

ECONOMICS OF URBANISATION IN INDIA: AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Sheshagiri. B*

Urbanisation in India is neither unique nor exclusive but is similar to a world-wide phenomenon. By the year 1900, only about 15 per cent of the population, about 250 million, lived and worked in urban areas, a number lower than the total urban population of India today, which itself is a tad less than 30 per cent of India's population. As for the magnitude, in 1901, only 25 million people constituting 10.84 per cent of population lived in urban areas in India. The state-wise variations are significant. This count increased to 28.53% according to 2001 census, and crossing 30% as per 2011 census, standing at 31.16%. However, in the case of Bangalore, the proportion has increased slightly. It is therefore worthy of note that the common notion that migration largely fuels urban growth is only partially correct. The level, quality and distribution of services have been very poor. Several studies have indicated large segments of urban population do not have access to drinking water, sanitation, basic health services and education. The impact of urbanisation may be considered in the context of urban infrastructure services comprising water supply, sanitation and solid waste management, Electricity, land and urban environment. The main objectives of the study as follows: (i) to study the level, trend and regional pattern of urbanization, (ii) to study examine the urban migration and basic amenities and facilities in major metro-cities, and (iii) to examine India future urbanisation in the light of new economic policy. The present paper is based on secondary sources of information such as the published and unpublished documents of Government of Karnataka, Department of Economics and Statistics, Government of India; NSSO, CSO and Economics survey, Peer-review Journals and reports, appropriate applies for tools like, percentage, ratio, average, CAGR, and CV etc.

INTRODUCTION

Urbanisation in India is neither unique nor exclusive but is similar to a world-wide phenomenon. Indian urbanisation has proceeded as it has elsewhere in the world as a part and product of economic change. Occupational shift from agriculture to urban-based industry and services is one part of the change. At the same time, increased agricultural performance has also promoted urbanisation as noticed in several top rice and wheat producing districts in the country. To cite some examples, in the districts of Chengalpet, Krishna, Burdwan, Ludhiana or Kurukshetra, the percentage of urban population is seen to be higher than the state average. New industrial investments and expansion of the services industry in new location is also another factor. As for the magnitude, in 1901, only 25 million people constituting 10.84 per cent of population lived in urban areas in India. In the 100 years since then, the urban population has grown 12 times and it is now around 285 million people constituting 28 per cent of the total population. In the following 20 years (2001-21), the urban population will nearly double itself to reach about 550 million. According to the World Urbanisation Prospects (the 1996 Revision), the urban population in the year 2025 will rise to 42.5 per cent (566 million).

*ICSSR Doctoral Fellow, Dept of Economics, Karnatak University, Dharwad – 03

Corresponding author: E-mail ID: sheshu.eco@gmail.com Mob No: 9901702007

The state wise variations are significant. The pace and spread of urbanisation are not uniform. Maharashtra with an urban population percentage of 42 per cent (41 million), Gujarat with 37 per cent (19 million) and Tamil Nadu with 44 per cent (27 million) and the least urbanised state, Assam with 13 per cent in 2001 indicate this inter-regional variation. In 2021, Maharashtra (50.45%), Gujarat (44.45%), Tamil Nadu (42.54%), Karnataka (41.12%) and Andhra Pradesh (39.13%) will be the most urbanised states in the country in that order. The impact of urbanisation may be considered in the context of urban infrastructure services comprising water supply, sanitation and solid waste management, land and urban environment. The level, quality and distribution of services have been very poor. Several studies have indicated large segments of urban population do not have access to drinking water, sanitation, basic health services and education. The Objectives of present paper is to analyse :

- i. The level, trend and regional pattern of urbanization,
- ii. The urban migration and basic amenities in major cities in India and
- ii. To examine India future urbanisation in the light of new economic policy.

METHODOLOGY

The present study is based on secondary data. Annual time series data is used for the entire period from 1970-2010. The data is collected to post and pre-reforms and also sub-period which are made use for comparison. The secondary data is obtained from published as well as documented sources, pertinent literature, and previous studies. The reports of Govt of India, Economic survey, NSSO (National Sample Survey), CSO (Central Statistical Organization), RBI Hand book of statistics, Indian stat, ILO studies different government sectors and peer-review journals, annual reports, are used for the study, statistical tools like percentage, ratio's, average, tools are used to analyze the data.

