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Abstract

While there have been numerous global discussions on how to promote city inclusiveness, a lot remains to be done and serious obstacles remain to be overcome. This paper discusses a series of fundamental urban planning and land management principles and concepts as the foundation for a comprehensive India National Housing Development Framework (NHDF). In addition, it discusses a series of housing and planning typologies including rental housing as an alternative to ownership allotment of subsidized housing for low-income groups (EWS and LIG) in Indian cities; and reviews existing key housing policies and development models in Jodhpur and Ahmedabad. This paper is an extract from a Mission Report delivered to ADB under the TA 7148 – IND Promoting Inclusive Urban Development in Indian Cities.
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I. Introduction

City inclusiveness is about promoting equity; about creating cities where all can participate in their social, economic and political dynamics. Inclusiveness is crucial for effectively achieving sustainable urban development. More than ever with rapidly growing rates of urbanisation and with increasing social, economic and environmental challenges, it is important to re-think the existing “development” approaches from national to community levels; from high to low-income people. Countries including India, Sweden, Denmark, Singapore, USA and Brazil have engaged in inclusive urban development initiatives with significant lessons to be learned.

The main objective of this Paper is to discuss a series of principles and concepts as guidelines for inclusive urban planning, land management and housing in support of the preparation of a National Housing Development Framework (NHDF - the “Framework”), the main outcome of this Technical Assistance (TA). These guidelines should support the preparation of a comprehensive Framework for provision of mass (and other) housing for the low-income groups (EWS and LIG) in Indian cities and consequently, result in the development of more inclusive, sustainable cities.

II. Towards a Comprehensive “Framework”

Urban Planning and Land Management are two key components of the overall National Housing Development Framework being prepared within an “inclusive city” context. Urban
planning principles to consider include the desire for compact urban areas easily serviced with efficient infrastructure, mobility for both goods and people, accessibility by all social groups to resilient shelter and sustainable services, mixed but compatible land uses providing convenient access to a range of social and economic amenities, advance planning to accommodate growth in an orderly manner to avoid sprawl and informal settlement, and an information base to inform sustainable environmental planning as the starting point. Critical Land Management elements include the institutional capacity of local government to identify and avoid vulnerable areas, provide tenure, register properties and facilitate an efficient land market. Zoning and development controls are essential land management tools and can also be the basis for development incentives in support of creating affordable housing in otherwise difficult markets. Land management is inseparable from urban planning and the two must work together to deliver sustainable, resilient urban social and economic growth. The physical and economic framework of an urban area is its transportation network upon which residential, commercial and industrial developments rely. Development of strong Transit Oriented Developments (TOD) along this network supports the principles outlined above regarding orderly growth, accessibility and environmental management.

All urban areas grow in two ways; expansion and densification. Urban planning and land management must accommodate and guide both. A variety of mechanisms to accommodate housing under both situations is discussed below.

III. Urban Planning – Towards Sustainable, Inclusive and Effective Cities

This section aims at providing an overview of urban planning issues that should be taken into consideration while preparing the NHDF. Numerous studies about building sustainable cities lead to the definition of numerous approaches, principles and concepts to best address urbanization and its impacts on the built and social environment.

Here we present a summary of key principles and concepts that are in direct relation to addressing housing in an effective manner. By “effective”, we reinforce the need for creating compact and integrated cities reducing urban sprawl, maximizing the use of existing infrastructure, promoting social-economic development, facilitating housing for all income levels, creating “places”, and promoting accessibility to resources and basic urban services among other criteria.

1. Key Principles

Urban Planning should be understood as a dynamic and multi-faceted process that, to achieve the ‘correct’ planning solution, requires a robust mixture and combination of considerations such as striking a balance between political considerations, multiple stakeholder needs, and spatial planning objectives and goals. As planning affects society as a whole, an iterative process which actively involves a full range of stakeholders taking the various fields into consideration and incorporating feedback is often the most promising approach. (Participatory Process)

As previously emphasised (GBeltrão-First Mission Report), Urban Planning forms the foundation for any/all proposed urban development including all forms of housing. Urban Planning takes into consideration the combination of environmental (healthy water/sanitation and resilient locations), social (inclusive housing, and social amenities), cultural (locally acceptable), economic (close proximity to formal/informal employment opportunities), financial (public and private resources), institutional (policies/regulations and capacity) and physical components (land and infrastructure). Figure 1 illustrates this complexity of issues
and sectors to be considered. The key point is that Urban Planning, as the framework for affordable housing, must integrate a wide cross-section of sectors to ensure a holistic, resilient and sustainable urban form that will result in safe, healthy, acceptable, locally appropriate and implementable communities. Key points with respect to development of housing focus on the physical planning dimensions of land (location, vulnerabilities, uses, availability, management) and infrastructure in particular, and how these must be appropriately planned to support healthy and appropriate social and economic development for the target beneficiaries within the local cultural context. Closely related to land use planning are the issues of land management which begins with the hierarchy of physical plans, land use zoning, surveying, parcelling and registration. One of the key items with respect to housing, mass or otherwise, is land tenure and the ease with which tenure can be allocated, registered, transferred and used as collateral where appropriate for development/purchasing finance. These all, in turn, affect the ease of land acquisition by either government or the private sector in order to efficiently proceed with development of housing. (Integrated Planning)

As it is fully recognised, rapid urbanization of the world has pushed governments, politicians, planners, private developers, civil society and many other actors to face significant challenges that are impacting everyone’s lives. Growing population and reduced living spaces are clearly leading to the deterioration of living conditions in urban centres. It is well known that urban centres continue to grow rapidly with much of it in an unplanned fashion. Moreover, policies, strategies, plans and implementation have not kept up with the speed of urban transformation. Cities, to accommodate such unprecedented population growth (internal growth and migration), need to re-think their spatial design/form, physical planning/infrastructure/housing and institutional organization matters. (Re-thinking the cities)
Often cities are thought of as isolated and self-sufficient systems. The truth is cities are part of a much larger and complex local, regional and international interconnected system for achieving success and comfort for its residents. What makes a successful inclusive city? What makes a city effective? Best practices in urban planning indicate that successful cities are the ones that offer mobility and accessibility through effective transportation for people, goods and information; cities that are inclusive promote cultural harmony and integration, and moreover, housing for all; cities that are well structured for business through good governance, participation, partnerships and good infrastructure; cities that are attractive through a healthy urban environment, good educational, health and recreational facilities; cities that are above all, aware of their vulnerabilities and are proactive in addressing them through investments in mitigation infrastructure: safe, green and with a good social and economic mix of cultures and activities. (Cities as systems)

Cities must be well governed; must promote mobility; and offer affordable housing. Historically, the best, great and most renowned cities “have a distinctive character, a memorable feel, as well as the ability to function in a civically coordinated way.”\(^1\) Furthermore, “a city cannot be great without having a series of dense, interconnected, identifiable, walkable, liveable, resilient, visually compelling, and transit-enabled neighbourhoods”.\(^2\) Clearly, most of our urbanizing centres/cities miss properly implementing these concepts. (Well Governed/Implementation)

A Framework for housing must consider a range of fundamental understandings informed by a vibrant, updated city information base related to sustainable urban planning and development. The following presents a number of principles defined by Kriken (2010) that are fundamental to sustainable, inclusive and effective cities. In addition, “mobility” and “vulnerabilities” should be considered as well. When applied, these principles may ensure the full integration of social, economic, environmental, institutional, financial and physical considerations, and support long-term sustainability of housing/urban investments. (Urban Planning Principles)

Key principles include:

1. Sustainability and Resilience
2. Accessibility
3. Diversity
4. Open Spaces
5. Compatibility
6. Incentives
7. Adaptability
8. Density
9. Identity – Sense of Place

**Note:** Principles’ illustrations from Kriken, 2010

**Figures 1a and 1b** illustrate Principle 1 - Sustainability with examples of sustainable and unsustainable models of urban growth. The Township development approach adopted in Indian cities must take into consideration sustainability and resilience. In general, a city must have a vision to grow with maximum use of existing urban land and municipal infrastructure. (A City Development Vision)

---

\(^1\) Kriken, J. Lung. City Building. 2010  
\(^2\) Kevin Lynch, 1970
Figure 2 illustrates adequate travel corridors for all models of movement guaranteeing accessibility — Principle 2. Multi-mode systems allow diversity, efficient use of roads and mobility for all. Figure 3 illustrates a mixed use scenario with affordable housing adding diversity to urban centres — Principle 3.

