As long as population concentration is there, urbanisation is there and as soon as population concentration stops, urbanisation also stops. How far urbanisation can go, we are unable to say because we do not know what limits of concentration, a society may be able to tolerate. However, this definition does not take into account the economic aspects of the process. Urbanisation involves more than increase in the number of people and growth in these concentrations.

In fact, it means an increasing shift from agricultural to industrial to service and distributive occupations. In brief urbanisation involves the following:

(i) Urbanisation involves an increase in the number of points of population concentration;

(ii) A growth in the size of these points;

(iii) Transfer of people from agriculture to non-agricultural occupations

Thus urbanisation takes place mainly in three ways;

(a) Natural increase in population.

(b) Reclassification of rural and urban places, so that some rural areas may be treated as urban.

(c) When net rural-urban migration occurs.
The growth of urbanisation in ancient times was related to the process of civilization and is known as ‘a cultural process’. Later on, in medieval times the urbanisation as a result of a political process, because of the establishment and downfall of kingdoms and dynasties. Lastly, in modern times, the urbanisation is mostly associated with industrialization and economic development and it is called an economic process.

The Census definition of an urban area in India remained more or less the same for the period of 1891-1951, and it was only in 1961 that several modifications were introduced to make the definition more satisfying from statistical point of view.

The definition of the ‘urban area’, according to the 2001 Census is as follows:

i. all places with a municipal corporation, cantonment Board, Municipality, Nagar Panchayat etc.,

ii. all other places which satisfy the following criteria;

(a) a minimum population of 5000;

(b) atleast 75 percent of the male working population should be engaged in non-agricultural pursuits; and

(c) a density of population of atleast 400 per sq.km.

The term ‘Urbanisation’ implies the movement of people to urban areas. The concept of urbanisation in economic aspects relates to the movement of people from agricultural activities to non-agricultural activities. This approach directly relates to economic development with urbanisation.
Urbanisation is the process whereby human beings concentrate in relatively large number at one particular spot of the earth's surface. It is a process wherein there is an increase in the urban population to total population in a country or region. It is generally expressed as \( \frac{U}{T} \times 100 \). This process takes place due to natural increase in population in urban areas and migration of people from rural areas to urban areas. Secondly some rural areas due to change in economic activity and growth of population become urban centres.

The rapid urban growth is a problem both in developed and developing countries of the world, because there is a wide gap between the rate of growth of urban population and the rate of progress of social overhead facilities including employment opportunities for the educated urban population. But this urban problem is more acute in less developed than the developed countries.

Among all the developing countries, India has got a rapid urban growth rather than urbanisation due to its rapid population growth. Urbanisation is a continuous process, which is not merely a concomitant of industrialization, but a concomitant of the whole gamut of factors underlying the process of economic growth and social change. India ranks third in the world with regard to urban growth (first China and second U.S.A.) even though it stood second in the size of population.

India is a part of an earth wide tide of urban growth but the pace of urban growth is slow compared to other countries. For example at the time of Independence the percentage of urban population was 17 percent, but it is only 27.8 today. Among the earth's ten most populated nations, India has the smallest percentage of urban population and also has the lowest current rate of increase of urban population.
By 1850 also, nearly 2.3 percent of the world population was in the large cities. By 1900, Indian urbanisation was far behind by about 50 years compared to the world. But urbanisation has been making big strides since the second decade of the 20th century in India. Between 1901 and 2001, there was more than an elevenfold increase in the urban population, while the total population has increased only about five times. By comparing the urban growth and the population growth in India through the index, it is very clear that urban population reached 1096, whereas the index of population (1901 as the base) reached only 431 by the end of 2001. In other words, by taking the absolute numbers, the urban population increased from 26 million in 1901 to 285 million by 2001, and the total population increased from 238 million in 1901 to 1027 million by 2001, while the corresponding increase in rural population was about 250 percent.

From the overall changes in population growth and urbanisation in India, in the twentieth century, there are two aspects that can be stressed.

1. A persistent growth of total population after the decades 1901–1911 & 1911–1921 of 1901 to 1921, which marks the end of the previous period of intermittent growth. Thereafter, the rate of growth accelerated in each successive decade with one exception, is from 1941 to 1951, due mainly to the deaths caused by the great famine in Bengal and the partition.

