



## PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS OF URBAN POOR IN HYDERABAD

**J.SURESH**

Research Scholar

Department Of Public Administration

Osmania University

Hyderabad

9493012729

### ABSTRACT

*The Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation (GHMC) has a population of 6,809,970 people and occupies an area of 650 square kilometres. In Hyderabad, there are 1476 slums, 1179 of which are notified and 297 of which are not. The overall slum area is 80.45 km<sup>2</sup>, accounting for 12% of the GHMC's total territory. The overall slum population is 19, 51,207, accounting for 28.65% of GHMC's total population. The slums have a total population of 4.06 lakh households.*

*Keywords: GHMC, SLUMS, URBAN POOR and CDP*

### INTRODUCTION

Slums and squatter settlements are an essential facet of the urban landscape of most countries and more so that of the developing countries. They are also a paradox in themselves. While on the one hand, they are a manifestation of urban poverty, on the other, they are a reflection of the economic pull of urban areas. The definition of a slum varies from country to country depending on the cultural mores and economic conditions.

Slums are residential areas of least choice, dilapidated houses, poor ventilation, inadequate lighting, poor sanitation, lack of safe drinking water, overcrowding, convoluted street patterns, fire and flood hazards, poor facilities for education and health, unhygienic living conditions and air and water- borne diseases. Socially, they are characterized by drug abuse, alcoholism, crime, vandalism, escapism, apathy and social isolation<sup>1</sup>.

Although they look like slums from the outside, squatter settlements lack essential facilities and consist of a cluster of houses erected on property that the squatters do not own or rent (builders). Invasion, gradual accretion, or government initiative are all methods by which these towns come to be. Cities in Asia, Latin America and Africa have a high rate of migration from traditional inner-city residences and rural areas, making them a common sight in these regions. As a result, they are referred to as "transitional" cities. They are seen as places of promise instead of places

---

<sup>1</sup> Boano, C., Zetter, R. & T. Morris (2008). *Environmentally displaced people. Understanding the linkages between environmental change, livelihoods and forced migration. Forced Migration Policy Briefing 1. Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford*

of desperation.

As a result, while the term "slum" refers to the physical characteristics of a location, the term "squatter" refers to the legal status of land ownership and infrastructure in a certain locale. Squatters tend to populate the city's outskirts rather than the city's slums, which tend to occupy the city's original settlement sites<sup>2</sup>. When people set up camp without permission, they are known as 'spontaneous settlements' or 'shanty towns.' They don't have the resources either. Migrants can settle more easily in these "transitional" areas on the outskirts of cities because they have a taste of both rural and urban life. Rather than "Slums of Despair," they are seen as "Slums of Hope" because they are capable of self-organization and government intervention to create social and communal services (Yeates and Garner,1971; Haggett et al,1981).

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. **Wiejaczka et al. (2018)**<sup>3</sup> who explored the perception of natives of Teesta Basin towards the hydro projects disapproves the dam construction totally as the dams shatter the socio-cultural and economic base of the area resulting in a decline in their income, along with the prevalence of insecurity among the natives.
2. **Aiyar and Kaushal (2018)**<sup>4</sup> compared the well-being of the dislocated and dislocated outsiders of the Sardar Sarovar dam and pointed out that the relocated families are in a better situation as they have better access to facilities, better livelihood opportunities and assets. However, besides these assets, space tends to hold great significance as 56 percent of these resettled families want to return to their native land.
3. **Wilmsen et al. (2018)**<sup>5</sup> conducted a longitudinal study across three phases of time to understand the value of the land for the displaced. He pointed out that land tends to hold a significant pace in ascertaining the well-being of the displaced because it provides a sense of security and a strong positive relationship between land size and income.