To achieve effective cities, watersheds (rivers, floodplains and drainage corridors) and other open spaces, must be preserved to guarantee healthy, resilient and sustainable growth. Figure 4 illustrates a combination of living environments while respecting and maintaining open/green spaces — Principle 4.
Building character along with building scale are some of the key elements of creating urban compatibility and interest – Principle 5. Architectural character, building materials and heritage preservation are critical for compatible and locally acceptable urban development of large, medium and small cities alike as illustrated on Figure 5. Moreover, building character and scale should reflect beneficiaries’ needs, capacity to pay and cultural preferences.

**Figure 5 - Architectural Character**

![Figure 5 - Architectural Character](image)

**Figure 6** illustrates a diverse and dynamic urban environment with multi-developer opportunities; an example of urban development incentives – Principle 6.

**Figure 6 - Development Quality**

![Figure 6 - Development Quality](image)

Effective cities require frameworks that combine easy circulation and open spaces. **Figure 7** illustrates this combination of adaptable spaces – Principle 7. **Figure 8** illustrates Principle 8 - Densification – compact cities with appropriate transit and maximum use of infrastructure and services. Principle 9 is illustrated in **Figure 9** - the creation and preservation of a unique and memorable sense of place through identifiable landmarks.

**Figure 7 - A Rational Framework**

![Figure 7 - A Rational Framework](image)

**Figure 8 - Transit Oriented Development**

![Figure 8 - Transit Oriented Development](image)
These planning principles combined allow cities to grow in an efficient, effective and sustainable manner committing to an environmental ethic; facilitating easy movement; maintaining variety and choices; regenerating natural systems to make cities more green; maintaining harmony and balance between the past, present and future (building preservation; scales, etc); renewing declining cities and rebuilding brownfields; facilitating wholeness and positive changes; developing a new relationship between technology and participation, designing compact cities and appropriate transit; creating/preserving a unique and memorable sense of place for all.

2. Key Concepts

This section presents overviews of two key urban planning and development concepts; Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and Complete Communities Development, and their relationship with urban planning and land management. These concepts incorporate key urban planning principles seeking the creation of effective cities.

a. TOD, Urban Planning & Land Management

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) was a key point of discussion during a recent ADB TA - 7148 Mission. Presentations highlighted key aspects of TOD with several examples of its application in various countries. This section aims at summarizing the relationship between TOD and urban planning and land management, and how TOD cannot be achieved without efficient urban planning and effective land management.

With the implementation of TOD, two main dynamics emerge in the city: transit guides and attracts development and development creates ridership (Figure 10). These two dynamics directly impact the city form and land use requiring proper urban planning and land management for maximum benefit of the transit system while creating compact cities. Land is the key and difficult to manage. Transit has to be seen as part of a larger set of initiatives that include infrastructure and services, both social and physical. All need to be considered together and sequenced logically. Figure 11 summarizes the key elements of a TOD initiative and how it shapes the city landscape, opens new areas for development, and integrates existing areas into the city transport system to support people’s daily activities. In general, TOD can promote compact and walkable, mixed-use, higher density development near transit facilities with typically a mix of public and private investment.
TOD is an effective development concept that helps to guide and manage growth while addressing climate change issues, promoting quality of life environmental improvements and potentially encouraging infill development and therefore densification. Moreover, TOD can increase mobility and public safety; increase households' disposable income and contribute to affordable housing by creating the opportunity for low-cost and accessible housing, and reducing transportation expenditures.³

In preparing a National Housing Development Framework, attention should be given to the importance of integrating housing development with an efficient transportation system (which is not the case of Arihant “affordable” housing development in Jodhpur). The TOD’s combination of transit system, open spaces, walking/friendly environment, mixed densities and diversity (housing/employment) enhances city inclusiveness. Therefore, key elements for the success as well as challenges encountered in implementing TOD, should be considered in the Framework in order to achieve effective housing development.

Key elements for the success of TOD include but are not limited to:

- City Development Vision considering TOD principles; TOD contributing to and implementing the City Vision;
- Adopting “intermediate planning” (area coverage – Master Plan, Structure Plan, Community Development Plan, etc. - and timeframe – 5 to 10 year plan, 10 to 15 year plan and so on) following incremental implementation based on demand and available resources;
- Incorporating urban planning mechanisms: TOD Overlay District (San Francisco), emphasis on densification and redevelopment before expensive expansion; etc;
- Including spatial planning for the creation of friendly, resilient, pleasurable and interesting urban spaces - giving people (and small-scale, informal sector activity) street space and priority;
- Adopting mechanism/incentives for private developers (relax parking requirements (also encourages greater public transport use if there are fewer parking spots), density bonuses (Floor Area Ratio), Transfer of Development Rights, and others;
- Promoting inter-agency coordination, especially the Urban Land Use Planners integrating with Transport Planners, disaster risk management entities, Housing Agencies and other infrastructure service providers (water, sanitation, power, etc.) to make sure infrastructure is in place in advance of building development;
- Adopting well defined development control regulations including institutionalized codes and procedures for land sub-division, zoning and management. Ensures development follows Plans, avoids vulnerable areas, minimizes informal take-over, but needs those shorter-term Intermediate Plans to more closely guide;
- Avoiding “leap-frog” greenfield developments which may contribute to urban sprawl by sequencing TOD development spatially, poor urban management, poor housing policy, expensive transport and servicing, etc. It is essential that Planning and Development Authorities work on ways to encourage/force development of the inner-city lands to their full potential before jumping out to easy, cheaper, undeveloped land that does not work efficiently from urban (land use, servicing, social or economic sustainability) or transport perspectives;
- Promoting community partnership through participatory planning and awareness campaigns that stimulate effective urban development and the use of the system (Ahmedabad Bus Rapid Transit public campaign);
- Understanding of local real estate market including environmentally sensitive areas, market segments, priorities and preferences, transfer, registration and financing options, access to information, regulated industry.
Key challenges to implementing TOD include but are not limited to:

- TOD can be a slow process (case of the San Francisco BART\(^4\));
- Planners’ aspirations may not match developers’ goals;
- Phasing/timing of TOD infrastructure and land development often difficult to coordinate and are vulnerable to political influence;
- TOD requires multi-agency integration including the private sector which is often difficult to coordinate (e.g. urban development and transit authorities);
- TOD planners promote higher density which existing residents resist (e.g. San Francisco BART system\(^5\));
- Private sector’s perception of higher benefits from investments in TOD around rail stations since considered more permanent than bus’s.\(^6\)

Studies indicate that the integration of public transport and land use/management leads to various sustainability benefits and TOD represents a “viable” solution.\(^7\) Beside the examples presented during the Jodhpur Workshop (Curitiba, Brazil; Bogota, Colombia and Guangzhou, China), a few other examples that could be further investigated include:

- Stockholm, Sweden – “Planetary Cluster Plan”; a good example of balanced growth with the creation of “jobs-housing balance along rail-served axial corridors” that led to directional-flow balances.
- Copenhagen, Denmark – “Finger Plan”; early planning of growth management (overspill from the centres) and infrastructure implementation; creation of greenbelt for agricultural, natural habitat and open spaces preservation.

