Journal of Advances in Science and Technology
Vol.23, Issue No. 1 March-2026, ISSN 2230-9659

Land-Use and Land-Cover Changes and their Effects on Biodiversity, Carbon Storage, Water Regulation, and Soil Conservation

Priyanka Yadav[1]*, Dr. Indra Jeet Sharma[2]

[1] Research Scholar, Faculty of Basic & Applied Science, Maharishi Arvind University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

priyankayadav199811@gmail.com

[2] Supervisor, Faculty of Basic & Applied Science, Maharishi Arvind University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

Abstract: Land-use and land-cover change (LULCC) is among the most important anthropogenic forces reshaping terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems. Expansion of agriculture, urbanisation, infrastructure development, deforestation, mining, wetland drainage and intensification of land management alter both the physical characteristics of landscapes and the ecological processes on which human well-being depends. This article critically examines the effects of LULCC on four interrelated dimensions of ecosystem functioning: biodiversity, carbon storage, water regulation and soil conservation. The study adopts an interdisciplinary and analytical approach based on established ecological literature and major international assessments. It traces the historical evolution of land transformation from early agricultural settlement to industrialisation, contemporary urban expansion and globalised commodity production. The analysis demonstrates that habitat loss and fragmentation reduce species richness, disrupt ecological connectivity and contribute to biological homogenisation. Conversion of forests, grasslands, wetlands and peatlands alters terrestrial carbon stocks and can transform long-term carbon sinks into sources of greenhouse-gas emissions. Changes in vegetation and soil properties also modify infiltration, evapotranspiration, groundwater recharge, surface runoff and water quality. In agricultural and rapidly urbanising landscapes, soil erosion, compaction, sealing, nutrient depletion and salinisation further undermine ecological productivity and resilience. These effects rarely occur independently: biodiversity supports soil processes, soil organic carbon improves water retention, vegetation influences hydrological regulation, and healthy watersheds contribute to habitat integrity. International experience demonstrates considerable regional variation, with tropical deforestation, agricultural intensification, urban sprawl, dryland degradation and wetland conversion creating different combinations of ecosystem-service losses. The article argues that contemporary land governance must shift from sectoral and reactive approaches towards integrated landscape planning, ecosystem restoration, biodiversity-sensitive agriculture, compact urban development, watershed management and protection of high-carbon and high-biodiversity ecosystems. International frameworks increasingly recognise these connections; the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, for example, calls for biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and restoration of degraded ecosystems. (Convention on Biological Diversity) Sustainable management of land and cover is therefore not simply a conservation objective but an essential condition for climate stability, water security, food production and long-term socio-economic resilience.

Keywords: Land-Use Change; Land-Cover Change; Biodiversity; Ecosystem Services; Carbon Storage; Carbon Sequestration; Water Regulation; Soil Conservation; Deforestation; Urbanisation; Agricultural Expansion; Land Degradation; Ecological Restoration; Sustainable Land Management

INTRODUCTION

Land represents the spatial and ecological foundation upon which terrestrial life, economic development and human civilisation depend. It supports food production, settlements, transportation networks, forests, biodiversity, freshwater systems and a wide range of ecological processes. However, land is neither unlimited nor ecologically interchangeable. Transforming a forest into cropland, a wetland into a residential settlement, a grassland into an industrial estate or diversified agricultural land into intensive monoculture changes not merely the visible landscape but also the underlying ecological functions performed by that landscape.

Land-use change and land-cover change are related but conceptually distinct processes. **Land cover** refers to the biophysical material found at the Earth's surface, such as forest, grassland, cropland, water, bare soil or built-up areas. **Land use**, in contrast, describes the purposes and management practices through which people utilise land, including agriculture, forestry, settlement, recreation, conservation and industry. A landscape may experience a land-use change without immediate complete alteration of its cover—for example, when traditional low-intensity farmland is converted into intensive commercial agriculture. Conversely, land-cover transformation may occur when woodland is removed and replaced by roads or buildings.

These changes are central to contemporary environmental challenges. The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) identified changes in land and sea use as the direct driver exerting the greatest relative negative impact on terrestrial and freshwater nature since 1970. The significance of this finding lies in the fact that land transformation simultaneously affects multiple ecosystem processes rather than a single environmental component.

Land-use and land-cover changes are driven by demographic, economic, institutional, technological and cultural factors. Population growth increases demand for food, housing and infrastructure. Rising incomes alter diets and consumption. Expanding cities convert surrounding agricultural and natural landscapes. Roads and transportation systems open new areas to settlement, logging and farming. Global trade connects commodity consumption in one country to land conversion thousands of kilometres away. Policies concerning subsidies, property rights, irrigation, industrial development and infrastructure can similarly influence patterns of land transformation.

The concept of ecosystem services provides an important framework for assessing the consequences. Ecosystems supply provisioning services such as food, timber and freshwater; regulating services such as climate moderation, pollination, erosion control and flood regulation; cultural benefits including recreation and aesthetic value; and fundamental ecological processes supporting nutrient cycling and soil formation. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment demonstrated that extensive modification of ecosystems had increased the production of certain commodities while simultaneously degrading many regulating and supporting services.

