CHAPTER 6
PEOPLE’S PARTICIPATION IN URBAN PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

In modern democracies, people’s participation has become the basic tenet of good governance. According to “Doctrine of popular sovereign”, people, in a democratic set up, possess final authority and thereby have the right to participate in administration. This calls for a change from “Representative Democracy” to “Participatory Democracy” and hence provides for “bottom-up rule”. Further, New Public Management (NPM) also considers participation of people in administration as a technique to increase efficiency and effectiveness of government. The government’s role was seen as that of a change agent, a facilitator of people’s self development.

Furthermore, since late 1990’s the concept of ‘good governance’ has become the buzzword for development in developing countries and planning has been adopted as an instrument to promote this ideal. International agencies have emphasized different dimensions of the concept of good governance. The World Bank emphasis is mainly on administrative and managerialist interpretation of good governance, whereas UN agencies such as UNDP emphasized the significance of democratic principles and human and civil rights in the administrative process. UN Habitat’s Global Campaign on Urban Governance launched in 2000 advocated good urban governance worldwide and emphasized on enhancing the capabilities of local/ municipal governments/ other stakeholders. According to UN Habitat, 3 major strategies work towards establishing good governance i.e. decentralizing responsibilities and resources to local governments; encouraging the participation of civil society and using partnerships to achieve common objectives.¹

From the human development perspective, good governance refers to democratic governance. Democratic governance means that²

i. “People’s human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected, allowing them to live with dignity.

ii. People have a say in decisions that affect their lives.

iii. People can hold decision-makers accountable.

iv. Inclusive and fair rules, institutions and practices govern social interactions.

v. Women are equal partners with men in private and public spheres of life and decisions-making.

vi. People are free from discrimination based on race, ethnicity, class, gender or any other attributes.

vii. The needs of future generations are reflected in current policies.

viii. Economic and social policies are responsive to people’s needs and aspirations.

ix. Economic and social policies aim at eradication of poverty and expanding the choices that all people have in their lives”.

In simple words, democratic governance is not just limited to casting votes; it is also concerned with promotion of wider participation in institutions and formulation of rules that directly affect people’s lives. The first HDR, 1990 stated that “people are the real wealth of a nation.” This implies that people are not just the beneficiaries of economic and social progress. However, they are also the “agents” who contribute towards the progress of all aspects of development. In a democratic set-up, people’s participation is considered the third pillar of the 21st century human development strategy. It has been of paramount significance for dealing with issues pertaining to human development such as protection of environment, promotion of gender equality, fostering of human rights and so on. It must be noted that both participation and human development mutually reinforce one another.

People’s participation, worldwide, has been accepted as the major driver of economic and social change as is evident from the developments that have taken place over the past decades. During the UN declared Second Development Decade (1970-1980) a new approach had emerged i.e. “the unified approach” to development. The approach emphasized participative development along with the integration of economic and social components. Its major objectives were to seek involvement of people in


later years, the efforts of various commissions and conferences provided the much needed support to the concept of participatory governance:

1. The Dag Hammarskjold Foundation concept of *Another Development* (1975) took into account the role of a country’s self direction. In other words, “endogenous and self-reliant growth” held the key to ‘another development’. Later, UNESCO’s concept of endogenous development soon won acceptance.

2. The Conference on Employment, Income Distribution and Social Progress organized by the ILO in 1976 offered another perspective i.e. *Basic Needs Approach* which had the merit of having universal applicability while being, at the same time, country specific.

3. The South Commission 1990 succinctly stated that “the base for a nation’s development must be its own resources, both human and material, fully used to meet its own needs.....development has therefore to be an effort of, by and for the people. True development has to be people-centered.”

4. In the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) held at Rio de Janeiro in 1992, 150 nations endorsed Agenda 21 which emphasized the importance of participation and cooperation of local authorities.

5. The World Development Report, 1992 focused on globalization and localization, and saw localization as revitalizing the local realm by raising levels of participation and involvement and providing people with a greater ability to shape their own lives. All this can result in more responsive and efficient local government.

6. The City Summit 1996, the General Assembly of the UN, officially recognized the vitality of local politics and the importance of local variations in the era of globalization.

7. The World Development Report, 2000 stated that 50 years of the development experiment had clearly indicated that growth does not trickle down and a more comprehensive approach to development is needed and development should be sustainable and be rooted in processes that are socially inclusive and responsive to changing circumstances. The Report recognized the importance of the ‘local’
for raising levels of participation and providing people with greater ability to shape the context of their lives.”

It is evident that the continuum of interaction between citizens and administration has undergone a change at the global level. Vigoda Earn refers to this change as one “from coercion to collaboration and partnerships, where the role of the citizens has culminated from being the subjects, to voters, to clients/customers and to partners.” The consequent change in the politico-administrative set-up, in terms of attitudes and structures, calls for collaborative endeavors between public, private and voluntary sectors. Here, the government should provide an enabling policy environment and communities should develop the people’s self-help capabilities and build networks for undertaking development projects.

The chapter, therefore, seeks to examine the nature and extent of peoples’ participation in urban plan formulation and implementation. The factors influencing the adoption of participatory approaches in administration of urban planning have also been studied. The chapter hypothesized that:

I. The peoples’ participation in urban planning and administration has been limited in nature in SAS Nagar.
   a. NGOs play a passive role in administration of urban planning processes in SAS Nagar.
   b. There has been limited scope for public private partnership in urban planning processes in SAS Nagar.
   c. Media does not play a participatory role in SAS Nagar.

II. There are several administrative obstacles in institutionalization of peoples’ participation in urban planning and administration in SAS Nagar.

Both primary and secondary data was utilized. Primary data was collected mainly through interviews schedules (Annexure VIII and IX). For this purpose, interviews were conducted with members of NGOs, private builders and developers and newspaper journalists covering urban issues in the city. The officials of GMADA
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and TCP were also interviewed to gauge their perception with respect to socially inclusive urban planning.

6.2 MEANING OF PEOPLE’S PARTICIPATION

There has been no unanimous definition of people’s participation, since it means different things to different people. People’s participation “means a kind of local autonomy in which people discover the possibilities of exercising choice and thereby, becoming capable of managing their own development.” According to UNESCO, participation is “collective sustained activity for the purpose of achieving some common objectives, especially a more equitable distribution of the benefits of development.” Further, participation is an interactive and co-operative process of analyzing, planning and decision-making in which all relevant groups and organizations i.e. stakeholders, take part. It is a process “...which allows all participants to formulate their interests and objectives in a dialogue, which leads to decisions and activities in harmony with each other, whereby the aims and interests of other participating groups are taken into account as far as possible.”

Emrich put forth six axioms to define participation. “Firstly, participation must begin at the very lowest level. There must be real opportunities for participative decision-making for the poorest, and those decisions must relate to the aspirations of the poor more than to the wispy musings of those who will not identify with them. Secondly, participation must take place at all stages of the development process, from the earliest pre-planning exercises, to the development of plans, the design of implementing mechanism and the actual implementation. Thirdly, it must be recognized that a solitary vote is not participation. If people do not participate as members of relatively powerful groups, which serve their interests, then they participate only for the benefits of their masters. Fourthly, participation must have sustenance and usually political clubs and cooperatives do not have sustenance. ‘Participative processes’ must

deal with the allocation and control of goods and services related to the production process. *Fifthly*, participation must somehow deal with existing loyalties. If the result is merely to strengthen existing inter-class groupings it will just strengthen existing leadership. *Sixthly*, it must be accepted that the development of effective participation will cause conflict in some form.\(^{10}\)

Thus, it is obvious that peoples' participation is not just confined to securing participation in the implementation of development projects and programmes. The concept has evolved over a period and, broadly, embraces the following characteristics:

- Consultation, Involvement and Empowerment of people
- Partnership with the government and its agencies in development process
- Control and management of resources
- Equitable involvement of every individual irrespective of gender
- Attainment of skills and capacity building of community
- Greater accessibility of services
- Cost sharing and resource mobilization
- Reliance on local knowledge for achieving sustainable development.

Thus, participation of people has been insinuated in decision making, design formulation, implementation, evaluation and monitoring of various development projects and programmes. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), “people’s participation is not just the process of involvement of people in project activities but rather it is the process by which people are able to organize themselves and are able to identify their own needs, share in design, implementation and evaluation in participatory action.”

6.2.1 Conditions for Successful Peoples’ Participation\(^{11}\)

Peoples’ participation is recognized as the key component in the socio-economic development of the nation. The institutions and techniques of peoples’ participation are the manifestation of democracy at the grass root levels. However, the success of peoples’ participation largely depends upon certain conditions:

i. “Committed city leadership, both political and bureaucratic.

ii. A conducive national policy and legislative framework, with support from higher levels of government.