![Figure 12 – Finger Plan](image)

Source: Cervero, Robert

---


\(^5\) IBID

\(^6\) CPCS/HABICO transport projects’ experience

\(^7\) Cervero, Robert. Public Transport and Sustainable Urbanism. 2006
Singapore – “Constellation Plan” – a good example of integration of transit and regional development promoting economic and environmental sustainability; the creation of new towns as specialized nodes that interact and depend upon other nodes.

Arlington County, Virginia, USA – “Bull’s Eye” concept; adopted various strategies to attract private investments: targeted infrastructure improvements, incentive zoning, development proffers (the ability for developers and authorities to informally reach an agreement on development direction prior to finalising formal procedures), permissive and as-of-right zoning, guaranteeing that authorities will not come back and reverse decisions once a comprehensive TOD direction has been agreed.

**Figure 13 – Bull’s Eye Concept**

These and other examples of TOD implementation present significant lessons that can be useful in preparing the NHDF.

**b. Complete Communities**

As a dynamic process, housing implies building communities. The concept of Complete Communities is implemented (with varying degrees of success) in North America through multi-use zoning and strategic investments to “anchor” commercial areas, offer community facilities and invest in mitigation infrastructure to create places to live, work, play and shop⁸. To achieve Complete Communities it is necessary to adopt a community-based process guided by planning principles based on promoting environment sustainability and diversity.

---

⁸ Complete Communities. [http://www.completecommunities.ca/](http://www.completecommunities.ca/)
Key Principles for implementing Complete Communities include:

- Integrated Transport System
- Mix of Complementary Land Uses
- Food Accessibility
- Resilient Urban Design
- Inclusive and Active Community (Participation)
- Glocal Economic Initiative ("think globally, act locally")

Mass housing development must focus on building communities rather than buildings only. New buildings will be occupied by people with different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, levels of education, financial capability, interests, desires, etc. Communities are not static and are constantly changing to better accommodate residents’ needs and desires. In other words, it is not a “prescriptive” approach. The concept of Townships discussed in Ahmedabad (Radhe Armaan – Private Developer) may give the “impression” of a Complete Community, however it is a “prescriptive” plan unable to be redefined by its future inhabitants. Building Complete Communities requires residents to be empowered through the planning process. The DBS (DBS Affordable Home Strategy Ltd. – Private Developer) housing development moves closer to a participatory process that may lead to Complete Community development in the future.

VI. Land Management for Housing

Managing land in the housing development process is one of the many key elements for promoting sustainable, resilient cities. Urban sprawl is the classic example of mismanagement of land and is unsustainable. There are two components to land management: physical and institutional. Figure 15 illustrated key elements under both components. An integrated and holistic approach to land management, including both components and elements, must take place to promote housing.
The physical aspects of land are largely related to planning, vulnerability, land development potential, environmental considerations, availability and selection, and servicing. The institutional aspects are related to provision of tenure, registration of land parcels and related cadastral information, financing of land purchase and servicing, establishing and enforcing development controls, identifying environmentally sensitive areas and taxation, and the political will and institutional capacities required to carry out all of these tasks. For any housing approach (Government housing programme, Sites and Services, Illegal Settlement Regularization and Upgrade, Public-Private Partnership, etc.) the physical and institutional components together set the framework for effective land management and city growth.

Land management is indeed complex and requires bringing all elements to function in a coordinated manner. Land management specifically requires <physical> information of vulnerable land and identifying available land; protecting watershed, vegetation, topography, drainage courses; guiding land development through mechanisms (land pooling, land banking, etc.) and incentives; locating accessible lots in close proximity to socio-economic opportunities; and allowing land servicing (access, water, sanitation, power, solid waste management). Moreover, <institutional> allowing forms of ownership (government, private, communal) and security (freehold, leasehold); surveying and registration; planning growth needs and expansion; defining instruments and incentives (FAR, etc.) to engage individuals and private developers; and considering the supply-demand dynamics (speculation and mechanisms to address it: punitive taxation, development controls, etc.; land acquisition).

V. Housing – Physical Planning Typologies

Housing is the foundation of all urban development, occupies the largest portion of land, demands the greatest levels of government investment in infrastructure, is the priority concern of all citizens, and is typically a family’s single largest investment. Two key principles
of a housing framework are that housing must first be recognized as a complex process as opposed to simply a collection of products (4 walls and a roof) and the process must provide access to an appropriate range of safe, healthy, acceptable, affordable and well located housing options and services for all socio-economic groups. **Figure 16** conceptually illustrates the complexity of housing components. Some key principles guiding housing development include:

- Provide convenient access to a full range of social amenities, community infrastructure and services;
- Provide convenient access to a full range of economic opportunities;
- Provide a range of affordable housing options including the ability for incremental development;
- Provide a system to deliver a range of housing types to meet a variety of needs and preferences;
- Provide for changing family needs and priorities;
- Provide access to basic services: water, sanitation, energy, solid waste management;
- Provide efficient and convenient access for mobility of people and goods.

The affordability aspect of housing requires the definition of the “target group” and its socio-economic capability. There is a tendency of getting “desired” mixed up with “affordable”. Not always what one desires is compatible with what one can afford. Everything is affordable to some group, and the challenge is to ensure that proposals are, in fact, affordable to the target group, and therefore represent a sustainable approach. Housing is a dynamic “process” that requires diverse and flexible approaches to address the needs of “all”.

Orderly urban planning and efficient land management as discussed above, and up-front provision of adequate infrastructure, site protection and services are the fundamental starting points for appropriate and sustainable housing within both urban expansion and urban densification.

---

**Figure 16 – Housing Components**

![Figure 16 – Housing Components](image)
A number of urban planning and land management approaches can be and are used in the provision of housing. These are briefly discussed below.

1. Greenfield

Greenfield development represents the "expansion" form of urban growth. Greenfield is a favoured form of housing development by many for its relative simplicity and often cheaper land costs. They are also favoured where there is a desire for a visible, large-scale "project", as large parcels of land are typically easier to consolidate (approach adopted by JDA). However, ensuring compliance with the full set of sustainable housing principles and good urban development can prove more difficult. Greenfield housing developments should be treated as developing viable communities not just a series of housing units incorporating the full range of convenient social and economic amenities. Good access and public transit are essential, as are community facilities, markets and local economic development opportunities particularly in support of lower-income groups. TOD supports this need and may help curtail ad hoc urban sprawl if development is closely tied to formally constructed infrastructure and community facilities. Land management and planning for Greenfield developments must select the most appropriate lands and avoid loss of productive agricultural or other valued natural heritage assets.

2. Infill

Infilling on vacant or underutilised lands within the existing built-up urban areas is an effective approach to maximising the use of existing infrastructure (including transport), avoiding urban sprawl, reducing transportation needs, and of allowing people to reside or remain in close proximity to employment opportunities and existing social amenities. Infill development supports compact urban development and can improve accessibility.

Infill developments tend to be smaller scale than Greenfield developments which may open up opportunities to smaller developers. At the same time, infill development may encounter more complex land ownership and management issues depending on the situation and history of the land. Although supporting intelligent, compact urban development should be politically attractive, a small infill project may be less attractive and gain less political support than a large new Greenfield project.

At the micro economic level - that of the individual project - a small infill project may appear more expensive due to land costs, no benefits of scale, and perhaps the need for greater creativity and a higher level of project management. However, at the macro-economic level - that of the city as a whole and the long-term of a family's residency - it may be far more affordable due to saved loss of agricultural land, lower daily transportation costs, savings on infrastructure, increased local market for commerce due to higher density, etc.