This article focuses particularly on biodiversity, carbon storage, water regulation and soil conservation because these functions are strongly interconnected. Biodiversity contributes to ecosystem stability, productivity, pollination, decomposition and resistance to disturbance. Vegetation and soils store carbon and thereby influence climate regulation. Forests, wetlands and healthy soils regulate water by intercepting precipitation, encouraging infiltration, filtering contaminants and moderating runoff. Soil itself supports vegetation, stores water and carbon, cycles nutrients and provides habitat for microorganisms.

When land use changes, these relationships can be disrupted. Deforestation may simultaneously remove wildlife habitat, release stored carbon, increase runoff and expose soil to erosion. Agricultural intensification may increase crop production but reduce pollinator diversity, soil organic matter and water quality. Urbanisation may provide housing and economic opportunities while sealing soil, fragmenting habitats and increasing flood risk.

The objective of the present study is therefore to provide an integrated assessment of the relationship between LULCC and four major ecosystem functions. It examines the historical evolution of land transformation, evaluates the consequences for biodiversity, carbon storage, water regulation and soil conservation, compares experiences across different regions of the world, and identifies approaches capable of reducing future ecological losses.

A central proposition of the article is that environmental consequences depend not merely on the quantity of land converted but on **what type of ecosystem is transformed, the intensity of the subsequent land use, the spatial configuration of change and the possibility of**

ecological recovery. Conversion of primary forest differs fundamentally from modification of previously degraded cropland. Similarly, a diversified agroforestry landscape performs differently from an intensively cultivated monoculture, while compact urbanisation differs from low-density sprawl.

Understanding these distinctions is essential for sustainable development. Land governance should not aim to prevent all human use of ecosystems. Rather, it should maintain development within ecological limits, protect irreplaceable ecosystems, minimise unnecessary conversion and restore degraded landscapes wherever possible.

Historical Background

Human societies have transformed landscapes for thousands of years, but the scale, intensity and speed of land-use and land-cover change have increased dramatically with technological and economic development. Early hunter-gatherer communities modified vegetation through fire, harvesting and selective hunting, yet population densities were generally low and transformations were comparatively limited in spatial extent. A major transition occurred with the development of agriculture during the Neolithic period. Domestication of plants and animals encouraged permanent settlements, population growth and systematic conversion of forests and natural grasslands into cultivated fields and pastures.

Early agricultural societies altered hydrological and soil systems through irrigation, terracing, drainage and vegetation clearance. Some traditional systems developed sustainable adaptations to local environments, including crop rotation, mixed farming, shifting cultivation with sufficiently long fallow periods, rainwater harvesting and agroforestry. Other systems generated erosion, salinity and loss of soil fertility where cultivation exceeded ecological capacity. Thus, land degradation is not exclusively a modern phenomenon, although modern technologies have greatly increased its possible scale.

The emergence of cities strengthened the ecological relationship between urban settlements and rural hinterlands. Cities required food, timber, water, fuel and construction materials from surrounding landscapes. Agricultural areas were therefore expanded and intensified to sustain growing non-farming populations. Historical urbanisation also modified rivers, wetlands and forests. Nevertheless, the limited speed of transport constrained the geographical reach of many pre-industrial cities.

Colonial expansion and the growth of international commerce fundamentally changed land-use patterns. European colonial economies promoted plantation systems producing sugar, cotton, tea, coffee, rubber and other commodities for international markets. Forests and diversified local landscapes were frequently replaced by large-scale monocultures. Land became increasingly treated as a commercial asset, while communal and customary management systems were displaced by formalised ownership regimes. These transitions often had ecological consequences including deforestation, erosion, habitat simplification and alteration of water regimes.

The Industrial Revolution produced another decisive acceleration. Fossil energy, mechanised transport and industrial technologies allowed cities to grow beyond the constraints of nearby resource availability. Railways, steamships and later motor transport connected urban consumers to increasingly distant agricultural and forest landscapes. Industrial cities expanded outward, while roads, housing, factories and commercial infrastructure replaced soil and vegetation with impervious surfaces.

Agriculture simultaneously became increasingly mechanised. The use of tractors, synthetic fertilisers, pesticides and engineered irrigation increased agricultural productivity but also intensified ecological modification. Larger fields and monocultures became common in many regions. Hedgerows, wetlands and natural vegetation were removed to increase cultivable area. Repeated tillage exposed soil to erosion, while synthetic nutrients and pesticides entered groundwater and surface-water systems.

The twentieth century marked an unprecedented expansion in both agricultural production and urban land consumption. The Green Revolution significantly increased cereal yields through high-yielding varieties, irrigation, fertilisers and agrochemicals. This contributed importantly to food security but also intensified groundwater extraction, chemical contamination and soil degradation in several regions. At the same time, suburbanisation expanded particularly rapidly in industrialised countries. Low-density development consumed agricultural and natural land, while transportation infrastructure fragmented ecosystems.