IMPACT OF URBANISATION

The impact of all this growth on space, environment and quality of life will be, to say the least, tremendous. The provision of infrastructural facilities required to support such large concentration of population is lagging far behind the pace of urbanisation. As a consequence, the urban environment, particularly in large cities, is deteriorating very rapidly. All cities have severe shortage of water supply, sewerage, developed land, housing, transportation and other facilities. The level, quality and distribution of services have been very poor. Several studies have indicated large segments of urban population do not have access to drinking water, sanitation, basic health services and education. The impact of urbanisation may be considered in the context of urban infrastructure services comprising water supply, sanitation and solid waste management, land and urban environment.

Contrary to popular perception, migration is not the principal or the dominant factor in urban growth. In the 1991-2001 period, natural increase accounted for 60 per cent of urban growth, migration for 21.20 per cent and reclassification of new towns 18.80 per cent. The figures for the past 3 decades show that nearly 60 per cent of the total migratory movement has been from rural to rural. However in the case of some large cities for certain periods of time, migration has been a major factor. For instance, migration has increased between 1991 and 2001 in the case of Mumbai, Delhi and Hyderabad, but as a component of city's growth its share has declined. However, in the case of Bangalore, the proportion has increased slightly. It is therefore worthy of note that the common notion that migration largely fuels urban growth is only partially correct.

Table 1 World urbanization pattern

Region	Level of Urbanization (per cent to total population)			Rate of Urbanization (percentage)
	1950	2000	2030	2005-2030
Africa	14.7	36.2	50.7	1.12
Asia	16.8	37.1	54.1	1.23
Latin America	42.0	75.4	84.3	0.34
Oceania	62.0	70.5	73.8	0.17
North America	63.9	79.1	86.7	0.29
Europe	50.5	71.7	78.3	0.33
World	29.0	46.7	59.9	0.83

Source: United Nations, 2006

Following table -1 provide details projected urbanization pattern by regional economies has indicated that urbanisation in developing countries as a whole is more rapid and massive as the share of urban population will increase by more than three times by 2030, thus touching almost 56 per cent from just 18 per cent in 1950. In particular, it is predicted that now it is Asia's turn for rapid urbanisation--from an urban population share of 37.1 per cent in 2000; it would reach 54.1 per cent by 2030. The problem of city-region disparities would be further accentuated on account of the proposed emergence of large cities. Out of the 22 cities which are expected to reach 10 million plus population by 2015, 17 will be in the developing countries, and more significantly, 11 out of 17 cities will be in the Asian region (UN 2006; Mohan and Dasgupta 2005).

Impact of Migration on Urbanisation

Following table No-2 Provides the details where the migration rate is higher in 2001 compared to 1991. Migration Pattern in Major Metropolitan cities in India the population growth the trend of increase and the share of migration in the population increase in the 5 metropolitan cities indicate some significant trends during the decade from 1991-2001. There has been an absolute increase in total population of all the 5 cities during the decade under review.

Table-2 Migration Pattern in Major Metropolitan Cities (Million)

Cities	Mumbai		Delhi		Chennai		Bangalore		Hyderabad	
	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001	1991	2001
Population	8.24	12.57	5.73	8.38	4.29	5.36	2.92	4.09	2.55	4.28
Population Increase	2.27	4.33	2.08	2.65	1.12	1.07	1.26	1.16	0.75	1.73
Of which Migration	1.55	1.81	1.16	1.36	0.68	0.57	0.50	0.51	0.25	0.55
In per cent	68.51	41.92	55.73	51.53	60.50	53.08	40.13	43.78	32.72	31.60

Source: NSS of 61st Round (July 2004- June 2005) Urban Housing;

The increase in population in the two metropolitan cities of Mumbai and Delhi is substantially higher compared to the other 3 cities of Chennai, Bangalore and Hyderabad. Similarly migration too has been comparatively higher in these two cities of Mumbai and Delhi. Migration as percentage of population increase has been higher in all the four cities of Mumbai, Delhi, Chennai and Hyderabad in 1991 compared to the increase in 2001. In Bangalore the percentage increase of migration has been higher in 2001 compared to 1991. The trend of percentage increase of migration in overall increase in population indicates that there is slowdown in the rate of increase of migration in 2001 compared to that of 1991 in four cities except in Bangalore. The projections of households and state of housing stock for the years 2010, 2020 and 2025 based on the Report of the Working Group on Urban Housing for the Ninth Plan using regression growth rates of pucca, semi-pucca and kutcha houses and the annual exponential growth rate of households are given in the following table. The congestion factor is estimated as 4.86% and obsolescence factor as 4.14% of the total housing stock. Based on these assumptions, the overall urban housing shortage will reduce to 1.66 million units by 2010 as against 8.23 million in 1991. The projections indicate substantial increase in pucca and semi-pucca units with marginal increase in kutcha houses. The group hopes that there will be no housing shortage from 2015 onwards.