3. Redevelopment/Densification

Redevelopment shares many features of infill development discussed above, although redevelopment may have greater opportunity for larger-scale projects. Redevelopment may include changes in urban land use as what were once peripheral industrial lands are now inner city due to urban expansion and no longer suitable for industry. As industry shifts to more appropriate locations the sites can be redeveloped as residential and mixed-use communities (Mills land approach). These have the advantage of proximity to existing infrastructure, which may or may not require upgrading, are already within the built-up footprint of the city, thereby avoiding any contribution to urban sprawl. Redevelopment may also occur when replacing rundown residential or informal settlements with similar residential land use, but with improved standards, formal land management and in the form of holistic,
integrated communities. As with infill development, redevelopment may contribute to increased urban densification which helps sustain commercial activities and infrastructure investments. Redevelopment can also encourage technological innovation that builds on participation and incremental growth of housing and community infrastructure. Redevelopment may be more politically attractive as it can be promoted as removing “urban blight” with large new developments. Slum removal is a potential issue, one that requires political will to retain the locational advantage of low income families and resist “gentrification.” Economies of scale may be achieved on larger redevelopment projects, although inner-city land prices may also be higher. Once again, the land ownership and acquisition issues may be more difficult than with a Greenfield development, and depending on the previous use, developers may find themselves facing environmental remediation challenges. Redevelopment of slum areas theoretically has the advantage of allowing people to remain close to their original economic opportunities and social network as long as the new development remains affordable. This likely requires the creative use of incentives and subsidies discussed elsewhere.

Taken together, infill and redevelopment mechanisms contribute significantly to the growth of efficient, compact cities with improved accessibility, higher densities, more sustainable public transport, and more viable commercial endeavours. How low income families can participate in the new developments at higher densities is the issue. Technology and participation need to be wed in a new and productive relationship.

VI. Housing - Rental

Rental housing represents the largest component of housing amongst the lower-income, recent urban arrivals/migrants and young start-up families. However, it is given little attention in most housing policies which tend to be ownership focused. Rental is the only affordable option for many, as it requires no down payment and no long-term financial commitment. The common argument against rental is that it is not building wealth (equity) for the occupants. However, the choice between building long-term equity and immediate shelter is not a difficult one to make. Rental housing runs the full range from large-scale mass housing, high-rise developments to the much harder to quantify "back-yard" rentals occurring throughout informal and slum settlements. Entire slums may be rental developments with rent paid to an absentee land owner. In a way, these then become "formalised" developments in that residents have obtained permission to reside in exchange for rent, although the site itself is likely without formal land-use approval. Security of tenure may not be high.

Renting is often the first step in a family's housing acquisition process until they accumulate sufficient resources to buy or build. For a healthy and secure rental environment to exist, adequate legislation and regulation must be in place to protect both landlord and tenant. Tenants must know that a lease protects them from rental increase and guarantees an agreed level of service and maintenance. Landlords must know that they can legally collect on delinquent rent and have the power to evict no compliant tenants. Governments often impose rent controls in an effort to artificially create affordable housing, but these must be done in the knowledge that controls are a disincentive to development and must come with an appropriate set of offsetting benefits.

Attention to Rental Housing is one of the four priorities recently expressed by the Joint Secretary (JS) of the MHUPA for inclusion in this TA.
VII. Policy Review

The Policy Review section highlights specific aspects of the “National Guidelines for Affordable Housing in Partnership” and the “Rajasthan Affordable Housing Policy 2009” providing comments and recommendations. The goal of the Review is to analyse the urban planning and land management aspects in support of the preparation of an effective and realistic National Housing Development Framework (NHDF) - the main outcome of this Technical Assistance.

Note that the comments below follow the policy’s section and paragraph numbering (p.#).

1. National Guidelines for Affordable Housing in Partnership – Highlights, Comments & Recommendations

- (Introduction) The Guidelines present clear acknowledgement of the importance of the private sector’s participation in affordable housing.

Comment: This may lead to a more effective way of addressing the need for affordable housing while increasing the housing stock from a supply-driven approach in a much faster and more effective manner. It implies the understanding that government should function as a facilitator and the private sector as the provider of housing. Global experience clearly indicates that no government can provide housing for everyone on its own. The Guidelines, however, promote a supply-driven approach. The problem of taking a supply-driven approach versus a demand-driven approach is discussed below. Global experience confirms that if housing initiatives are to be successful in achieving their socio-economic goals, they must be demand-driven.

- (p.1.1) It provides a limited indication of employment opportunities from housing construction.

Comment: This suggests a narrow understanding of the socio-economic implications within the housing process. Housing goes far beyond simply hiring a labour force to lay bricks. Housing must be understood as a process that does not start nor end with the construction of a flat, but involves the full complement of infrastructure, and social and economic facilities. All of these generate employment opportunities with resultant economic spin-off benefits. The housing programmes for EWS/LIG should take the opportunity to engage the local community and future beneficiaries in the planning and implementation processes. This integrated participation will lead directly to a demand-driven approach. Moreover, instead of recruiting cheap labour from the countryside (case of the housing project visited in Jodhpur10), hiring locally may create opportunities for potential buyers to participate, increase local economic activity, and promote local project pride. The workers can be the same potential buyers, or providers of future services. This approach takes a broader macro-economic view of the housing process. “Labour-as-Down-Payment” could be a model.

Recommendation: The policy should recommend mechanisms for expanding local community participation in the housing process to both create economic opportunities and develop a demand-driven approach to housing delivery (DBS’ model in Ahmedabad11).

---

10 Arihant Affordable Housing Project (AFHP) visit. May/2012
11 DBS presentation/visit. May/2012
• *(p.1.2)* **Urban land availability for city expansions.**

Comment: Urban expansion must happen in accordance with a Master Plan (MP). The MP should define the location, scale and nature of expansion zones to accommodate population growth overtime. These must include coordinated infrastructure extensions. Furthermore, MPs must include the incremental growth steps needed to achieve the final development through a series of intermediate plans (5-10 year plans) that can be more easily implemented and regulated. Orderly and carefully monitored urban land management is critical for preventing urban sprawl and informal development that is not in-line with the MP. This Guideline does not mention the important potential for urban infill, densification or redevelopment as an alternative approach to land management for affordable housing in urban areas. A fully integrated and inclusive approach to planning land for housing development is required that goes far beyond the simple supply-driven, large project targets that are the focus of the Guidelines.

Recommendation: Urban lands, both existing and potential expansion areas, must be carefully and incrementally planned in an integrated manner with accompanying institutional capacity to regulate development through a combination of land use zoning and sub-division control. Uncontrolled urban sprawl must be avoided and priority attention should be given to making maximum use of existing infrastructure (public transit, water supply, etc.) and built-up areas by promoting infill, densification and redevelopment.

• *(p.1.4)* **Encourages government to be the land provider for affordable housing.**

Comment: Government’s role in allocating, consolidating, acquiring and planning land is key for promoting housing that is affordable to the LIG and EWS groups. Some form of subsidy is likely to be needed, and only government can provide that. Being the provider of land facilitates attracting the private sector into mass provision of housing while guiding urban development – allocation of land for housing should be in accordance with the MP as discussed above. To effectively manage all land within an urban area, and as projected in a Master Plan, some form of functional, efficient and maintained Land Information System (LIS) is required. Not only does this allow a rapid identification of available, surveyed and serviced lands, but allows important integration with infrastructure planning and maintenance, land taxation systems, recording of property developments, and the ability to implement, manage and monitor private sector development incentives such as Floor Area Ratio (FAR increase and Transfer of Development Rights (TDR). These incentives are forms of subsidy and may lead directly to more affordable land and housing for the targeted lower income groups.