2. Urban population has increased at the rate that exceeds the growth rate of the whole population.
Again by studying the decadal verification of urban growths two tentative conclusions emerge;

- The proportion of urban growth due to rural urban migration has increased substantially since the 1951–61 and 1961–71 decades.

The city size growth further displays that about 65 percent of the urban population lived in 296 towns of 1,00,000 population or more in 1991 and the increase in the number of class I and class II towns over the period 1961–2001 is striking, particularly in comparison with what happened in town size, class and categories. The overall trend appears to be one of increasing concentration of the urban population in the larger towns.

The individual state level statistics manifests some interesting aspects. The combined urban population of just four states Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal comprise almost half (i.e., 44 percent) the total urban population of India. Maharashtra itself possesses almost 41 million urban dwellers, amounting to 14.4 percent of the national total: Maharashtra is also the most highly urbanised state, with 42 percent of its inhabitants living in urban areas. Gujarat, the neighbouring state is also relatively highly urbanised (37.4 percent) as is the southern state of Tamil Nadu (43.9 percent). Of the remaining major states Karnataka, Punjab and West Bengal show an above average level of Indian urbanisation.

The pace of urban growth in major states further reveals that there is a clear negative relationship between, the level of
urbanisation already attained and the rate of growth of urban population. The three most urbanised states, Maharashtra, Gujarat and Tamil Nadu, experienced below average urban growth rates during the decades 1991 – 2001. But states with proportionally small urban sectors, such as Orissa, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, experienced higher than the average rate of growth of urban population. In the case of the most urbanised states such as Tamil Nadu, West Bengal, the contribution of rural – urban migration to total urban growth is likely to be relatively small, whereas in the least urbanised states, it probably plays a more prominent role.

The 1991 – 2001 decade has witnessed a significant quickening in the pace of India’s urbanisation, an acceleration reflecting in particular two important and interrelated trends;

- A shift in the spatial pattern of new urbanisation away from the traditional areas of urban growth, and

- A concentration of growth in intermediate size cities.

Another important aspect observed is the slow decline of the annual urban growth rate. During 1971–1981 the annual urban growth rate which registered 3.86 percent, declined to 3.14 percent in 1981–1991 and again declined to 2.75 percent in the 1991 - 2001 decade.

During 1951–2001 the total population of our country increased 3.6 times whereas the urban population shows a ten fold increase, but the number of towns and cities increased only 1.5 times.

The number of ‘millions cities’ has increased from 1 in 1901 to 35 in 2001. The population of these 35 cities is about 38
percent of the total urban population. Metropolises and particularly Mega cities amongst them are growing at a rapid pace and there are four such giant cities of India namely Mumbai, Kolkata, Delhi and Chennai.

Coming to the growth of urban population in Andhra Pradesh between 1901 to 2001, the growth of urban population is phenomenal during the last six decades, but its pace was rather slow from 1901 to 1931 having increased from 17.68 million to just 23.17 million, but then accelerated from 1941 onwards. The proportion constitutes only 9.42 percent in 1901 and it increased at a decreasing rate until 1941, i.e., 13.5 percent. The average annual growth rate increased from 0.9 percent in 1901 to 1.12 percent in 1931 to 1.37 percent in 1941. Even after 1941, the average annual growth rate of urban population was less i.e., 1.73 percent in 1951 to 1.9 percent in 1971, it was 2.3 percent in 1981, 2.68 percent in 1991 and further it grew to 2.71 percent in 2001.

The class size urban growth statistics in Andhra Pradesh helps to draw some interesting conclusions. The proportion of urban population in class I towns has increased from 24.38 percent in 1901 to 75.31 percent in 2001, whereas the class II towns increased from 2.5 percent in 1901 to 13.95 percent in 2001. This high concentration of population in big cities may be due to the natural rate of population growth living in the urban areas and the migration of population from rural to urban areas. The class I cities are expanding at the cost of small towns.