\(^{10}\) S. Narayanasamy, op.cit, p.47
\(^{11}\) UN-Habitat, op.cit, p.109
iii. Suitable political arrangements at the city or metropolitan level to ensure coordination and accountability, complemented by provision for direct and indirect participation.

iv. Participation that is broad and inclusive involving all relevant stakeholders, especially disadvantaged groups with multiple channels for participation to involve all social groups at various levels of government.

v. Timeliness – opportunities for participation that can influence decision-making.

vi. A high likelihood of outputs being adopted through prioritization and sequencing of action.

vii. Open, fair and accountable processes, which are comprehensible, transparent and based on clear ground rules.

viii. Skilled, independent and flexible facilitation by planners to be built through professional education, continuing professional development and peer exchanges.

ix. A distinction between short- and long-term objectives, with rapid progress on selected short-term actions to build legitimacy and sustain commitment, and proposals linked to investment plans and a financing strategy.

x. A willingness to strive for consensus, backed up by conflict resolution techniques and sound political decision-making.

xi. Support for and collaboration with civil society and community organizations and learning from their proven methods for organizing and empowering the poor.

xii. Tools appropriate to the form and purpose of the participatory process.

xiii. Monitoring and evaluation processes to track progress and outcomes and learn from experience, including mechanisms for citizen involvement in supervising implementation.

xiv. Provision of long-term support to cities by their associations, national governments, bilateral donors or international agencies, and promotion of knowledge sharing between them.

xv. Closer links in legislation and practice between multi sectoral urban planning and management and land-use planning so that promising participatory approaches can benefit land-use plan preparation and planning decisions.”
Hence, to nurture peoples’ participation, there is need to create requisite legal, political, social and economic environment. Such participatory approaches and techniques should be evolved that facilitate greater participation of people in administrative processes.

### 6.2.2 Modes of People’s Participation

The conditions listed in the previous section are essential for creation of requisite environment for people’s participation. At the same time, it is imperative to identify the modes for securing people’s participation. A Philippine study identified six modes of participation, varying participants and levels of participation, moving towards more meaningful participation in higher modes:

i. “The first mode involved only the educated and moneyed people in the community without the participation of the ‘grassroots’ or the beneficiaries.

ii. The second mode is one in which the people or beneficiaries are asked to legitimize or ratify projects identified as formulated by the government.

iii. The third mode provides that the people are consulted about the project but they do not actually participate in the planning and management of project.

iv. The fourth mode, the people are consulted from the very start and they actively participate in the planning and management of projects.

v. The fifth mode, the people or the beneficiaries are represented in the highest policy making body of the agency.

vi. The sixth mode, the representatives of the people control the highest policy making body of the agency.”

Of these six modes of participation, the latter three are more democratic and representative in nature. These modes provides for wider participation of people in the decision-making process. On the contrary, the former three modes of participation seem to seek token involvement of people. Nevertheless, the various modes of people’s participation are adopted depending upon the nature of the politico-administrative system in place.
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12 S. Narayanasamy, loc.cit
6.2.3 Dimensions of Peoples' Participation

The various modes of participation define the varieties of participation in modern governance. The institutionalization of participation, therefore, depend on three important dimensions of participation i.e. (i) who should participate; (ii) how participants communicate and make decisions and (iii) what is the impact of public participation. These dimensions define the framework of participation in institutional design.

a) Selection of Participants: For enhanced citizens' participation, there is need to identify the eligible participants. The participation selection methods range from more exclusive to more inclusive participation. The various actors includes (i) Expert Administrators i.e. staff of public bureaucracies; (ii) Elected Representatives i.e. elected politicians and local representatives; (iii) Professional Stakeholders i.e. paid representatives of organized interest groups and public officials; (iv) Lay Stakeholders i.e. unpaid citizens who have deep interest in public concerns for example association boards; (v) Random selection i.e. randomly selected participants to discuss public issues; (vi) Open-Targeted Recruiting i.e. participants are selected from a particular sub-groups such as senior citizens; (vii) Open Self-Selection i.e. those participants who have special interests and wish to participate and (viii) Diffuse Public Space i.e. it includes large public spaces such as mass media, secondary associations and informal discussions. Of the eight modes selection of participants, first four methods are more exclusive, while the second four methods allows greater participation of people in administrative activities.

b) Modes of Communication and Decision-making: The second dimension of participation defines how participants should communicate and make decisions in a participatory setting. There are mainly six modes of communication and decision that varies from less intensive to more intensive. These include (i) Information seeking i.e. participants seek information about some policy or project. They do not put forward their own views; (ii) Express Preference i.e. participants only express their preference to the concerned officials; (iii) Develop Preferences i.e. participants in a organized forms indulge in
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discussions to explore, develop and transform their views and opinion into alternatives addressing specific issues; (iv) *Aggregation & Bargaining* i.e. participants aggregate their preferences and jointly bargain with officials to find the best available alternatives; (v) *Deliberations & Negotiations* i.e. participants deliberate and negotiate with each other to develop their individual views and opinions in an group context; (vi) *Deploy Technical Expertise* i.e. policy decisions not only rely on community deliberations rather it also requires professional specialization to solve specific issues. It consists of planners, social worker, teachers, regulators and so on. Of the six modes, first three are communication modes and second three are decision making modes, advancing from lower to higher intensity.

c) **Extent of Authority and Power:** The third dimension emphasizes the impact of citizens’ participation on administrative processes. The community influence is arrayed systematically from least authority to most authority, where authority denotes influence of participants on the administrative activities. This includes (i) *Personal Benefits* i.e. participants aim to seek personal benefit in place of exercising influence on public policy and action; (ii) *Communicative influence* i.e. it exerts indirect influence on the officials by mobilizing public opinion. Decisions and actions of the government is the result of public influence; (iii) *Advice & Consultation* i.e. officials commit themselves to seek advice and consult the common masses while preserving their power and discretion; (iv) *Co-governing partnerships* i.e. officials and community members jointly make plans and policies and develop strategies for implementation; (v) *Direct Authority* i.e. participants posses direct authority to take public decisions and exercise control over local resources. In some cities of United State, for example, neighborhood councils control substantial zoning authority. Hence, citizens’ posses least authority in first three participatory modes, while in second two they exercise substantial control over public decision-making.

The three dimension of participation are, therefore, essential for understanding the potential and limits of participatory forms in administrative processes and activities.
6.2.4 Peoples’ Participation in India

In India till the Seventh Five Year Plan, the most important missing dimension of India’s planned development were the elements of peoples’ participation and urban development. The report of National Commission on Urbanization (1988) was the eye opener; it highlighted the plight of urban areas and the merits of peoples’ participation. The Commission stated that, “the increased centralized decision-making power in this country tends to pre-empt initiatives and formulated generalized responses – as opposed to local and indigenous ones. It is encouraging to record the proliferation, over the decades, of citizen’s associations and action-oriented groups, addressing a wide variety of urban issues, ranging from the pollution of our environment and the rights of squatter colonies to the preservation of our built heritage. These represented the beginning of a new relationship between citizens and government”1. It was in the backdrop of this report that the Eighth Five Year Plan (1992-97), for the first time, realized the significance and role of urban sector as well as peoples’ participation in the nation’s development.

The focus of the Eighth Plan (1992-97) was qualitatively different from the earlier plans. The main concern of the Plan was “human development” and thereby it promoted inclusive urban governance. It called for re-orientation of government’s role in development and identified people's participation as the core component for accomplishment of development goals. It stressed that the government, as a facilitator, should create conducive environment and institutional infrastructure that mobilizes peoples’ initiative rather than considering them as objects or recipient of government policies and programmes. The plan document advocated legitimizing the role of NGOs and CBOs since the involvement of beneficiaries could be expected to be easily achieved through the organization of beneficiaries. Further, these organizations would help in effective utilization of development outlays which had declined over the years. Thus, the theme of people-centered development became more apparent and vital from the Eighth Plan onwards15.