Scientific concern regarding land degradation developed gradually. Early conservation movements emphasised forests, wildlife and soil preservation. The North American Dust Bowl of the 1930s dramatically illustrated the interaction among drought, vegetation removal and inappropriate agricultural practices. Large areas of cultivated soil became vulnerable to severe wind erosion, demonstrating that agricultural productivity ultimately depended upon ecological soil functions.

From the second half of the twentieth century onwards, ecology increasingly documented the consequences of human dominance over ecosystems. Vitousek and colleagues demonstrated that human activities had become a pervasive force modifying terrestrial systems, biogeochemical cycles and biodiversity. The 1990s also witnessed the growing influence of the ecosystem-services concept. Daily (1997) described the dependence of human society on natural ecosystem functions, while Costanza and colleagues (1997) stimulated international debate by estimating the economic significance of global ecosystem services.

Advances in satellite remote sensing subsequently transformed the study of LULCC. Researchers could increasingly monitor forest loss, agricultural expansion, urban growth and vegetation changes across national borders. Land-system science moved beyond simple population explanations toward recognition of interactions among markets, policies, technology, infrastructure and institutions. Lambin and colleagues (2001) argued that land-use change could not be satisfactorily explained through simplistic assumptions about population pressure alone; multiple interacting social and economic factors were involved.

During the early twenty-first century, climate science gave land conversion renewed importance. Forest clearance and degradation were recognised as important sources of carbon dioxide, while agricultural soils were simultaneously identified as potential sites for carbon sequestration. Lal (2004) demonstrated that improving soil-carbon management could support both climate mitigation and food security. Foley and colleagues (2005) subsequently emphasised that modern land use provides essential commodities but profoundly affects climate, water, biodiversity and biogeochemical cycles.

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment in 2005 consolidated the understanding that human well-being and ecosystem integrity are inseparable. It found that ecosystem transformation had occurred rapidly during the preceding decades and that gains in provisioning services were frequently accompanied by deterioration of regulating services. Research on hydrological services likewise demonstrated that ecosystems influence water quantity, quality, location and timing, making land management central to water security.

Concern about soil sustainability also strengthened. Montgomery (2007) showed that erosion from conventionally cultivated fields can greatly exceed natural soil-formation rates, raising questions regarding the long-term sustainability of intensive land use. Urban ecology simultaneously demonstrated that cities are not isolated from global environmental change. Grimm and colleagues (2008) conceptualised cities as socio-ecological systems that both influence and experience changes in climate, hydrology, biodiversity and biogeochemical cycles.

Globalisation further disconnected locations of consumption from locations of ecological damage. DeFries and colleagues (2010) demonstrated that tropical deforestation had become increasingly associated with urban population growth and international agricultural trade. Urban residents could therefore influence land-cover change far beyond municipal or national borders.

The twenty-first century has consequently produced a shift from viewing land degradation as a local agricultural problem to understanding LULCC as a global sustainability challenge. The 2019 IPBES Global Assessment placed land-use change at the centre of biodiversity decline, while the IPCC linked land management to both climate mitigation and adaptation. The UNCCD's *Global Land Outlook 2* further emphasised restoration, sustainable management and resilience as essential responses to widespread land degradation.

Most recently, the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework has moved land-use planning into the centre of global biodiversity policy. Its targets call for biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning, restoration of at least 30 per cent of degraded terrestrial, inland-water, coastal and marine ecosystems by 2030, and enhancement of ecosystem functions including water regulation and soil health. The historical trajectory therefore reveals an important evolution: land was initially regarded largely as a resource to be converted for production, whereas contemporary environmental governance increasingly recognises it as multifunctional natural capital whose ecological services must be maintained alongside human development.

Land-Use and Land-Cover Change as an Ecosystem-Service Driver

LULCC affects ecosystems through several interconnected mechanisms. The first is **habitat replacement**. When forests, wetlands or grasslands are converted to agriculture or settlements, native biological communities lose physical space. The second is **fragmentation**, in which remaining habitat is divided into smaller isolated patches. Third, changes in vegetation modify energy, carbon and water exchange between land and atmosphere. Fourth, disturbance of soil alters its physical structure, organic matter and biological communities. Finally, infrastructure and intensive production can introduce pollutants, invasive species and altered fire regimes.

These pathways demonstrate why LULCC cannot be evaluated solely through simple categories such as "forest," "cropland" or "urban area." The intensity of use is equally important. Newbold et al. (2015) showed that heavily modified terrestrial environments generally support lower local biodiversity than minimally disturbed habitats. Management practices therefore influence the extent of ecological loss even after conversion has occurred.

Effects of Land-Use and Land-Cover Changes on Biodiversity

Biodiversity encompasses variation at genetic, species and ecosystem levels. It is both an intrinsic component of nature and an important contributor to ecosystem functioning. Diverse communities can enhance productivity, pollination, pest regulation, decomposition and ecological resilience.

Habitat conversion represents one of the most direct mechanisms of biodiversity loss. When natural forest is converted to farmland, plantation, mining infrastructure or settlement, species dependent upon the original habitat may decline or disappear. Specialist organisms are generally more vulnerable than adaptable generalists.

