase

Sample size preparationPrimary informations aggregationSecondary informations aggregationData confirmation, redacting and inputChapter 6: MethodologyChapter 7: Datas analysisChapter 8: Objective 5 and 6

Evaluation and decision

Chapter 9: FindingsChapter 10: Recommendations and Implementation guidelinesChapter 11: Decision

Concluding presentation and entry