Likewise, the Ninth Plan (1997-2002) too stepped on the footprints of the Eighth Plan. It clearly stated “people-oriented planning” as it foremost objective. It

stated that the Plan was “...ushering in a new era of people oriented participative planning, in which people at large and especially poor can participate.” To fulfill this objective, it called for social mobilization of resources and providing assistance in capacity building of people-oriented organizations.\textsuperscript{16}

Further, the Tenth Plan (2002-07) while stressing the increased peoples’ participation called for strengthening of institutions of democratic decentralization i.e. urban local bodies. It enunciated that resolution of urban management issues revolve around the consolidation of these democratic institutions. In this sphere, they should be assisted by state governments and urban development authorities, who, for a long time, have been dominating the functional domain of urban local bodies.\textsuperscript{17}

The Eleventh Plan (2007-2012) emphasized improving the efficiency of government funded programmes. The Plan envisaged that evaluation of effectiveness of these programmes could be enhanced “by involving communities in both the design and implementation of such programmes, although such involvement may vary from sector to sector.” It stated that Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) can work with PRIs to improve the effectiveness of these programmes. Such participation in programme design would give more flexibility in decision making at the local level.\textsuperscript{18}

The Twelfth Plan (2012-17) considered that civil society could play a crucial role in strengthening of local institutions and in bringing innovation into government programmes. It emphasized evolving partnership between civil society and government in design of development programmes. The Plan advocated that “Government must strongly encourage partnerships with civil society including not only NGOs, but also academic institutions, professional associations and universities. The precise institutional arrangements could vary, depending on the requirement and context.” The partnerships could be either in sourcing or out-sourcing types of relationships for achieving greater synchronization between the State and civil society.\textsuperscript{19}

The report on Indian Urban Infrastructure and Services (2011) recognized the significance of citizen participation in urban governance. It stated that “citizen participation needs to be strengthened to create ‘citizen owned, citizen paid, and citizen

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{17} Government of India, \textit{Tenth Five Year Plan (2002-07). Planning Commission, New Delhi.}
\textsuperscript{19} Government of India, \textit{An Approach to the Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012-17). Planning Commission, New Delhi.}
\end{flushleft}
managed’ cities.” The Public Disclosure Law and Community Participation Law are important tools for enhancing transparency and accountability in governance. It considered establishment of Ward Committees & Area Committees, enactment of the Model Community Participation Law and the Nagara Raj Bill 2006 under Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) reforms very crucial for augmentation of community participation in urban governance.20

The Second Administrative Reforms Commission (2005) advocated involvement citizens’ groups and professional organizations in regulation activities; stating that, “the burden of the enforcement machinery can be shared by associating citizens’ groups as well as professional organizations to certify compliance and report violations of the regulations to the concerned authorities.” The Commission cited the example of Delhi where the procedure for grant of building permissions has been simplified and the registered architects have been authorized to certify the building plans of houses. This, in turn, has helped in reducing the work of the civic agencies and has reduced corruption as well.21

Hence, it is evident that in India, the concept of democratic decentralization i.e. the peoples’ centered approaches have gained legitimacy only after 1991. The Eighth plan became the harbinger of people-centered development, urban governance and urban development. The missing ‘urban dimension’, therefore, received the desired attention; subsequent five year plans further consolidated the concept of democratic decentralization in India.

6.3 PEOPLES’ PARTICIPATION AND URBAN PLANNING

“Modern urban planning is like a bicycle, one wheel (government) powers the bicycle while the other (civil society) largely steers”.22 This implies that the people’s participation in urban planning and administration facilitates incorporation of peoples’ aspirations and requirements in city development plans. This enables the creation of
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peoples' friendly cities. Hence, in current times, it is imperative to recognize the role of people's participation in urban plan formulation and implementation.

Generally, urban planning has been concerned with buildings and physical environment i.e. land use, locations and design of buildings, streets, other transportation facilities, utility lines and open spaces. However, planners, usually, ignored the social structures, institutions, cultures and sub-cultures, socio-economic classes, age-groups and political blocs that constituted the social fiber of community. They failed to consider that people's lives are largely affected by social and economic environment in which that physical environment is used. In this context, Weber rightly said, “I contend that we have been searching for the wrong grails that values associated with the desired urban structure do not reside in the spatial structure. One pattern of settlement and its associated land use form is superior to another as it serves to accommodate ongoing social processes and to further the non-spatial ends of the political communities.” It was found that these social processes and non-spatial ends are determined by peoples' income, education and occupation and by their ethnic, religious and political allegiances. Further, these characteristics guide peoples' behavior, goals and their problems and influence social, economic and political environment in which they live.

Several evidences have highlighted that physical planning does not play any significant role in peoples' lives. In the nineteenth century, the Protestant Americans began city planning as a reform movement. They aimed at emancipating the poor living conditions of Non-Protestants European migrants. The reformers upheld the “facility centered theory of social change.” They believed that if the poor would be provided properly designed facilities, they would leave the slums and would also mend their ways of living. However, they failed to achieve their objective; mainly because of the failure to understand that community facilities would only be accepted if they are part of social environment and are accepted by the masses i.e. they overlooked the social and economic dimensions of people lives.

Hence, the importance of peoples' participation in urban planning is undeniable. It can be attributed to two main reasons: Firstly, in a heterogeneous urban-industrial society, diverse living cultures prevail. Secondly, varying educational and income level of people determine the aspirations and perceptions of people. Thus,
planners should work closely with sociologists, psychologists and behavioral scientists along with the people to gauge their needs, problems and opinions. In simple words, the planner should plan with the people rather than just planning for them.²³

Further, with the emergence of liberal democracies during the 1960s, the emphasis of urban development literature has shifted towards development of participatory approaches in urban planning and administration. Apparently, there has been a shift from the technocratic approach to the democratic approach of urban planning. Participation in urban planning began to be considered instrumental in empowering communities and building social capital; to design better urban projects and to allow incorporation of people’s concerns within planning strategies. It was only since 1970’s that non-governmental and international development agencies began promoting adoption of participatory approaches for streamlining the goals and outcomes of urban planning to fulfill the aspirations of the neighborhood.

Hence, planning no longer is the exclusive domain of technical experts. Today, planners, along with plan preparation, need to determine who should be involved, how they should be involved, what function citizens should serve, and how to adapt a planning method to a process involving a wide range of interests and groups. Hence, in a democratic set-up, peoples’ participation flayed the treatment of people as “objects” of development and advocated that they should be considered as “subjects” who have their say in designing strategies for improving their lives.

However, the success of participation depends upon certain pre-conditions related to the political context. Since participation involves power-sharing, forging participatory approaches in administrative systems and procedures would lead to power imbalances. This is so because participation is based on democratic theory that provides education in democratic practices fosters sense of affiliation, leads to acceptance of collective decisions, encourages bureaucratic responsiveness and accountability and brings collective knowledge and new ideas to bear on decision-making. Thus, a political system that supports and recognizes the aforesaid characteristics of participation and partnerships between government and other actors of development is

a pre-requisite. Citizen participation in urban planning, generally, possess following features:

i. "It occurs at different levels, including local, city-wide and supra-city levels.

ii. It could be initiated by different actors, including government agencies, elected politicians, communities and other actors.

iii. It occurs at different stages in the planning process, including identification of needs, preparation of plans or formulation of policies, implementation and evaluation.

iv. It relates to a variety of planning and decision-making processes, including the formulation of a broad vision, policy or plan-making, proposals for particular activities or areas, and periodic resource allocation through budgeting processes.

v. It varies depending upon stakeholders' capacities (e.g. time, resources, awareness of rights and opportunities to participate) and identity. This is especially so with regards to gender." 24

A sustainable urban planning process, therefore, is a methodological process, structured over distinct sequential stages; resulting in development of a continuous, interactive, integrated and participative planning process. Public Participation, to a great extent, encourage an innovative process that would guarantee an efficient sustainable urban planning and would promote a sustainable new way of living in community. The methodology for sustainable urban planning process consisted of four sequential stages i.e. (i) intervention aims definitions; (ii) reference situation analysis; (iii) plan design and (iv) implementation (Figure 6.1). These stages have been developed sequentially and depended on each other. The next stage begins only after the evaluation/validation of the previous one. For the purpose of evaluation/validation, it has been imperative to involve people for providing accurate knowledge of the area and about their explicit needs to decision makers.
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The figure, therefore, clearly shows that public participation could be sought at all stages of plan development, either by seeking information through surveys & public forums or by creating plan monitoring commissions. Such formal means of participation, largely, intended to assess needs and expectation of population, to show progress of work and to gather information about the adaptability of an urban plan to the pre-defined priorities. Furthermore, participation during evaluation/validation phases, at all stages, generate feedback that could result in plan reformulation, incorporation of people’s expectations, increase in efficiency, prevention of occurrence of potential conflicts, faster acceptance of new ideas for urban structure and systematic plan execution.  

6.3.1 Forms of Participatory Urban Planning²⁶

Participatory urban planning calls for knowledge sharing and collective dialogue between the people and the concerned administrative agencies to yield desirable outcomes. The participation of people, therefore, exists in different types. This typology, however, presents a continuum of development of forms of participation from ‘weak’ to ‘strong’. Table 6.1 illustrates the form, purpose, meaning and potential approach of citizen participation in different types of participation.