Fragmentation compounds this effect. A landscape may technically retain some natural vegetation while losing ecological connectivity. Roads, fields and settlements divide habitat into isolated patches. Smaller populations become vulnerable to demographic fluctuations and genetic isolation, while edge conditions alter temperature, moisture, predation and species composition.

Agricultural intensification has particularly important biodiversity consequences. Traditional heterogeneous landscapes containing multiple crops, hedgerows, trees, ponds and uncultivated margins can provide habitat for birds, insects and small mammals. In contrast, large monocultures reduce structural diversity. Pesticides may affect non-target species, including pollinators and natural predators, while fertiliser enrichment changes plant communities.

Urbanisation generally produces an even more complete transformation of habitat within the built footprint. Buildings, roads and parking areas support relatively limited biological communities compared with the ecosystems they replace. Urban landscapes also introduce artificial light, traffic noise, domestic animals and exotic vegetation. These pressures favour a relatively restricted group of adaptable species, potentially producing ecological homogenisation.

Nevertheless, land-use change does not always cause biodiversity decline. Restoration of degraded agricultural land, reforestation using ecologically appropriate native species, wetland rehabilitation and development of connected urban green networks can increase habitat availability. Agroforestry and diversified agriculture can also strengthen landscape heterogeneity.

The most effective biodiversity strategy, however, remains prevention of unnecessary conversion of ecosystems possessing high ecological integrity. Restoration cannot immediately reproduce the complex biological relationships present in ancient forests, peatlands, mature grasslands or undisturbed wetlands. The IPBES assessment therefore provides strong justification for placing land-use planning at the centre of biodiversity conservation.

Effects on Carbon Storage and Climate Regulation

Land ecosystems are major components of the global carbon cycle. Carbon is stored in vegetation, roots, litter, dead organic matter and soils. Land-use and land-cover transformations alter these pools and affect the exchange of greenhouse gases between ecosystems and the atmosphere.

Deforestation generates carbon emissions through removal or burning of vegetation and decomposition of residual biomass. Soil disturbance following conversion can produce additional emissions. When mature forests are replaced with annual crops, the new vegetation generally contains far less carbon even if agricultural productivity is high.

Wetlands and peatlands are particularly important carbon reservoirs. Their waterlogged conditions slow decomposition and allow organic material to accumulate. Drainage exposes this material to oxygen, accelerating decomposition and releasing carbon dioxide. Fires in drained peatlands can produce severe and prolonged emissions.

Grasslands likewise contain substantial carbon below ground. Conversion to intensive cropping may reduce soil organic matter through tillage and disruption of root systems. The ecological importance of grasslands is therefore underestimated when carbon assessment considers only visible above-ground biomass.

Agricultural practices strongly influence soil carbon after conversion. Frequent tillage, residue removal, overgrazing and erosion reduce organic matter, while conservation tillage, cover crops, crop rotation, organic amendments and agroforestry can increase carbon inputs. Lal (2004) argued that soil-carbon restoration can contribute simultaneously to climate mitigation, soil fertility and food security.

Urbanisation affects carbon storage through removal of vegetation, soil disturbance and sealing. Although parks and urban forests store carbon, built-up areas usually retain less biological carbon than natural landscapes. Urban form also influences emissions indirectly. Low-density sprawl increases infrastructure requirements, transportation distances and land consumption.

Carbon-centred policies nevertheless require caution. Planting trees is not automatically beneficial in every ecosystem. The IPCC notes that replacing naturally treeless ecosystems such as certain grasslands, savannas or peatlands with unsuitable plantation forests can damage biodiversity and affect water supplies. Climate mitigation should therefore protect existing high-carbon ecosystems and recognise differences among ecological regions.

The relationship between biodiversity and carbon also deserves attention. Diverse natural forests frequently provide both high carbon storage and habitat value. However, monoculture plantations designed primarily for carbon accumulation may provide substantially lower biodiversity benefits. Integrated land management must therefore assess multiple ecosystem services rather than maximising carbon alone.

Effects on Water Regulation and Hydrological Services

Water regulation is one of the most important but frequently undervalued functions of terrestrial ecosystems. Vegetation intercepts precipitation, soils absorb and store water, wetlands temporarily retain floodwaters, and riparian ecosystems filter sediment and pollutants. Changes in land cover can alter each of these functions.

Forests influence hydrological processes through canopy interception, root systems, soil structure and evapotranspiration. Deforestation may increase surface runoff, particularly when combined with soil compaction or road construction. Sediment transported from exposed land can degrade streams, reservoirs and aquatic habitats.

Agriculture influences water regulation through irrigation, drainage, tillage and agrochemical inputs. Intensive irrigation can lower groundwater levels and reduce river flows. In poorly drained environments, irrigation may contribute to waterlogging and salinisation. Fertiliser and manure runoff adds nitrogen and phosphorus to aquatic ecosystems, potentially causing eutrophication.

Agricultural management can also improve water regulation. Conservation tillage, cover crops, contour farming, terraces, vegetated buffers and agroforestry reduce runoff and promote infiltration. Increasing soil organic matter enhances water-holding capacity, making farms more resilient during droughts.