Recommendation: Continue to support government’s role as a land provider for affordable housing through various development models such as those prepared in the Rajasthan Housing Policy. At the same time, government’s interventions in the land market must be carefully controlled with clearly defined and managed subsidies for the LIG and EWS groups. Government’s activities in this sector must be careful not to adversely affect the entire urban land market, nor inadvertently support non-compliant housing developments.

• *(p.2.1)* **Acknowledges the need to ensure equitable supply of land, shelter and services at affordable prices to all sections of society in order to prevent the proliferation of slums.**

---

12 Affordable Housing Policy - 2009
Comment: To prevent the proliferation of slums, government has to be ahead of the game. Therefore, advanced planning for supplying affordable land and services is critical based on the planning process discussed above. Rural–urban migration is one of the many causes of slum proliferation as cities are typically not prepared to accommodate the newcomers arrival. An “entry point” to the housing process is critical. Rental housing is an important option as a step towards home ownership in the future (incremental housing) for the lower income. Land, shelter and services must be provided with convenient access (physically close or inexpensive and fast transit) to employment, and rental housing can be an important component of urban infill, redevelopment and densification which utilises already developed and serviced land, reducing the need for costly expansion and urban sprawl. The same advanced planning and servicing of lands is required for middle and higher income groups, but these sectors more easily attract private sector investment and government can and should retreat to its primary role as a facilitator.

In order for housing to address all sections of society it is important to clearly define the target groups. Their socio-economic capabilities and priorities must be assessed prior to investments in housing. In other words, to be effective, housing provision must be demand-driven. This is where the old-fashioned “project” approach to mass housing that is being promoted in the Guidelines will not likely work. Target delivery numbers may be achieved, but a socially and economically sustainable community is unlikely. The construction of EWS-LIG housing (or any other income level) cannot be formalized in a supply-driven approach that ignores the wide range of individual needs across all segments of society. The most effective and sustainable housing must be done through provision of key interventions to support incremental development at the beneficiaries’ rate of capacity. In other words, it must be demand-driven to develop inclusive and sustainable housing and urban centres.

Recommendation: The policy should promote demand-driven supply of land, shelter and infrastructure including the concepts of incremental and rental housing.

(p.3.1) Suggests that shortages of land for housing in some cities (65 BSUP cities) is driving unplanned growth and raising home prices and rentals to unsustainable levels.

Comment: Land shortages for unsustainable housing is partially the result of an absence of integrated and coordinated short, medium and long term urban planning. There is the need for intermediate plans covering specific locations, shorter timeframes, and including detailed implementation strategies. In their absence, uncontrolled, ad hoc and often informal development takes place that promotes urban sprawl pushing the urban poor to the city limits or beyond. Uncontrolled growth is partly also the result of the tradition of not putting infrastructure in place first. Infrastructure must come first to set a strong development framework. In the absence of that, ad hoc random development occurs with infrastructure trying to catch up later. It does not work well. Policy and guideline emphasis on large-scale, supply-driven rather than demand-driven projects also drives up the cost of land and infrastructure, as identifying and consolidated large land parcels is difficult and expensive without going outside of the existing city. This “greenfields” approach promotes unmanageable urban sprawl and defeats the objectives of inclusive, integrated cities, and puts the urban poor far beyond job opportunities and where they want to live.

Recommendation: Greater emphasis must be placed on infill, redevelopment and densification to address land, infrastructure and affordability issues. A series of Intermediary Plans should be prepared as part of Master Plan implementation.
Infrastructure should be planned and developed in advance of property development to ensure urban services are in place.

- **(p.4.1) Acknowledges the need for housing EWS and LIG, and younger migrants, and defines unit sizes and costs of repayment brackets supposedly “affordable” for these groups.**

Comment: These groups generally do not have proved income for entering the housing market, especially upon arrival in the cities. Arrival Cities (refer to Arrival Cities by Doug Saunders, 2011) are the starting points of the future middle class and urban economic development, if given the chance and the right interventions. These groups generally live from the informal sector on a “trickle” economy basis. By this is meant that money earned today is only sufficient for today’s needs with very little scope for significant savings. Money trickles in, money trickles out. The result is that anything requiring a substantial capital outlay, such as a house down-payment, is not achievable. Incremental development is the only realistically affordable solution, and one that allows individual adjustments to particular needs and resource levels.

The Policy stresses a prescriptive “supply-side” approach throughout. A shift in philosophy to a “demand side” approach is required if true affordability and sustainability are to be achieved. There must be sufficient flexibility in programmes to cater to a full range of “realities” - the specific needs and priorities of individual families. The definition of what is “affordable” varies for each family. Another way of considering supply versus demand is that housing policies must be “proscriptive” – outlining objectives and performance goals, and what people can do, rather than “prescriptive” – dictating what must be done (unit size, cost, design, etc.).

Recommendation: Adopt a demand-driven (proscriptive) approach to housing rather then the current supply-driven (prescriptive) approach.

- **(s.5.1) Mentions but does not define “integrated housing projects”**

Comment: To be sustainable, all housing, not just “projects”, must be fully integrated; integrated physically, socially and economically into the main city and adjacent neighbourhoods. Integration also means that a community needs a combination of residential, social and economic facilities with adequate supporting infrastructure. Furthermore, integration means a fully functioning role in local administration including participation in decision making and tax support.

Recommendation: All housing initiatives must be looked at within the context of the full range of connected infrastructure and services with an aim at creating sustainable communities, not just numbers of house units.

- **(s.5.1) Suggests various incentives (zoning-related incentives) for attracting the private sector to build on their land.**

Comment: Incentives are critical for promoting private sector participation in housing provision for the EWS and LIG. Nevertheless the private sector must follow the overall urban development strategy defined by the MP. Typically developers are forced, or attracted, to greenfield development (leap-frog) because of high inner-city land costs. However, pushing the lower income to the periphery and beyond has an even higher social and economic development cost. Incentives, in the various FAR, TDR, taxation and other development subsidies discussed elsewhere should be implemented to promote more sustainable development including urban infill and redevelopment for low-income housing. This acknowledges the fact that proximity to employment
opportunities, social amenities and public transport significantly impact sustainable housing affordability for the poor. Zoning-related incentives can enhance infill development.

Recommendation: Continue to apply incentives while adjusting existing, and creating new ones to accommodate different situations under a long term development strategy. The institutional capacity for enforcement and monitoring is the key to effective incentives to ensure they benefit the intended target groups. Incentives are a form of subsidy and need careful management. Punitive taxation is another form of incentive that would encourage best use of developable lands and consequently improve infrastructure economics and reduce urban sprawl.

- **(p.6.2.b) Emphasizes that land could be identified within the municipal limits, etc.**
  Comment: Not only that but land identification, planning and development must follow intermediate planning recommendations (area coverage and timeframe) – short, medium and long term. Intermediate plans establish realistically implementable development stages that should be driven by infrastructure development to set the framework. Institutional capacity is required to ensure that development follows planning requirements. Without control, developers, including government's own agencies, will tend to leap-frog to land beyond municipal boundaries that is “cheaper” but not necessarily more “economical”, and certainly not more sustainable, if considered holistically. City limit expansion should not be dictated by ad hoc development.

  Recommendation: Compact urban form is more efficient and sustainable environmentally, socially, economically, and far more cost effective to provide infrastructure and services to. Urban sprawl should be minimised or eliminated.

- **(p.6.2.e) Housing layouts**
  Comment: housing layouts should allow incremental development and accommodate a mix of social and economic activities. They must also respond to environmental conditions while accommodating cultural values of the intended residents. The guidelines present fixed technical specifications for projects as well as individual dwelling units. This approach eliminates the ability to be responsive to varied needs or changing circumstances. As discussed above, taking the prescriptive approach is supply driven and unlikely to match the needs and priorities of beneficiaries in the way a participatory demand-driven, or proscriptive, approach would. Housing layouts must also create a sense of place and community, perhaps anchored on transportation and social facility hubs. Residents must be able to identify with their community and gain a sense of pride and ownership. This will only happen if the layout is responsive to participatory inputs at the design and development stages.

  Recommendation: At the community level, housing developments must be fully integrated into their surroundings providing a safe, comfortable and attractive “place” that residents can take pride in. At the individual unit level, the policy of demand-driven should be adopted by providing choices, flexibility and the ability to incrementally adopt or finish a unit in accordance with individual needs, priorities and available resources.

2. Rajasthan – Affordable Housing Policy – Highlights, Comments & Recommendations

- General comment: There is no mention of a VISION to guide overall urban planning and development interventions including housing. Housing needs to be thought as a holistic, integrated process - not simply a product!
• General comment: Rental housing is an important option for the poor and the private sector can play a significant role in building the stock especially if proper incentives are provided. Rental units can be provided in smaller scale, formal and informal, as well as large scale. This can be an opportunity for urban infill and re-development, as promoted in the National Urban Housing and Habitat Policy, 1.18. This means treating housing support as an integrated programme addressing a range of needs rather than just a series of large-scale projects. Infill and redevelopment may be more work for implementers, but can be far more affordable and socially-economically appropriate.

• (4.02.ii) For self-employed to acquire an Income Certificate can be a problem.

Comment: Determining income for the EWS/LIG is difficult given the high level of informal activity often in numerous jobs. How to avoid corruption in the certifying process is an issue.

• (4.02.vii) Building maintenance relying on funds from government

Comment: If maintenance is relying on funds from a government program (like BSUP), there is a high potential for it not to work. Too many government programmes fail to make adequate provision for maintenance, and capital investments quickly lose value. Along with this is a sense of pride in community. Experiences elsewhere prove that maintenance soon becomes a burden and no priority for the low-income groups residing on apartment blocks.

Recommendation: Maintenance must be part of a “condo fee” that the residents will need to take responsibility for.

• (4.03.i) Land selection

Comment: Land selection must be done in accordance with the City Development Strategy, Master Plan and Local Development Plans. Land allocation for housing is a critical element for affordability. Urban sprawl must be avoided and infill development encouraged. Available and serviced land should be developed only as part of a gradual process of city expansion; leap-frog development to new green-field should be discouraged as much as possible. Site should NOT “PREFERABLY” be in the vicinity of existing infrastructure; it MUST be. Infrastructure development should/must take place PRIOR to building development. In conjunction with this, and in the interests of infrastructure economics, compact, higher density cities should be promoted. Infrastructure provision requires fully designed, agreed and implemented roles for public and private sectors. These should be entrenched in Development regulations with provision for some creative negotiation on a case-by-case basis.

Recommendation: Coordination of urban and infrastructure (transport, water supply, etc) planning is critical.

• (4.03.vi) Conversion of agricultural land

Comment: Land use change should be in accordance with the City Development Strategy, Master Plan and Local Development Plan. The conversion of agricultural land into residential/commercial must be avoided especially if not within the city limits. When the decision is made to convert agricultural land, it should be done only following a careful environmental and economic assessment of which lands are least productive.

---

and most suitable for other uses. The creation of townships should also follow overall city development to accommodate growth. “Townships” should be treated as neighbourhoods, or communities with an appropriate mix of housing types and integrated land uses to ensure provision of social amenities and economic opportunities.

Recommendation: Coordinate city expansion with intermediate plans (5-10 year plans). Do not use the “townships” concept as a mean to promote greenfield/leap-frog development.

▪ **Ch5 (B) Incentives to developers**

Comment: No charge to private sector for conversion of agricultural land is an incentive that encourages urban sprawl. It also negatively impacts the rural environment while destroying families’ livelihood/sources of income.

Recommendation: Use similar incentives, but to promote urban infill development in close proximity to infrastructure, employment, social amenities, etc.

▪ **(Ch6, pt8) Land bank**

General comment: Land bank is a critical mechanism for planning and implementing affordable housing in accordance with local development plans. Land banking tends to occur in outlying “greenfield” locations well in advance of development and anticipating future growth. Care must be taken that this not translate quickly into promoting leap-frog new developments in contradiction to the general policy of wishing to promote compact, higher-density, more accessible urban centres, and avoiding urban sprawl.

General suggestion to be explored - a recommended potential model for affordable housing (based on a slum upgrading model implemented in Recife, Brazil): 1. inner city government’s land allocation or acquisition close to urban transport and social amenities/facilities; 2.parceling; 3.servicing (water, sanitation, electricity, access – the private sector could come in to build infrastructure and social facilities. The private sector can also be encouraged to work more sustainably with target communities to encourage participation, capacity building leading to more demand-driven communities in exchange for additional FAR or other incentives. DBS Communities (India) is an example of a developer employing such community development techniques; 4.title deed; 5.definition of minimum (proscriptive) building standards (incremental approach to housing); 6.setting up a community construction material bank; 7.set up an Urbanization Committee (community, NGO and local body) for plan, implement and managing/monitoring the urbanization process.

**VIII. Models Review**

This section presents a review of the five (5) housing models outlined in the Rajasthan Affordable Housing Policy (2009). It also reviews two (2) samples of privately developed housing schemes in Ahmedabad, Rajasthan. The goal of the Review is to analyse key aspects of urban planning and land management in each model and provide comments related to the preparation of an effective and realistic National Housing Development Framework (NHDF) - the main outcome of this Technical Assistance (TA). Comments related to building and unit design are also included. Comments are based on the relevance, sustainability and replicability of each model.
The five (5) models of affordable housing outlined by the Rajasthan Affordable Housing Policy (2009) are: #1. Mandatory Provisions; #2. Private Developers on Private Land; #3. Private Developers on Acquired Land; #4. Private Developers on Government Land; #5. Slum Housing. From the private sector, two (2) models are analysed: DBS Affordable Housing Strategy and Radhe Armaan.