Table-3 Projections for Housing Stock, Households and Housing Shortage (2001 – 2025)

(in million units)

Category	Trend Rate (%)	1991	2010	2020	2025*
Pucca	4.99	29.8	75.85	123.44	157.47
Semi Pucca	1.16	6.2	7.72	8.66	9.17
Kutcha	0.76	3.2	3.69	3.98	4.13
Households	3.40	40.7	77.71	108.56	128.32
Housing Shortage	--	8.23	1.65	0	0

Source: Report of the Working Group on Urban Housing, Ninth Plan *Computed

The following table No-3 provides the details Projections for Housing stocks, Households and Housing Shortage (2001-2025) in million units. The Project rate of growth of pucca houses is much above (4.88%) those of semi pucca (1.16%) and Kutcha (0.78%) during the period from 1991 to 2025 Pucca houses which were 29.8 mi in 1991 and 75-85 million in 2010 are projected to grow upto 123-44 m in 2020 and 157.47 m in 2025. Semi pucca houses would grow from 6.2 m in 1991, 7.72 million units in 2010 to 8.66 million units in 2020 and to 9.17 million units in 2025. Projections indicate a slow growth of in 2010 to 3.98 m in 2025. Thus the relatively high growth of pucca houses indicate that urbanization is accompanied with increase in pucca houses factors responsible for such high increase could be the rise in percapita income of urban population and liberal housing finance from financial institutions. The growth of households in projected to increase from 40.7 million units in 1991 and 77.71 million units in 2010 to 108.56 million units in 2020 and 128.32 million units in 2025. Housing shortage reduced from 8.23 million units in 1991 to 1.65 million units in 2010. However, the figures of housing stock in terms of bricks and mortar or dwelling units as such are only a part of the story. The availability of basic urban services may well be persisting problems. Slum settlements need not necessarily mean jhuggis. In most cities,

the prevailing scene is one of pucca housing in Kutch environment. The serious strain on the quantum and quality of urban services has been discussed already. Housing without services is a distortion as well as a drain on the economy.

Table-4 Slum Population—Census 2001

Slum population 1991 (TCPO estimates)	46.26 million
Slum population 2001 (TCPO estimates)	61.82 million
No. of towns reporting slums in Census 2001	640#
Reported slum population in 640 towns, 2001	42.58 million
Population of towns/cities reporting slums, 2001	184.35 million
Share of slum population to population of towns/cities reporting slums, 2001	23.1%

Source: NSS of 61st Round (July 2004- June 2005).

The shows tables No-4 provides the details Slum Population – Census 2001. Urbanization has been accompanied with growth of slum population in India creating socio-economic and environmental Problems. The 2001 census provides details of the population rose from 46.26 million in 1991 to 61.82 million in 2001. The number of towns reporting slums in 2001 (Census – 2001) was 640 with a reported slum population of 42.58 million. Population of towns/cities reporting slums in 2001 was 184.35 million. The share of slum population to population of towns/cities reporting slums in 2001 was 23.1 per cent.

Basic Amenities and facilities in Urbanisation

Table-5 Population, Housing and Basic Amenities in India

Total population of India 2001	1028.6 million
Urban population 2001	286.1 million
% share urban 2001	27.8%
Total urban housing stock 2001	52.0 million
Pucca houses	79.16%
Semi-pucca houses	15.58%
Household with Tenure Status, Urban, 2001	
Owned	66.8%
Rented	28.5%
Others	4.7%
Households having Access to, Urban, 2001	
Safe drinking water	90.01
Electricity	87.59%
Toilet	73.72%
Drainage	77.86%
Kitchen within the house	75.96%
LPG for cooking	47.96%
Electricity for cooking	0.31%
Biogas for cooking	0.37%

Source: Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation, Govt. of India.