Urbanisation creates particularly abrupt hydrological transformations because roofs, roads and paved surfaces are largely impermeable. Rainfall that previously infiltrated into soil is rapidly converted into surface runoff. Conventional stormwater systems transport this water toward rivers, increasing peak discharge and sometimes contributing to flooding.

Urban runoff can carry oil, metals, plastics, nutrients and other contaminants. At the same time, reduced infiltration may lower groundwater recharge. Loss of wetlands and floodplains removes natural storage precisely when expanding built surfaces increase runoff.

Green and blue infrastructure provides an important response. Permeable surfaces, rain gardens, bioswales, urban wetlands, green roofs, restored rivers and urban forests can partially reproduce natural hydrological functions. However, such measures should complement rather than substitute for protecting existing wetlands and drainage systems.

Water regulation also illustrates the necessity of watershed-scale governance. Administrative boundaries rarely correspond with hydrological boundaries. Deforestation or intensive farming upstream can affect water supplies and flood risks in distant urban areas. Similarly, downstream ecosystems may bear the consequences of urban and industrial pollution.

Climate change increases the importance of this relationship. Changes in precipitation patterns, drought and extreme rainfall interact with land-use conditions. The IPCC identifies land-use change, climate change and pollution as important interacting drivers of terrestrial and freshwater ecosystem degradation. Landscapes capable of storing water, maintaining vegetation and moderating runoff therefore constitute increasingly important climate-adaptation infrastructure.

Effects on Soil Conservation

Soil forms extraordinarily slowly yet can be degraded rapidly. It supports crops and natural vegetation, regulates water, stores carbon, cycles nutrients and contains a highly diverse biological community. Land-use decisions therefore determine not simply the productivity of the present landscape but its future ecological capacity.

Vegetation removal exposes soil to rainfall and wind. When forest or grassland is converted to cropland, protective canopy and root systems may be lost. Tillage further loosens soil particles and reduces aggregate stability. On sloping land, these processes can cause severe erosion.

Montgomery (2007) demonstrated that soil erosion under conventional agricultural systems often occurs at rates substantially higher than geological soil production. Continuous loss of topsoil therefore represents depletion of natural capital rather than an indefinitely sustainable production practice.

Soil erosion has consequences beyond farm boundaries. Sediment enters rivers, canals and reservoirs, increasing turbidity and reducing water-storage capacity. Nutrients and pesticides attached to soil particles contaminate water bodies. Loss of organic-rich topsoil simultaneously reduces agricultural productivity and carbon storage.

Agricultural intensification can also cause compaction. Heavy machinery compresses pore spaces, reducing infiltration, root penetration and biological activity. Overgrazing produces similar effects where livestock concentration exceeds ecosystem capacity.

Irrigation creates additional risks. In arid environments, evaporation can leave salts behind in the soil profile. When drainage is inadequate, salinisation reduces crop productivity and can eventually render land unsuitable for conventional agriculture.

Urbanisation causes perhaps the most physically complete form of soil degradation: **soil sealing**. Construction removes, mixes or compacts soil before covering it with buildings, asphalt or concrete. These surfaces largely eliminate the soil's ability to infiltrate water, support vegetation and exchange organic matter.

The spatial extent of agricultural soil degradation is nevertheless far greater globally because agricultural land covers enormous areas. FAO assessments identify declining soil quality, freshwater limitations and biodiversity loss among major pressures threatening agricultural systems.

Soil conservation requires a combination of preventive and restorative measures. Maintaining permanent vegetation cover, crop rotation, reduced tillage, contour farming, terraces, shelterbelts and organic amendments can reduce erosion and increase organic matter. Agroforestry is particularly valuable because tree roots stabilise soil while litter contributes nutrients and carbon.

Land-use planning can also prevent soil loss by protecting highly fertile agricultural soils from irreversible urban development. Urban expansion frequently occurs around historically productive agricultural zones because cities themselves developed in fertile valleys and plains. Once fertile soil is sealed beneath infrastructure, restoration is extremely difficult.

Interrelationship Among Biodiversity, Carbon, Water and Soil

Although biodiversity, carbon, water and soil are frequently studied separately, they operate as components of a single ecological system. Loss of one service can produce cascading effects on the others.

Vegetation illustrates these relationships clearly. Trees provide habitat for biodiversity, store carbon, intercept precipitation and stabilise soil. Removing vegetation therefore creates simultaneous changes in all four service categories.

Soil organic matter similarly links carbon and water. Carbon-rich soils generally contain stable aggregates and improved pore structure, increasing infiltration and water-holding capacity. Soil organisms contribute to decomposition and nutrient cycling, linking biodiversity with agricultural productivity.

Wetlands provide another example. They support specialised biodiversity, store substantial carbon, filter contaminants and regulate floodwater. Draining a wetland therefore produces ecological losses that cannot adequately be represented by considering only the value of the newly created agricultural or urban land.

This interdependence has important policy implications. A programme designed solely to maximise agricultural yield may inadvertently reduce pollination, water quality or soil carbon. A climate programme focused exclusively on tree planting may damage natural grassland biodiversity or water availability. Integrated assessment is therefore essential.