See Matrix below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Key Features</th>
<th>Comments, Opportunities &amp; Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| #1. Mandatory Provisions  | • Government land/housing construction  
• Rajasthan Housing Board (RHB): ≈50% plots/units for EWS/LIG; 20% plots/units for LIG-A  
• Other bodies: ≈25% plots/units for EWS/LIG; 20% plots/units for LIG-A  
• Private developer: 15% units for EWS/LIG (Township/Group Housing)  
• Provision of extra FAR/FSI | • Government acting as a housing “provider” instead of a “facilitator” (contradicts NUH&HP 3.1 i ref: “facilitator” but 1.24 supports social housing) – limits sustainability and replicability in the long term;  
• Land allocation/development must be supported by a Land Management System and allocated according to urban development plan (master plan/infrastructure plan) if to achieve integration, sustainable;  
• Cross subsidize of land cost allows cost reduction for LIG/EWS;  
• Private sector contribution (15%) to EWS/LIG housing must follow city development strategy/MP;  
• Extra FAR/FSI incentive is a critical element for enhancing PPP; focus should be giving to building “communities”;  
• Following the city Master Plan, government land/plots could be allocated and serviced; land development % applied; a Community Development Plan prepared (participatory process); micro-finance arranged; minimum building standards defined (Building Guidelines should be prepared); Urban Local Bodies should be involved in the planning, implementation and monitoring; private sector involved in construction (use FAR incentives); NGO/CBO support should be organized; EWS/LIG incremental housing promoted based on individuals’ financial capability and priorities (space/layouts);  
• “Townships” or other housing developments must incorporate appropriate and convenient social and economic amenities. Integrated developments;  
• Infrastructure must be developed first. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Key Features</th>
<th>Comments, Opportunities &amp; Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| #2. Private Developers on Private Land | • Private land/private sector construction of flats (G+2/G+3)  
• Minimum 40% of the land for EWS/LIG housing; out of the total number of houses/flats, 50% for EWS  
• Nodal agency (Avas Vikas Limited - AVL)  
• Units at pre-determined prices, layouts  
• Various incentives to developers (double of normal FAR, Transferable Development Rights (TDR) facility, waiver of EDC, Building Plan approval fee, conversion charges, 10% of total land for commercial use as profit incentive, fast track approvals, etc)  
• Land allocation for commercial use | • Private sector participation in housing EWS/LIG brings the process to a more effective approach;  
• To achieve effective, friendly, inclusive cities, private land development must follow city MP if to avoid urban sprawl; local bodies must play a critical role on guiding development to maximize use of serviced land and creating integrated and diverse environments;  
• The participation of a Nodal agency for monitoring construction is critical; avoiding corruption in the construction-monitoring-approval process is a challenge;  
• Pre-determined unit designs are a “prescriptive” top-down approach not involving a sustainable participatory approach to determine actual needs, priorities;  
• Pre-determined unit prices may lead to reduced quality due to market construction cost fluctuation; fixing prices is a “prescriptive” approach and not realistic – not sustainable nor replicable;  
• Does ethnic/cultural mix work?? Promoting cultural diversity is desired in some societies but not all; caution is recommended;  
• Commercial land use allowance gives developers an incentive for promoting EWS/LIG housing as well as promotes local employment opportunity while amortizing the investment cost on MIG-A/B and HIG housing. |

**Figure: Model #2 Land/Units Allowances**

- 50% units for EWS
- 40% of the land EWS/LIG G+3 (G+2 in some cases)
- 50% of the land MIG-A/B, HIG
- Height per building regulations
- 10% of the land for commercial use
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Key Features</th>
<th>Comments, Opportunities &amp; Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| #3. Private Developer on Acquired Land     | • Land acquired/under acquisition by local bodies  
• Flats constructed by the private sector (G+2/G+3)  
• All categories of housing (EWS/LIG/MIG-A and B/HIG)  
• Flats for EWS/LIG: G+3 on minimum 40% area of land  
• Land available to private sector on payment compensation (land acquisition cost + 10% admin charges)  
• Model #2 parameters/incentives applied | • Local bodies responsible for identifying land for acquisition gives the opportunity for promoting integrated planning through both managed expansion, and densification, infill and redevelopment as well as integrating development with existing and planned infrastructure (water, public transport, etc.);  
• Combining residential and commercial uses allow diversification, business and employment opportunity in the community;  
• Participation of AVL in the land acquisition process may promote transparency;  
• Local bodies subsidizing external development charges is beneficial for promoting EWS/LIG housing while attracting developers; nevertheless, local bodies must have proper planning in place to avoid leap-frog development;  
• Allowance for commercial use amortize the investment cost on MIG-A/B and HIG housing;  
• See Model #2 notes on “prescribing” pre-determined unit layouts and prices.  
• Rental housing units should be considered as part of all housing models as an important, affordable housing alternative.  
• A “One-Stop-Shop” (Single Window) facility would ease development bureaucratic burdens and reduce costs for all models. |

**Figure: Model #3 Land/Units Allowances**

- 40% of the land EWS/LIG G+3 only (G+2 in some cases)
- 50% of the land MIG-A/B, HIG
- 10% of the land for commercial use
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Key Features</th>
<th>Comments, Opportunities &amp; Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| #4. Private Developers on Government Land | • Construction of EWS/LIG/MIG-A (G+3)/HIG flats (high rise permitted)  
• Free of land cost to the developer  
• Units for rental housing or outright sale basis  
• Project opportunities tendered to interested private developers based on maximum number of LIG-EWS units to be provided  
• ULB covers all external (off-site) infrastructure costs as another incentive  
• Internal infrastructure costs end up being all borne by the MIG-LIG buyers | • External infrastructure costs are passed along to other city residents and/or projects to cover at least portion of the subsidy. A potential political issue;  
• “Free” land is a major subsidy that may or may not be sustainable, and is subject to significant corruption opportunities;  
• See Model #2 notes re: pre-determined and fixed unit layouts and costs. This prescriptive approach greatly reduces sustainability and the likelihood of the development meeting the wide range of individual needs and priorities;  
• As with other models, this one assumes, and relies upon a mix of income groups, which may also imply a mix of ethnic and social groups. This mix is not always culturally acceptable and can lead to significant community social problems and/or buyer resistance.  
• Rental housing units should be incorporated into all developments as an affordable housing option, particularly for new entries to the market. |

**Figure: Model #4 Land/Units Allowances**

- 50% units for EWS
- 40% of the land EWS/LIG G+3 (G+2 in some cases)
- 50% of the land MIG-A/B, HIG Height per building regulations
- 10% of the land for commercial use
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Key Features</th>
<th>Comments, Opportunities &amp; Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| #5. Slum housing | • Addressed through the JNNURM Basic Services for Urban Poor Scheme (BSUP)  
• Addressed by Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (IHSDP), GOI  
• Rajiv Avas Yojana is a new slum housing programme – dwellings and infrastructure  
• PPP is being attempted  
• A aim at eliminating slums | • Focus by some programmes on building new housing units to re-locate slum dwellers. This normally involves “greenfield” developments beyond the built-up city resulting in dislocated residents into often non-sustainable socio-economic situations away from established social and economic networks;  
• Greater emphasis should be placed on in-situ upgrading and redevelopment as promoted in the Urban Housing & Habitat Policy. This not only supports more sustainable, compact, higher-density urban development, but allows residents to remain within their established social and economic networks;  
• Slums should be recognized as urban “entry” points that can evolve into rationalized urban areas through participatory processes and focused interventions. Slum clearance seldom works as residents will/must find a way back to their places of employment;  
• Pre-determined unit layouts, building types and prices eliminate flexibility to accommodate the wide range of needs and priorities;  
• Emphasis is typically focused almost entirely on housing units only, rather than creation of the community that is necessary for sustainability.  
• Infill, densification and redevelopment of informal, slum areas provide prime opportunities to develop affordable rental housing stock as a viable option to purchasing. |
| #6. DBS Affordable Home Strategy Ltd. – Private Developer | • Housing strategy that integrates design and production, community development and housing finance;  
• Target group analysis/definition;  
• Outreach process - a Single Window system  
• Multi-stakeholder participatory process  
• Information dissemination and hand-holding process  
• Diverse land and construction arrangement: DBS and owner  
• Rent + Ownership model | • Thinking beyond the “bricks”; seeking the creation of good spaces (airflow, light, etc); building communities and supporting buyers in the housing acquisition process; model that approaches housing as a process;  
• Taking the time to understand potential buyers’ situation (profile – employment situation, income levels, residing location, etc) in order to address their housing needs;  
• Outreach process through a Housing Facilitation Centre – a “Single Window” system – a critical process for housing options awareness; beneficial for developers and buyers;  
• “Hand-holding” process – essential to inform and make families...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Key Features</th>
<th>Comments, Opportunities &amp; Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comfortable though the process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Promoting multi-stakeholders participatory process (potential buyers, government, banks, investors, developers, policy makers, etc);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The “rent + ownership” model is an innovative approach to housing especially the EWS/LIG groups; renting is the most affordable housing option for newcomers and low-income groups as a start; ownership;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Housing costs leave out the bottom range of the EWS; affordable for some, not all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7 Radhe Armaan – Private Developer</td>
<td>• Township concept – multi-storey buildings; large scale mass housing provision;</td>
<td>• Leap-frog development to unserviced land promoting urban sprawl; to properly function township development must take a holistic approach of full provision small, medium and large scale housing, commercial areas, social amenities, environmental conservation, management, etc.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A open market scheme;</td>
<td>• Far distance from the city without public transport; the scheme does not adopt a Transit Oriented Development approach; it in an automobile-oriented-development which will not serve EWS/LIG, or contribute to environmentally sustainable urban development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential, commercial and social amenities;</td>
<td>• Conversion of agricultural land into residential has a potential to impact villagers’ livelihood; this group will probably not afford to buy into the scheme;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Housing scheme to absorb local industries potential demand;</td>
<td>• Villages’ social and economic disruption since they are still not fully prepared to deal with significant changes such as larger local population impacting employment opportunities, higher land price (due to local investment), increase in infrastructure taxes, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agricultural and industrial land conversion;</td>
<td>• A supply-driven open market scheme – not aiming at addressing EWS/LIG needs for incremental access to housing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Segregated from city and infrastructure even though within city limit;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. Lessons Learned: Jodhpur-Ahmedabad-Delhi Mission

