



## FIVE YEAR PLANS ' IMPRINT ON THE MASTER PLANNING EXERCISE FOR CITIES – A STUDY OF DELHI

**Ar. Taiyaba Munawer**

Senior Assistant Professor, Faculty of Architecture & Ekistics, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi – 25

**ABSTRACT** The Five year plans in India were adopted as policy making mechanisms for the country on Five yearly bases at the national level. The policies so framed found place in the states' policies and programs for development. The Master Planning exercise in India began with Delhi where Five year plans find a clear and strong imprint in them along with the method of land use planning and zoning. The plan so prepared, became blueprint of city planning for the other Indian states irrespective of divergent ground realities. The Niti Aayog with its strategic approach of planning intends to find relevant and sustainable solutions for urban planning to make cities that belong to all.

### KEYWORDS :

In the Independent India, under the Nehruvian model, the Five Year Plans were adopted as national policy making instrument for the country. These Plans then used to become the guiding principles for the state governments policy making. The Urban development, housing and urban policy are State subject as per the Constitution of India, hence the making of policy, policy documents like master plans for the Cities come under the purview of the State. The central government can only guide the state government, issue directives and provide funding for some projects for the urban areas. It is up to the state to decide the trajectory of the urban growth of its cities. With the increasing urbanization, the Planning of Cities has become an important foundational principle of the state and hence lot of stress is laid on the making of the Master Plans of the Cities. However, the states majorly depended on the policies outlined in the National Five year plans and other policies and programs of the Central Government. The First Five year plan (1951-56) had the challenge of rehabilitating the refugees pouring in from the Pakistan. Hence, the Ministry of works and Housing was set up to take care of the rehabilitation colonies, sub towns being set up for the same. For bringing the nation to the same frequency in aspects of City Planning as other countries, National Building organization, School of Planning and Architecture and the Town and Country Planning organization were set up for providing guidance and assistance to central and state government on issues pertaining to urban problems and development.

The Second Five year plan (1956-61) recognized the increasing slums and haphazard growth in and around the city, with people buying land on the fringes of the town in speculation. The plan called for regional planning and preparing of master plans of the cities. In order to make this feasible, the Town and Country Planning Legislation was enacted and in many states the institutions responsible for the Preparation of the Master Plans were set up. Also, in 1956, the Slums Area (Improvement and Clearance) Act was passed in which the principle, having socialist leanings, for slum improvement and clearance were clearly laid as *minimum dislocation of people, providing housing as near as possible to the existing sites...so that they are not uprooted from their employment....and providing only minimum standards of environmental hygiene and essential civic amenities* [Batra, 2009]

The clear imprint of the national Five year plan and the Slums Act can be seen in the First Master Plan of Delhi in which the Master Planning exercise for Delhi had already started by the Indian Planners in TCPO in 1955 and later was joined by the Ford Foundation. The MPD-1962 conducted an extensive survey of the fabric and provided a scheme for the redevelopment of the *slum areas (Old Delhi)*. The scheme mentions the same point of minimum dislocation, provision of basic housing, clearing the lanes, structuring the land uses as per zoning, providing basic civic amenities adopting lesser space standards. The non conforming land uses and village like trades had to be shifted and new developments were proposed as per the rigid zoning regulations. [MPD-1962]

Urban renewal operates to shape the urban structure so that all human activities may take place in environments conducive to their proper functioning and in harmony with other activities all within human

possibility, comprehension and dignity. *"One of the basic policies arrived at is that in the near future there will be no large scale mass demolition of structures here, even in the redevelopment areas". The planning has to be dynamic and comprehensive. The solution lies in evolving urban renewal plans as an integral part of the general plan for the city and the region and not just clearing slums.* [MPD-62]

The Third Five year plan (1961-66) emphasized the role of industrial development in urban development and had policies related to promoting industrialization by providing aid in land acquisition in backward areas, subsidies for infrastructure, tax benefits, electricity, roads, etc. Also, it was suggested the Master Plans should be prepared for 100,000 plus cities along with regional plans for industrial development areas in which the decentralized industrial development should be pursued so as to discourage growth of metropolitan areas. But the policy was implemented in such a way that it achieved just the reverse. *Between 1956-61, two third of all licenses for new industrial units or for the expansion of the old ones went to Maharashtra and Gujarat (predominantly Bombay) and to West Bengal (almost exclusively to Calcutta)* [Ansari, 2002].

The Fourth Five year plan (1966-71) recognized the problem of financing the development schemes and lack of housing for the poor. In this regard, Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUDCO) was set up in 1970 to provide funds to metropolitan authorities, state housing boards etc for the construction of houses. By this time, the government had realized that it was not able to meet the housing demand which led to the growing slums in the city. Hence it was not feasible to do slum removal as blanket scheme for the city. Rather it called for the amelioration of living conditions of the slum dwellers by providing the basic services and reconditioning of slums. Environmental Improvement of Urban Slums (EIUS) was set up in 1972-73 for serving this purpose.

In 1973, a review of the First Master Plan was taken up and it was found that the Master Plan has failed on many accounts and especially nothing has been done for the walled city. [DDA, 1973]

The Fifth Five year plan (1974-79) carried forward the slum improvement program and launched Integrated Urban Development Programme (IUDP) for developing the infrastructure in cities. The emergency period, between 1975-77, saw the passing of the Urban Land (Ceilings and Regulation) Act 1976 (ULCRA, 1976) which set up a ceiling limit for land ownership of vacant land in urban agglomerations and acquisition of excess land for provision of housing to the poor.

In 1976, the emergency saw uprooting of 7 lakh people and demolition of 1.5lakh houses by DDA, from the inner city slums (Old Delhi) in Delhi by Sanjay Gandhi and Jagmohan [Batra, 2009], leading to widespread anguish among the people.

In 1980, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi came back to power after emergency, defeating the Janata party government after their 2.5yr rule. There was a very strong need and urgency to reclaim pro-poor

image, and removing the bitterness of emergency. Hence, the Sixth Five year Plan *specifically talked of slum improvement*, and not *dislocation*, by providing the basic facilities of sanitation, drainage, roads, water supply, etc. So when the second Master Plan of Delhi (1981-2001) was being made in the late 70s, **it talked in pacifying ways and called the Old City as Special area** (instead of slums), in need of area-specific measures for the development leading to improvement of the fabric and amelioration of people. By this time, the definition of slums became all encompassing, comprising of all the slums in Delhi and not just areas restricted to Old Delhi as per MPD-1962.

The Sixth Five year plan (1980-85) saw the replacement of IUDP by the Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns (IDSMT) which emphasized the provision of infrastructure and promoting growth of small and medium sized towns (with less than 100,000 populations).

The Seventh Five year plan (1985-90) called for radical reorientation towards liberalization by increasing the private sector participation in providing housing [Batra, 2009]. It also saw passing of The National Environment Act 1986 which placed the conservation of physical environment in priority on the national agenda. The National Housing Policy (1988), the National Housing Bank and the National Commission on Urbanization (1989) were established during this Plan.

The Eighth Five year Plan (1992-97) saw the passing of the 74<sup>th</sup> Constitutional Amendment Act in 1992 which laid stress on creating the urban local bodies as instruments of self governance which will provide the services and lead to sustainable development of metropolitan cities. The TCPO drafted a National Urban Policy in 1992 which talked about regional development and planning towards evolving a spatial pattern of population distribution and economic activities.

**In 1996, the India Infrastructure Report : Policy imperatives for Growth and Welfare** came out which turned out to be the landmark turning point, championing the commercialization of infrastructure projects. By this time, it was the duty of the government to provide the infrastructure on the basis of the need of the people. The report changed the whole direction of growth by suggesting that *it was beyond the capacity of the government to mobilize the kind of resources required for the urban sector*. There is a very strong need of privatization and commercialization of infrastructure – its creation, management, service provision and regulatory mechanisms. And in order to achieve this privatization, there is a need of overhauling the governance, legislative and administrative framework in all the cities. The report is important because it brought the commercialization to the front in bold letters, raising serious doubts about the ability of the government to supply the infrastructure services sufficiently and shifted the method from the ‘need based’ to the ‘projected demand’ based. It asked the municipalities to become attractive for inviting the private investments in urban projects and become an apparatus of capital gains for the private players. *“The IIR thus overturns the principle of access to basic urban services as a matter of citizen’s right regardless of the ability to pay to one of “consumer satisfaction” determined by the ability to pay.”* [Batra, 2009]

IIR found six sectors which were in need of private investment for infrastructure improvement as urban development, power, telecommunications, roads, industrial parks and roads. Although, IIR is criticized about making faulty assumptions, suggesting that private capital is more efficient than the government but it did bring the focus to the importance, enhancement and augmentation of the infrastructure in urban areas in order to make the cities grow and develop over the time.

Soon, this became ‘THE’ backbone of all the central and state policies related to infrastructure in urban sectors. The states went all out of the way to change the legislative and administrative apparatus so as to carry the imprint of IIR into their policies, plans and projects.

The Ninth Five year Plan (1997-2002) was greatly influenced by the IIR and encouraged private sector participation in all the infrastructure related projects. The ULCRA was repealed and IDSMT was found to be a big failure. The government in 2002, keeping its role to be a facilitator, allowed 100% Foreign Direct Investment in integrated

townships which comprised of housing, commercial premises, hotels, resorts, etc. On the local governance level there were measures adopted for decentralization of governance through the local bodies as well as evolving market based forms of financing for them. In 1999, the Draft National Slum Policy was made which talked of **integration of slums in the mainstream urban life through in-situ up gradation**. This basically implies that there is lacunae in the public housing, where the government could not do anything substantial regarding housing for the lower, middle income and the poor of cities. The housing projects that do come up were so unaffordable that they ultimately catered to the better off.

The 2002-2003 Union Budget happened at the end of the ninth plan and pushed the urban reforms by reforming the Rent Control Act, creating market led models for the public private partnerships in infrastructure projects, simplifying the legal and procedural framework for conversion of agricultural land for non agricultural purposes, etc. This gave the whole new dimension to the Tenth Five Year Plan (2002-2007) in which the Union Budget steps were reiterated so as to push the investment of private players in city building. The Plan placed a lot of emphasis on making the Urban Local Bodies financially strong and less dependent on state coffers. This was made possible by introducing measures like improving property tax collection, reducing the stamp duties, levying betterment charges, etc. The whole idea was to make ULBs worthy of their values so as to mobilize the funds for capital markets and investors.

In December 2005, Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Regeneration Mission (JNNURM) was introduced by the Prime minister Dr. Manmohan Singh. It was almost a revolutionary scheme of regenerating the urban areas of the cities by means of reforms linked to the incentives and providing assistance to the state governments and urban local bodies. The mission has detailed out the schemes and procedure so as to take up urban projects under two major headings: Providing Urban Infrastructure and Governance and Providing Basic services to the Urban Poor. The whole mission is based on market driven forces of urban development running on Public Private Partnership models with government acting as facilitator and regulator.

Meanwhile, the preparation of Third Master Plan for Delhi (2001-2021) was underway, which was promulgated in 2006 instead of 2001, but had all the components derived heavily from the India Infrastructure report, Ninth and Tenth Plans, Draft National Slum Policy and the Foreign Direct Investment. The MPD-2021 aims to make Delhi a World Class city, with infrastructure projects and Mass Rapid transit systems connecting the whole city. The projects are envisaged on the Public Private Partnership model through Foreign Direct Investment. The commercial land use being intensified along the network so as to capitalize on the increased connectivity. The mixed land use being allowed and no further dislocation of commercial from the residential locations with the approach of ‘managing’ the growth. The slums are proposed to be upgraded with the infrastructure and basic amenities as per the slum policy. The national Five year plans and policies again find a strong and a clear imprint in the Third Master Plan of Delhi.

The Eleventh Five Year Plan (2007-2012) introduced the concept of development through capacity building in order to increase the efficiency and productivity of the cities. The plan aimed to end the monopoly of public sector over urban infrastructure, and using technology as a means of rapid urbanization. The Twelfth Five year plan (2012-2017) had proposed to consolidate JNNURM and envisaged its wider role in urban reforms.

### In Conclusion

On 15<sup>th</sup> August 2014, Prime Minister Narendra Modi dissolved the 64 year old Planning Commission, which was an important instrument for nation building in independent India, and constituted *Niti Aayog* in its place. The aim is to give more autonomy and flexibility to States to decide about the policies and programs relevant to their contexts and spend their resources accordingly leading to bottom to top approach of planning. The earlier top to down approach of decision making was time taking and sometimes unsuitable to the divergent socio-economic context of the states. The *Niti Aayog*, it is intended, would follow the strategic approach of planning at micro and macro level. The states will make schemes of infrastructure and investments decisions as per the need and priorities of their people. But even this needs to be

safeguarded, as there are possibilities of states spending less on social sectors or becoming too dependent on the private sector investment. The same applies to the Urban Planning where there is a strong need to change the way cities are being planned and becoming pro-capitalist in the long run. The twenty year Master Planning exercise of making a coloured map needs to change to short term strategic planning approach with projects being taken up on priority basis in sync with ground realities and with the consent and participation of the community. Then only we would be able to have '*actual smart cities, sustainable and meant for all.*

## REFERENCES

1. Ansari J.H, Mahavir, Reading Material on Planning Techniques, ITPI, 2002
2. Batra Lalit, A review of the Urbanization and Urban Policy in Post Colonial India, Centre for the study of Law and Governance, JNU, April 2009
3. R.Ramachandran, Urbanization and Urban Systems in India, OUP, 2016 reprint edition
4. Kumar, Ashok, Major concerns of the Planning Profession, Background paper presented at the National Workshop on " Planning Practise and Education in India" SPA, 6-7Jan 2001
5. Mohan Rakesh, Infrastructure Development in India : Emerging Challenges, World Bank Annual Conference on Development Economics, Bangalore, May 2003
6. Delhi Development Authority, Master Plan of Delhi-1962, 1962
7. Delhi Development Authority, Work Studies of Master Plan of Delhi-1962, 1962
8. Delhi Development Authority, Review of the Master Plan of Delhi-1962, 1973
9. Delhi Development Authority, Master Plan of Delhi-2001, 2001
10. Delhi Development Authority, Master Plan of Delhi-2021, 2021
11. <http://www.insightsonindia.com/2014/10/29/urbanization-in-india-facts-and-issues/> accessed on 12.05.2017
12. <http://www.firstpost.com/india/end-planning-commission-modi-govt-ignore-opposition-misgivings-1840127.html> accessed on 17.05.2017
13. [http://www.business-standard.com/article/economy-policy/abolition-of-planning-commission-doesn-t-mean-planning-process-is-over-m-govinda-rao-115020700539\\_1.html](http://www.business-standard.com/article/economy-policy/abolition-of-planning-commission-doesn-t-mean-planning-process-is-over-m-govinda-rao-115020700539_1.html) accessed on 17.05.2017
14. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planning\\_Commission\\_\(India\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planning_Commission_(India)) accessed on 12.05.2017