---

<sup>2</sup> Canares, M. P. (2012). *COHRE (2008). Women, Slums and Urbanization: Examining the Causes and Consequences. Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions, Women and Housing Rights Programme. May 2008*

<sup>3</sup> Wiejaczka, L., Piróg, D., Tamang, L., & Prokop, P. (2018). *Local Residents' Perceptions of a Dam and Reservoir Project in the Teesta Basin, Darjeeling Himalayas, India. Mountain Research and Development, 38(3):203-210 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1659/MRD-JOURNAL-D-16-00124.1>*

<sup>4</sup> Aiyar, S. S. A., & Kaushal, N. (2018). *Are Resettled Oustees From The Sardar Sarovar Dam Project Better Off Today Than Their Former Neighbors Who Were Not Ousted ? (NBER, Working Paper 24423). Retrieved from National Bureau Of Economic Research Website: <https://www.nber.org/papers/w24423.pdf>*

<sup>5</sup> Wilmsen, B., Adjarney, D., & Hulten, A.V. (2018). *Challenging the risks-based model of involuntary resettlement using evidence from the Bui Dam, Ghana. International Journal of Water Resources Development, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07900627.2018.1471390>*

4. **Bui and Schreinemachers (2018)**<sup>6</sup> also disdained the failure of cash resettlement as the economic status of the families had declined severely on account of inability to obtain the same amount and quality of land and inability to adjust to the new technologies.
5. **Agrawal (2018)**<sup>7</sup> looked at the failure of Pancheswar dam to involve people to look after their livelihoods.

## **OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY**

1. To study the problems and prospects of urban poor in Hyderabad.

## **HYPOTHESES**

- Development of urban poor mostly depends on improved income generation activities.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

- **Data Collection**

Data is collected from primary and secondary sources. The secondary sources include books, articles, periodicals, newspapers, government reports, reports from different committees and commissions. Primary data is collected from specifically designed structural and unstructured schedules from the research sample slum dwellers and officials.

## **HOUSING THE URBAN POOR IN HYDERABAD: AN OVERVIEW**

### **Hyderabad – the vital statistics**

MCH, nine smaller municipalities around it, Secunderabad Cantonment, and a number of urbanized villages make up the metropolitan region of Hyderabad. 4.616 million People lived in the 1534 square kilometer region governed by the Hyderabad Urban Development Authority (HUDA) in the 1991 census.

Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad (MCH) is the most populous metropolis in the state, home to 3.146 million people spread across an area of 169.31 square kilometers (in 1991). In 1991, a total of 963,000 people lived in the nine smaller municipalities, which collectively occupied a land area of 376.97 square kilometers. With 431,000 residents in 1991, the remaining HUDA territory is divided into 242 villages and 106 Gram Panchayats (rural local bodies).

---

<sup>6</sup> Bui, T. M. H., & Schreinemachers, P. (2018). *Livelihood changes of affected households under resource scarcity: The Son La hydropower project in Vietnam*. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, xxx(2018), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2018.08.004>

<sup>7</sup> Agrawal, R. (2018). *Pancheswar Dam Destruction in the Name of Development*. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 53(14), 25-28. Retrieved from <https://www.epw.in/journal/2018/15/commentary/pancheshwar-dam.html>

The population growth rate in the HUDA area between 1981 and 1991 was 70.33 percent. There were predicted to be 6.7 million people in the Hyderabad Development Area in 2001, and 8.6 million in 2011, according to a draught master plan published by the HUDA in 1993.

The HUDA region's population increased by 70.33 percent between 1981 and 1991. An estimated population of 8.6 million people was forecasted for the Hyderabad Development Area in the Draft Revised Master Plan–2011 prepared by the Hyderabad Development Authority in 1993.

### **Housing types of the urban poor**

The urban poor in Hyderabad live in the following categories of housing:

- Apartments built by government agencies to rehabilitate squatters, as part of Shelter upgrades, or as a "land sharing" method.
- Illegal land subdivisions in which the planning and construction of structures have not been approved.
- New sites and services initiatives to either rehabilitate squatters from 'objectionable' lands on a separate location or upgrade an existing slum by reo scaping.
- Slums/squatter colonies with makeshift, temporary shelters on public or private networks
- Temporary, unauthorized hutments (land parcels rented out to "hutters" without local authority approval, mainly to house construction workers, etc.)
- Village villages encircled/engulfed by growing urbanization.

### **Hyderabad Metropolitan Development Authority (HMDA)**

By G. O. Ms. No. 411 M.A dated 27-09-1975, the State Government established the Hyderabad Urban Development Authority (HUDA), which has authority over 1864 square kilometers and is home to 6.5 million people (Census 2001). Hyderabad Metropolitan Development Authority (HMDA) was established by the Government of Andhra Pradesh under GO Ms. No. 274 MA, 20-04-2007. (HMDA). Expanding HMDA's range of jurisdiction brings into its scrutiny all of the development and construction projects now going place outside of HUDA's previously established jurisdiction. G.O.Ms. No. 570 M.A., dt. 25-08-2008, created the HMDA, which covers an area of 7228.09 Sq. Km, and dissolved the authorities such as HUDA/HADA/CDA in order to maximize agglomeration economies.

55 Mandals in five districts are covered under the HMDA's jurisdiction. As a whole, this contains 16 Mandals from Hyderabad, 10 Mandals from Medak, 22 Mandals from Rangareddy and just two from Nalgonda districts (5 out of 59 Mandals). HMDA now has India's second-largest jurisdiction. The growth of Hyderabad is depicted in the figure 1 below.

### **Constituents of Hyderabad Metropolitan Region (HMR)**

In terms of urbanization, industrialization, and percentage of non-farm employment, the Hyderabad Metropolitan Region may be clearly split into three sub regions. They are:

**Hyderabad Urban Agglomeration (HUA)**-It is the economic foundation of HMR and the Core Area of HMDA. Hyderabad, Rangareddy, and Medak comprise 11.64 percent of HMR's total land area, whereas Rangareddy and Hyderabad each have 12 Mandals (2 Mandals). Census data from the year 2001 shows that the HUA region consists of 12 municipalities, three census towns, and 13 outgrowths. There are 57.42 lakh HUA people living in the HMR, or around 75% of the overall HMR population. Core Area is not a static area, but rather dynamic. As January 2001, the HUA's total size has grown from 298.5 square kilometers to 831.39 square kilometers. As a comparison, the HUA's population has grown from 17.96 lakh in 1971 to 57.42 lakh since then, with an annual CAGR of 3.95 percent.

**B. Rest of HUDA & HADA** - 18 deserted villages and three urban communities are found in this area. This has a diameter of 47.22 Km and is circular in shape. Over 5.7 million people (7.49 percent) call this part of HMR home, and most of them are rural dwellers (Census, 2001). When compared to HUA, the economic foundation of this subcomponent is primarily rural and somewhat impoverished.

**C. Extended Area of HMDA** - This includes 635 communities, with 26 deserted villages and seven urban settlements included. Extensive HMDA covers an area of 5017.90 Sq. Km. It's also worth noting that this part of the region's expanded territory is mostly rural, with a population of 13.38 million people, and hence has a comparatively low economic foundation compared to other parts of the region like the Hyderabad Urban Agglomeration (HUA). Better amenities are needed to keep this rural population from migrating to the urban agglomeration, which will increase its competitiveness and decrease its inequities. Figure 3.3 depicts the three parts of Hyderabad Metropolitan Regions conceptually.

✚ ANALYSIS OF URBAN POOR IN GHMC

**Table-1**  
**Demographic profile of HMDA**

Region/Zone	Status	Population 2001	HH size	Density	Growth rate	Sex ratio
A-HUA	Urban	57,42,036	5.2	7,078	41.9	931
B-Rest of HUDA &HADA	Urban	38,510	4.6	1,324	71.5	853
	Rural	5,35,005	4.8	374	48.2	936
	Total	5,73,515	4.8	393	49.5	931
C-Extended area of HMDA	Urban	1,84,418	5	2,766	32.9	938
	Rural	11,54,447	4.9	235	16	957
	Total	13,38,865	4.9	270	18.2	954
D-HMR (A+B+C)	Total	76,54,416	5.1	1,070	37.7	935

Greater Hyderabad has a population of 6,809,970 and is India's fourth-largest metropolis, while the urban agglomeration as a whole has a population of 7,749,334. There are 150 wards in the Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation, which is organized into five zones and 18 circles. Hyderabad's gender ratio was somewhat higher than the national average of 926 females for every 1000 males in 2001, according to the Indian population census.

➤ **Status of Slums in GHMC as Per Hyderabad CDP**

**Table-2**  
**Slum wise Population in GHMC area as per CDP**

S. No.	Municipality/Circle	No. of Slums	Slum Population	% of Slum Population
1	MCH	985	1411000	20.72
2	Serilingampally	61	73866	1.08
3	Kukatpally	68	19585	0.29
4	Quthbullapur	64	138360	2.03
5	Alwal	49	62585	0.92
6	Malkajgiri	42	47396	0.70
7	Kapra	51	47064	0.69

8	Uppalkalan	29	43586	0.64
9	L.B.Nagar	75	23478	0.34
10	Rajendranagar	45	84287	1.24
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1476</b>	<b>1951210</b>	<b>28.65</b>

According to the data in Table (3.3) below, there are 1476 slums in the Greater Hyderabad Metropolitan Region (GHMC) with a combined population of around 2.0 million people that are not concentrated in any one place. They're dispersed all over the place, which is concerning and necessitates a plan of action. In addition, several of them are unreported, making it impossible to maintain infrastructure and other services.

**Table-3  
Circle wise Slums**

Sl.No	Circle	No. of Slums
1	Kapra - 1	51
2	Uppal - 2	28
3	L.B.Nagar - 3	84
4	Charminar - 4	221
5	Charminar - 5	94
6	Rajendra nagar - 6	45
7	Khairatabad - 7	147
8	Abids - 8	36
9	Abids - 9	186
10	Khairatabad - 10	160
11	Sherilingampally (S) - 11	26
12	Sherilingampally (N) – 12 RC puram & Patan	32
13	Chervu - 13	12
14	Kukatpally - 14	68
15	Quthbullapur - 15	63
16	Alwal -16	49
17	Malkajgiri - 17	42
18	Secunderabad - 18	132
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1476</b>

As seen from Table (3) there are a total of 1476 slums in the GHMC area. Circle wise slum location maps are given in annexure 11. The maximum numbers of slums numbering 221 exist in Circle – 4 and the least number of 12 slums in Circle 13 (Patancheruvu). A closer analysis reveals that 66% of the slums (numbering 985) are in the seven circles of GHMC and the remaining 34% in peripheral areas. Amongst the peripheral areas a major chunk of the slums

are in Kukatpally, LB Nagar, and Quthbullapur, followed by Alwal, Kapra, Malkajgiir, Rajendra Nagar and Serilingamally.

**Table-4**  
**Classification of slums based on Density distribution**

Age of slums (in years)	No. of slums
0-5	18
6-10	94
11-20	112
21-30	353
31-40	418
41-50	112
Above 50	370
Total	1476

Table-1476 slums of  
based on the population density.

GHMC were classified

## CONCLUSION

The purpose of this report is to analyze and explain the vulnerable condition of the Urban Poor of Greater Hyderabad Municipal Cooperation. The chapter has captured the approaches and strategies for Housing, Livelihood and Institutional Reform. Later on the report has captured the general profile of the Hyderabad City and status of urban poor in terms of accessing the basic services, education & health facilities and other government run programmes and social security / welfare schemes. In this section, attempt has been made to explain the background profile, Socio-economic Profile and facilities mapping of slum dwellers. The report has covered the three specific case study and presented the vulnerability and marginalization status of slum dwellers of GHMC.