The total population of India as per 2001 census was 1028.6 million which is the second largest next only to China, Urban Population constituted 27.8 per cent of the total population of the country. The total urban housing stock in 2001 was 52.0 million. Pucca houses constituted 79.16 per cent of the urban housing stock while semipucca houses accounted for 15.58 percent. Majority 66.8 per cent of the household owned the houses while 28.5 per cent of households resided in rented houses. A small number of 4.7 per cent of households had other type of tenure in 2001. **Urban Facilities:** The basic facility of drinking water was available for 90.01 percent of households electricity supply was provided to 87.59 percent of households while toilet facility was available for 73.72 percent. Drainage facility was available for 77.96 percent of household and separate kitchen with in the house was available for 75.96 percent of households. Availability of LPG for cooking was available for only 47.96 per cent of households while biogas for cooking was available for 0.37 percent of households. The available for 0.37 per cent of household. The details indicate that large majority of household had basic facilities of drinking water, electricity, toilet, drainage separate kitchen etc.

Table-6 Major State-wise Projected Slum Population in India (2011-2017)

States/UTs	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Delhi	3.40	3.43	3.47	3.50	3.54	3.58	3.62
Karnataka	0.57	3.90	3.89	3.88	3.88	3.87	3.86
Kerala	0.57	0.56	0.56	0.55	0.54	0.53	0.52
Tamil Nadu	9.29	9.33	9.37	9.41	9.44	9.47	9.49
Uttar Pradesh	11.69	11.72	11.74	11.77	11.79	11.82	11.84
India	25.53	28.94	29.03	29.11	29.20	29.28	29.35

Source: Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation, Govt. of India.

Following table No-6 provide the details. State-wise projected slum Population in India (2011-2017) Projections of slum population growth during 2011-17 indicate a slow but consistent increase for the state like Delhi, Tamil Nadu, and Uttar Pradesh during the 15 years. However marginal variations in the growth of slum population from year to year during 2011 to 2017 are observed in case of Karnataka and Kerala. Growth projections of slum Population for Kerala actually indicate a small decline from year to year between 2011 to 2017. The average growth of slum population for India during the corresponding period indicates a small but persistent increase.

Table-7 State-wise Number of Houses Completed and Allotted to (BSUP) and (IHSDP) in India (2008-2009 to 2011-2012-upto 23.08.2011)

States	2008-2009 to 2010-2011		2011-12 (upto 23.08.2011)	
	BSUP	IHSDP	BSUP	IHSDP
Delhi	0.26	--	--	--
Karnataka	3.24	--	20.08	62.15
Kerala	28.50	32.24	16.80	5.87
Tamil Nadu	49.05	61.37	18.51	22.62
Uttar Pradesh	18.95	6.39	53.87	9.35
India	100.00	100.00	109.26	100

Note: Poor/Slum Dwellers under Basic Service to Urban Poor (BSUP), Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (IHSDP)

Following the **table No-7** provides the details. State-wise Number of Houses Completed and Allotted to (BSUP) and (IHSDP) in India (2008-2009 to 2011-12 up to 23-08-2011). Tamil Nadu tops the list of 5 states with maximum of 49.05 per cent of houses completed and allotted to BSUP followed by Kerala (28.50) per cent Uttar Pradesh (18.95%), Karnataka (3.24%) and Delhi (0.26%) similarly Tamil Nadu tops the list (61.37%) in completing and allotting houses under IHSDP followed by Kerala (32.24%) and Uttar Pradesh (6.39%) during 2010-2011. During 2011-12 upto 28.08.2011) Uttar Pradesh tops the list with 53.87 per cent followed by Karnataka (20.08%), Tamil Nadu (18.51%) and Kerala (16.80%) for completing and allotting houses to BSUP. Karnataka topped the list with 62.15 per cent of completing and allotting houses to IHSDP followed by Tamil Nadu (22.62%), Uttar Pradesh (9.35%) and Kerala (5.87%).

Table-8 Category-wise Percentage of Slum Working Population to Total Working Slum Population in Million Plus Cities in India-2001

Million Plus Municipal Corporations	States/UTs	Agricultural Cultivators	Household Labourers	Other Industry	Workers
Greater Mumbai	Maharashtra	0.1	0.1	3.7	96.1
Delhi	Delhi	0.1	0.1	3.9	95.9
Kolkata	West Bengal	0.4	0.5	4.2	95
Chennai	Tamil Nadu	1.2	0.5	2.3	96
Bangalore	Karnataka	0.2	0.3	4	95.5
Hyderabad	Andhra Pradesh	1.1	0.8	3.6	94.5
Total		3.10	2.30	21.70	573.00

Source: Census of India.

