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## ABSTRACT

The formulation of a systems dynamics model which was applied to obtain forecasts of important urban variables such as population and housing, is discussed. It is shown that the model simulated the growth trends in the town, at least for the period for which data was available, satisfactorily. A sensitivity analysis of the model was carried out and no sensitive parameters were identified during the 6 year simulation interval. An optimization strategy by which the occupation rate of housing was restricted to certain limits, is also discussed.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The development of a urban model by Joubert [1] at the department of Applied Mathematics at the University of Zululand came to the attention of the Town Board of Richards Bay during 1982. This led to a request from the Town Board for a mathematical model which could be used for short term forecasting of the values of certain dynamic urban variables such as population, housing, etc.

The most urgent problem facing the town planning department of the Town Board was the timeous proclamation and development of new residential areas. Proclamation of new residential areas involves large amounts of money and if it takes place prematurely (i.e. at a time when no urgent demand for residential land exists) the situation might arise that these funds could have been applied more efficiently elsewhere in the town. If, on the other hand, the development is delayed for too long the shortage of residential land may become a limiting factor in the growth processes of the town. The town planning department decided to solve this problem by implementing a mathematical model which could be used to forecast the housing needs for a 6 year period.

A large scale mathematical model with 23 state variables had already been developed by Joubert [1] to simulate growth in Richards Bay. This model was however not calibrated to follow historical growth patterns and furthermore it also contained a large body of information which was irrelevant to the specific problem of housing demand. It was consequently decided to develop a simpler and goal-orientated model which could be used to solve the problem posed above.
2. THE HOUSING MODEL

This new model consisted of 5 state variables which represented the most important relevant urban variables. These state variables are defined by a coupled system of first order,
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FIGURE 1
ordinary, non-linear differential equations. The system consisting of 5 simultaneous differential equations was numerically solved using an Euler integration algorithm. The time dependent solution was found for the 5 year period from January 1982 to January 1987.

A system dynamics flow chart diagram (see Forrester [2] for a description of system dynamics) for the system under discussion is shown in figure 1. The state variables are represented by rectangles, the rate variables by valve symbols and the auxilliary variables by circles. Constant parameters are represented by the symbol $\theta$. The formulation of the model equations and relations between variables can be followed on the flow chart diagram.

A complete list of all model equations as well as all symbol names appear in the appendix. The most important model variable is the number of houses ( H ) and consequently only equations directly involved in its calculation are discussed in some detail.

The number of houses $(H)$ at any time in the town is a state variable and is defined by the following differential equation :
$\frac{\mathrm{dH}}{\mathrm{dt}}=\mathrm{HC}-\mathrm{HO}_{0}$
$H=$ Number of houses in town (Houses)
HC = Number of houses constructed per year (Houses/Year)
HO = Number of houses demolished per year (Houses/Year)
$\mathrm{t}=$ Time
(Year)
$H C=H^{*} H C N * H M$
HC = Number of houses constructed per year (Houses/Year)
$H=$ Number of houses in town (Houses)
HM = Housing multiplier
(Dimensionless)
HCN = Normal housing construction rate. (Fraction/Year)
$\mathrm{HCN}=0,135$

Equation (2) is an example of the calculation of a typical rate variable in system dynamics. The rate variable (HC) is defined as the product of a state variable ( $H$ ), a normal rate ( HCN ), and a dimensionless multiplier (HM) which adjusts the normal rate. It is further assumed that the rate at which houses are constructed ( HC ) is a fraction of the number of houses ( H ) in town at any time. The value of 0,135 for HCN implies that under normal circumstances (i.e. when $H M=1$ ) houses are constructed at an annual rate of 13,5 percent. This value was evaluated from available data supplied by the Town Board.

$$
\begin{align*}
H M & =H F * H P M * H B M & & \ldots \ldots . .  \tag{3}\\
H M & =\text { Housing multiplier } & & \text { (Dimensionless) } \\
H P M & =\text { Housing population multiplier } & & \text { (Dimensionless) } \\
H B M & =\text { Housing business multiplier } & & \text { (Dimensionless) } \\
H F & =\text { Housing factor } & & \text { (Dimensionless) } \\
H F & =1,0 & &
\end{align*}
$$