The number of towns in the state increased from 116 in 1901 to 296 in 1991, which are treated as urban units. Out of the 296 class I cities in India by 1991 with a population of 1 lakh and above during 1991-2001 decade. Out of them two cities are located
in Andhra Pradesh namely Nellore, due to its agricultural moorings and Trupati, due to the Balaji temple complex and educational institutions and industries located there. Andhra Pradesh has 39 class I cities by the end of 2001. Hyderabad is the only city in Andhra Pradesh, prior to 1951, to have a population of 1 lakh and above. Out of 39 cities, 16 cities are located in Coastal Andhra, 11 cities are in the Telangana region and 12 cities are in the Rayalaseema region.

Andhra Pradesh reveals imbalance in the urban development through the clustering of urban settlements in delta districts of Costal Andhra region. In the Rayalaseema region, only Kurnool, Adoni and Nandyal cities affect the surrounding areas to a considerable extent. In the rest of Rayalaseema, urban influences are not so significant. In the Telangana region, only Hyderabad city group, and Warangal influenced more for the concentration of urban population.

An enquiry into the Census of city growth in Andhra Pradesh may reveal two important aspects; (i) Natural increase and (ii) Rural - urban migration. We can add further that inadequate employment opportunities for the rural masses, poor economic conditions and lack of adequate infrastructural facilities in small towns were the other aspects. To avoid congestional and allied problems, the promotion of small towns is socially desirable.

The share of urban population to the total population of the state in the three regions (Costal Andhra Telangana and Rayalaseema regions) from 1901 to 2001 reveals a different picture.

The Coastal Andhra region is in the first place regarding the share of urban population to the state from 1901 - 1981 and the Telangana region overtook the coastal Andhra region and stood in
the first place in 1991. Even though it maintained the first place in terms of number of towns and cities right from 1901 to 1991. The number of towns and cities during this period had increased three fold.

Another interesting phenomenon observed in Telangana region, is that it registered 24.7 percent of the total urban population of the state in 1901 which increased to 45.8 percent in 2001. This clearly shows that the Telangana region gained what Coastal Andhra and Rayalaseema region lost over the decades. The Telangana region has registered an almost fourfold increase in the number of towns during these ten decades.

The Rayalaseema region is in the last place regarding the share of urban population to the state. It contributed one fourth of the urban population in 1901 but has steadily lost its importance and finally it has come down to 15.2 percent in the 2001 census. It has roughly lost 10 percent over the ten decades. The Rayalaseema region has registered a continuous increase in the number of towns and cities and by 2001 there is a little more than a two fold increase.

Urbanisation and levels of development of Andhra Pradesh reveals that only five districts namely Hyderabad, Krishna, Visakhapatnam, Guntur and Ranga Reddy are placed in the category of ‘High Level of Developments’, estimated with the help of developmental indicators. 14 districts are placed under the category of ‘Medium Level of Development’ and “Low Level of Development” is found in the four districts namely, Medak, Nalgonda, Srikakulam and Mahaboob Nagar districts.

From this analysis it is clear that 18 districts have not yet attained the level of development. With this we can conclude
that there is a close relationship between urbanisation and development where the percentage of urban population of these 18 districts has recorded lower than the state average.

Kurnool district is one of the most important historical and largest districts in Rayalaseema region. There is a rapid development in urban progress in the late 1950's and, the growth rate of urban population is higher than the growth rate of the total population. The growth rate of urban population has recorded a great increase from 10.75 percent in 1931 to 22.57 percent in 2001. But it was 25.83 percent in the 1991 Census. The percentage variation over the decade varied from 24.94 percent in 1931 to 46.50 percent in 1981, but afterwards it has shown a declining trend. It recorded 30.27 percent in 1991 Census and only 3.20 percent in the 2001 Census. (This is almost the least percentage recorded forever.) It is because of the loss of five major urban centres declassified as villages in the 2001 Census. Once all of these five towns were Taluq head quarters and urban centres. Due to effective administrative measures the Government of Andhra Pradesh implemented 'mandal system' in the place of Taluqs. This is one of the reason where the migration is somewhat controlled by the system which affected the existing urban centres.

The distribution of towns by industrial workforce in the district reveals that 12.6 percent of workers living in the towns of Kurnool district are engaged in agricultural sector either as cultivators or as agricultural labourers.

The functional classifications of towns indicated that the centres like Kurnool, Nandyal, Adoni and Yemmiganur have significant manufacturing industry as well as trade and commerce,
From the point view of the district, even though the non-agricultural activity as a whole is not significant.

In terms of trade and commerce, Nandyal, Adoni and Bugganapalli are the main centres. The shift from primary activity and services to trade and commerce either fully or partly was observed in the towns of Nandyal and Kallur. Similarly, a shift from industry to trade and commerce either partly or fully was observed in respect of Kurnool, Nandyal and Adoni cities.

Kurnool district is a well-known drought-prone area in the state and not much efforts have been made to develop the district by the policy makers, so the process of urbanization is very low in the district. Among the four districts of Rayalaseema region, Kurnool district has contributed 4.1 percent of the total urban population of the state during 1901, and has significantly increased to 5.4 percent in 1941. But the share of urban population to the state declined to 3.9 percent by 2001. With this we may conclude that there is a conspicuous neglect of this district by the planners and decision makers.

The trend of urban concentration is also observed in the Kurnool district. During the 2001 Census, the five class I and II towns and cities, namely Kurnool, Nandyal, Adoni, Kallur and Yemmiganur have accounted for 73 percent of the total urban population of the district.

The growth of towns and cities in Kurnool district observed frequent fluctuations. In 1901, only three towns were found in Kurnool district, But it reached the highest number in 1941 i.e., fourteen and it declined to 10 in 1961 and slightly increased to eleven in 1971. During 1991 Census the number again increased slightly to
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twelve, but again declined to ten in 2001 census. The changes in the definitions of urban area, the formation of Prakasam District with major geographical area of Kurnool district, and the formation of mandal system are responsible for the fluctuations in the growth of towns and cities in Kurnool district.

The growth rate of urban population in all the towns of Kurnool district is categorized but only five important towns and cities namely Kurnool, Nandyal, Adoni, Kallur and Yemmiganur, show significant growth.

The townwise urban growth indicates that Kurnool city (1052) progressed rapidly due to industrial and educational progress. This is followed by Nandyal (1002), Adoni (514) and Yemmiganur (482).

Urbanisation and economic development has been studied and it has revealed that urbanisation is a concomitant for economic development in Kurnool district. At the same time, the urbanisation process in Kurnool district has got its own impact on the overall economic development of the district. Urbanisation is favourably associated with all the indicators of development except the percentage of agricultural workers to total workers, (the percentage of workers to non workers, percentage of total workers to total population and decadal growth rate.)

The urbanisation problems are creating stress and strain both to the public as well as to the Government in the form of growing urban unrest, social tensions, congestion, proliferation of slums, environmental degradation, wide spread poverty and excess demand for such facilities as education, health, transportation, water and other essential supplies. The Government is also facing difficulty in solving the
problems of scarcity of all kinds of resources for the proper maintenance and provision of even the basic amenities to the growing number. To solve the over urbanisation problem, the following solutions are proposed;

➢ Find out the ways and means to ease the present congestions of the major towns and cities,

➢ By formulating and implementing programmes of slum clearance, urban planning of creation of satellite towns and development of small and medium towns.

When most of the people are living in rural areas their main occupation is agriculture. Therefore urbanisation through rural development can prove to be a suitable measures to arrest and prevent further over-urbanisation.

There are two important causes for urbanisation in Kurnool district. Firstly, the rural population is migrating towards cities and towns; secondly the pull factor. Kurnool district continues to be predominantly rural, though the urban population increased substantially during the last Census. Due to poverty, most of the rural agricultural population is unable to use scientific methods in cultivations, so that the farmer is forced to move to urban areas to secure work opportunity. Therefore, the Government must take necessary steps to control the pushes and pulls. Further, sufficient steps to develop agriculture in all possible ways can go a long way in preventing the movement of people from villages to big cities and towns. Equally important is the extension of the communication and power facilities to the villages. (Extension of means of postal and communication) to reduce the communication gap between the villager and the urban
dweller. The communication gap disappears altogether in the case of high rate of literacy.

The most important problems of present urbanisation are numerous. To mention a few, they are as follows:

(i) Informal growth of urban poor and cities environs, slums and squatter settlements;
(ii) Unemployment and underemployment;
(iii) Inadequate expansion of educational facilities;
(iv) Public health and sanitation;
(v) Poor transport and communication systems;
(vi) Conservation of basic resources; and
(vii) Control of pollution and epidemic diseases etc.,;

The above problems can be solved through a proper policy of the Government. In the case of the policies, the Government of India has sponsored five year plans. Ever since the third five year plan, one of the stated objectives of planning has been to reduce the rate of urbanisation. The first five year plan policies laid emphasis on rehabilitation of refugees through a sound and country planning. The second five year plan laid emphasis on the expansion of housing facilities and the methods for planned urban development have been taken up the major issues.

The third five year plan provided for understanding the preparation of 72 master plans for all the major cities and the industrial centres and also for some of the rapidly growing areas.
The fourth five year plan emphasized on the need to prevent unrestricted growth of metropolitan cities and recommended regional approach to the problems of under development.

In the fifth five year plan the problem of urbanisation and urban development was directed to promote the development of smaller towns and new urban centres. The sixth five year plan recognized the problems of unregulated urbanisation and suggested various remedies to control the urbanisation.

The seventh five year plan emphasized the need for integrated development of small and medium towns, on the other side, to minimize the growth of metropolitan cities. In the eighth five year plan there was a shift and emphasis was laid on the significant development of small towns.

The ninth five year plan stressed in the new economic environment of liberalization and structural reforms in the urban sector. The present tenth five year plan has opened many avenues for the development of urban areas.

The urban development and urbanisation policy outlined so far by the Five Year Plans have the following principal objectives;

(i) To reverse the growth pattern so that the smallest towns grow rapidly and the largest ones either grow slowly or preferably stop growing;

(ii) To decongest the over-populated areas of large cities so as to create a more balanced and rational relationship between residential and work places, such as shops and schools; and
(iii) To see that small and medium towns and new cities develop in a way which ensures that the problems of the past are not repeated.

The following measures are proposed to be taken with a view to achieving these objectives:

- To prevent the growth of industries, large, small and big, and other employment-generating activities in cities over a certain maximum size;
- To enhance the rates charged for all infrastructural inputs and services in large cities and the resources so generated to be used for subsidizing these inputs in small and medium towns. They may be provided for offices, factories etc., which move to small cities or move from congested areas to permissible areas;
- To create inviolable green belts and green areas around all cities;
- To ensure a sharp reduction in FSI indices and impose limits on the construction of high rise buildings in large cities;
- To invest in the creation of infrastructure facilities and amenities in small and medium towns and make them available to all private and public parties at concessional rates, e.g., soft loans for industries, housing subsidies for schools, hospitals, colleges, cinemas, transport, telephone connections on demand, subsidized power and water tariffs;
- To improve and regularly clear slums and shanty towns;
- To formulate and implement well-planned urban development programmes, taking note of the need for parks, to minimize community distances and build proper sewage and transportation systems;
- To ban private cars from congested streets and augment public transportation systems; and
- To see that government offices, banks, financial institutions, public sector corporations give a lead in spearheading this decongestion movement.
SUGGESTIONS

In spite of the above policy the actual impact is very limited. Therefore the Government should come out first in clear terms in favour of a strict National urbanisation policy, which is closely linked with the population policy. It is mainly the rapid population growth responsible for this unregulated urban growth. A more realistic people oriented approach to urban policies and planning is needed to solve urbanisation problems.

In order to avoid the congestional and allied problems, the promotion of small towns is socially more desirable. The development of the small towns is very important for the rural development. This will help rural people to use the health and educational services. One can be involved in banking and other economic activities. The farmers in the concerned areas can concentrate on commercial crops, save on transport and even get financial resources from the urban entrepreneurs for such crops. The relation between rural and urban small towns can be so structured as to avoid environmental pollution. Indeed small towns, small producers and technologies favouring decentralization all go together to lay strong foundations of environmentally sustainable development.

There is an urgent need for an intensive study of the urban problems, especially in relation to the urban settlement patterns and growth in the different regions, identification of the factors behind these patterns of growth, institutional framework for the management of urban affairs, the source of revenue and the pattern of expenditure of the urban local bodies. The financial implications of urban development programmes are becoming increasingly unmanageable for the local bodies. A sound perspective of urban
development involving all the specialists, like architects, town planners, engineers, economists, bureaucrats, transport, health and medical specialists as well as sociologists is needed.

Indian urban planning bodies seldom give weightage to urban link with rural hinterland. Purely civic issues such as those relating to provision of safe drinking water, solid waste disposal, drainage, sanitation and roads tend to dominate the thinking while the role of an urban centre as a focal point for regional and rural development is often overlooked. Such policies turn out to be self defeating as they ignore the very process of urbanisation. For example a programme for beautifying a town and making all the necessary provisions for urban infrastructure for a target group of urban population is eventually negated by the larger than estimated influx of rural people. It is therefore highly plausible to see urban centre as a well crafted embroidery on a rural fabric.

It is also necessary to have a philosophy of urbanisation. It is high time to realise that the so called western urbanisation paths i.e., Industrialization $\rightarrow$ urbanisation $\rightarrow$ Modernisation, is not the best path for us. At the same time, we must clearly recognise the essential role of urbanisation in the process of economic development and social change in India. The growth of urban areas of our country are developed in the way of cultural centres $\rightarrow$ Administration centres $\rightarrow$ Economic centres: We have to design the urban development schemes and programmes according to the Indian urban style.

Rootless urbanisation is not suitable for India. Already big cities like Kolkata, Mumbai, Delhi and Chennai are overcrowded and congested. We should not overlook the perils associated with vast aggregations of population in a few cities. Urbanisation should be aimed at,
extensively and not intensively. India should have medium sized, open and airy towns and cantonments. Schemes should be evolved to develop semi-rural areas in full fledged urban cities, rather than intensifying the suburbs around big cities like Kolkata, Mumbai, Chennai and Delhi etc. Housing problems, transportation problems, sanitary and sewerage problems are posing a grave threat to humanity in these centers. Above all the problems of getting fresh water for living is increasing day by day. The policy should envisage urbanisation of rural areas for healthy living and ruralisation and de-population of the most congested urban areas with suitable plans and programmes.

Overcrowding in cities leads to several social and environmental problems. Homelessness and the subsequent sanitation, health, ecological hardships are a few of such consequences. The ecological hazards, no doubt, would be directly proportionate to this over crowding.

There is a direct relationship between urbanisation and small scale industries. The greater the degree of urbanisation the more is the growth of small scale industries. The small scale industries cannot grow in backward villages, where the basic infrastructural facilities are not available. The promotion of dispersed growth centres or small towns is essential for the growth and development of small scale industries. Towns and cities act as market centres for the surrounding villages.

The promotion of small scale and tiny industries, outside the urban centres to a certain extent, redirects the flow of rural-urban migration. Rural development programmes in view of this could be framed with the broad spectrum of decentralized planning. The ventures prominent in the urban informal sector could be given priority in the regional rural plans incorporating the potential of skilled and unskilled labourers. The rural-urban disparities
could be reduced with such a balanced approach of development planning coupled with infrastructure development.

In India, urbanisation did not take place in the real sense of the terms, rather big cities grow up at the expense of small cities and towns. The seat of administration and concentration of trade in big cities enabled them to grow faster and people from smaller towns migrated to big cities and towns because of higher wages and better marketing and financial facilities in them. Proper measures are required to develop market towns and small towns to facilitate an efficient marketing of agricultural produce and enable non-farm rural economy, to provide certain service facilities to encourage small scale industries, and to divert some of the migration and investment that would otherwise go to large cities.

Population growth in large cities, particularly in slum areas where the population growth rate is very high, should be checked with all available family welfare measures. Proper targets for each city should be planned, and the progress should be reviewed from time to time by the Urban development authorities.

The growth of slums has reached unimaginable proportions. Slum improvement and clearance should be undertaken with a determined plan and set targets. New areas should be picked up, and a proper rehabilitation plan should be undertaken. New areas should be selected to settle the families which have been cleared from the slums. Rehabilitation centres should be located in such a way so that suitable employment opportunities are available within a reasonable distance.

The growth of small towns should be encouraged by providing sufficient economic and social infrastructures. The tendency to
locate private and public offices in the congested capital city and other very large cities should be discouraged.

Massive rural employment programmes should be undertaken to prevent the flight of people from rural to urban areas. This can be done only through well planned rural development programmes, coordination between rural industrialization programmes, family welfare programmes and agricultural development programmes, should be worked out with a perspective plan to integrate rural hinterlands with small and medium towns.

To manage urban affairs and their programmes, policies and strategic plans are taken to appropriate political and techno-economic administrative institutions—both old and new—for promoting new concepts and leadership in unfamiliar areas. These institutions should be most adaptive to changing situations and receptive to new innovative ideas for promoting change and community’s welfare. But these institutions should have an access to and control over the resources required for managing urban development affairs. This necessitates political mandate and training for urban managers including the professionals involved in the planning and policy administration of urban affairs giving high priority to urban management in the developing countries of the world.

Since urban growth is outpacing investment in urban infrastructure and the investment decisions are outpacing the growth of planning and administrative skills, the task of urban development is posing horrendous problems for effective urban administration. The administration responsibilities for implementation of urban development programmes are generally divided among a wide variety of development agencies and functionaries. These agencies have their different perspectives, coverage, subject areas and process. Policy administration requires
constructive collaboration of different field agencies and people's participation in decision-making, which is a pre-requisite for effective action on human settlements. Peoples' participation is an important instrument of political processes of decision making, heightening their awareness in the complexity and interrelatedness of the problems by using their ingenuity and skills for mobilizing citizen's interest in the development process.

The development of growth poles has been widely recommended to prevent the expansion of industries in congested cities and develop new centres of attraction. The growth poles are cities, already existing or planned with the design to grow large enough to serve as "countermagnets". To continue economic explanation and population settlements in very large cities, growth pole cities may be suburban satellite towns within commuting distance of a major metropolis, or they may be developed in isolated regions where it is desired to establish a nucleus for an industrial complex.

The decentralisation of industries has been given priority and as an effective strategy for the attainment of a balanced regional development and for checking undue concentration and the resultant problems in large cities.

The construction and development of new towns has been advocated as an effective measure for the prevention of further concentration and congestion in large cities and metropolitan areas. Such new towns might help to check migration to large cities. It is also possible to relocate some of the activities of the over-crowded principal cities in satellite towns and thereby decongest the cities.
The experience of Indian urbanisation is something unique. The urbanisation in our country with a higher proportion of labour force in agriculture has led to the view that it is experiencing “over-urbanisation” or “hyper-urbanisation” or “urban-inflation”. So, for rapid urbanisation, it is inevitable for the policy makers to concentrate on rural development.

The explosive increase in population, gross inadequacy of infrastructural facilities and services, overcrowding and traffic jams, neighborhood degradation, expansion of slums and spontaneous settlements, insanitary backyards and public places, etc., is culminating in an urban crisis in India. Now there is a need to encourage private and foreign investment for the development of urban infrastructure.

The disastrous effects of water and air pollution are creating various problems in big cities. Whereas the Government has undertaken Eco-city Projects as a precautionary measure in big cities only. But it is better to implement Eco-city Projects in all the cities which have more than 50,000 population.

The ever increasing population in slum areas and the expansion of slums have become a great hindrance in the city administration. Voluntary Organisations along with the Government and Philanthropologists have to concentrate on this issue and efforts are required in a large scale.

The real estate business is spreading its tentacles and encroaching public assets, Wakf lands Endowment lands and Christian missionary properties. The civil administration has to create awareness among the people regarding the dubious techniques of real estate businessman.
The Municipal Corporation and District Registration Office has to lay strategies to check the malpractices of real estate businessmen. Public places should be notified clearly, so that they cannot be misused by these builders.

**Appartment Culture** in cities is a feather in the cap of housing sector where there is a dearth of land in cities. But they are beyond the reach of Middle Income group as the services are charged on commercial basis. In order to facilitate the M I G the government has to provide the services in a feasible manner.

In order to strengthen urbanisation, the Government has to take measures to safeguard **Monuments of historical importance** and develop Tourism, so that even small towns may also gain cultural importance.

The authorities of city administration have to check the development of townships in the nearby villages of the cities where the builders are not providing sufficient roads and also approach roads. In future this hinders the expansion of the city.