Following the table-8 provide details category wise percentage of slum working population to total working population in Million Plus cities in India -2011. Agricultural cultivators constitute 0.1 per cent of slum working population to total working slum population in greater Mumbai and Delhi. The respective per centage for Kolkata, Chennai, Bangalore and Hyderabad were 0.4, 1.02, 0.2 and 1.1 per cent with a total of 3.10 per cent. Households labourers constituted 0.1% of slum working population to total working slum population in greater Mumbai, and Delhi. The respective percentage for Kolkata, Chennai, Bangalore and Hyderabad were 0.5, 0.5 0.3 and 0.8 per cent. With a total of 2.30% workers in other industry constituted 3.7 per cent , 3.9%, 4.2%, 2.3%, 4% and 3.6% of slum working population to total slum population in greater Mumbai, Delhi, Kolkata, Chennai , Bangalore and respectively. Workers constituted 96.1% of slum working population to total working slum population in Greater Mumbai 95.9% in Delhi 95% in Kolkata 96% in Chennai 95.5% in Bangalore and 94.5% in Hyderabad.

Following table No – 9 Major State-wise Urban Population in India (1981, 1991 and 2000). Andhra Pradesh led the other 5 Major states with 75727541 of total population in 2001 followed by Tamil Nadu (62110839), Karnataka (52733958), Kerala (31838619), Delhi (13782976) and

Nagaland (1988636). Tamil Nadu led other states in terms of urban population with 27241553 followed by Andhra Pradesh (20503597), Karnataka (17919858), Delhi (12819761), Kerala (8267135) and Nagaland (352821). There has been continues increase in Urban population as percentage of total population of all the 6 states between 1981 and 2001. Delhi has recorded the highest percentage of urban population (93.01%) in 2001 compared to other 5 states. Sex ratio was the highest at 1058 in Kerala indicating more females per 1000 males. Followed by Tamil Nadu (980), Andhra Pradesh (965), Karnataka (940), Delhi (822) and Nagaland (809). Sex ratio at all India was 901. Table no provides the details Major state-wise urban population in India (1981, 1991 and 2001).

Table-9 Major State-wise Urban Population in India (1981, 1991 & 2001)

States/UTs	Population 2001		% of Urban to Total Population			Sex Ratio 2001
	Total Population	Urban Population	2001	1991	1981	
Tamil Nadu	62110839	27241553	43.86	34.15	32.95	980
Karnataka	52733958	17919858	33.98	30.92	28.89	940
Andhra Pradesh	75727541	20503597	27.08	26.78	23.32	965
Kerala	31838619	8267135	25.97	26.39	18.74	1058
Delhi	13782976	12819761	93.01	89.93	92.73	822
Nagaland	1988636	352821	17.74	17.21	15.52	809
India	1.027E+09	285354954	27.78	25.71	23.34	901

Source: Census of India.

Following the table – 10 provide details rank cities on Sanitation by Points under National Urban Sanitation Policy in India (2009-2010). Mysore city in Karnataka with second ranks tops of the list with 70.65 points in terms of Sanitation followed by Delhi cantonment with 61.35 points and Mangalore in Karnataka with 8th rank with 57.34 points. The other cities in Karnataka with in 20 ranks in terms of sanitation are Bangalore (12th ranks) and Mandya (15th rank) with 53.64 and 53.33 points respectively. Davangere ranked the lowest at 357 among cities in India with 24.95 points other cities in Karnataka with lower ranks in sanitation are Shimoga (168), Gulbarga (175), Kolar (177), Bellary (181), Bhadravati (184), Tumkur (185), Hubli-Dharwad (197), Raichur (212), Gadag Betgeri (222) and Chitradurga (355). Cities with poor sanitation performance outside Karnataka are DMC (Delhi) (170), Kanhangad (Kerala) (176) and Kurnool (AP) (198). Metropolitan cities with tolerably better sanitation are Chennai (13), Kolkata (25) Greater Mumbai (46), Kochi (Kerala-82) Hyderabad (89), Vishakpatanam (92) and Coimbatore (93).