The parameter $H F(=1$ ) is included in equation (3) for two reasons. During a calibration of the model HF may be adjusted in order to cause certain model variables to fit time series data. This parameter is also important in a sensitivity analysis of the model. The effect of changes in it can be interpreted as the sensitivity of the model to changes in the other factors, HPM and HBM, of the term on the right hand side of equation 3. (See for example [1] Chapter 4 , for a discussion of table function sensitivity.)

Equation (3) further implies that the housing multiplier (HM) and by equation (2) also the annual housing constructions (HC), depend on a population factor (HPM) and a business factor (HBM). Equations (4) and (5) respectively express HPM and HBM as functions of the occupancy rate of housing (HOR) and the business growth rate (BGT). The variable HOR is later defined in equation (9) while the definition of BGT is listed together with the other
model equations in the appendix. It should be noted that both HOR and BGT may be expressed in terms of state variables and (constant) parameters.

```
HPM = HPM(HOR)
HPM = Housing population multiplier (Dimensionless) -
HOR = Housing occupancy rate (People/house)
HBM = HBM(BGT)
HBM = Housing business multiplier (Dimensionless)
BGT = Business growth rate (Fraction/year)
```

The functional relations between $H P M$ and $H O R$ and $H B M$ and BGT respectively appear in the appendix in the form of so called table functions. These functions are specified as a set of co-ordinates and linear interpolation between these points is assumed. The shape of a specific table function may either be determined from available data or in the absence of data may be assumed. Such assumptions can have significant influence on model behaviour and should, as was done in this case, be thoroughly investigated by means of a sensitivity analysis.

Equation (6) defines the demolition rate ( $H 0$ ) of houses in town. According to Alfeld and Craham [3] it may be assumed that the average life span of a house is in the order of 90 years. This implies that during the 5 year simulation period early in the town's history, only a few houses deteriorate to such an extent that it becomes necessary to be demolished. A relatively low normal demolition rate ( HON ) of 0,01 is consequently assumed.

$$
\begin{equation*}
H O=H * H O N \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
H O & =\text { Number of houses demolished per year } & & \text { (Houses/year) } \\
H & =\text { Number of houses in town } & & \text { (Houses) } \\
H O N & =\text { Normal housing demolition rate } & & \text { (Fraction/year) } \\
H O N & =0,01 & &
\end{aligned}
$$

From the equations discussed as well as those listed in the appendix it follows that state variables are defined by equations of the following form :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\mathrm{dx}}{\mathrm{dt}}=\underline{\mathbf{f}}(\underline{\mathrm{x}}, \underline{\mathrm{p}}, \mathrm{t}) \\
& \underline{\underline{x}}=\text { state vector } \\
& \underline{\mathbf{p}}=\text { parameter vector } \\
& \mathrm{t}=\text { time }
\end{aligned}
$$

## 3. RESULTS

Before any results could be obtained, the model had to be calibrated by means of historical data made available by the Town Board. It was also necessary to estimate some parameters on which no data was available. An example of such an estimated parameter is the normal demolition rate (HON) of houses.


Figure 2 shows the forecasted monthly house completions and on the same axis system the actual number of houses completed for the period January to December 1982.

These curves do not differ significantly at any time during 1983 and it may be concluded that the model could provide a sound basis for short term forecasting of housing demand. Similar results were found for population forecasts during the abovementioned period.