This section presents an overview of key lessons learned from the Workshop (24-25 May 2012) and field visit in Jodhpur, and field visits in Ahmedabad (26-26 May 2012). The lessons focus primarily on elements of urban planning and land management.

1. Jodhpur Workshop and Field Visits

Key lessons from the Workshop – “Building Sustainable Future Cities: Exploring Prospects for Transit-Oriented Development in Jodhpur” and field visits include:

- The Jodhpur BRT project (ADB TA 7750 IND) misses integrating transport and land use planning (in spite of discussions indicating a full understanding); there is no indication of integrating transport and housing or adopting principles of TOD, such as densification around the stations, and transport modes integration. Nevertheless, it considers good elements for future urban development such as the creation of BRT and pedestrian only streets, and potential improvement of urban conditions for shopping and pedestrian movements (Option #1); both considerations have a direct relationship to urban planning and land management requiring advance planning for land allowance for future urban transformations. BRT Option #2 presents some potential social-cultural impacts (destruction of heritage/religious buildings, etc.) due to the implementation of a tunnel in the busy centre of Jodhpur – not clear how these issues will be effectively addressed. Option #3 considers the implementation of a Comprehensive Urban Renewal plan, incorporating elements of urban design to create a friendly, comfortable environment for pedestrians, but this will not effectively happen without densification and diversification. A holistic approach to the Jodhpur BRT should be considered.

- Various presentations emphasised the importance of promoting TOD in Indian cities, however lack of political will, proper planning and agency integration are key factor of failure.

- The Ministry of Urban Development (Urban Transport) recognises the need for mass investments in infrastructure in support to India’s growing economy. Investing in integrated transport is a key action to address economic, environmental and social needs efficiently considering different technologies and modes of transport. Re-enforces the need to bring the private sector to participate in this process and highlighted the need for policies to integrate land use and transport planning.

- One of Jodhpur Development Authority’s goals is to integrate slums into the city with access to infrastructure. This represents an inclusive and socially effective approach to dealing with slums. Moreover, JDA emphasises the need to integrate land use and urban transportation. However, these strategies are not reflected in the “affordable” housing project visited (Arihant) during the mission – greenfield development, not connected to urban transport, finished product (one-layout-fits-all), no infrastructure available in the area, etc. There is a gap in between policy and implementation that must be filled. These points question the local bodies capacity to plan and implement housing/urban development programmes/projects.

- Government of Rajasthan’s initiatives focus on various levels of planning, or “intermediate plan” (National Policy, Master Plans for cities and town, MP for
villages, etc.). Critical for managing orderly implementation and avoiding *ad hoc* development.

- Government of Rajasthan, Housing Policy – comments provided in the previous section.

- EMBARQ enforces the need for implementing public transport to minimize land consumption/urban sprawl. Also highlights the importance of public participation in planning (TOD). Through the Navanagar BOT project, presents the application of principles of TOD: densification, green paths, walkable areas; all critical for promoting effective cities. Through the Namma Metro project, EMBARQ re-enforces the concept of “intermediate plan” (phased implementation – timeframe dimension) for addressing future demand. In the MIDC Canteen project, the proposed redevelopment looks nice, but ignores the reality of urban life. Cleaning things up, must also accommodate things! Last but not least, acknowledges the need for integrating urban transport and urban development, and the need for agencies collaborate.

2. Ahmedabad Field Visits

Key lessons from the Ahmedabad BRT and private housing developments include:

- Ahmedabad BRT project enforces key elements of effective urban development incorporating principles of TOD: creates a network considering the existing – planning for the future, considers the real estate market, growth direction, higher density, marketing strategy, focus on “moving people”, etc. Importance lessons are the gradual mixed-use densification towards the centre and the promotion of urban infill through redevelopment of Mill land.

- DBS approach to affordable housing includes the definition of the target groups, which makes the housing alternatives affordable from the beginning. This is a proscriptive approach that is based on the socio-economic reality of the people – a positive approach to housing. Also, the strategy of integrating design and production with community development initiatives and housing finance has greater potential to achieve affordable housing while creating communities.

Considering that it is difficult to achieve the “affordable” design/layout of housing for EWS/LIG, DBS takes an incremental approach of building unfinished but pleasant spaces (airflow, light). On top of reducing the cost, leaving the final touches (finishing) for the occupants, gives them the opportunity to give their “own” character to the house. Another critical lesson learned from DBS initiatives is the potential of developing rental housing. Further comments are provided in the previous section (Model Review).

- The Radhe Armaan township project is creating urban sprawl; township development is a potential for mass housing, however, it must be developed as “complete communities. Further comments are provided in the previous section (Model Review).

- Regarding the housing development for accommodating families relocated from the River Redevelopment Project, it is critical to highlight that families did not sound very happy with the relocation site and lack of access to urban transport. This may suggest a top-down approach to resettlement which is proved to be a failure. Moreover, the buildings lack spaces for economic activities limiting the residents’ ability to employment and consequently income generation.
X. Conclusion

As the world continues to rapidly urbanise with the accompanying growth in social, economic and environmental challenges, the need for comprehensive, inclusive approaches to urban planning, development and housing provision increases. Cities must grow to listen to and accommodate the needs and priorities of a full range of residents; must protect their environmental hinterlands which are the basis of economic health; must make cities accessible to all with maximum mobility; must utilise land and infrastructure fully; must minimise sprawl, must develop a full range of affordable housing options with access to social amenities; must make sure that institutional capacities are in-tune with social and physical needs; and above all, must promote the development of cities as places people enjoy being in. Inclusiveness is essential for sustainability.

In the case of Indian cities, the fundamental issues are the same. While notable examples exist of moving towards inclusiveness, full opportunities to participate in the urban future - “a right to the city”14 - remain elusive. Many appropriate policies are in place, but implementation remains weak due to a lack of institutional capacity resulting in weak land management and urban planning. Urban sprawl continues almost unchecked, and access to the potential benefits of the city continue to be denied to a significant proportion of the population due to lack of mobility, poor infrastructure and lack of access to affordable housing; housing that meets the full range of integrated social and economic community needs. International experience with TOD developments, as an example, are being carefully looked at as a means of densifying urban development and improving those key issues of accessibility, mobility and densification. New urban policies, such as those in Ahmadabad and Jodhpur are being prepared and seeking the resources and political will to implement. Most importantly, the dialogue is strengthening and Indian urban authorities are recognizing the importance of prioritising sustainable order in urban development.

---

14 Constructing the ‘Right To The City’ in Brazil. Edésio Fernandes. Social & Legal Studies 2007:16:201