The 2024 IPBES Nexus Assessment reflects this emerging approach by explicitly examining interconnections among biodiversity, water, food and health while also considering climate change. (IPBES ICT) Such approaches represent an important transition away from fragmented environmental governance.

International Perspectives

Asia

Asia represents a major region of contemporary LULCC because rapid urbanisation, agricultural intensification, infrastructure expansion and industrial development occur alongside exceptional biodiversity and large human populations.

In South and East Asia, cities frequently expand onto highly productive agricultural land. Conversion of peri-urban cropland reduces local food-producing capacity and can displace agriculture into other areas. Urban growth also seals soils and places increasing pressure on groundwater.

India demonstrates the complexity of these interactions. Rapid expansion of metropolitan areas has transformed agricultural fields, wetlands and drainage systems. Encroachment upon floodplains and lakes can intensify urban flooding, while groundwater extraction interacts with reduced recharge caused by impervious surfaces.

Agricultural land use in India also varies significantly. Intensively irrigated systems have contributed greatly to national food production but face challenges associated with groundwater depletion, soil degradation, nutrient imbalance and chemical use. Traditional rainwater harvesting, mixed cropping and agroforestry nevertheless demonstrate alternative approaches.

Southeast Asia presents another pattern in which tropical forests and peatlands have been converted for plantation agriculture, settlements and infrastructure. Peatland drainage is particularly significant because it combines biodiversity loss with high carbon emissions, fire vulnerability and hydrological alteration.

Africa

African land systems are shaped by agricultural expansion, pastoralism, rapid urban growth and increasing climatic variability. Farming remains essential for livelihoods across much of the continent, yet expansion into forests and savannas can reduce biodiversity and alter carbon storage.

Land degradation in drylands is particularly important because vegetation recovery may be slow. Overgrazing, inappropriate cultivation and repeated drought can interact to reduce vegetation and expose soil. However, pastoral mobility and traditional land management can represent adaptive responses rather than drivers of degradation when appropriate access to grazing areas is maintained.

Urbanisation is also rapidly transforming African landscapes. Where planning and infrastructure fail to keep pace with population growth, settlements may develop on wetlands, floodplains or steep slopes. Environmental vulnerability becomes closely connected with poverty and unequal access to land.

Agroforestry, farmer-managed natural regeneration, restoration of degraded land and water-harvesting systems have demonstrated significant potential in African landscapes. Sustainable solutions must recognise community tenure, indigenous knowledge and livelihood requirements rather than relying exclusively on centralised land-management programmes.

Europe

European landscapes have undergone centuries of agricultural and urban transformation. Many ecosystems are therefore cultural landscapes in which biodiversity has become associated with particular forms of traditional management.

Contemporary land-use challenges include urban sprawl, soil sealing, agricultural intensification and abandonment of marginal farmland. Agricultural abandonment may permit woodland regeneration and carbon sequestration, but it can also reduce open habitats supporting specialised species.

European policy increasingly promotes green infrastructure, ecosystem restoration and sustainable agriculture. Urban river restoration, wetland conservation and connected green spaces have demonstrated the potential to recover certain ecological functions within heavily modified landscapes.

North America

North American land-use history includes extensive forest clearance, conversion of native grasslands, industrial agriculture and automobile-based suburbanisation. Low-density urban expansion has consumed agricultural land and fragmented habitats around major metropolitan regions.

Agriculture in the United States and Canada is highly productive but faces issues including nutrient pollution, soil erosion and loss of grasslands. The historical Dust Bowl remains a powerful demonstration of the consequences of exposing soil through intensive cultivation.

Conservation tillage, cover crops, wetland restoration, buffer strips and conservation easements have been adopted to address some of these pressures. However, sustainable land management requires long-term incentives capable of competing with development pressures and commodity markets.

Latin America

Latin America contains globally important tropical forests, savannas and wetlands. Agricultural expansion for cattle ranching and commodity crops has been a major driver of habitat conversion in several regions.

The Amazon is particularly significant because its forests support exceptional biodiversity, store carbon and influence regional hydrological processes. Deforestation therefore affects ecosystem services far beyond individual cleared sites.

Urbanisation is also extensive throughout Latin America. Metropolitan regions combine dense development with expanding peripheral settlements. Planning challenges include protection of water sources, steep slopes, floodplains and remaining natural habitats.

Protected areas, indigenous territories, forest monitoring and payment-for-ecosystem-services programmes demonstrate important policy innovations. Their effectiveness, however, depends on enforcement, secure tenure and economic conditions influencing agricultural expansion.

Across regions, the comparison reveals that no single form of LULCC is universally dominant. Tropical regions experience especially severe biodiversity and carbon losses from deforestation; intensively cultivated areas face soil and water pressures; rapidly growing cities experience sealing and hydrological alteration; while drylands remain vulnerable to interactions among land management and climatic stress.

Strategies for Sustainable Land Management

The first priority should be **avoiding conversion of ecosystems possessing high biodiversity, carbon stocks, water-regulation functions or irreplaceable soils**. Avoidance is generally more effective than attempting to reconstruct mature ecosystems after destruction.

Integrated spatial planning can identify ecological corridors, floodplains, wetlands, groundwater-recharge zones, prime agricultural soils and high-carbon ecosystems before development decisions are made. The Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework specifically calls for biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning capable of reducing loss of ecologically important areas.

Sustainable agriculture represents a second major strategy. Conservation agriculture, agroforestry, crop diversification, integrated nutrient management and reduced chemical dependence can maintain productivity while conserving ecosystem functions.

Urban policy should prioritise redevelopment of previously disturbed land, compact urban growth and protection of connected green and blue infrastructure. Urban forests, wetlands, permeable surfaces and restored waterways can provide biodiversity, cooling and water-management benefits.

Restoration is necessary where degradation has already occurred. The UNCCD emphasises restoration as a pathway toward ecological resilience, livelihood improvement and reversal of land degradation. (UNCCD) Restoration should nevertheless be ecologically appropriate: restoring grasslands, wetlands or native forests may provide greater benefits than indiscriminate tree plantation.

Finally, economic and legal systems must recognise ecosystem-service losses. Environmental assessment should evaluate cumulative rather than merely project-specific impacts. Incentives should reward conservation, while subsidies encouraging unsustainable land conversion should be reconsidered.

Future Scope

Future research on LULCC should increasingly combine remote sensing, field ecology, socio-economic analysis and climate modelling. Satellite imagery provides unprecedented capacity to identify changes in forest cover, urban surfaces, cropland and water bodies, but remotely sensed land-cover classes cannot fully reveal ecological quality. Field investigations remain essential for measuring species diversity, soil carbon, groundwater processes and local land-management practices.

Artificial intelligence and machine-learning techniques can substantially improve land-change detection and scenario modelling. Future studies should use high-resolution spatial data to identify not only the quantity of land converted but also the ecological importance of the areas affected.

Research should pay greater attention to indirect land-use change. Conversion in one location can displace agricultural production to another. Similarly, urban consumption drives resource extraction and agricultural expansion across international supply chains. Consumption-based land-footprint analysis can therefore complement territorial indicators.

Long-term studies of restoration are required. Many restoration projects are evaluated after only a few years, even though soil development, forest succession and biodiversity recovery may require decades. Research should determine which ecological functions recover rapidly and which losses are effectively irreversible.

Urban research should examine the quality and accessibility of green infrastructure rather than simply calculating green-space percentages. Ecological benefits depend on vegetation structure, native biodiversity, connectivity, soil condition and equitable public access.

Agricultural research should similarly move beyond crop yield as the principal measure of performance. Long-term experiments should evaluate combinations of yield, profitability, biodiversity, water efficiency, soil carbon and resilience.

Further investigation is needed into ecological thresholds. Ecosystems may tolerate gradual change until a critical point is crossed, after which rapid degradation occurs. Identifying such thresholds could allow land-use regulation to intervene before irreversible transformation takes place.

Climate change should also be incorporated into all future LULCC assessment. A wetland that currently provides moderate flood protection may become indispensable under more extreme rainfall. Similarly, soil organic matter and vegetation cover become increasingly valuable under drought conditions.

More research is required on the relationship between land governance and environmental justice. Indigenous peoples, local communities, small farmers and low-income urban residents frequently experience environmental consequences without receiving proportional economic benefits from land conversion. Participatory land governance and secure tenure should therefore form part of ecosystem-service research.

The growing international emphasis on interconnected systems provides a particularly important future direction. The IPBES Nexus Assessment demonstrates the need to evaluate biodiversity, water, food, health and climate simultaneously rather than addressing each through isolated policies. Future assessment frameworks should extend this approach to include land-use planning, ecosystem services and socio-economic inequality.

Finally, future research should examine the effectiveness of the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework in changing actual land-use trajectories. Its targets relating to integrated spatial planning, restoration and ecosystem services are ambitious, but their success will depend on implementation at national and local levels.

CONCLUSION

Land-use and land-cover changes represent one of the defining environmental challenges of the contemporary era. Agriculture, urbanisation, infrastructure, forestry and other land uses have enabled unprecedented economic development and improvements in human welfare, yet they have simultaneously transformed the ecological systems supporting biodiversity, climate regulation, water security and soil fertility.

The analysis demonstrates that effects on biodiversity occur primarily through habitat loss, fragmentation, intensification and ecological homogenisation. Species dependent upon natural and structurally complex habitats are particularly vulnerable, while highly modified landscapes tend to favour adaptable generalists.

LULCC affects carbon storage through removal of biomass, soil disturbance, drainage of wetlands and changes in agricultural management. Protecting existing high-carbon ecosystems is generally more effective than attempting to compensate for their destruction through later sequestration.

Hydrological effects arise through changes in vegetation, soil permeability, irrigation, drainage and urban impervious surfaces. Deforestation and soil degradation alter runoff, while urban sealing intensifies stormwater generation and reduces infiltration. Wetlands and healthy soils consequently function as essential natural water infrastructure.

Soil conservation represents the foundation connecting many of these processes. Soil degradation reduces productivity, water retention, biological diversity and carbon storage. Agricultural erosion and urban soil sealing differ in mechanism but both represent potentially serious losses of natural capital.

A central conclusion is that these ecosystem services cannot be managed independently. Biodiversity influences soil and vegetation functioning; soils store carbon and water; vegetation regulates runoff; and hydrological systems maintain habitat. Policies designed to maximise only one benefit can therefore generate unintended trade-offs.

International experience further demonstrates substantial regional differences in the causes and consequences of LULCC. Tropical deforestation creates particularly severe biodiversity and carbon impacts, agricultural intensification dominates many productive landscapes, dryland degradation threatens vulnerable livelihoods, and urbanisation increasingly transforms fertile and hydrologically important land.

Effective land governance must therefore become anticipatory rather than reactive. Development planning should identify ecosystem functions before conversion takes place. High-value forests, wetlands, grasslands, floodplains and productive soils should receive priority protection. Degraded areas should be restored, agriculture should become more ecologically regenerative, and cities should expand through compact and biodiversity-sensitive planning.

The most important principle emerging from this study is that land should not be regarded merely as an economic surface available for competing human activities. It is a living ecological system providing services essential to society. Protecting biodiversity, carbon stocks, water-regulation capacity and soil integrity is consequently not separate from development. It is a prerequisite for food security, climate stability, disaster resilience, public health and sustainable economic prosperity.

References

1. Daily, G. C. (Ed.). (1997). *Nature's services: Societal dependence on natural ecosystems*. Island Press.
2. Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., de Groot, R., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., Limburg, K., Naeem, S., O'Neill, R. V., Paruelo, J., Raskin, R. G., Sutton, P., & van den Belt, M. (1997). The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature, 387*(6630), 253–260.
3. Vitousek, P. M., Mooney, H. A., Lubchenco, J., & Melillo, J. M. (1997). Human domination of Earth's ecosystems. *Science, 277*(5325), 494–499.
4. Lambin, E. F., Turner, B. L., Geist, H. J., Agbola, S. B., Angelsen, A., Bruce, J. W., Coomes, O. T., Dirzo, R., Fischer, G., Folke, C., George, P. S., Homewood, K., Imbernon, J., Leemans, R., Li, X., Moran, E. F., Mortimore, M., Ramakrishnan, P. S., Richards, J. F., … Xu, J. (2001). The causes of land-use and land-cover change: Moving beyond the myths. *Global Environmental Change, 11*(4), 261–269.
5. Lal, R. (2004). Soil carbon sequestration impacts on global climate change and food security. *Science, 304*(5677), 1623–1627.
6. Foley, J. A., DeFries, R., Asner, G. P., Barford, C., Bonan, G., Carpenter, S. R., Chapin, F. S., Coe, M. T., Daily, G. C., Gibbs, H. K., Helkowski, J. H., Holloway, T., Howard, E. A., Kucharik, C. J., Monfreda, C., Patz, J. A., Prentice, I. C., Ramankutty, N., & Snyder, P. K. (2005). Global consequences of land use. *Science, 309*(5734), 570–574.
7. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. (2005). *Ecosystems and human well-being: Synthesis*. Island Press.
8. Brauman, K. A., Daily, G. C., Duarte, T. K. E., & Mooney, H. A. (2007). The nature and value of ecosystem services: An overview highlighting hydrologic services. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 32*, 67–98.
9. Montgomery, D. R. (2007). Soil erosion and agricultural sustainability. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 104*(33), 13268–13272.

10. Grimm, N. B., Faeth, S. H., Golubiewski, N. E., Redman, C. L., Wu, J., Bai, X., & Briggs, J. M. (2008). Global change and the ecology of cities. *Science, 319*(5864), 756–760.
11. DeFries, R. S., Rudel, T., Uriarte, M., & Hansen, M. (2010). Deforestation driven by urban population growth and agricultural trade in the twenty-first century. *Nature Geoscience, 3*, 178–181.
12. Seto, K. C., Güneralp, B., & Hutyra, L. R. (2012). Global forecasts of urban expansion to 2030 and direct impacts on biodiversity and carbon pools. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 109*(40), 16083–16088.
13. Newbold, T., Hudson, L. N., Hill, S. L. L., Contu, S., Lysenko, I., Senior, R. A., Börger, L., Bennett, D. J., Choimes, A., Collen, B., Day, J., De Palma, A., Díaz, S., Echeverria-Londoño, S., Edgar, M. J., Feldman, A., Garon, M., Harrison, M. L. K., Alhusseini, T., … Purvis, A. (2015). Global effects of land use on local terrestrial biodiversity. *Nature, 520*(7545), 45–50.
14. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. (2019). *Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services*. IPBES Secretariat.
15. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2019). *Climate change and land: An IPCC special report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems*. IPCC.
16. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2021). *The state of the world's land and water resources for food and agriculture 2021: Systems at breaking point*. FAO.
17. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). *Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press.
18. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification. (2022). *Global land outlook 2: Land restoration for recovery and resilience*. UNCCD.
19. Convention on Biological Diversity. (2022). *Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework*. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
20. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. (2024). *Thematic assessment report on the interlinkages among biodiversity, water, food and health*. IPBES Secretariat.