## 4. SENSITIVITY OF THE MODEL

The importance of sensitivity analyses in the modelling process has been emphasised by Vermeulen and De Jongh [4]. A parameter sensitivity analysis involving the following 9 parameters was carried out on the housing model, EVN, EHF, HCN, HF, PMN, BCN, BF, PDN, BON. (The names of these parameters appear in the appendix.) The model exhibited small values for all normalised sensitivity functions which in general are of the following form :
$N_{i, j}(t)=\frac{\partial x_{i}(t)}{\partial p_{j}} / \frac{x_{i}(t)}{p_{j}}$
$x_{i}=1$ th state variables
$\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{j}}=\mathbf{j}$ th parameter
Perturbations of $1 \%$ in each of the 9 parameters were separately considered and in none of the cases did any of these perturbations cause changes greater than $1 \%$ in any of the state variables during the 5 year simulation interval. A combination of simultaneous perturbations of $10 \%$ each in the 3 most sensitive parameters( HCN , PMN and HF) were consequently considered. This resulted in increments of $15,9 \%$ in the housing ( $H$ ), $10,1 \%$ in the population $(P)$ and $14,8 \%$ in the number of plots sold (PL) at the end of the simulation period. The influence of this combined parameter perturbation on the number of houses ( $H$ ) in the town is shown in figure 3.

5. OPTIMIZATION OF THE OCCUPANCY RATE (HOR)

The occupancy rate of housing at the start of the simulation interval was $H O R=5,42$. This value was slightly high by urban standards and it was decided to investigate the effects of a control on this variable on the simulated values of some other model variables. This exercise was not part of the Richards Bay Town Board's request but is included to illustrate how an objective function, such as $H O R$, can be controlled in a model of this nature.

The control consisted of stepwise increments in the parameters HCN and PMN that directly determine HOR. Consider the definition of HOR :

```
HOR = P/H
HOR = Housing occupancy rate (People/house)
    P = Number of people in town (People)
    H = Number of houses in town (Houses)
```

From equations (1) and (2) follows that increments in the constant parameter HCN leads to an increased rate of housing construction. In a similar way an increment in the normal migration rate (PMN) leads to increased migrations to the town.

The control was designed to become operative whenever HOR exceeded the limits of a desired interval $[4,5 ; 5,0]$. In cases where HOR > 5,0 , HCN was increased by $10 \%$ and PMN simultaneously decreased by $1 \%$, until HOR once more entered the prescribed interval. The numerical values of the increments of $10 \%$ and $1 \%$ respectively were arbitrarily chosen to reflect the relative ease by which these parameters can be adjusted in a real life situation. Conversely PMN was increased by $1 \%$ and HCN decreased by $10 \%$ whenever $H 0 R<4,5$.

The behaviour of the objective function, $H O R$, over the simulation period with and without the optimization algorithm in operation is shown in figure 4.

The percentage deviation of the housing ( $H$ ) and population ( $P$ ) from the standard values due to the optimization algorithm appear in table 1. These deviations are given at yearly intervals during the simulation period. It follows from table 1 that no large deviations resulted from this particular optimization algorithm.

## 6. CONCLUSION

An important achievement of this project was the fact that urban decision-makers made use of a mathematical model in the formulation of land proclamation policy. The systems dynamics model described the system under discussion adequately without being particularly sensitive to a wide range of parameter perturbations.
http://orion.journals.ac.za/

TABLE 1
Percentage Deviation from standard values of Housing and Fopulation due to oftimization strategy - 1932-1997

|  | rousing <br> Deviation | Population <br> Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1982 | - | - |
| 1983 | 13,2 | 0,4 |
| 1994 | 23,9 | 4.5 |
| 1985 | 14,5 | 8,1 |
| 1986 | 5,6 | 8,4 |
| 1987 | 6,1 | 6,8 |



It is of interest that the Jown Board of Richards Bay subsequently requested a continuation of this project. Data on housing and plot sales become available at monthly intervals, and it was felt that six monthly updates of the projections would enable them to become aware of any possible future shortfalls in availability of residential land. The town board further created a post for an urban researcher who could assist with the task of data collection and preparation. As part of the project it was also envisaged that town board staff could be trained to run and experiment with the model on the town board's own computer.

These arrangements are, from a modeller's point of view, very satisfying as close collaboration between modeller and user ensures constant feedback regarding the model's performance. Specifically, this feedback led to a few refinements of the model, so that the one presently in use differs slightly from the model described in text.

The algorithm employed to restrict the chosen objective function's values to a given interval can readily be extended to accommodate more complicated objective functions. Optimization techniques such as the one described above may have important practical implications for urban decision-makers. It is further foreseen that the incorporation of these techniques in a mathematical model may contribute towards the better understanding of the system's behaviour in response to particular urban strategies.
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## APPENDIX

Model Equations, Symbol Names and State variable values


| TIME | POP. (P) | HDUSES( H ) | PLOTS(PL) | Bus. (B) | BUS.AU.(BA) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1982.0000 | 9571.3000 | 1764.0000 | 2101.0000 | 324.0000 | 324.0000 |
| 1982.0833 | 9709.1608 | 1790.8990 | 2135.5991 | 324.2764 | 324.0058 |
| 1982.1667 | 9848.7031 | 1818.1667 | 2170.7148 | 324.6036 | 324.0182 |
| 1982.2500 | 9989.6488 | 1845.8056 | 2206.3517 | 324.9816 | 324.0363 |
| 1982.3333 | 10132.0184 | 1873.8185 | 2242.5142 | 325.4105 | 324.0669 |
| 1982.4167 | 10275.8315 | 1902.2080 | 2279.2070 | 325.8903 | 324.1049 |
| 1982.5000 | 10421.1067 | 1930.9770 | 2316.4351 | 326.4211 | 324.1531 |
| 1982.5833 | 10567.8619 | 1960.1283 | 2354.2033 | 327.0029 | 324.2125 |
| 1982.6667 | 10716.1144 | 1989.6649 | 2392.5167 | 327.6358 | 324.2838 |
| 1982.7500 | 10865.8807 | 2019.5899 | 2431.3802 | 328.3198 | 324.3679 |
| 1982.8333 | 11017.1769 | 2049.9062 | 2470.7991 | 329.0550 | 324.4655 |
| 1982.9167 | 11170.0188 | 2080.6169 | 2510.7785 | 329.8416 | 324.5775 |
| 1983.0000 | 11324.4216 | 2111.7252 | 2551.3239 | 330.6796 | 324.7047 |
| 1983.0833 | 11480.4004 | 2143.2343 | 2592.4404 | 331.5690 | 324.8477 |
| 1983.1667 | 11637.9699 | 2175.1474 | 2634.1337 | 332.5101 | 325.0073 |
| 1983.2500 | 11797.1447 | 2207.4677 | 2676.4091 | 332.5029 | 325.1843 |
| 1983.3333 | 11957.9394 | 2240.1985 | 2719.2722 | 334.5475 | 325.3794 |
| 1983.4167 | 12120.3684 | 2273.3432 | 2782.7385 | 335.6440 | 325.5932 |
| 1983.5000 | 12284.4460 | 2306.9050 | 2806.7838 | 336.7926 | 325.8265 |
| 1983.5833 | 12450.1865 | 2340.8875 | 2851.4437 | 337.9935 | 326.0800 |
| 1983.5667 | 12617.6045 | 2375.2939 | 2896.7140 | 339.2466 | 326.3543 |
| 1983.7500 | 12786.7144 | 2410.1277 | 2942.5004 | 340.5522 | 326.6501 |
| 1983.3333 | 12957.5309 | 2445.3923 | 2989.1088 | 341.9105 | 326.9680 |
| 1983.9167 | 13130.0054 | 2481.0982 | 3036.2542 | 343.3215 | 327.3087 |
| 1984.0000 | 13303.87d7 | 2517.2794 | 3084.0826 | 344.7854 | 327.6728 |
| 1984.0833 | 13479.1703 | 2553.9396 | 3132.6004 | 346.3022 | 99 |
| 1984.1667 | 13655.91:4 | 2591.0823 | 3181.3139 | 347.8720 | 328.4736 |
| 1984.2500 | 13834.1251 | 2628.7114 | 3231.7295 | 349.4947 | 328.9:16 |
| 1984.3333 | 14013.8362 | 2666.8306 | 3282.3538 | 351.1706 | 329.3753 |
| 1984.4167 | 14195.0696 | 2705.4440 | 3333.6936 | 352.8995 | 329.8654 |
| 1984.5000 | 14377.9499 | 2744.5553 | 3385.7555 | $354.68: 6$ | 330.3824 |
| 1984.5833 | 14562.2019 | 2784.1687 | 3438.5465 | 356.5170 | 330.9269 |
| 1984.6667 | 14749.1501 | 2824.2881 | 3492.0735 | 358.4058 | 331. |
| 1984.7500 | 14935.7193 | 2964.9179 | 3546.3437 | 360.3480 | 332.1004 |
| 1984.3333 | 15124.9341 | 2906.0621 | 3601.3642 | 362.3438 | 332.7304 |
| 1984.9167 | 15315.9196 | 2947.7251 | 3657.1423 | 364.3933 | 333.3901 |
| 1985.0000 | 15508.4005 | 2989.9112 | 3713.6854 | 366.4965 | 334.0798 |
| 1985.0833 | 15702.7020 | 3032.6248 | 3771.0011 | 368.6537 | 334.8001 |
| 1985.1667 | 15998.7493 | 3075.8704 | 3829.0989 | 370.8650 | 335.5514 |
| 1985.2500 | 18096.5680 | 3119.6525 | 3887.9805 | 373.1305 | 336.3343 |
| 1985.3333 | 18296.2408 | 3163.9758 | 3947.6598 | 375.4489 | 337.1492 |
| 1985.4167 | 16497.8765 | 3208.8451 | 4008.1430 | 377.8177 | 337,9965 |
| 1985.5000 | 16701.4973 | 3254.2655 | 4069.4385 | 380.2377 | 338.8765 |
| 1985.5833 | 16907.1256 | 3300.2423 | 4131.5553 | 382.7088 | 339.7896 |
| 1985.6667 | 17114.7845 | 3346.7808 | 4194.5020 | 385.2315 | 340.7363 |
| 1985.7500 | 17324.4971 | 3393.8862 | 4258.2876 | 387.8060 | 341.7170 |
| 1985.8333 | 17536.2874 | 3441.5642 | 4322.92:1 | 390.4326 | 342.7319 |
| 1985.9167 | 17750.1795 | 3489.8199 | 4388.4116 | 393.1115 | 343.7814 |
| 1986.0000 | 17966.1978 | 3538.6591 | 4454.7684 | 395.8432 | 344.8661 |
| 1986.0833 | 18184.3675 | 3598.0973 | 4522.0008 | 398.6279 | 345.9861 |
| 1986.1667 | 18404.7140 | 3638.1101 | 4590.1181 | 401.4658 | 347.1419 |
| 1986. 2500 | 18627.2631 | 3688.7332 | 4659.1301 | 404.3574 | 349.3339 |
| 1986. 3333 | 18852.0412 | 3739.9624 | 4729.0462 | 407.3030 | 349.5624 |
| 1988.4167 | 19979.0750 | 3791.8035 | 4799.8764 | 410.3028 | 350.8278 |
| 1986.5000 | 19308.3917 | 3844.2625 | 4871.6305 | 413.3573 | 352.1305 |
| 1986.5833 | 19540.0189 | 3897.3453 | 4944.3184 | 416.4667 | 353.4709 |
| 1986.6667 | 19773.9848 | 3951.0580 | 5017.9505 | 419.6315 | 354.8492 |
| 1986.7500 | 20010.3180 | 4005.4067 | 5092.5368 | 422.8519 | 356.2659 |
| 1986.3333 | 20249.0474 | 4060.3976 | 5168.0878 | 426.1284 | 357.7214 |
| 1986.9167 | 20490.2025 | 4116.0369 | 5244.6141 | 429.4613 | 359.2160 |
| 1987.0000 | 20733.8132 | 4172.3310 | 5322.1262 | 432.8510 | 360.7500 |

