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Like many other cities in the developing world, a considerable percentage of the total population of Delhi lives in squatters and slums. Figures from census 2001 suggest that slum and squatter population account for 15.72\% of the total population of National Capital Territory of Delhi. Another estimate suggests that the population living in J.J. Clusters, Slum Designated Areas, Unauthorised Colonies and Resettlement Colonies is at 52\% (Government of Delhi, 2002: 129). According to unofficial sources (Dhar Chakravarti, 2001: 2), the rate of growth of squatter population in Delhi (including both the natural rate of growth of existing squatter population and in-migration) during 1981-94 was four and a half times higher than the non-squatter population.

With such a sizeable population of the city living in slums, the general positive picture that emerges for Delhi when compared with other states of India in terms of different economic indicators is belied. For example, the percentage of population below the poverty line in all of Delhi is around 8\% compared to the All India figure of 26\% (Government of Delhi, 2002: 167). The same percentage for the slum population is, however, closer to the All India estimate. According to Mitra (2003: 82), the percent of population below the poverty line in ‘recognized slums’ is at 25\%. Delhi ranks the third in terms of per capita income (Government of Delhi, 2002: 2), at constant 1993-94 prices it is estimated at Rs.24,450 for 2001 (ibid: 8). The income levels of the slum population is much lower. A NCAER survey (2002: 31) estimated the average household monthly income of population living in slums to be Rs. 3073 and per capita monthly income Rs. 575.

\footnote{1 Consultant, Institute of Social Studies Trust, New Delhi}
Low income levels, along with lack of access to basic amenities, leads to precarious living conditions that contribute to low levels of human development. In some instances, available data on access to basic services and human development indicators in the slums compare poorly with the corresponding statistics at the All-India level, even though Delhi as such may compare in favourable terms. For example, the overall female literacy rate in Delhi is at 74.7% according to latest census (2001) estimates. In contrast, the literacy rate among women residing in slums of Delhi stood at a mere 38.9% (NCAER, 2002: 33). This is lower than the All-India rural female literacy rate (2001) of 46.7%. In terms of access to basic services, at the overall national level, around 19% in urban areas do not have access to sanitation facilities. The same figure for Delhi is at 6% (NFHS, 1998-9). The NCAER (2002: 35) study on slums in Delhi estimates these figures to be at 26.7%.

Most of the residents of slums are migrants from other parts of India, mostly rural India. Employment opportunities offered by the city even though mainly in the informal sector, ad hoc and unstable is the major attraction. But not all migrants especially those with strong linkages with their native villages want to settle down in the city. Many would like to return to the village with capital to buy land while others just want to eke out a living during the difficult months when no agricultural activity is possible. With the onset of the rains, they would return to their villages to resume cultivation. For those who settle down in the slums, it is not clear what prompts the decision. Is the decision pre-meditated or taken in due course as the migrant is able to gain a foothold in the city? Unfavourable economic circumstances (such as landlessness, indebtedness) in the village are likely to be a major contributory factor in the migrant’s decision. Slums are the only place available to them for residence- cost of living is low; it is (generally) close to their

---

2 An estimated 83.9% of the population who migrated to Delhi is from rural areas, 15.8% from small and medium towns (with population less than a million) and 0.3% from metropolis (million plus cities) (Dhar Chakravarti, 2001: 3).

3 A study of the labour market in Delhi found that the proportion of migrants who moved into the city after receiving assurances of job from their urban contacts was same for both formal and informal sector suggesting that the informal sector too can act as a pull factor (Bucci and Banerji, 1994 as cited in Mitra, 2003).
working place as well as offers a neighbourhood close to their relatives, friends and co-villagers.

As Delhi continues to grow further in the context of a globalizing and liberalizing economy, its attraction as a source of employment for rural migrants is likely to be further enhanced. This in turn is likely to lead to a further increase in the population living in slums. Urban policy needs to find ways of integrating slums into the city’s settlement system and ensuring that these settlements have access to basic services.