Table-10 Rank of Cities on Sanitation by Points under National Urban Sanitation Policy in India-(2009-2010)

Rank	City	States/UTs	Points			Total
			Output	Process	Outcome	
2	Mysore	Karnataka	33.08	25.07	12.5	70.65
5	Delhi Cantt	UP	30.75	19.417	11.2	61.37
8	Mangalore	Karnataka	20.84	22.5	14	57.34
12	Bangalore	Karnataka	21.7	18.87	13.067	53.64
13	Chennai	Tamil Nadu	25.5	20.66	7.47	53.63
15	Mandya	Karnataka	18.74	20.59	14	53.33
20	Alandur	Tamil Nadu	22.24	21	7	50.24
22	Bidar	Karnataka	17.17	21.45	11.2	49.82
25	Kolkata	West Bengal	17.33	23.002	8.633	48.97
26	Thanjavur	Tamil Nadu	20.27	19.3	9.25	48.82
44	Udupi	Karnataka	13.67	19.48	12.25	45.4
45	Agartala	Tripura	19.2	16.99	9.1	45.29
46	Greater Mumbai	Maharashtra	14.25	23.593	7.233	45.08
47	Chikmagalur	Karnataka	14.92	19.95	10.15	45.02
48	Kottayam	Kerala	26	13.4	5.6	45
72	Hospet	Karnataka	12.67	20.05	9.1	41.82
74	Thiruvananthapuram	Kerala	18.42	18.04	5.25	41.71
77	Bijapur	Karnataka	11.02	20.001	10.5	41.52
78	Kukatpally	Andhra Pradesh	14.81	19.93	6.65	41.39
82	Kochi	Kerala	16.17	19.3	5.6	41.07
89	Hyderabad	Andhra Pradesh	16.342	17.958	6.3	40.6
91	Belgaum	Karnataka	16.83	12.48	11.2	40.51
92	Visakhapatnam	Andhra Pradesh	17.114	16.5	6.88	40.49
93	Coimbatore	Tamil Nadu	16.2	18.69	5.6	40.49
168	Shimoga	Karnataka	13.17	14.037	9.8	37.01
170	DMC(U)	Delhi	18.643	12.487	5.833	36.96
175	Gulbarga	Karnataka	12.92	17.91	5.95	36.78
176	Kanhangad	Kerala	18.25	14	4.5	36.75
177	Kollar	Karnataka	16.08	14.33	6.3	36.71
181	Bellary	Karnataka	12.05	17.44	7	36.49
184	Bhadravati	Karnataka	11.92	13.39	10.85	36.16
185	Tumkur	Karnataka	9.61	22	4.55	36.16
197	Hubli-Dharwad	Karnataka	10.77	19.21	5.25	35.23
198	Kurnool	Andhra Pradesh	13.417	16.848	4.9	35.17
212	Raichur	Karnataka	10.5	12.28	11.75	34.53
222	Gadag-Betigeri	Karnataka	8.76	16.96	8.4	34.12
355	Chitradurga	Karnataka	8.76	10.75	5.6	25.11
357	Davanagere	Karnataka	9.67	11.08	4.2	24.95

Source: Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation, Govt. of India.

Impact of Drinking water, Electricity on Urbanisation

Table-11 Percentage of Households Classified by Availability of Drinking Water, Electricity and Toilet Facility in Selected Cities of India (1991 Census)

Million Plus City/ Urban Area	Within/Outside Premises	Drinking Water Available	Electricity		Toilet	
			Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available
Bangalore	Within Premises	55.71	70.98	9.55	11.91	2.29
	Outside Premises	44.29	29.02	90.45	88.09	97.71
Chennai	Within Premises	61.6	77.46	28.85	20.52	8.12
	Outside Premises	38.4	22.54	71.15	79.48	91.88
Delhi	Within Premises	74.79	95.53	53.89	72.21	14.24
	Outside Premises	25.21	4.47	46.11	27.79	85.76
Greater Mumbai	Within Premises	69.21	84.21	36.45	25.75	10.43
	Outside Premises	30.79	15.79	63.55	74.25	89.57
Hyderabad	Within Premises	67.04	81.82	20.8	18.33	4.89
	Outside Premises	32.96	18.18	79.2	81.67	95.11
Kolkata	Within Premises	52.59	65.03	19.78	21.95	4.58
	Outside Premises	47.41	34.97	80.22	78.05	95.42

Source: Metropolitan housing statistics 2002 ministry of Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation, Government of India.

