

博士論文 (要約)

**Mass Housing & Beyond: A Path Dependent Approach for Studying the
Development of Institutional Networks for Implementation of Slum
Improvement & Redevelopment Strategies in India**

(マス・ハウジングを超えて：経路依存アプローチによるインドのスラム改善・再開
戦略実施における制度的ネットワークの編成に関する研究)

Abhijit Datey

ダデー アビジット

India is facing a huge housing crisis. A crisis which could be defined by oversupply of unaffordable housing, increasing slums and meagre affordability of households. Slum unfortunately is a dominant housing type for many urban residents in India. Indian housing markets are scarred by regressive legislations like rent control acts which are still not repealed in many states even after repeated reminders by the national government and urban land ceiling which has left land markets in a jeopardy. The urban housing shortage in the year 2012 was estimated to be 18.78 million while more than 95 per cent share of this shortage was for lower income groups and economically weaker sections.

Indian slum situation is rather typical. In 2001 almost 23.5 per cent of urban residents lived in slums which decreased by a little more than 1 per cent to 22.4 per cent in 2011. The slum population in urban areas of India increased by 13 million during the decade of 2001-11 and the decadal growth rate was 25.1 per cent. A detail to note is that in 2012 almost 56 per cent of slums were situated on public lands. The percentage share of slums on private land has been increasing lately and has reached 44 per cent in 2012.

It shows two important intervention characteristics. The first is that a large number of slums could be intervened by the government through various programme approaches. A very large share of slums is on lands belonging to local bodies, which could take suitable actions regarding them. In the year 2012, 41.1 per cent of slums were on lands owned by local bodies. Another characteristic to note is the housing quality in these slums. The percentage share of permanent houses or *pucca*¹ houses has increased from 30.5 per cent in 1993 to 59.6 per cent in 2012, which shows that there is sustained investment by the slum dwellers to improve the quality of their own housing. A mere 15.6 per cent of houses were made of non-permanent materials. The trend clearly shows that the quality of housing in slum areas is improving by people's own interventions. The second key characteristic which has to be taken into consideration while interventions is that commonly used strategy of demolishing and reconstructing is not everywhere possible as the households have already invested in making the housing quality better for themselves.

In this context what are the options available for slum improvement or redevelopment? The literature explains that these approaches could be categorised in three major categories according to the location chosen for interventions. If solutions are provided at the site of slums such approaches are called in-situ. Approaches where slums are moved from their original location are called relocation approaches while where both these approaches co-exist are called part-relocation approaches. The four major components of housing are land, building, basic services and finance and even if one of these

¹ *Pucca* house means one with concrete roof, *Semi-pucca* house is the one which consists

components is missing housing could not be called adequate as per the concept floated by UNHABITAT. Slums are considered as inadequate housing therefore another view of looking at slum improvement and redevelopment solutions is the addition of all or few components to make housing adequate. Historically approaches have dwelt on a certain component and a solution has stemmed out of it. Land has given rise to Tenure regularisation programmes while basic services have given rise to programmes like Slum Networking in Ahmedabad, India.

In India the policies have learned from the above solutions which could be seen in the fact that various kinds of slum improvement programmes have been undertaken in India using alternative approaches. Though in the long run programmes have become multi-optional but on the ground extremely centred around mass housing approaches. A plethora of choices with one dominant choice is what this dissertation calls as “Mass Housing hegemony”. This Mass Housing Hegemony has been built on certain connected decisions by the National government. To understand these sets of decisions this dissertation in the first part of analysis has picked up “Path Dependence” perspective to explain that while choices of available approaches in Indian housing programmes have increased, the decisions are far away from site level contexts and are deeply rooted in “Mass Housing” approaches. To explain this argument this dissertation looks at the five year plans since the year 1950 and traces formation of all new institutions, ideas and programmes and keeps them in a path dependent perspective.

While the path dependence analysis makes it fairly visible that Mass Housing Hegemony exists in Indian Slum Improvement and Redevelopment programmes, to prove this hypothesis further the dissertation in its next part of analysis looks at a currently running programme called Basic Services for Urban Poor (BSUP) through detailed data analysis and assessment on the basis of raw data collected from 153 Minutes of the Meeting and performance reports since the year March 2005 till March 2014. In this part of the dissertation the Mass Housing Hegemony is verified and its ill impacts are illustrated in detail using various parameters like timeline of projects, funding, project components, extent of relocation and changes occurred. One size fits all approach led to immense wastage of subsidy as the current figures suggest that 24.2 per cent of completed BSUP units still lie empty.

In the next section of analysis this dissertation has used network analysis to explore relationships between various institutions involved in BSUP and find out key institutions and their impact on solution choice. In this section institutions involved are placed vis-à-vis choices of projects they make giving an insight into the aims and objectives of institutions and how they perceive slum improvement and redevelopment programmes. Many illustrative diagrams are created which show the top down characteristic of decision making where powers are concentrated in the hands of a few. Beneficiaries have no role to play in planning and implementation and are mere meagre funders of their share.

Approval of projects is routed through two major institutions which filter out multi-optional project. The detailed diagrams show how centralised is the decision making process and how hard it is for beneficiaries to have a say in the process.

While it is verified that Mass Housing Hegemony exists in most parts of the programme implementation, there are certain organisational networks which make use of benefits given by multi-optional slum improvement programmes and are able to generate contextual, beneficiary oriented solutions due to their structure and characteristics of key institutions involved in them. In the last section of analysis this dissertation looks deeper into these unique cases of network reorganisation and their benefits for the beneficiaries. The two case studies include the work of a state level nodal agency called Kudumbshree in Kerala and a unique slum redevelopment project in Yerawada slums of Pune led by SPARC and Mahila Milan.

There are three major conclusions of this dissertation. The first one is that slum improvement and redevelopment programmes in India are rather stuck in a mass housing hegemony glut making the benefits of other likely options diminish. Houses are constructed even at slum locations where it is not needed, and more stress is given on relocating slums towards far away locations. A programme stuck in mass housing hegemony is a wastage of resources and counterproductive for slum improvement and redevelopment. It converts housing projects into a mere number of houses where more construction means more benefits which is particularly not true. Cities build because money is available and success is linked to number of housing units constructed rather than number of families benefitted. Projects turn into mathematical equations where one could predict the amount used for water supply by looking at cost of housing units, and all major discussions get subverted into deciding what cost is suitable to build the house even if in reality building it may not be required. In the end beneficiaries are dissatisfied, slum problem is far from getting solved and constructed houses lie vacant.

The second major conclusion of this dissertation is the fact that mass housing hegemony could be sidelined by formation of better organisational networks at the grassroots level by bringing beneficiaries into the realm of planning and monitoring of projects. It may result in availing multitude of choices allowed by the programmes. The case studies show that emergence of people led or people oriented institutions could change the way projects are planned and implemented and also force key institutions at the central level to accept them.

The third major conclusion is that there is a lack of institution at the central level which could give importance to all approaches equally. The central government is stuck in the idea of build fast and cheap and therefore needs to redefine its course. The two major institutions guiding central level institutions

were built on this premise and they are the major bottlenecks that alternative approaches are not picked up by the cities and states even when they want to.

While Mass Housing has always been the easiest answer to eliminate housing shortage for urban poor and slums, the reality is that such housing is always out of context, is not built through proper channels of participation and is seldom appreciated by the beneficiaries. Mass housing is indeed an alternative but not the only alternative and its dominance over other approaches could decrease benefit of a slum improvement programme.