**Section I: A typology of slums**

As per the Economic Survey of Delhi (2002: 129), there are eight types of settlements in Delhi:

- *Jhuggi-Jhompri* Clusters (JJ clusters)
- Slum designated areas
- Unauthorised colonies
- Resettlement colonies
- Rural villages
- Regularised- Unauthorised colonies
- Urban villages
- Planned colonies

The first two categories account for the bulk of slum population in Delhi. Legally notified slums are those which have been designated as slums under the Slum Areas Improvement and Clearance Act (1956). Majority of these notified areas are in the walled areas of the

---

4 During the last decade, an estimated 38% of the growth of population in Delhi was due to in-migration. Although in relative terms the extent of in-migration to population growth has declined over the years, it has registered an increase in absolute terms (Dhar Chakravarti, 2001: 2).
city (Shahjahanabad). Originally meant to accommodate 60,000 people, the current population is about 2 million (Dhar Chakravarti, 2001: 7).

JJ clusters, on the other hand, are illegal occupants or squatters on public or private land (ibid). In a survey carried out in Delhi in 1990, 2.59 lakhs households were estimated to be living in 929 slums (Government of Delhi, 2002: 131). Another estimate by the Slum Wing of MCD (idem) suggests about 1100 JJ clusters with 6 lakh households and an approximate population of 21 lakh. Unlike cities such as Kolkata or Mumbai, Delhi does not have slum settlements in certain specified areas instead they are scattered throughout the cities in small settlements as near railway tracks, roads, river banks, parks and other vacant lands (Dhar Chakravarti, 2001). The number of households in a settlement is 100 or below in slightly more than 50% of the slum settlements while another quarter has a size of more than 100 but less than 300 households (Slum Wing of DDA, 1990 as given in Ali and Singh, 1998). These settlements are generally formed along lines of regional, linguistic and caste affiliations, though there are many clusters that are heterogeneous in composition (Dhar Chakravarti, 2001).

Resettlement colonies, as the name suggests, comprise of JJ cluster households that have been resettled from their original settlements. The total population in resettlement colonies is estimated to be 18 lakhs (2000) in 44 resettlement colonies (Government of Delhi, 2002: 129-130). The first resettlement programme was carried out in 1961 and subsequently many JJ clusters have been shifted to resettlement colonies. However, given the limited size of slum population prior to 1970, it was possible to shift most of the households (43, 000) living in these settlements to various resettlement colonies, but after 1970, as the rate of migration increased, resettlement has not been able to keep pace with the growth of JJ clusters (ibid: 131).

Many slums also fall under ‘unauthorised’ colonies and ‘regularised- unauthorised’ colonies, though the exact proportion is not known. Urban villages are another category where due to lack of basic amenities and rapid population growth the living conditions are like those in slums (Dhar Chakravarti, 2001).
This typology is important as each of the different type of residential settlements has implications in terms of entitlements to basic services. For the purpose of understanding and research on slums, a slightly different classification has been suggested by Ali (2003: 7). It includes apart from some of the above categories (legally notified slums, JJ clusters, unauthorised colonies, urban villages, resettlement colonies), Harijan Bastis and pavement dwellers.

Section II: Slums and Resettlement Colonies

The results of a NCAER (2002) survey suggest that resettlement colonies as opposed to slums have better access to essential amenities. The legal recognition given to resettlement colonies makes it mandatory for the government to ensure the provision of basic infrastructure in these settlements5. JJ clusters, on the other hand, do not enjoy any such entitlements since they are considered illegal occupants of public/private land. The difference in entitlements is what accounts for the difference in access to basic infrastructure between the JJ clusters and resettlement colonies and this difference in turn contributes to the overall better living conditions in resettlement colonies as against slums.

For instance, location of a human settlement is an important determinant of living conditions. Location near a nallah (stream) or an industry heightens the risk posed to health on account of the pollution (either human or industrial). These risks are minimized if settlements are instead located near highways or main roads; though here too the residents are exposed to vehicular pollution and risks of accidents (particularly high for children). All the resettlement colonies (see Table 1 below) are located near highways/

---

5 The government launched a scheme in 1979-80 to provide and improve basic civic amenities in 44 resettlement colonies. In 1988-89, resettlement colonies were transferred from DDA to MCD with the assurance that the maintenance expenditure will be borne by Government of Delhi. Between 1979- March 2002, the Delhi Government has released an estimated Rs. 4517.67 crores under plan expenditure and Rs. 470.18 crores under non-plan expenditure (for maintenance) (Government of Delhi, 2002: 130).
roads. Slums, on the other hand, have mixed locational profile. A quarter of the sample slums are located near highways/ roads, another 20% near *nallah* (stream) and railway tracks each. Arguably, the better location of resettlement colonies is because these colonies have been settled in a *planned* manner.

Table 1: Location of Slums and Resettlement Colony

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location near</th>
<th>Slum</th>
<th>Resettlement Colony</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railway track</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River/ <em>Nallah</em></td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway/ Road</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction site</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious/ Public place</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NCAER (2002: 15)

Other evidence of better infrastructure in resettlement colonies as opposed to slums is that 93.8% of respondents in slums and 100% in resettlement colonies reported piped/ tap water as the major source of drinking water (NCAER, 2002:15). Lack of access to sanitation facilities in slums vis-à-vis resettlement areas is another aspect of the comparative better living conditions in the latter. More than 90% of the sample households in the slums and 50% in resettlement colonies do not have access to independent toilets (see Table 2). In fact, only around half of the sample slums have proper drainage facilities and while all the resettlement colonies reported the existence of drainage facilities though it is not clear if these facilities are functional or not (NCAER, 2002: 6).
Table 2: Availability of sanitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Slums</th>
<th></th>
<th>Resettlement Colony</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult male</td>
<td>Adult female</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Adult male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own toilet</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public toilet</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just outside the</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defecation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own toilet</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public toilet</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just outside the</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NCAER (2002: 35)

In addition to lack of drainage facilities, 70% of the slums and 13% of the resettlement colonies do not have a proper system of waste disposal and therefore, garbage is dumped in the open (NCAER, 2002: 16).

All the resettlement colonies enjoyed access to electricity. The survey found near universal accessibility to electricity in slums (95.4%) too (NCAER, 2002: 34), but a deeper probe would have thrown up a different picture in terms of number of connections that are legal versus those that are paid for but are not recognised as legal connections. Since slums are not recognized by the state, they are not entitled to electricity connections. Nevertheless, in most cases, a middleman who has an official connection supplies electricity to slum households. In common parlance, these connections are referred to as illegal and it is assumed that the slum dwellers enjoy electricity free of charge. But this is not the case, indeed it is the opposite. The illegality of their...
The differences between slums and resettlement colonies extend to the social and economic sphere as well. The security of tenancy that these settlements enjoy encourage residents to make investments in housing, health and education while at the same time the comparatively better living conditions has also contributed to better health of the residents and thereby, improvement in incomes. In addition, the dwellers in resettlement colonies have been in Delhi for a longer duration (many of the resettlement colonies were set up prior to 1970s) and therefore, have a stronger foothold in the city, which allows them to better access employment and educational/health facilities.

If the income parameter is taken into account both in terms of average income level and distribution of income, resettlement colonies are better off than their counterparts in slum colonies (NCAER, 2002: 20-21). The average income of a slum household is Rs. 2,840 while it is Rs. 4,020 per month in a resettlement colony. In terms of per capita income, it works out to be Rs. 533 in a slum and Rs. 733 in a resettlement colony. The distribution of income too is skewed towards the lower end in slums. The median income level for slums lies in the range of Rs. 2,000 to Rs. 3,000 with nearly 30% of the households having income less than Rs. 2,000 per month and only 5% having income more than Rs. 5,000 per month. On the other hand, the median income level in resettlement colonies is between Rs. 3,000 and Rs. 5,000 per month, a lower proportion of households are below Rs. 2,000 per month and a much higher percent have monthly income level more than Rs. 5,000 per month. Data on household expenditures and possession of assets confirm that the residents of resettlement colony are better placed than their slum counterparts.

The occupational profile too reflects the differences with regard to the income level between slums and resettlement colonies (NCAER, 2002: 26). A larger percent of the population in slums is dependent on daily wage employment (40%) where earnings are both low and irregular. The other main occupations reported are shop keeping or business (20%), salaried employment (14%) and self-employment (13%). In contrast, there are

connections means that dwellers end up paying a high price for it than if the connections were legal and for a highly erratic and irregular service.
three main sources of employment in the resettlement colonies- nearly 40% are in business and about one-fourth each in salaried and wage earning job. Another significant difference is that around 8% of the respondents in slums worked as domestic servants (such as cooks, maids, chowkidars, etc) and another 5% as sweepers while these proportions were negligible in resettlement colonies.

90% of the sample households in resettlement colonies lived in pucca houses, the corresponding figure for slums is much lower at one-quarter. Around 50% of the slum residents live in semi-pucca houses and another quarter in kutcha houses. Nearly 80% of the households in slums do not have a separate kitchen; the corresponding percent for resettlement colony is much lower (NCAER, 2002: 22). The better housing condition of residents of resettlement colonies is a direct consequence of the security of tenancy that these residents enjoy. Since property rights are guaranteed, residents of resettlement colonies, unlike those in JJ clusters, can invest and improve over the long term their housing conditions without fearing the threat of eviction.

The NCAER study (2002: 52) also estimated morbidity rates in slums and resettlement colonies of Delhi, it is lower in resettlement colonies (88 per 1,000) than in slums (112 per 1,000). Differences in the prevalence of acute illness especially among women accounts for higher morbidity prevalence rate in slums. Rate of hospitalisation reported on the basis of 365 days recall (20 per 1,000) too is higher for slums.

The differences between slums and resettlement colonies also hold if we consider the educational background of the sample households. Rate of illiteracy was higher in slums than in resettlement colonies. A further breakdown in terms of class completion rates indicates that the ‘primary and middle school’ completion rates are similar for both males and females, but widen if ‘high school or above’ completion rates is considered, especially for males.

---

7 Illness that occurred in the previous 30 days provided that the overall duration is less than 90 days.
In general, the available data confirms the link between physical living conditions and human development indicators. It also brings out the importance of security of tenancy in improving living conditions.

Nevertheless, while JJ clusters are worse off than resettlement colonies, both are far from having an adequate provision of basic amenities. Indeed, the evidence from the NCAER (2002) study should not be taken to mean that all is well with resettlement colonies. The provision of infrastructure in resettlement colonies is more often than not adequate, given its population size. A survey conducted by Council for Social Development (1990 as cited in Ali (2003) highlights the poor state of infrastructure in three resettlement colonies (Trilokpuri, Kalyanpuri, Kichripur) set up in 1977. Some of the key findings of the study are as follows:

- About 30,000 households reside on 22000 plots
- About 11,000 squatters had emerged on open spaces reserved for housing, parks, and health and education facilities and so on.
- Half the population did not have individual tap connections for water supply
- Few households have access to individual lavatories; the population largely depends on community lavatories or has no option but to defecate in the open.
- There are 17,000 electric connections and 4500 illegal connections.
- Domestic garbage is dumped in the open. The rate of clearance is low and consequently provides veritable breeding grounds for different diseases. Drainage alongside the roads is also not maintained properly.
- Parks and open spaces were there, but they were devoid of greenery. Of the 259 public parks, 25 were occupied by jhuggis at the time of survey.

Section III: The politics of slum development

It has been argued that an important reason for the growth of slums in Delhi is the Master Plan itself. The Master Plan is based on an elaborate idea of ‘zoning’ (Nigam, 2001: 43)
where land is segregated as residential, commercial and industrial. The industrial zones, however, do not have any provision to house workers who would come to work in these industrial zones.

On the other hand, provisions in the Master Plan that could have been instrumental in meeting the housing needs of the poor migrating into the city, for instance, the original plan stipulated ‘suitable [residential] sites in several zones’ for the economically disadvantaged, have been ignored (Dewan, 2002: 84).

Furthermore, over the years there has been a gradual dilution of provisions of resettlement for the slum population.

To begin with, the plot size allocated to households in resettlement colonies has been steadily declining. The provision in the Master Plan of Delhi (1962) was of an allotment of 80 sq. metres per household (Nigam, 2001). This was subsequently reduced to 40 sq. metres during the massive resettlements of the 1970s (Dewan, 2002). The Master Plan of Delhi (2001) then brought this down to 25 sq. metres (Nigam, 2001). In reality the plot size actually allocated is even smaller. Slums that were resettled in Narela (2000) as well as evictees from the Yamuna Pushta slums (2004) were allocated a plot size of 12.5 sq. metres (Dewan, 2002; Jamwal, 2004). Dewan (2002: 82), in fact, argues that

‘The small resettlement plots do not even compare well with the space that people occupy in slums. The land under slum settlements in Delhi is around 4000 hectares while the number of slum families between 400,000 and 600,000. Even with the higher estimate of number of families, the gross area occupied is 66 sq. metres per family. In planned housing area, the net residential area (the area under house plots and appurtenant services but excluding major roads and facilities) is about half the gross area. In slums the net residential area tends to be even greater (on average well over 33 sq. metres) with little land under other facilities.’

---

8 Some of the evictees from the demolished Yamuna Pushta slums were allocated a slightly higher plot size of 18 sq. meters (Jamwal, 2004).
Apart from limited space per family, housing on small plot size contributes to the deterioration of resettlement colonies into slums (Delhi Master Plan 1961 and 1990 as cited in Dewan, 2002). Dewan (ibid: 83) summarises this as ‘it is generally true that current slum resettlement projects usually end up looking not very different from the slums they replace’.

Secondly, the first resettlement of JJ clusters in early 1960s entitled the residents not only to a plot size of 80 sq. metres but one that was serviced with WC, water tap and plinth (Ali, 2003). Selection of the resettlement site had to be done keeping in mind availability of essential services such as water supply, sewerage and electricity as well as schools, dispensary and community centres. Residents were given ownership rights- subsidy was to the tune of 50% and repayment was on a monthly basis. Over time these standards have got diluted; there has been a shift towards provision of services for a group rather than on an individual basis. Thus, in the resettlement schemes carried out in 1975-76, along with a decline in plot size to 25 sq. meters and elimination of ownership rights, the following standards were laid down for the provision of services (ibid: 79):

- Hand pump (1) for 20 persons
- Filtered water hydrants (1) for 40 persons
- Bathrooms (1 seat) for 6 families
- Latrines (1 seat) for 5 families

In recent years, resettlement sites are increasingly on the outskirts of the city (for example, Narela, Holambi Kalan, Bawana, Madanpur Khader, Tikri Khurd) in violation of the recommendations of the Master Plan, which argued for integration of people from different cross-section of income groups in residential neighbourhoods\(^9\) (Dewan, 2002).

---

\(^9\) The logic behind avoiding segregation of housing settlements in terms of income groups is that a mixed income profile is advantageous both for the economically marginalized and the better-off. It enables the latter to access the services offered by the poor. On the other hand, not only do the poor find it easier to access livelihood options, but they can also access better basic infrastructure as roads, water, electricity, etc (Dewan, 2002).
Apart from lack of infrastructure facilities in these colonies\(^{10}\), what is of particular concern to the poor is the lack of transport facilities. These sites located on the periphery of the cities provide little employment opportunities for the poor for which they have to commute to the city centre. However, the absence of proper transport facilities makes this journey costly in terms of physical and monetary resources as well as in terms of the time spent on travel. As a result, people often find it prudent to sell off their tenements and return to the city, thus defying the logic of resettlement (ibid).

Yet another dilution pertains to the resettlement process. During the resettlement drive of 1975-76, provisions were made for camping sites to allow temporary habitations (Ali and Singh, 1998). Such considerations no longer form part of the resettlement process. The decision to relocate slums in Yamuna Pushta was taken at a high level meeting in January (2004), the first demolitions were carried out in February and the process was completed by early April (Jamwal, 2004). Not only were the residents not given enough time to prepare for the demolition, the authorities did not also bother that the demolition drive in the months of February and March coincided with school exams. Further, many residents of JJ clusters were left out of the resettlement process. The list of households eligible for plots in the resettlement site is based on a four-year old survey which does not take into account the new residents in the slum. Also, houses recorded as ‘locked’ in the survey were not considered for resettlement (ibid).

Furthermore, given the high rates of migration, the rapid increase in slums and paucity of land, resettlement of JJ clusters has not been able to keep pace and increasingly appears arbitrary and governed by extraneous factors not related to welfare of slum dwellers. Dewan (2002: 87) in fact argues that slums are resettled under ‘special circumstances’. One such circumstance is when the land on which slums are settled is required to be developed by the land owning agency. For example, the addition of a premier facility to AIIMS (in 2000) necessitated the resettlement of 5000 huts that had developed on its 20

\(^{10}\) After a visit to one of the resettlement colonies in Delhi (Narela), a federation of non-government organisations and community based organisations came out with a report which The Asian Age (August 10, 2000 as cited in Dewan, 2002: 82) summarised as ‘altogether Narela is the new name of hell’.
acres of land (ibid). The other circumstance arises when court orders (often as a result of public interest litigation or PIL) seek removal of slums. The latter, Dewan notes, has also extended to appeals to politicians for removal of slums under the guise of what is termed as public interest. For example, in February 2000 residents invited the then Minister for Urban Development (Jagmohan) to see the squalor around Kalka Temple and as a result the slums in adjoining land with more than 5000 huts were surveyed for resettlement (ibid). In addition, slums are also resettled on account of environmental concerns, specifically the need to develop or maintain green area in the city. The recent (2004) demolitions of slum clusters in Yamuna Pushta were necessitated because the Union Tourism Ministry wants to develop it as tourism spot and green belt (Jamwal, 2004).

In addition, ideas as the National Capital Territory which could have helped to deal with the problem of rapid growth of slums have failed to take-off. The idea behind National Capital Territory (comprising of six districts of Haryana, three districts of Uttar Pradesh and a part of Alwar district in Rajasthan) was to develop a number of satellite and ring towns around Delhi as industrial areas that would provide alternate low-skilled employment opportunities and thereby, help to ‘deflect’ the large number of migrants who come to the city in search of employment (Nigam, 2001: 41). The idea has not really succeeded, poor infrastructure being one of the main reasons. In recent years, Gurgaon and Noida, which lie on the outskirts of the city, have witnessed phenomenal growth, but so far this growth has largely been confined to the service sector and has benefited mostly the educated urban middle class as opposed to the poor who have limited skills.

**Section IV: Schemes for slums**

A number of government schemes do exist that seek to provide better living conditions to people living in the slums. For instance, as per Economic Survey of Delhi (2002), the government made provisions for the following schemes in JJ clusters:

- Construction of *Basti Vikas Kendra*
- In situ upgradation of JJ clusters
However, the success of the different schemes initiated by the government in achieving the desired objectives is likely to be limited; these schemes are essentially short run interventions and there is lack of a holistic approach towards slum welfare. The various schemes fail to ensure a uniform pattern in terms of accessibility to different services (Sudarshan and Bhattacharya, 2006). There is, for example, no uniform ratio of total population and the number of taps/toilets in the slums. The functioning of Pay and Use Jan Suvidha toilet complexes is another example. Field observations\textsuperscript{11} suggest that while in some slums women and children are allowed to use the complexes free, in others children are debarred from using them and there is no uniformity of rates.

Further, over the years there has been a dilution of standards of provisions of basic services in the slums as evident from the table below.

\textsuperscript{11} Personal communication with Amita Joshi, Coordinator, ISST Field Office
Table 3: Different schemes for slums and dilution of provisions overtime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Name of the Scheme</th>
<th>Provisions under the Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.     | Environmental Improvement Scheme            | ▪ Water taps (1 for 50 persons)  
|        |                                              | ▪ Community toilet (1 for 20-50 persons) |
| 2.     | Urban Basic Services Programme (1985-90)    | ▪ Water taps (1 for 150 persons or 30 families) 
|        |                                              | ▪ Community bath (1 for 50 persons or 10 households)  
|        |                                              | ▪ Community toilet/ 'Pay and Use' Jansuvidha toilets (1 for 50 persons or 10 households) |
| 3.     | Prayog Vihar Project                        | The project approach was to rearrange plots on the same site and provision of community infrastructure.  
|        |                                              | ▪ Realignment of plots on the same site, 0.47 hectares were allocated per beneficiary (as opposed to 4.0 hectares they occupied) to achieve a density of 2200 people per hectare.  
|        |                                              | ▪ Each beneficiary was allocated a room of 9.5 sq. metres with a provision for expansion on the first floor and group bath and WC (1 for 7 families). |


Moreover, the concept of upgradation of slums as a means to provide better living conditions to the slum population has also been questioned (Dewan, 2002). Since most of the slums are densely populated (jhuggis in Delhi occupy only 5% of the total land while accounting for a bulk of the city's population), it has been argued in situ upgradation means that a large number of poor people are confined to a small area resulting in inequitable distribution of land. Secondly, many of the slums are in precarious location such as near railway tracks or along water bodies as a result of which they are prone to disasters such as floods or fire hazards. In- situ upgradation does not
ensure these settlements from these disasters, whether natural or man-made and can at best be seen as temporary measure.

**Section V: Emerging Issues and Considerations**

A greater understanding is needed of the different categories of slums, in particular the entitlements of each of these categories of human settlements and the extent to which they have been fulfilled. Also, it needs to be analysed as to what determines the entitlements of each of these different types of settlements and as to why they are different.

Ensuring equitable and dignified quality of life for all is essential to achieve sustainable development. The challenge before the city, therefore, is to simultaneously expand and modernise its infrastructure while dealing with profound socio-economic inequalities and severe environmental deterioration.
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