The following Table-11 **provides** details percentage of Households Classified by Availability of Drinking Water, Electricity and Toilet Facility in selected cities of India (1991 Census). Drinking water availability is the highest in Delhi within the premises for 74.79 per cent of households followed by greater Mumbai (69.21%), Hyderabad (67.04%) Chennai (61.6%), Bangalore (55.71%), Kolkata (52.59%). Kolkata has higher percentage of households with drinking water supply outside the premises (47.41%), followed by Bangalore (44.29%), Chennai (38.4%), Hyderabad (32.96%), Mumbai (30.79%), and Delhi (25.21%). The data indicate that large majority of households in the six major cities had drinking water facility within the premises; however a good number of households ranging between 25.21% in Delhi to 47.41% in Kolkata depended on drinking water facility outside the premises. **Electricity:** Households with electricity within the premises were maximum in Delhi (95.53%), followed by Greater Bombay (84.21%), Hyderabad (81.82%), Chennai (77.46%), Bangalore (70.98%), Kolkata (65.03%). Electricity outside the premises was available to maximum number of households in Kolkata (34.97%), followed by Bangalore (29.02%), Chennai (22.54%), Hyderabad (18.18%), Mumbai (15.79%) and Delhi (4.47%). Electricity was not available outside the premises for maximum of households in Bangalore (90.45%), followed by Kolkata (80.22%), Hyderabad (79.20%), Chennai (71.15%), Greater Mumbai (63.55%), Delhi (46.11%). Electricity within premises was not available for maximum of 53.89%, of households in Delhi followed by Greater Mumbai (36.45%), Chennai (28.85%), Hyderabad (20.8%), Kolkata and Bangalore (9.55%). The data indicate that large majority of households in the six major cities did not have electricity

outside their premises while a lesser number of households did not have the facility of electricity within their premises. **Toilets:** It is found from the data that large majority of households did not have toilet facility outside the premises in the six major cities covered by the study. A very small number of households did not have toilets facility within their premises in the six cities.

CONCLUSION

Let me attempt to summarise my key observations. Our approach to the future of urbanization in the next thirty years has to be informed by the realization that more urban population will be added during this period than any comparable period in history. The ongoing process of globalization and technical change will bring many new challenges, including many that cannot be foreseen today. We will need to focus more than even before on the “soft” parts of urban needs connected with health, education and the provision of urban amenities. Approaching public space as the great equalizer will have to be part of this approach. The demographic transitions of this century will be different from those of the last century with overall rates of population growth falling everywhere, and with the weight of urban population increasing; there will be much more organic urban population growth than from rural urban migration. With increasing longevity everywhere, cities will get more aged everywhere: social security will be an issue, and providing appropriate facilities for the aged will be an issue, including special arrangements for their transportation. Urban management needs to become much professional and attractive so that the next generation of urban managers are the best and brightest.

References:

- Aus India (2002)**, “Bangalore Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Master Plan. Bangalore: Bangalore Water Supply and Sewage Board.
- Berry, B L J (1963)**, “Commercial Structure and Commercial Blight” Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Brunn, Stanley D and Jack F Williams (1983)**, “Cities of the World: World Region Urban Development”, New York: Harper and Rau.
- Coulter, John and Paul Ivory (1982)**. “The Rural-Urban Dichotomy in China: A Case Study of the Mid-Yellow River Region Using Remote-Sensing Data”, *The Australian Journal of Chinese Affaire*, VII: 37-53.
- DFID (2006)**, “So Close to the City, So Far from the Pipes: The Governance of Water and Sanitation and Peri-Urban Poor”, London: Department for International Development (DFID).
- Govt. of India (1999a)**, Census of India: Town Directory of Karnataka. New Delhi: Registrar-General of Census.
- (1999b), Census of India: Population Projection for India and States, 1996-2016. New Delhi: Registrar-General of Census.
- (2001), Census of India: Provisional Population Totals. New Delhi: Registrar--General of Census.
- Govt of Karnataka (2007)**, Economic Survey 2006-07. Bangalore: Planning and Statistics Department, Govt. of Karnataka.
- (2002), “High Power Committee for Redressal of Regional Imbalances: Final Report (Chairman: Dr D M Nanjundappa)”. Bangalore: Govt of Karnataka.
- The World Commission on Environment and Development (1987), “Our Common Future”, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- United Nations (2006)**, “World Urbanisation Prospects: The 2005 Revision”, Working Paper No.ESA/P/WP/200. New York: Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs.