Management of Slums and Dreaming of Slum - Free Cities: An Assessment of Policies and the Changes in India

Dr M. MAHADEVA, PHD

Professor in Research, Institute of Finance and International Management (IFIM), KIADB Industrial Area, Electronic City Phase I, Bangalore -560 100
Email: profmmahadeva@ifim.edu.in

Abstract*:* Ever since the commencement of urbanization in India, slums have been co-existed in the urban areas, especially in the major cities. The incidence of slum is spread across almost all the states of the Union of India at varied levels. In fact, the number of slums and the incidence are at alarming level in the case of a group of states. The public efforts for development of the urban slums to make them human settlement friendly and then an integral part of urban life have had many setbacks. They mainly include the ad hoc approaches which were in vogue till the end of Tenth Five Year Plan. Lack of public policy commitment coupled with inadequate public finance, concerted efforts for the improvement of housing and living conditions of the slum dwellers have been the major impediments. But the national consensus evolved from late 90s heralded several initiatives to achieve slum-free urban India, which has brought considerable improvement. Under the windfall, slums have put up a decent level of achievements, in terms of the development of the living standard, access to housing amenities, degraded environment and marginalising the development gaps. Although slums have achieved better performance than their hosts (urban areas) but not only the overall development interventions must be stepped up but have to still go a long way. Achieving slum-free urban India is a gigantic task that needs huge investment not just from the government but also from others as well. Given the challenging considerations, this research offers a few policy implications like other corporate players part, integrated approach for both development of housing and amenities as well to improve the degraded environment, vigilant role of urban local bodies to mainstream the urban slums.

Keywords*:* Slums, Incidence, Slum-Free, Inclusion, Development, Implications

INTRODUCTION

Understanding the world of slum within the urban context is extremely important from two points of view, first to take note of a different degraded urban environment existing inside and to upgrade that segment on par with rest of the urban areas of India. Regrettably, scholarly attempts in exposing the degraded world of slums for public policy making and for the development interventions were very limited in the late seventies. Yet a few research studies have attempted to characterise and define slums according to different contextual understandings. It is argued that slums are such parts of the cities, that may be unfit for human habitation either because the structures therein are old, dilapidated, grossly congested and out of repairs or because it is impossible to preserve sanitation for want of sanitary facilities including ventilation, drainage, water supply etc., or because the sites by themselves are unhealthy (Singh 1978). The 58th Round of National Sample Survey defined that a slum is a compact settlement with a collection of poorly built tenements, mostly of temporary nature, crowded together, usually with inadequate sanitary and drinking water facilities in unhygienic conditions (NSS0 2002). Further, the draft National Slum Policy-2003 (DNSP) called slum is a compact area with 300 population or about 60-70 households, poorly built congested tenements, unhygienic environment, inadequate infrastructure, lacking proper sanitary and drinking water facilities (GOI 2003). Another research opined that notwithstanding their economic conditions, urban poorest of the poor who generally live-in slums have greater contribution to the urban economy in terms of the labour force, consumption, governance, public voice etc (Seetharam and Reddy 2014).

Slums have been an integral part of the urban growth eversince the industrialisation of the country, which was coincided with the process of development planning. Unfortunately, there were hardly any serious attempts on the part of the government or society to assess and understand the gamut of sub-human segments comprehensively. Reliable and analysable official data base based on the ground realities of the slums was also a serious constraint. That apart whatever the academic efforts for understanding the socio-economic conditions of the slums have confined to just stray writings. Also, such studies have had their own limitations in regard to

the coverage of slums, methodology of investigation, scope of the research etc. To mention a few, the National Institute of Urban Affairs have highlighted the slums in India and their relationship with the growth of India's urbanization between the 1971 and 1981 (NIUA 1988). Slums in major cities with their households, housing characters, including access to amenities and the government policies during the plan period for slums have been captured with regard to three metropolitan cities of Calcutta, Delhi and Chennai, as the centres of the urban slums (Gupta D 1985). Additionally, the NSS and Census have brought to the fore that there have been an increasing number of Cities with One Million Population (COMP) to twenty seven, spread over to thirteen states with a noticeable population size. For example, Maharashtra State has been housing seven one million cities, including Greater Bombay, followed by five in Uttar Pradesh, three in Gujarat, two each in Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal. Additionally, seven other industrial hubs and economic centres (Delhi, Chennai, Bangalore, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Ludhiana, Patna and Faridabad) of the seven states account to a major portion of the slum population. Further, the share of the slum population, its distribution by different size of the urban areas, housing conditions of the slum dwellers, the living environment, availability of the social infrastructure and demographic outcomes have also been highlighted by other scholars (Cherunilam and Heggade 1987 & Chandrasekhar 2005).

Development of the slums from the viewpoint of orderly human settlement and inclusive urbanisation assumes a very significant importance from two perspectives. First, to seize the existence of two different and contrast world within the urban areas and second sink the development gaps between the non-slum and slums. This calls for an assessment of the performance in the redevelopment, especially after the watershed in the housing sector from late 80s. At the same time, thanks to the United Nations Vancouver Declaration (Habitat 1976) to assess the incidence of slums and to prepare the development agenda for improvement/redevelopment of the slums in developing countries, including India (Habitat 2003). These, declarations have not only sensitised the governments regarding the necessities of making public policies for slums iprovement but also prompted to prepare roadmaps for eradication of slums. Correspondingly important to note that Indian government has not only responded to the UN Declaration positively but also declared to redevelop its cities to wipe out slums (slum-free) in the urban environment. Since development efforts towards the urban poor is generally being refer to the slums or informal settlements in India (Kunal Sen 2014), slum improvement initiatives have almost coincided with that of the development planning process commenced from early fifties. The interventions over the years have not only improved the living conditions of the people in the slums to some extent but also have facilitated subsuming or mainstreaming process, if not in a very large scale. Highlighting the process of understanding the slums in terms of their incidence, distribution, and the development scale is the overall objectives of this research. Specifically, the paper has three major objectives (a) to capture the incidence and distribution of slums in the country by classifying the Indian states into three categories i.e. states with high incidence of slums, states with lower incidence and states without slums at all; (b) to discuss the redevelopment strategies of the slums and their living environment in the backdrop of the Rajiv Awaas Yojana (RAY), whiich is also aiming to achieve the dream of Slum-Free Cities; and lastly (c) to capture the levels of development with selected parameters like housing, drinking water, sanitation, energy, and development levels, across the notified and non-notified slums of urban areas. The paper has used the official data extensively, as presented recently by Census of India for 2011 to analyse all the three objectives. Additionally, the paper also used the official policy documents and the latest NSSO survey findings of 2013 (69th Round) in comparison with that of the 2009 (65th Round), mainly to account the subsuming process of the slums vis-à-vis the urban rest, housing and amenities development and change in the selected environmental parameters.

Understanding & Assessing Slum Incidence
The guidelines for sustainable urbanization and the Global Shelter Strategy of the United Nations have played a catalytic role in influenting and sensitising the governments of the member nations about the ugly part of the urban areas (Habitat 1996 & Habitat 1998). They clearly and respectively emphasised to develop housing sector as a significant component of economic welfare of the people and pointed to address the housing and amenities needs of poorer sections, more so in the slums. The subsequent public attempts in capturing the living conditions of the people in slums and the sub-human environment therein have laid strong foundations to evolve the development interventions of the government for the mainstreaming process. Even though growth of urban slums has been synonymous with the urbanization and industrialisation in the Indian context since its independence, this subject had not attracted any public understanding, excepting the ad hoc interventions for improvement. Then came the conspicuous attempts of assessing the slums and their incidence across urban India from late seventies, facilitated by the National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO). The first ever attempt to understand the socio-economic conditions of slums was done in 1976-77 (31st Round), follwed by the second in 1993 (49th Round), the third in 2002 (58th Round) and the fourth in 2009 (65th Round). There were lots of differences between the first two and the last two surveys, in terms of the coverage and the methodology. In the first (31st Round), only Class I towns having one lakh or more population as per 1971 census and Class II towns viz, Shillong and Pondicherry was covered. The second (1993- NSS 49th Round) included rural areas also into

its coverage and based on the declarations of the local authorities, the slums were classified as 'Declared' and 'Undeclared'. Again the third survey (NSS 58th Round) held in 2002 limited the slums into only urban areas, in terms of availability of the facilities rather than their adequacy. The last survey (2009-65th Round) portrayed the slum area, availability of approach roads, electricity, drinking water, sewerage, drainage, garbage disposal and their improvement over the years in the notified and non-notified slums in urban India. Thereafter, Census of India was the second authority to have collected and presented data on the distribution of slums and their population for the year in 2011. Undoubtedly and beyond apprehensions, these studies have proved the growing incidence of the slums, besides enlightening the multifaceted dimensions of sub-human living conditions, degraded environment etc.

In fact, these exposures about the precarious world of slum by the National Sample Survey organisation for the past three and a half decades has prompted in evolving a national consensus like Draft National Slum Policy-2003 (DNSP). The DNSP enshrined the essential strategic interventions both by the central and state governments across the country (GOI 2003). The DNSP has been a guiding force at the sub-national levels (or states) to evolve their own action plans for the redevelopment of slums in their respective regions. This apart, Rajiv Awas Yojana (RAY), has been a major intervention in securing housing facility with access to amenities for the slum dwellers and improving the living conditions. Interestingly, the RAY has also dreamt of achieving slum-free urban India in the years to come (GOI 2007). Lastly, the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation has attempted to present a very pertinent and seminal work that directly established comprehensive linkage around the inclusive urban policies and planning by including the urban slums in India (MHUPA 2014), which is a major policy change for the improvement of the slums. It has addressed the various issues like the conditions of the poor in urban areas, poverty of housing, deprivation of basic amenities, development of infrastructure, issues pertaining to mainstreaming of urban slums, role of the market and local government, policies, and planning strategies for the alleviation and so on.

Urban India has registered 2822 slum reported towns out of the total number of 8027. This means over one-third (35.16 per cent) of India's urban towns or geography is inhabited by slums. These slums have been housing over 35 million households out of the total number of 167.82 million urban households, which works out to roughly 21 per cent (Table 1). If this is the overall scenario, the disaggregated setting portrays three different situations. Higher incidence of slums has been recorded in seven states and have housed 25 per cent of the total slum households in the country. There are 912 slum reporting towns (34 per cent) with 30 million households dwell in them. Considering the magnitude and the density, these states can be called as "Centres of Slums". This apart, these states reveal a few other traits. Sikkim, as one of the states in the category has projected two distinct but contrasting picture. It has a smallest number of towns (9) and majority of them (77.78 per cent) have reportedly having slums but recorded a marginally less number of the slum households at 24.1 per cent, which is slightly below the group average of about 25 per cent. Madhya Pradesh being the second largest state in the group with more than 63 per cent of its towns (302) registered with slums, the share of the households living in the slums is much more than the group average (28.3 per cent). This is also the case of the state of Chhattisgarh with around 52 per cent of the towns are in slums with 32 per cent of the slum households. The undivided Andhra Pradesh is a topper in the group with highest number of households (35.7 per cent) living in the slums, which is almost one and half times more than the group average. Also, 124 of its towns have housed slum households. Whereas Lastly, all the other states (Orissa, Maharashtra, and West Bengal) have relatively registered a lower incidence of slum households at 23.1, 22.7 and 21.9 per cent, which is below the group average. However, it is indeed necessary to remark that the State of Maharashtra has not only recorded highest number of urban households but also households in slums as well within the group. Maharashtra accounted for 84 per cent of the urban households in the group and accounted for 82 per cent of the slum households.

Lower incidence of slums is registered in the second group of 24 states and union territories and have accommodated around 11 per cent of slum households in 1910 towns (36.24 per cent), out of the total number of 5270 towns in this group. In all, 5.23 million households have taken shelter in these slums that works out to roughly 11 per cent. Evidently and interestingly, the slum reporting towns are higher in five states of the group, which is above the national average. Pondicherry recorded highest number of towns (60 per cent) inflicted with slums, followed by Karnataka (59.37 per cent), Haryana (48.70 per cent), Tamilnadu (45.94 per cent) and Himachal Pradesh (37.29 per cent). Similarly, higher incidence of slum households has registered in three major states viz. Tamilnadu with 1.45 million or 28 per cent, followed by Uttar Pradesh (0.99 million or 19 per cent) and Karnataka (0.73 million or 14 per cent). With this, these three states alone constitute to around 61 per cent of the total slum households of the group. Contrarily, a good number of states have recorded lower incidence of slum towns as well as the slum households, that is lower than the group average. In seven independent states and two union territories, the incidence of slum households is less than 10 per cent, as seen in the table. Lastly, the third category consist of one state and three union territories is free from the incidence of slum. Interestingly, though the geography is very small as compared to the other categories, this category has not registered even a single slum, despite having 71 urban towns with a very negligible number of households. With this, it is obvious to mention that only a limited portion of urban India is slum - free.

Slum Development Policies

Notwithstanding the delay in understanding, the schematic approaches for the development of slums were clearly laid down along with the development planning from 1950s. Especially, the Second Five-Year Plan has suggested seven important strategic approaches: (a) Acquisition and clearing of slum areas; (b) Acquisition of private lands and allotment of independent sites; (c) Acquisition of private open lands to rehabilitate the slum dwellers;(d) Construction of small independent houses on house sites for allotment of slum families; (e) Construction of small twin houses for two slum families; (f) Construction of multi-storeyed buildings to rehabilitate the slum dwellers; and (g) Environmental improvements in the slums that are located in the government, municipality, corporation and City Improvement Trust Board lands (GOI 1956 and Shivalingappa 1975). But the disappointment is that these strategies have had very limited impact on the target account of (a) Displacement of Slum Dwellers from their workplaces as well as social network; (b) Litigations by Private Landowners; and (c) Inadequate Public Funding. About the funding of the slum's redevelopment, national government alone had to channelise public investment in the absence of any institutional avenues and market financing was altogether missing. The central investments were routed through state housing boards, city improvement trusts, town planning authorities and slum clearance boards, which was entirely inadequate to meet the total challenge or not at all in proportionate to the need. Subsequently, the responsibility of funding the slums redevelopment was entrusted to the Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUDCO) after its creation to administer the public investment for development of slums in the country. It must be noted that these strategic interventions or financing were by and large ad hoc in nature and were not necessarily based on the ground perspectives.

The redevelopment strategies of the slums in the country were evolved around two different approaches: (a) Ad hoc Approach, which was in vogue during 1956-1996; and (b) Pragmatic Approach, which is also called or Inclusive urbanisation from 1998 onwards. The main difference between these two is that under the first, the thrust was to physically clear the slums and relocate the households in new residential layouts. But the approach proved unsuccessful due to non-availability of public land for relocation and due to resistance of the slum dwellers on account of losing the existing social life as well as the displacement, risks in resettlements etc. Further, the ad hoc strategy was pursued almost without a national commitment and clear road map for the redevelopment of slums. The second approach has been a paradigm shift and the main thrust is to in-situ improvement of the slums, wherever they are located. This is found to be suitable and acceptable, as the same is free from relocation related fears of the dwellers. It is also considered as windfall for the slum's eradication, followed by a number of proactive measures and schemes introduced subsequently. The main strategies have been to earmark specific funds and action plan of the programmes aiming at improving the urban life in general and designing a pragmatic and feasible scheme exclusively to improve the housing and living conditions of slum dwellers. If Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) and Housing for All by 2022 or Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (PMAY-U) are the examples of the first and Rajiv Awas Yojana (RAY) is the other.

JNNURM was a tenured programme for seven years between 2005 and 2012), was a significant intervention for the redevelopment of slums with two sub-missions to ensure basic services and to provide integrated housing for the urban poor in the identified 63 cities. The mission was aiming to provide seven entitlements of security of tenure, affordable housing, water, sanitation, health, education, and social security to the low-income segments. The mission had three mandates (a) earmarking of 25 per cent of municipal budget for provision of basic services, including affordable housing for the urban poor; (b) implementation of 7-point charter for the poor in a time-bound manner; and (c) reservation of 25 per cent of developed land in all housing projects critical for slum improvement. The mission had given big role to both state governments and urban local bodies with community participation. The mission was succeeded by Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT), to ensure assured tap water and sewerage connection to every households, among a few other mandates. The mission was to cover 500 cities with a population of over one lakh with notified municipalities during 2015-16 to 2019-20 with a total outlay of Rs 50,000 crores. Yet other important feature of the mission is that the fund earmarked to all states/UT should be equally divided between the major urban areas and other statutory towns, which has never been the case earlier. Housing for All by 2022 or Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (Urban) (PMAY) is yet another critical intervention, as far as redevelopment of the slums are concerned. PMAY declared to construct 20 million housing units in urban areas (and 30 million units in rural areas) for the poor in urban areas. By providing central assistance to the urban local bodies, the PMAY has mandated in-situ rehabilitation of the existing slums through private participation, which is first of its kind to enhance the pace of redevelopment of the slums.

RAY is a Central Assistance Scheme for construction of affordable housing for slum dwellers exclusively and is aiming at achieving "inclusive city" as well as "slum free city" (Ananya Roy 2014). RAY has three-pronged critical objectives to achieve: (a) subsuming slums with the remaining urban system and achieve parity-based amenities; (b) redressing failures of formal system that have come in the way of slum development and put an

end to creation of new slums; and (c) tackling the twin problems of shortage of urban land and housing of the urban poor. In order to realize these objectives, RAY mandates that states and union territories assign legal title to slum dwellers over their dwelling space through legislation for property rights and bring about necessary reforms to make urban development inclusive. The other mandates are to prepare Slum-Free Plan of Action (POA) for the entire state by the respective governments with the approval of the legislative assembly and Slum-Free City Planning (SCP) by the urban local bodies. POA intending up-gradation of existing slums, based on surveys and mapping of slums and to prevent growth of new slums, by proposing specific actions regarding availability of lands and construction of affordable houses commensurately, with property rights to slum dwellers for each city. The SCP should submit development model for each slum, as per the guidelines of the state government and the nodal agency of RAY and should be submitted to central government for funding under RAY, based on (a) survey and mapping of all slums; and (b) integration of geo-spatial and socio-economic data. Government of India besides financing all the POA and SCP also supports for conducting slum surveys, slums database, slums mapping, expert consultancies, organization of NGOs/Community Based Organisations, biometric identification of slum dwellers and hard wares training programmes etc. Finally, the scope of RAY was enhanced in 2013 to launch Affordable Housing Partnership with an outlay of Rs 5,000 crores to construct one million houses for LIG/MIG with 25 per cent of the houses for the EWS. It has envisaged partnership of government, urban local bodies and developers to realise the goal.

Capturing the Changes

The two complimentary policy initiatives clearly indicate the endeavours to redevelop the urban slums pragmatically, which was an outstanding issue in the development discourse. But what matters is the process of improvement commenced earnestly and changes have taken place evidently in the case of few if not in all the case, as the official data indicate. In other words, the redevelopment initiatives started from one and a half decade ago have been posting the hopes of changes in the world of slums. The first and the foremost is the subsuming process of the slums with the rest of the urban areas on account of their improving status, which is what a commendable achievement. A good number of slums have ceased to exist due to the various interventions implemented in improving the living conditions, be it housing situation, housing amenities, and living environment (NSSO 2013). The numbers of slums that have subsumed with the rest of urban areas worked out to 13,484 and as a result, the total number of slums have decimated to only 35,510 in 2013, against 48,994 in 2009 (NSSO 2009). In real sense, 27 per cent of the slums have ceased to exist and have subsumed themselves with the rest of urban areas, which is an applaudable achievement. What is further conspicuous is the subsuming process across the notified and non-notified slums, with an edge over the former. Because of the 11,020 slums having been subsumed in the notified category, their numbers have dwindled to 13,761 from 24,781 during the period. Moreover their share has also dropped to about 39 per cent from 51 per cent. Further, the process of subsuming of slums is also true in the case of non-notified slums, although the volume of success is not in par with notified slums. This is only a predicament of discrimination in the implementation of redevelopment initiatives towards the non-notified slums. The number of slums ceased in the non-notified category is only 4,464, which are far less than by over two times the notified slums. That apart, the share of the non-notified slums has increased to over 61 per cent from 49 per cent in the total with 19,749 during the period. This only speaks of the eagerness and casual attitudes of the implementation authorities of the redevelopment measures towards the non-notified slums.

Secondly, what speaks of the disaggregated picture of the subsuming process is the quality of housing stock in the slums, which has improved over the years. The Quality housing stock or standard or pucca have been on the rise in the slums. It goes without saying that these structures are constructed by the standard materials like sand, cement, bricks, iron etc for both wall and roof (NBO 1988). These would not only provide permanent dwelling status but are also qualifies generally for the connection of the chief housing amenities. Important to note that quality housing stock has increased by 7 per cent in the slums from 57 to 64 per cent. Especially, in the notified slums, the standard housing stock has increased by 21 per cent - threefold more than the national average for the reason noted already. As against this positive trend, the standard stock in the non-notified slums slumped by 8 per cent, which is a cause for concern not only because of the lack of new construction but also due to lack of upkeeping or upgradation of the existing stock. Construction of standard housing units needs no more emphasis, as they play critical role in ensuring the housing amenities for all households and realises the dreams of the slum dwellers in terms of minimising deprivations about tapped drinking water, electricity, household latrine and what not. The growth in the standard housing units also facilitated drinking water connectivity through taps in the slum households. In fact, supply of drinking water through taps in the notified slums has increased to 82 per cent of the households, although the situation is not encouraging in the non-notified slums. As many as 16 per cent of the households in the non-notified slums have been thrown out of the tap water connections. This would reconfirm the discriminatory implementation merely because of non-recognition of these slums by the urban local authority. The same growth trajectory continues even regarding household electricity. Being an economic good in nature and given its contribution to domestic economic activities, the necessity of household connection

to energy hardly needs any emphasis. Electricity being the main source of energy, its access by the slum households has been commendable at 94 per cent. It is worthy to mention that notified slum households have attained electricity connections for 99 per cent, which is just short of 1 per cent from the total coverage. Even in the case of non-notified, the households have attained better access to electricity at 89 per cent, which is highest across the other household attainments. However, it goes without saying that rest of the households could not have had access to electricity largely on account of unaffordable installations, bearing consumption charges etc. But an incredible reality has been that most of the deprived households have resorted to unauthorized electricity connections from the streetlights. Last but not the least is the other important concern, which slums have been facing a pathetic situation is about sanitation (latrine) facility. A harsh reality has been that with the coverage of two-third of the slum households with latrines (69 per cent), still a quarter of them have been deprived of this basic facility. Given the conspicuous variations in the achievement between the notified (86 per cent) and non-notified (58 per cent) slums, the deprived households have resort to open defecation, which is a disappointing reality.

Thirdly, slums and degraded environment condition are the synonyms in the Indian context. It is being interchangeably used, as slums have always been enjoying dubious distinction of being the centres of unfavourable environmental conditions. This is largely due to lack of road connectivity, drainage facility, water logging and mounting garbage. On all these fronts, slums need reinvigorated approaches, although the achievements are better with two-third of the success. But a prompting reality is the marked difference in the achievements between the two types of the slums. In three of the four parameters, notified slums have achieved an upper hand over the non-notified slums. 83 per cent of pucca roads, 89 per cent of the drainage facility and 89 per cent of garbage collection in the notified slums is a much better situation. At the same time, the coverage of the non-notified slums is far below the average at 55, 55 and 63 per cent respectively. Against this, the issue of water logging is an exception in which not only has there been an overall improvement by 7 per cent but also impartial implementation of the initiative across the slums. Especially, the achievement in the non-notified slums is eye catching with 16 per cent improvement.

Lastly but interestngly, there have a number of mixed outcomes in minimizing the development gaps between the non-slum urban areas and the slums. In a number of cases, the non-slum urban areas have been far ahead in their achievement as against the slums. Slums at the same time have also been ahead of their acievement against the rest of urban areas. If the first success is largely due to market intervention and household initiatives, the second success is largely due to public commitment and facilitation. These differences in the achievement are presented in Table 3. The marking differences are evident between them and across different parameters. The non-slum urban areas are ahead in the cases of electrity,separate kitchen at home, flush latrine, separate washroom and connectivity to close drainage. These provisions are ensured at the time of the planning and execution while constructing houses by and large on priority basis. Seldom the people neglect these comforts and consider these facilities are part of comfortable living and settlement. The best part is that they never look for anybody's support and intervention. But it is not the case with the slums. The slum dwellers being largely poorer sections, generally these facilities are expected to be provided by the government and the possibilty of their contribution is very bleak. Despite these limitations, slums have achieved some degree of success in number of cases like standard housing stock and prision of treated wated and in a few cases the development gap is very marginal. What is significant to note is the presence of the dilapidated housing stock in large number in the slums as compared to the non slum urban areas. With almost three folds more, the dilapidated stocks are in the order of 14 per cent of the total as against 5 per cent, which is 9 per cent higher than the non-slum areas. Similarly, the incidences of driking untreated water and using kerosene for lighting is very high in slums. Lack of household kitchen, washrooms and toilets in more number houses of the slums is the other reality. These deficiencies along with the lack of access to drainage have led to the practice of open defecation and filth environment chiefly around the houses in slums. With this marked difference in the levels of development, urban areas cannot afford to have two different and distinct worlds within its boundary. These distinct difference would always be a set back to the process of inclusive urbanisation as well to achieve development parity.

CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS
This research has evidently shown that 31 of the 35 states, including a few union territories have been facing the problem of slums or unauthorised settlements of the poor in varied degrees in urban India. Also, brough to the fore that over 35 million households or 21 per cent of the urban households live in the slums. Interestingly, seven major states have reportedly housing 30 million households in the slums, which is over 85 per cent of the total incidence of the country. While if these seven states have become the prominent centres of slums, the other twenty three states and one Union Territory have accounted for the remaining 5.23 million households (15 per cent) in the slums. Surprisingly, there is only one state and three union territories have been considered free from the incidence of slums. In other words and unquestionably, most of the India's urban areas irrespective of their size have been facing the problem of slums, at varied degrees of incidence. Beyond the doubt, the development efforts have impacted the slums and made marked difference in the achievements both in the

notified and non-notified slums. The focussed redevelopment strategies of the slums begun from last fifteen years have yielded a few positive changes in the life of the slums and gives hopes to realise the dream of slum-free urban India in the years to come. Much could have achieved had thre been additional impetus to the existing subsuming process and minimizing the development gaps between the non-slum urban and slums. It is also a paramount importance to promote construction of permanent housing structure on sustainable basis in the slums, given its direct relationship with the development of chief housing amenities like safe water, electricity, sanitation, and others. At the same time, the present multi-pronged approach should be continued to reverse the degraded environment in the slums, to make them orderly settlements and part of the urban areas, in addition to the other two strategies. Further, undoubtedly, government has been playing a critical role in building slum-free urban India, whose interventions have been grossly inadequate, as compared to the nature and volume of the problem. It needs to rope in the partners into the rebuilding process of urban areas through a strong and responsive Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) strategy. It would not be unreasonable to suggest that if only the corporate world is made a partner of inclusive urbanization with fiscal concessions and financial support, several thousands of urban slums can be subsumed with core urban life under the CSR. Besides, increasing CSR would pave way for increasing access to the core urban life and interface between the slum dwellers and non-slum urban population.

Presence of unauthorised settlements in whatever the form or size is not conducive to an orderly urban society. Also, such parts with glaring development disparities, degraded environment, deprivation of basic needs and deficiencies in basic amenities cannot be considered homogenous. Therefore, there are all the need to redevelop those segments to mainstream them to the orderly urban society. By two methods slum free urban society can be established: (a) development of all the existing slums in all measures, with adequate public investment on sustainable basis on par with rest of the urban society, which is already in process; (b) controlling of fresh slums. The first strategy needs a multi-pronged approach with all the stake holders (governments, local bodies, slum dwellers) participation. The government as a principal game changer has to evolve mission mode approach with a timeframe to ensure inclusion of all slums into core urban life, in order to bring visibility to its commitment for the cause. Otherwise, the inclusive agenda of slums of the government would go the way as it has gone hitherto. The mission mode of inclusion of slums also demands an uninterrupted public financing adequately on the part of the government, apart from periodic review of the progress of the mission, redressing of the deficiencies/problems and direct financing for the municipalities, which are encountering the slums and are involved in the inclusion mission. Local bodies or municipalities cannot be pushed to be in isolation as it happened but have greater role to play in the inclusive mission of urban slums, as a lower tier government. These bodies should be given the administrative responsibilities for the development with adequate capacities (especially the financial) to administer and planning of projects, identification of new settlements and development of the existing slums under the mission mode. Apart from government and local bodies, community organizations of the slums have greater role to motivate and sensitise the people about the settlement transformation within their place of living besides making them to participate in the development, withstanding all the inconveniences, without being voluntarily excluded. Community organizations also need to monitor the inclusionary process of the slum dwellers and settlement to ensure the timely completion of the transformation and to act as pressure group on the implementation agencies. This kind of check and balance would ensure accountability on the part of the implementation agencies including local bodies/municipalities. The second one demands the urban administration, particularly municipalities, corporations, and others to be very vigilant about the settlements and to ensure planned settlements of the migrants with temporary shelters, night shelters etc. Moreover, what is largely needed is the political will not to promote unplanned settlements of the people as vote banks.

Regarding housing the slum dwellers, construction of only standard or permanent units must be given priority besides adequacy for want of developing the basic housing amenities and to completely eradicate the housing insecurity on account of dilapidated stock and other forms of shelters. It can be done by two ways, first by reconstructing the existing sub-standard housing stocks as standard units and secondly by constructing only the standard units in the public lands. Simultaneously and interestedly, development of housing amenities like tap drinking water, electricity, sanitation, drainage connections etc., shall be the need of the hour, if at all dwelling parity need to be established between the slum dwellers and other urbanites. As a solution, integrated housing and amenities development strategy for the slum dwellers would go a long way in ensuring all the basic amenities along with standard housing units. This strategy would only demand enhancing the unit cost of construction, besides including the amenities charges. Additionally, the environmental problems such as drainage, sewerage connectivity and water logging have been continuously daunting, especially in the non-notified slums, which needs immediate corrective actions, non-discriminatory attitude, and the development priority. All weather roads, closed drainage, household's connectivity to sewerage should be integratedly developed to ensure housing environment tidy and hygienic in the urban slums. In this front, it can be said that higher the household connectivity to sewerage better is hygienic and living environment and vice-versa. Equally important is that almost half of the slums being in low laying areas, water logging is a common and a recurring

problem. One of the reasons for the continued degraded environment in slums could be excessive dependence on the state action for their improvements. But what is largely needed is the private and corporate participation in the improvement of the slums and the subsuming process, having availed public facilitation, concessions, connectivity etc. In this regard, what goes a long way is the adoption of slums by the corporate houses, industries, and others for their overall development.

REFERENCES

1. Chandrasekhar. S (2005), Growth of Slums, Availability of Infrastructure and Demographic Outcomes in Slums: Evidence from India- A paper presented during the session on Urbanization in Developing Countries at the Population Association of America's Annual Meeting, Philadelphia: USA
2. Cherunilam, Francis and O D Heggade (1987), Housing in India (First Edition), Himalaya Publishing House: Bombay.
3. Government of India (1956), Housing (Chapter XXVI), Second Five Year Plan, Planning Commission, New Delhi: pp 555-569.
4. Government of India (2003), Draft National Slum Policy, Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, New Delhi.
5. Governments of India (2007), Rajiv Awas Yojana - Guidelines for Slum-free City Planning, Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, New Delhi.
6. Government of India (2003), Report of the Committee on Slum Statistics/Census, Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, New Delhi.
7. Gupta, Devendra, B (1985), Urban Housing in India, World Bank Staff Working Papers (Number 730), The World Bank: Washington D.C., USA.
8. Habitat (1976), Report of United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, New York.
9. (1996), An Urbanizing World, Global Report on Human Settlements, Oxford University Press: New York
10. -------- (1998), Shelter for All: The Global Shelter Strategy to the Year 2000, United Nations Centre for Human Settlement: Nairobi.
11. --------- (2003), The Challenge of Slums: Global Report on Human Settlements, United Nations Human Settlement Programme, London: Earthscan.
12. MHUPA (2014), Inclusive Urban Planning: State of the Urban Poor Report 2013, Oxford University Press, Government of India: New Delhi.
13. NBO (1988), Housing Needs, National Buildings Organisation, New Delhi.
14. NIUA (1988), State of India's Urbanisation, National Institute of Urban Affairs: New Delhi.
15. NSSO (2002), Conditions of Urban Slums, NSS 58th Round, Government of India, New Delhi.
16. NSSO (2009), Some Characteristics of Urban Slums, NSS 65th Round, Government of India, New Delhi.
17. NSSO (2013), Key Indicators of Urban Slums in India, NSS 69th Round, Ministry of Statistics & Programme Implementation, Government of India, New Delhi.
18. Roy, Ananya (2014), The Inclusive City ….., Inclusive Urban Planning: State of the Urban Poor Report 2013, Oxford University Press, Government of India: New Delhi. Pp 134-147.
19. Sen, Kunal (2014), Inclusive Growth, Social Exclusion, and the Urban Poor, Inclusive Urban Planning: State of the Urban Poor Report 2013, Oxford University Press, Government of India: New Delhi. Pp 97-115.
20. Seetharamu, Kala Sridhar & Venugopala Reddy A (2014), Contribution of the Urban Poor, Inclusive Urban Planning: State of the Urban Poor Report 2013, Oxford University Press, Government of India: New Delhi. Pp 248-264.
21. Shivalingappa B.K (1975), Slum Clearance Related Problems and Programmes, Housing in Karnataka, (Ed) Administrative Training Institute, Mysore.
22. Singh, Andrea Menefee (1978), Poverty and Slum Dwellers in Urban India-Some Urgent Research and Policy considerations, Social Action, April-June, p.165.

Table 1: Incidence of Slums by their Distribution across Urban India

Sl. No	State & Union Territory	Total of Towns	Slum Reporting Towns	Urban Households (in Million)	Households in Slums (in Million)	Slum Households (in Million)
A. States with Higher Incidence of Slums						
01	Andhra Pradesh	353	124 (35.13)	6.78	2.42	35.7
02	Chhattisgarh	182	94 (51.65)	1.24	0.40	31.9
03	Madhya Pradesh	476	302 (63.45)	3.85	1.09	28.3
04	Sikkim	9	7 (77.78)	-	-	24.1
05	Orissa	223	76 (34.08)	1.52	0.04	23.1
06	Maharashtra	534	187 (35.02)	100.81	24.29	22.7
07	West Bengal	909	122 (13.42)	6.35	1.39	21.9
	Total	**2686**	**912 (33.95)**	**120.05**	**29.83**	**24.85**
B. States with Lower Incidence of Slums						
01	Jammu & Kashmir	122	40 (32.79)	0.52	0.01	18.8
02	Haryana	154	75 (48.70)	1.75	0.33	18.6
03	Pondicherry	10	6 (60.00)	0.02	0.01	17.0
04	Tamilnadu	1097	504 (45.94)	8.93	1.45	16.3
05	Uttarakhand	115	31 (26.96)	0.59	0.01	15.1
06	Tripura	42	15 (35.71)	0.24	0.01	14.4
07	Punjab	217	71 (32.72)	2.09	0.30	14.2
08	Mizoram	23	1 (04.35)	0.12	Neg	14.0
09	Karnataka	347	206 (59.37)	5.32	0.73	13.7
10	Nagaland	26	7 (26.92)	0.12	Neg	13.3
11	Uttar Pradesh	915	260 (28.42)	7.45	0.99	13.3
12	Rajasthan	297	107 (36.03)	3.09	0.38	12.4
13	Delhi	113	22 (19.47)	3.26	0.38	11.8
14	Chandigarh	6	1 (16.67)	0.23	Neg	9.7
15	Bihar	299	71 (23.75)	2.01	0.20	9.6
16	Meghalaya	22	6 (27.27)	0.12	Neg	9.4
17	A & N Island	5	1 (20.00)	Neg	Neg	8.9
18	Himachal Pradesh	59	22 (37.29)	0.17	Neg	8.6
19	Gujarat	348	96 (27.59)	5.42	0.36	6.7
20	Arunachal Pradesh	27	5 (18.52)	0.01	Neg	6.1
21	Jharkhand	222	31 (13.96)	1.50	0.01	5.3
22	Assam	214	31 (14.49)	0.99	0.05	4.8
23	Goa	70	3 (04.29)	0.20	Neg	2.4
24	Kerala	520	19 (03.65)	3.62	0.01	1.5
	Total	**5270**	**1910 (36.24)**	**47.77**	**5.23**	**10.95**
C. States & Union Territories Without Slums						
01	Manipur	51	Nil	0.17	Nil	Nil
02	Daman & Diu	8	Nil	Neg	Nil	Nil
03	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	6	Nil	Neg	Nil	Nil
04	Lakshadweep	6	Nil	Neg	Nil	Nil
	Total	**71**	**Nil**	**Neg**	**Nil**	**Nil**
	All Total	**8027**	**2822 (35.16)**	**167.82**	**35.06**	**20.89**

Note: Neg represents less than one lakh households
Source: Census of India (2011), Housing Stock, Amenities and Assets in Slums, India Series 1,   Registrar and Census Commissioner. India

Table 2: Slums and their Development by Type in India

Parameters	2009 (65th Round)			2013 (69th Round)			Change		
	Notified	Non-Notified	Total	Notified	Non-Notified	Total	Notified	Non-Notified	Total
Subsuming with Rest of Urban Areas	24,781 (50.57)	24,213 (49.43)	48,994	13,761 (38.75)	19,749 (61.25)	35,510	11,020	4,464	13,484
Estimated Hholds & Average Hhs	NA	NA	NA	55.60	32.49	88.09	55.60	32.49	88.09
% of Pucca Houses	64	50	57	85	42	64	21	-8	7
% of Drinking water Through Tap	79	77	78	82	61	71	3	-16	-7
% of Availability of Electricity	92	93	93	99	89	94	7	-4	1
% of Availability of Household Latrine	90	80	85	86	58	69	-4	-22	-16
% of Slums with Pucca Road	78	57	68	83	55	66	5	-2	-2
% of Slums with Drainage Facility	90	77	84	89	55	69	-1	-22	-15
% of Slums without Water Logging	64	55	61	65	71	68	1	16	7
% Slums with Garbage Collection Arrangement	88	73	84	89	63	73	1	-10	-11

Source: NSSO, Some Characteristics of Urban Slums, 65th Round (July 2008 - June 2009) & NSSO, Key Indicators of Urban Slums in India, 69th Round (July 2012 – December 2012), Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India

Table 3: Development Gaps in Housing Amenities in Urban Areas & Slums - 2011 (Percentage)

SL. NO	Housing Amenities	Non Slum Urban Area	Slums	Difference (+ or-)
	Type of Housing Stock			
	Standard	53.4	57.0	3.6
	Sub-Standard	41.2	29.0	- 12.2
	Dilapidated	5.4	14.0	8.6
	Access to Drinking Water			
	Treated Tap Water	61.3	65.3	4.0
	Untreated Water	8.3	8.7	0.4
	Covered Well	1.8	0.8	- 1.0
	Uncovered Well	5.0	2.3	- 2.7
	Hand pump	11.7	12.7	1.0
	Bore well	9.2	7.6	-2.4
	Others	2.4	2.7	0.3
	Access to Energy			
	Electricity	93.1	90.5	-3.4
	Kerosene	6.1	8.2	2.1
	Solar Energy	0.2	0.3	0.1
	Other Oil	0.1	0.2	-0.1
	Any Other	0.2	0.2	0.0
	No Lighting	0.3	0.5	0.2
	Access to Kitchen and Fuel			
	Has Kitchen	82.0	67.3	-14.7
	Doesn't Have Kitchen	17.5	32.1	14.6
	No Cooking	00.5	00.5	0.0
	LPG	67.9	51.3	-16.6
	Kerosene	06.2	14.0	7.8
	Others	24.7	33.3	8.6
	Access to Sanitation			
	Flush Latrine	75.7	57.7	-18.0
	Pit Latrine	7.3	6.2	-1.1
	Night Soil to Open Drain	1.1	1.6	0.5
	Service Latrine	0.5	0.6	0.1
	Public Latrine	4.1	15.1	11.0
	Open Defecation	11.3	18.9	7.6
	Access to Freshness			
	Bathroom	79.8	66.6	-13.2
	Bathroom Without Roof	8.4	14.5	6.1
	No Bathroom	11.8	19.0	-8.8
	Drainage Connectivity			
	Closed Drainage	46.1	36.9	- 9.2
	Open Drainage	35.8	44.3	8.5
	No Drainage	18.8	18.8	0.0

Source: Census of India (2011), Housing Stock, Amenities and Assets in Slums, India
Series 1. Registrar and Census Commissioner, India.