Table 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Meaning of Participation to Implementing Agencies</th>
<th>Potential Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Display, manipulation</td>
<td>Legitimization to show that it is doing something; pre-empt opposition</td>
<td>Token representation on decision-making bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>Assembling useful information</td>
<td>Better informed decision-making with no loss of control</td>
<td>Information collection through systematic data collection, consultative processes, responses to proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>A means of increasing efficiency and stretching</td>
<td>Efficiency to draw on beneficiaries resources, increase cost effectiveness and</td>
<td>Contribution to costs (money, labour etc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁶ Ibid p.94
external resources further improve the prospects of successful operation and maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>To give people a say in decision making through the political system or specific channels</th>
<th>Sustainability; established systems are used for the expression of voice, improving responsiveness &amp; ensuring accountability; provides a means of organizing &amp; aggregating different views</th>
<th>Representative electoral political system (national &amp; local government; decision making and advisory bodies at city or local level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformative</td>
<td>Both a means and an end</td>
<td>Partnership with non-governmental actors; collaborative decision-making &amp; implementation</td>
<td>Governance arrangements that involve partnerships or ‘contract’ between government &amp; citizen groups; devolution of powers, responsibilities &amp; resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Modified from UN-Habitat Report, 2009

Table clearly shows that the nominal form of participation is the weakest type of participation i.e. a tokenistic approach to participation, while transformative form of participation is the strongest form i.e. citizen exercise control over decision-making. Hence, it is evident that potential approaches to participation of people would advance from tokenistic approach of peoples’ participation to formulation of partnerships & contracts and devolution of powers & responsibilities.

6.3.2 Global trends in urban planning and participation

The extent to which people’s participation approaches have replaced or complemented the technocratic approach to urban planning largely varies across the world. The idea of master planning has been subject to major critique in the planning literature and in some parts of the world it has been replaced by processes and plans that are more participatory, flexible, strategic and action-oriented. However in many regions and particularly in developing nations, the early 20th century idea of master planning and land use zoning has persisted till date. In many parts of the world, citizens are still excluded from the planning process or informed only after planning decisions
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27 UN-Habitat, op.cit, pp. 95-100.
have been made. The existence of such variations among countries/regions could be attributed to the factors discussed below:

i. Political System: Every country possesses unique political systems and environment that directly influences the participatory approaches and practices. The nature and form of participatory planning depends largely on the political context in which it is operating. An enabling political environment is therefore essential as it determines:
   a) Motives of the elected representative at the city-level.
   b) The scope of involvement of stakeholders in planning processes (i.e. formulation and implementation).
   c) The process of allocation of resources among various stakeholders.
   d) The process of participation i.e. whether the government or external actors such as NGOs, donors and citizen organizations would initiate participation.

ii. Legal and Regulatory Framework: A decent legal base provides legitimacy to the participatory aspects of planning. The local governance and planning legislations (i) provides for local political arrangement i.e. what kind of representatives bodies should be there such as advisory bodies and (ii) provides for the participatory processes i.e. whether the outcomes of deliberations would be taken into account or not during plan-making. These legislations also define the role of government in regulation of land-use and development.

iii. Historical Evolution of Urban Planning: The historical background of planning processes determines the nature, scope and purpose of participation in planning practices.

iv. Allocation of Responsibility: The extent of participation depends on the allocation of responsibilities among various levels of government, local government and other agencies for planning, implementation and regulation of urban plans. These responsibilities determine the scope of cooperation and partnerships, the levels at which planning and decision-making would take place and the accountability of various actors to resources.

v. Government Capacity: The government should possess appropriate skill to prepare and implement plans so as to respond to locally articulated needs and
priorities. Thus, the government with adequate manpower and skill would, especially at local level, support participatory approaches to planning.

vi. Citizen Awareness: The awareness of citizens with respect to their entitlement to political representation, their capacity to organize, identify their need and articulate their priorities provide much required momentum to people’s participation in planning processes.

The nature and form of participatory planning, therefore, depend heavily on these factors. The following discussion about the form and techniques of participatory planning in different regions and countries across the globe would illustrate the contribution of the aforesaid factors.

A. Developed Countries

Developed countries adopted formal procedures that allowed public participation in urban planning decisions since a long time. Though these countries invariably established representative democratic political systems; the distribution of planning powers and responsibilities varies among different levels of government. The power to make planning decisions typically lies with local elected politicians while approval of plans and decisions on major or contentious planning proposals are reserved with central governments. Elected representatives are responsible to take the views of their constituents into account and to balance conflicting interests. However, the formal procedures permit right to object or appeal against proposals or development decisions and public hearing prior to plan approval in these countries. The following discussion illustrates the nature and scope of peoples’ participation in urban planning in some developed countries.

In France, zoning approaches to planning are associated with civil law systems thereby providing scope for participation in plan preparation. However, the decisions pertaining to applications seeking development permission in compliance with zoning provisions are taken by concerned administrative departments.

In United Kingdom, participatory approaches to development control have been associated to common law systems. Thus, there is a scope for participation in both plan preparation and development regulations. The plans
are guidance documents which constitutes only one of the factors taken into account in decisions.

In United States of America, participation has been mandated in urban renewal programmes, since 1960’s. However, the accentuation is mainly on improving communication rather than power sharing.

In transitional countries of Europe, the nature of citizen participation in urban planning has assumed different dimensions. For example: in Yugoslavia, though some public participation has been a legal requirement. However, urban plans are generally prepared by the political elites, who are being considered as representatives of citizen’s interests. Hence, it is clear that public participation has been a mere formality. This is mainly in form of public hearings that are mostly attended by technocratic elites and also in form of ceremonial exhibitions, where master plans are being displayed for the general public.

Like Western European nations, provisions for participation have been included in newly introduced constitutional provisions as well as spatial planning laws by many transitional countries since 1989. More often such participation occurs in environmental planning such as in Czech Republic where NGO’s have promoted active participation in environmental planning hearings. However, such attempts are more commonly tokenistic. In practice, planners and technocrats offer technical solutions to urban problems. The master planning approach for creating ideal cities is followed. This, however, has failed to generate greater citizen’s interest in local plan proposals or specific construction projects.

The communist countries notably Russia have resorted to new form of participation. Though it has opted for market economy, however, strong centralized government co-exists. Thus, civil society participation has been permitted only by means of government approved non-profit organizations. These organizations are easier to interact with and are perceived to be less threatening.

Thus, irrespective of variety of tools and techniques of participation, it has been found that securing wide participation is quite onerous. The elected politicians and planners do not support participatory approaches. The former is
threatened with respect to their own role as elected representatives who then become responsible for striking a balance between interests and priorities. While the latter remain aggrieved on account of the process of participatory decision-making being slow and time consuming and also contributes to increasing the costs of planning. Also, some social groups such as women, youth, ethnic minorities and so on remain underrepresented. Therefore, extensive and radical participation in urban planning and decision-making remains a distant dream. Table 6.2 depicts the status of peoples’ participation in developed countries.

Table 6.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Challeges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Requisite provisions in constitution and spatial planning laws have legitimized peoples’ participation in urban plan preparation and development regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Different political ideologies determine the scope of peoples’ participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication rather than power sharing has been the focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technocratic approach to urban planning overrides participatory approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learnt</td>
<td>Legal support has laid the strong foundation for securing and encouraging peoples’ participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of participatory approaches fosters greater sensitivity to human needs and aspirations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

The nature and scope of public participation in urban planning in Sub-Saharan Africa has been a colonial legacy. In these inherited colonial legislations final authority is generally vested with the government, while public surveys and hearings on draft plans would be conducted to collect opinion of the people. In the post-independence era, government has rarely made efforts to revise these colonial urban planning legislations and technocratic blueprints approach continues to persist. Further, the shift from authoritarian to democratic
rule destabilizes the government structures thereby restricting the consolidation of participatory planning processes. Till the later part of the 1970s and early 1980, planning was considered as an activity undertaken only by the public sector; citizens were taken not to understand the process.

However since 1980s, due to failure of government agencies to implement urban development plans and to provide basic urban services, serious attempts have been made to revise urban planning legislations. The aim was to adopt more flexible, realistic and participatory approaches to urban planning. Such attempts were facilitated by external agencies through various programmes such as Sustainable Cities Programmes, the Urban Management Programmes, the Municipal Development Partnership and the City Development Strategies approach. Furthermore, the Structural Adjustment Programme in 1980 has led to the formation of various types of community based organizations (CBO’s) in western African countries such as Mali, Senegal and Burkina Faso. Such CBO’s fought for increased participation in urban management.

According to the report of United Nations Centre for Human Settlement, 1995\(^\text{28}\) since urban planning began to democratize from 1980’s onwards, community or popular participation in the process gained currency and momentum. Thereby wide variety of participants/ actors including the government (central, state/regional and local levels), community and neighborhood associations as well as other civil society stakeholders and interest groups came to the forefront. Broadly, these actors could be categorized as: “a) Those whose interests are affected by urban planning processes – such as households, businesses, community or neighborhood associations, and land-holding/owning interest groups etc. Community or popular participation has come about in a variety of ways, mostly at the local level through demands for recognition of illegal housing areas by local political parties as in Tanzania and Zambia, for example. However, community or popular participation at a more city-wide level has been very much limited. b) Those who control relevant

implementation interests – namely, politicians, planners, major investors and implementation agencies are drawn from a wide variety of governmental, parastatal and private sector organizations etc. c) Those who possess relevant information and expertise needed for dealing with the wide spectrum of issues to be addressed and the variety of instruments to be applied – such as Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), business organizations, academicians and other experts. The increasing concerns with sustainable urban development require both the investment of a wider variety of professional skills and new forms of institutional coordination mechanisms.”

Furthermore, with the introduction of the concepts of democratization and decentralization during the 1990’s, the scope for public participation has increased considerably. In Francophone West Africa, the public participation in plan preparation has been facilitated through public hearings. Such public hearings lasts for two months and all observations and objections to draft master or sub division plans are being recorded. However, the government promotes only the organized participation whereas individual participation has been absent. Also, the final decision making authority has been vested with the government.

It has, therefore, been observed that more realistic opportunities for participation is being provided by large scale projects mainly funded by international agencies. This is evident form a recent large scale project of Dalifort in Dakar. Here, three structures for participation were established: “Firstly, an advisory committee comprising of area representatives, important people and religious leaders; Secondly, sectoral technical committees (i.e. women, health, environment etc) and Lastly, a local business initiative involving all plot owners”. Besides this, initiatives were undertaken to upgrade the capacity of local planning offices to work with the resident and identify their needs and develop appropriate solutions, using participatory diagnosis and planning tools. Paradoxically, the participatory approaches advocated by these agencies are more often than not being adopted by the recipient States on large scale.
In totality, the Sub-Saharan Africa lacks any serious effort to encourage and involve citizens in decision-making. Table 6.3 summarizes the success, challenges and the lesson drawn from the participatory approaches in Africa.

**Table 6.3**

*Peoples’ Participation in Sub-Saharan Africa*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evolution of participatory approaches in urban planning in post colonialism</td>
<td>Colonial urban planning legislations promotes centralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up gradation of urban planning administration by revising colonial urban planning legislations</td>
<td>Weak institutional base for urban planning administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited revenue base of local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate technical and administrative skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient administrative autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak civil society organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technocratic approach to urban planning overrides participatory approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learnt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timely regulatory audit is essential for incorporation of relevant provisions in urban planning legislations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate democratization and decentralization would enhanced the capacity of local planning offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External professional agencies, through various programmes, could facilitate espousal of participatory approaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. ASIA**

In *Southern Asia*, the democratic local government in urban areas has not gained strong foothold. The countries of the region have shown patchy trends towards democratic decentralization since 1990’s. The institutions of local government could not emerge as grass-root democracies because of excessive state control, inadequate autonomy and limited capacity and availability of resources with them. Further, urban planning legislations generally do not contain adequate provisions for ensuring participation in plan preparation. The conventional master
planning techniques, despite their inherent shortcomings, are followed by the planners. The progress with democratic decentralization has been very limited in countries such as Pakistan, Nepal and Bangladesh.

**In India** progress with regard to participatory urban planning has been significant. For the institutionalization of the concept of democratic decentralization, the 74th Constitutional Amendment Act was enacted in 1992. The basic aim of the Act has been to enhance citizen participation and responsiveness & accountability of the government, mainly at local levels. In 2005, under Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission provisions have been made to build up participatory approach in urban planning through the preparation of city development plans. The State of Kerala has set an example in this direction. It launched a People’s Campaign for Decentralized Planning in 1996. The basic aim was to strengthen democratic decentralization by identifying local needs and establishing local development options and priorities through local consultations and participation. The participation structure for decentralized planning for the annual planning and budgeting involved four stages:

- “Mobilization of citizens for identification of felt needs
- Systematic appraisal of felt needs by development seminars comprising of local representatives, local political representatives, officials and experts.
- Conversion of recommendations of the development seminars into projects by task force.
- Prioritization of the projects by elected local self-government institutions and incorporation within a local plan for implementation.”

Thereafter, in the state-wide evaluation of the first stage of the campaign (1996–2001) in 2002, it has been found that: (i) The participatory process has been institutionalized and level of socially inclusive participation had raised; (ii) Fiscal devolution to local governments in form of grant in aids had been substantial i.e. 35 to 40 per cent of the state development budget; (iii) Local governments had power to plan, fund and implement development policies and projects compliance with state policy and advice; and (iv) there has been increase in representation including the unrepresented (i.e. women) and
disadvantaged groups in participatory processes. The success of campaign, therefore, could be attributed to: political commitment, clear procedures and guidance by the state government, capacity-building through a massive training programme at the local and district level, and the ability to build on the experience and draw on the volunteers of civil society organizations.

Furthermore in some cities NGO’s, representing a strongly organized civil society, have been working for poor or disadvantaged sections of the society. They have developed tools such as citizen report cards to assess the performance of government agencies and held them accountable. They also support the organization and networking of CBO’s.

In East and South East Asia, for most countries of the region urban planning is still a top-down process. Numerous factors are responsible for such state of affairs such as (i) prevalence of weak democratic traditions with limited civil liberties and political rights; (ii) existence of highly centralized government structure and adoption of top-down approach; and (iii) outdated legislations that provides inadequately for formal strategic and spatial planning for urban development and growth. All these factors, therefore, cumulatively retard the growth of the role of relevant stakeholders in urban planning process.

Nevertheless, many countries of the region have restored to community driven development approach at local level. Under this approach, the government institutions have begun to recognize the role of communities as facilitator of development and people are considered as active partners who are responsible for project planning, implementation, monitoring and management. In Indonesia, in post disaster areas various projects such as North Java Flood Control Sector Project, reconstruction after the 2006 earthquake in Yogyakarta and rehabilitation and reconstruction after 2004 tsunami in Aceh and Nias were facilitated and coordinated by government agencies and information had been provided by the communities; voicing their opinions and made decisions pertaining to such projects.

Similarly, in Cambodia, Thailand and the Philippines another form of organized community participation has emerged. There has been emergence of federations of urban poor that represents its organized interests. They carried
out their activities through community managed savings and credit groups. These federations worked with the national and local government so as to design and implement programmes for provision of housing and sanitation to slum dwellers.

Furthermore, the great variation with respect to the development of organized civil society is another notable feature of the countries of the East and South East Asia. The Philippines has the most developed civil society whereas countries such as China, Vietnam and Cambodia still have to develop a vibrant civil society and also, do not significance of civic participation. This low level of participation could be attributed to lack of awareness and understanding of the concept of decentralization and participation among the urban population and also to the attitude and limited capacity of government agencies in the region. Hence, high degree of variation could be witnessed in the countries of the Asian region. Table 6.4 illustrates the growth of community participation in Asian countries.

**Table 6.4**  
**Peoples’ Participation in Asia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Establishment of democratic decentralization fostering community participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evolution of strongly organized civil society in form of NGOs, CBOs and community federations for promoting interests of urban poor and disadvantaged groups in urban planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Efficient synchronization between the government and civil society to design and implement urban development programmes and projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enactment of requisite urban planning legislations for enhanced people participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Non-establishment of democratic local government institutions in many countries of the region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-liberal political ideologies interferes with community initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implicit provisions for peoples’ participation in urban planning legislations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative autonomy of democratic local institutions restricted by excessive state control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons learnt</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Robust democratic local institutions ensures enhanced transparency and accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legitimization of participatory approaches by urban planning legislations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. LATIN AND CARIBBEAN AMERICA

Before 1980’s, the nature of participation was project specific and was limited to consultative and instrumental form of participation. However, after 1990’s, the mobilization of civil society organizations have led to widespread democratization at both the national and local levels. Thus, the newly elected democratic governments began to adopt participatory governance approach so as to establish their political credibility and complement representative democracies with participatory democracies. The efforts were made to engage citizens in decision-making through collective dialogues. They were involved in decision-making on policy issues and in allocation of resources either directly or through neighborhood councils, in coordination with elected bodies. On the other hand, the countries, being inspired by the practices of government in United States, have set up consultative and advisory councils to communicate the views and opinion of urban stakeholders to elected governments. However, the institutionalization of the participatory approaches in national and local legislations varies across the region. The countries such as Brazil and Bolivia have made significant progress in this direction. The Participatory Budgeting adopted in Brazil has been most widely emulated.

Further, the countries of the region have made diligent utilization of media and public spaces to mobilize widespread participation. This is evident from the increasing use of participatory media and information and communication technologies. In Ajusco, foothills of Mexico City, newspapers have been used to inform residents about the process of obtaining land titles and services. In order to set priorities or resolve conflicts public polls are being conducted through newspapers and radio stations and internet websites so as to gauge opinion of stakeholder regarding planning matters. Thereby covering wide range of urban population which otherwise could not be possible in face to face consultation. Another most popular mode of drawing participation has been “Street politics” i.e. carrying out demonstration in public spaces to draw attention of decision-makers, media and the public at large towards broad issues of plan preparation and implementation.
Despite of several efforts and initiatives, it has been observed that like other developing regions, most countries of Latin and Caribbean America have been unable to create a favorable environment for embracing participatory planning practices and methods. Lack of political will, technical expertise and adequate data has hampered the evolution of participatory planning approach. Further, physical planning is largely politicized i.e. party based issues prevail upon technical expertise and community inputs thereby resulting in marginalization of social dimension of urban planning. Such short-term political interests arrest the benefits of participatory planning approach.

Therefore, to ameliorate the existing situation, it has become indispensable to link the organized community organizations with the representative political system and to wider networks i.e. the under-represented groups such as women and minorities. Nevertheless, the participatory approaches should be adopted in such a manner that they should rather complement the vibrant representative democracy, instead of replacing it. Table 6.5 summarizes the community participation initiative in Latin and Caribbean America.

### Table 6.5
**Peoples’ Participation in Latin and Caribbean America**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Lessons learnt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Institutionalization of participatory approaches through collective dialogue, neighborhood councils and consultative &amp; advisory councils</td>
<td>• Regional variations dominates universalization of participatory approaches</td>
<td>• Participatory democracies should integrate with representative democracies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diligent utilization of media</td>
<td>• Political interests transcends social objectives in urban planning</td>
<td>• Use of media could be instrumental in gauging public perceptions for urban plan preparation and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Marginalization of underrepresented groups i.e. women and minorities</td>
<td>• Conducive political environment is imperative for embracing participatory planning practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The perusal of participatory practices in different regions of the world revealed that concerted efforts have been made for evolving socially inclusive urban planning processes. However, the success of these efforts varied across the different parts of the globe. Political and social environment of the region, largely, determines the nature, scope and modes of peoples’ participation. Developed countries of Europe and USA have succeeded in institutionalization of participatory governance, while countries of Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin & Caribbean America and transitional countries of Europe are still endeavoring to imbibe the principles of participatory governance in administration of urban planning. Thus, peoples’ participation, in current times, has been recognized as an integral part of democratic governance all over the world.

6.3.3 Peoples’ participation and urban planning in India

Decentralized planning was advocated by the First Five Year Plan (1951-56). It suggested that the planning process should be undertaken at the state and district levels too. For this purpose, a District Development Council (DDC) was constituted in each district to prepare plans, by embracing varying village-level participative processes. Further, the First Administrative Reforms Commission (1967) stressed the need for meaningful planning at the district level focusing on local variations in development patterns. Later, in 1969, the Planning Commission issued its first guidelines for formulating district plans by the states. However, barring a few excellent examples, these initiatives in district planning tapered away as these local planning exercises were not linked to the annual planning process in most states. Also, these initiatives did not incorporate urban planning processes as part of district planning.29

The 74th Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992 has been a stalwart legislation for encouraging participation of people in the urban governance process. It provided for establishment of District Planning Committees (DPCs) for facilitating peoples’ participation in planning process. However, non-establishment of DPCs in most of the states has defeated the very objective of decentralized planning. Also, large variation in provisions relating to participation of people in state urban planning legislations has been apparent.

The Second Administrative Reforms Commission (2005) suggested that citizens' participation in governance could be conceptualized in a variety of formulations, progressively participative. These formulations are advancing from one stage to another i.e. from seeking information, giving suggestions, demanding better service, holding government and service providers accountable to participation in administrative decision making. These are described in detail in forthcoming discussion.30

i. Citizens Seeking Information: Access to information is a fundamental pre-requisite for ensuring citizens' participation in governance. Making information available (on procedures, prices, application forms, officers to be contacted for grievance redressal etc) is the first step in any strategy to empower citizens for their interaction with government. Right to Information Act in India has in essence already laid down the ground-work for ensuring this pre-requisite for citizens’ participation in governance.

ii. Citizens Giving Suggestions: Seeking citizen’s suggestions has been the starting point of participation of citizens in governance. This could be achieved through public hearings, surveys, referenda etc. where citizens could give their suggestions with regard to their problems as well as the possible solutions; thereby complementing local knowledge and skills with governmental expertise. In Bangalore, Bangalore Agenda Task Force (BATF) was set up in 1999 with the goal to transform Bangalore into a world class city. It drew participation of its leading citizens including the heads of its major IT companies, as well as prominent members of the Bangalore civic community. BATF was asked to explore how to improve city services and infrastructure, expand the city resource base and enhance the administrative capacity of the city corporation. It held six-monthly public summits in the presence of the media and the Chief Minister to follow up these objectives. Such an engagement not only gave citizens’ groups the opportunity to make suggestions on what needed to be done but also enforced accountability in the city service providers by creating a forum where objectives have to be achieved in a time bound manner. The suggestions of citizens could be of great help both at the

level of policy making and implementation since citizens are in the best position to indicate their priorities and the possible solutions.

iii. **Citizens Demanding Better Services:** The civil servants should be accountable not only to their superiors but also to citizens. It is only when this is realized by government agencies that citizens can voice their grievances with assurance that due attention would be given to them. For example, the Hyderabad Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board (HMWSSB) created a campaign called the Customers' Meets campaign. Under this campaign the senior managers were required to interact directly with citizens in neighborhoods throughout the city. The campaign not only provided valuable customer feedback to the Metro Water Management, but also sparked pressure from citizens for further reform. It was followed by the establishment of a Metro Customer Care (MCC) centre located at the head office. The MCC was open 24 hours a day to receive and coordinate the responses to complaints filed by citizens through a designated telephone number. A software package, called the Customer Redressal Efficiency System, provided senior managers with a regular stream of performance-related data that could be used to hold frontline and middle-level managers accountable for service quality and compliance with the norms in Metro Water’s new citizens’ charter launched in January 2000 by the Chief Minister. Finally, a Single Window Cell (SWC) was established at the head office to receive process and coordinate all new water and sewerage connection applications. Hence, the efficiency of a government organization could be best judged by its responsiveness to complaints/demands from its clients.

iv. **Citizens Holding Service Providers and Government Agencies Accountable:** For ensuring efficient service delivery citizens would be required to voice their grievance and their dissatisfaction in an organized manner. This could be achieved through citizen’s feedback and surveys, citizens’ report card and social audit. This is evident from the fact that “three citizens’ report cards (CRC) on city services in Bangalore conducted by the Public Affairs Centre (PAC)” – in
1994, 1999 and 2003 - showed a significant improvement in the quality of services provided by city agencies. The three utilities – the Bangalore Electric Supply Company, the telecom company (BSNL) and the Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board (BWSSB) – showed major improvements across all three report cards. The Bangalore Mahanagara Palike (BMP; city corporation), public hospitals, and the Bangalore Development Authority (BDA) improved fastest between 1994 and 1999, with satisfaction ratings remaining steady or falling marginally in the 1999-2003 period. Bangalore’s five regional transport offices (RTOs) recorded major improvements between 1999 and 2003, reflecting reforms, including the use of e-governance”.

Regular citizens’ feedback and survey and citizens report cards should be conducted by all departments for this purpose. This would not only give a voice to the citizens but also enable the concerned agencies to judge citizen’s satisfaction and the need for improvement.

v. Active Citizens’ Participation in Administration / Decision-making: Access to the decision-making process, beyond periodic consultations is a more mature and intensive form of citizens’ participation in governance which would help them to negotiate with government for better policy, better plans, better projects etc. At this stage, the citizens no longer merely voice their grievances with government, but are involved in government’s actually working. Examples of such participation would include participatory municipal budgeting, allowing citizens to vote directly through a referendum on specific proposals for changes in public policies, projects and laws; mandatory public hearings before approval of projects or decisions such as changes in land use plans, that affect the environment and/or the local community, giving citizens’ representation on management committees for local hospitals and schools, social audit etc.

Hence, participation of people could be achieved through a variety of forms in the urban planning process. The forms of peoples’ participation are found to be evolving i.e. from seeking information regarding the functioning of an urban agency to participation of people in administrative decision making. Thus, scope of peoples’ participation could be enhanced in administration of urban planning.
6.4 PEOPLES’ PARTICIPATION IN ADMINISTRATION OF URBAN PLANNING IN SAS NAGAR

The Punjab Regional and Town Planning and Development 2006 Act did not provide for adoption of participatory approaches for urban plan formulation and implementation (See discussion on p.). The study, therefore, examined the status of peoples’ participation in urban planning process in SAS Nagar. It studied the role of public private partnership, non-government organizations and mass media (mainly newspaper) in urban plan preparation and implementation. For this purpose, opinions of officials of GMADA and TCP, members of NGOs, private builders and developers and newspaper journalists covering urban issues were sought through interview schedules. The study also studied the factors that affected participation of people in administration of urban planning in SAS Nagar.

6.4.1 Public Private Partnerships in Urban Planning and Administration (PPP)

The governments across the world increasingly looked at the private sector to supplement infrastructure investments and provide public services through Public Private Partnerships (PPP). PPP is defined as “a contractual arrangement, made by a government or statutory entity and a private sector company, to provide an infrastructure service.” In other words, Public Private Partnership (PPP) “is a contract or concession agreement, between a government or statutory entity on the one side and a private sector company on the other side, for delivering an infrastructure service on payment of user charges.” It is, therefore, a partnership between government and private sector for enhancing efficiency in accomplishment of public goals.

The rationale of PPP could be explained at three different levels: (i) For Public Sector, PPP allows government to utilize the private sector’s innovations. The government could define the desired services and outcomes and the private sector could meet these objectives by introducing innovative solutions. Also, it allows accessibility to private capital to government and hence, both could share their responsibility by tapping each other’s expertise. (ii) For Private Sector, it allows the private sector greater business opportunities as it facilitates entry into public sector domain. Further, it enhances their innovative skills as they have to develop and design innovative solutions.

techniques for efficient and effective delivery of public services. (iii) For General Public, it is a boon as it enjoins upon meeting the public needs without compromising public policy goals. Further, the government will have to ensure that public interest is protected and people should get public needs at the “best value for money.” Thus, the basic rationale of PPP is to upgrade service delivery mechanism. At the same time, it provides a shift in government’s focus i.e. from “providing the service to managing the service provider.”

In recent times, it has assumed greater dimensions and has been venturing into various sectors such as water supply and sanitation, roads, housing and so on. In late 2000, several PPP based projects have been implemented successfully in the cities of Latur, Chandrapur, Haldia, Chennai, Kolkatta, Mysore, Madurai and Nagpur. Various components of water supply and sanitation such as distribution cum revenue collection contract in Latur and Chandrapur; bulk supply cum operation & maintenance contract in Chennai and augmentation cum operation and maintenance contract for distribution system for a cluster of ULB’s in Karnataka are some of the instances of PPP initiatives in this sector. Several instances of private sector participation in road projects development could be found. The Ahmedabad Urban Development Authority (AUDA) has been successful in realizing the prestigious project of the Sardar Patel Ring Road in Ahmedabad in brief time with private sector participation in the project. Thus, PPP is playing a substantial role in provision of urban basic services.

Similarly, the Punjab Government has been actively pursuing private sector investment to create world-class infrastructure and to upgrade the present infrastructure in the state. The government established the Punjab Infrastructure Development Board (PIDB) in 1998. The PIDB, headed by the Chief Minister, has been an apex empowered body responsible for overall planning of infrastructure sector and infrastructure projects in the State across different sectors i.e. roads & highways, urban infrastructure, industrial infrastructure, electricity, health and education. It also acts as a body to find alternative funding. An Executive Committee, headed by the Chief Secretary, assists
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the Board. The administrative departments identify projects suitable for PPP. The Punjab Infrastructure Initiative Fund, with a corpus of Rs 20 crore to finance project developmental costs, has been intended to identify, develop and structure projects to prepare a shelf of financially viable projects, and create a superior model for PPPs in the state through modern project management, monitoring, and execution practices. Projects in PPP mode are for running industrial training institutes (ITIs) and polytechnics, bus terminals, Ludhiana ring road, and bridges. Planned PPP initiatives are in the transport, airport, health, medical education, irrigation, water supply, and power sectors.34

Furthermore, the Punjab Government has enacted the Punjab Infrastructure Development Act in 2002 and set up the Punjab Infrastructure Regulatory Authority (PIRA). The State Government recognized that to attract private participation, there was a need for an over-arching legislation to secure a level-playing field for private players, and establishing a transparent regulatory framework governed by an autonomous regulator to grant various concessions and incentives to make projects and investment opportunities viable and attractive. The Act provides the necessary legal and policy framework to facilitate private investment in infrastructure projects.35 Hence, private sector participation has been sought mainly for building high quality infrastructure; however, participation of private sector in urban plan formulation and implementation has been found to be negligible.

In SAS Nagar, PPP was also there for construction of housing and establishment of urban estates. The private builders and developers were mainly engaged in provision of housing facilities. The participation of private sector has been governed by the Punjab Apartments and Property Regulation 2006 Act. The Act provided that no builder, colonizer, contractor, promoter, estate agent could do business without being registered and licensed as an estate agent. For this purpose, the Additional Chief Administrator, Mohali has been delegated the power to issue license to promoters and to register estate agents in the Greater Mohali Region, including the city of SAS Nagar.

An official commented that private builders and developers were primarily interested in making money. Their sole aim was to obtain approval for project in a

desired location. For this, they were always ready to please the concerned officials. The nexus between the officials and builders had assumed unimaginable dimensions in recent times. From top to bottom, specific rates were defined for getting approval for different kinds of urban activities. Thus, he asserted that this put a question mark on the participation of private developers and builders in urban planning process. Further he remarked low professional and technical qualifications did not place these private developers in a position to make any meaningful contribution in urban plan formulation and implementation. Interviews with the developers operating in the city supported this view point. The developers had a tunnel vision with regard to the concept of urban planning; they were mainly concerned with the construction of infrastructure. They believed that land had been provided to them for developing urban estates in line with the requisite guidelines pertaining to percent of green cover area, height of buildings, floor area ratio, plinth area, building plans, provision of basic infrastructure and so on provided by the Authority from time to time. However, they possessed mixed views with respect to their participation in urban planning. They considered their participation in administration of urban planning as a positive approach of the government. On the contrary, they also believed that adoption of participatory approach would hardly make any difference because all decision making powers were concentrated in the hands of the government; due weightage would not be attached to their opinion by the government. It was, therefore, evident that in SAS Nagar the scope of public private partnership was limited in nature i.e. private developers and builders were confined to construction of urban estates and infrastructure.

6.4.2 Role of Non-Governmental Organizations in Urban Planning and Administration

The Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) have emerged as the third pillar, besides the government and market, in the development process. Like, the government sector that creates public capital and market sector that creates market capital, civil society creates social capital. The development of social capital is essential for preserving the social fabric of a nation. Thus, the need to balance the government, market and social sector becomes paramount. In India, the sector though has been in emergence since ancient times; it has been formally recognized only after the Sixth Five Year Plan (1980-85). NGO’s have been playing a substantial role in redefining
and redesigning public policy and programmes in various spheres namely social welfare, environment, human rights, women empowerment and so on.

Furthermore, NGOs, in present times, play the role of being important actors or partners in development; resulting in realization of people-centered development. However with respect to urban development, the failure of the five year plans and the government institutions in addressing the urban development problems, witnessed the rise of NGOs to ameliorate the plight of urban areas. NGOs, therefore, seek to invigorate people centered development for accomplishment of urban development goals. The city of Mumbai presents a glaring example of civil activism in urban development. Several NGOs such as Railway Slum Dwellers Federation, Mahila Milan, Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centre (SPARC) and so on have emerged as partners of government and focused on direct interaction with institutions of state government in providing services in the area of housing, education and health care. Likewise in Pune, local NGOs were engaged in urban plan implementation. Also, they succeeded in holding back the modifications, considered threatening, in the original urban plan; with the support of print media. The success of NGOs and media-NGO partnership has highlighted the significance of peoples’ participation in urban planning administration.

However, in SAS Nagar, only few NGOs, with limited scope, have been found to be operational. The focus areas of these NGOs were mainly women and child welfare, AIDS awareness, drug abuse, health, education and so on. However, none of the NGOs in the city was found to be engaged in urban development. An official said that they had to call NGOs form Delhi since the Jurong International, a Singapore-based consultancy hired by GMADA for urban plan formulation, required the participation of NGOs. This was done because they could not find any NGOs in the city that could provide requisite assistance of the Company. The members of NGOs put forth that urban development has been a vast subject that embraces varied kind of activities and requires huge investment. Thus, weak financial condition of NGOs did not allow them to take up urban development initiatives.

Further, the members of NGO’s unanimously admitted that they did not participate in the process of urban plan formulation and implementation. They stated that the Punjab Regional and Town Planning and Department 2006 Act has created opaque bodies in form of urban development authorities. GMADA, therefore, did not encourage participation of people in urban planning process. The members reiterated that they were aware of the provisions that called for public suggestions/objections on draft master plan. However, they opined that these provisions were mere formalities since the Authority did not conduct any consultation or feedback programmes during urban plan formulation and implementation for gauging peoples’ opinion. The citizens have, therefore, always been at the receiving end and are not treated as partners in urban development. Thus, NGOs in SAS Nagar could not serve as a medium for facilitating participation of people in urban planning process.

6.4.3 Role of Media

Mass media, in current times, plays a crucial role in our day to day life. It has become an important tool for dissemination of information and mobilizing public participation. Various means of communication such as radio, television, newspaper, journals and internet has been instrumental in creating awareness and generating feedback. Likewise in urban planning administration, creation of public awareness through various means of mass media has becomes indispensable. In urban planning, media could be used as a tool in breaking down the barriers between planners and people. It could be used as a way to draw together ideas and promote bottom-up approach. As a result, urban plans would become more sensitive to the needs of the people and citizens would feel empowered in their ability to directly influence public policy.

The study focused mainly on the role of newspapers in promoting peoples’ participation in administration of urban planning in SAS Nagar. The role of other means of communication i.e. radio and television has not been studied; because the concerned urban agencies had not been utilizing the latter means of communication for widespread dissemination of information and generation of feedback.

a) Newspaper

Newspapers have served cultures through times of political and economic tribulations and during periods of social, political and economic
stability. It has been playing multifarious role in fulfilling in welfare objectives of the society since times immemorial. Firstly, it has been instrumental in shaping public thoughts, principally about those who control political and economic power; Secondly, it has provided a platform for public discussion and debate and has allowed the people to guide the public policy makers in accomplishment of socio-economic goals of the nation; and Thirdly, it has assumed the role of a watchdog and has protected the people from the oppressive tendencies of the government. Hence, newspapers’ information dispersal function ultimately helps in coordination of society and in the socialization of its members.\(^\text{38}\)

To study the role of newspaper in mobilizing peoples’ participation, articles and editorial on urban development of four newspapers namely The Tribune, the Times of India, Indian Express and Dainik Jagran were reviewed. Newspapers had been instrumental in highlighting the adhocracy of urban development authorities in resolving the urban development issues. It was, however, found that it did not play any substantial role in encouraging participation of people in administration of urban planning in SAS Nagar.

Interviews with the journalists revealed that no separate and regular edition covering urban development issues was published. The news relating to urban issues were published as and when an issue had arisen. The nature of news was mainly descriptive and analytical. They told that articles and editorials highlighting the vagaries of government and urban development authorities were published to protect the interests of common masses. Many times newspapers, through their articles, had been instrumental in resolving issues relating to land acquisition, allotment of plots, compensation to beneficiaries and so on. Also, such articles were aimed at creating awareness among people about the status of administration of urban planning in the city.

It was found that urban development authorities i.e. TCP and GMADA had not been using newspaper as the participatory media. The journalists told that urban development agencies did not access newspaper for integrating the relevant stakeholders in urban plan formulation and implementation. They told

that participatory initiatives such as invitation of collective dialogue and public polling on urban planning matters was not restored by them for gauging widespread public opinion. Furthermore, it did not draw on newspaper for broadcasting information pertaining to procedures involved in urban plan formulation & implementation. However, newspaper was mainly sought by urban development agencies for advertising i.e. publication of tender notices, auction notices and display of draft master plan notices. Thus, newspaper has not been catered for gathering public opinion and connecting people with the urban planning process.

b) Internet

In current times, internet has proved to be a highly dynamic means of communication that has changed the way the people communicate with each other. It has facilitated social participation and social involvement of people in a wider space. The Interactive Service Model / Government-to-Citizen-to-Government Model (G2C2G) of e-governance is considered to be a superior model as it provides for direct participation of people in the governance processes. The model enhances participation, transparency and efficiency in the functioning of the government. It creates interactive Government-to-Citizen-to-Government (G2C2G) channels both for performance of functions and participation of people in governance processes. Online participative tools mainly include consultations, public debates, feedback surveys, opinion polls and blogs that allow people to express their views and ventilate their grievances. Therefore, the internet could be used as a means for communicating with the masses at large scale and gathering their collective views and perceptions. Thus, electronic governance is promoting the utilization of information technologies in governance process to enhance the accessibility and accountability of government to people.

In reality, the interactive model of e-governance has not been instrumental in generating feedback on administrative processes to guide future policy decisions. Similarly, in SAS Nagar, GMADA has created a website that provides information on various urban initiatives of the Authority in district
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SAS Nagar. The website provides information on property details, RTI application status and single window status, registering of complaints and E-tendering. However, the G2C2G model was not used by the Authority for gauging peoples’ ideas pertaining to urban planning in the city. The internet was not used for conducting public debates and opinion polls on urban issues before formulation of urban plans by the Authority. It, therefore, was ignored as a medium for involving people in administration of urban planning in the city.

From the above discussion, it can be concluded that participation of people in administration of urban planning has not been given due importance by the State Government. Also, various actors i.e. NGOs, public-private partnerships and mass media could not pose as an instrument facilitating peoples’ participation in urban plan formulation and administration.

6.5 AN ANALYSIS OF PEOPLE’S PARTICIPATION IN URBAN PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION IN SAS NAGAR

Typically, peoples’ participation in urban planning is envisaged at a number of stages. Participation of both the people and administration is crucial for determining the relation between the community and the final urban plan. The evaluation / validation through people participation at all stages of planning ensure the success of sustainable urban planning (figure 6.1). The study has, therefore, studied the status of people’s participation in urban planning and administration in SAS Nagar. It had examined the level of accessibility of people’s participation from the standpoint of policy framework, provisions in urban planning legislations, administrative structure, modes of communication and decision-making, attitude of officials, feedback mechanism and nature of participation.

I. Absence of Requisite Policy Framework

A requisite national policy and legislative framework with support from higher level of government is essential for promotion of peoples’ participation. Non-enactment of a well-defined urban policy till date has adversely affected the adoption of participatory approach in urban planning. The absence of a state urban policy, delineating the provisions pertaining to participatory approach, has not provided due legitimacy to community participation in urban planning.
Consequently, the 2006 Act also did not provide for peoples’ participation. This elucidated the insensitivity of the State Government towards involvement of relevant stakeholders in various stages of urban planning process. An official, in concurrence with this view, stated that the policy provisions would have bound the authorities for undertaking inclusive urban planning. Also, the 2006 Act too would then have taken the cue enough to incorporate provisions that facilitate people’s participation.

The members of NGOs considered this as a major setback to participatory planning. They opined that requisite policy guidelines would have provided a clear mandate to urban development authorities i.e. GMADA for undertaking “people centric planning”. Such initiatives, therefore, would provide better opportunity to people to voice their concerns and problems in urban plan preparation.

II. Implicit provision for people’s participation in urban planning legislation

The Punjab Regional and Town Planning and Development (Amendment) 2006 Act under Section 70(3) provided that the master plan shall be displayed at prescribed place for a period of thirty days to invite suggestions and objections from the public. However, this sole provision seemed to be an inadequate mechanism for people’s participation for various reasons. The study found the provisions for peoples’ participation in the Act was lacking on several accounts.

Firstly, the concept of people’s participation was ambiguous i.e. the Act did not define the role and responsibility of the community in the urban planning process. It did not specify what role people would play during the various stages of plan formulation and implementation (Figure 6.1). As a result, the officials did not attach much importance to people’s participation and considered it a tedious process.

In this regard, a member of a NGO lamented that this state of affairs had provided complete discretion to urban planning agencies to decide the fate of the city and its citizens. The citizens, however, remained silent spectators to the builder friendly urban plan proposals of the urban planning authority.
Secondly, the Act did not define the scope of participation. It did not provide for identification of relevant stakeholders in the urban planning process. Further, the Act did not identify the various means through which people’s participation could be sought. Hence, it is evident that the Act did not provide for institutionalization of people’s engagement in urban planning.

Thirdly, the Act provided for invitation of suggestions/objections of citizens on proposed master plan. However, it does not specify how the planning agencies shall proceed with suggestions and objections made by the people. Finally, the Act conferred complete autonomy to urban planning agencies for inclusion or exclusion of such suggestions made by people. The Act, therefore, provided for a nominal form of participation which reflects the tokenistic approach of the Government toward peoples’ participation. In this regard, a respondent stated that such provisions are just an eye wash and does not yield the desired outcomes.

III. Centralized Administrative Structure

As discussed in Chapter V, the 2006 Act provided for a highly centralized administrative structure of urban planning in SAS Nagar, since it did not provide for the creation of any institution that facilitated peoples’ participation. Consequently, TCP and GMADA, mainly opaque bodies, did not identify any means for institutionalizing the participation of NGOs in the urban planning process such as creation of an independent council of NGOs, collective dialogue, establishment of neighborhood councils and consultative & advisory councils and so on that could provide information on urban issues and comment on decision-making process; relegating the significance of peoples’ perception and opinion.

The respondents, therefore, believed that the Authority considered increased people’s participation as a threat to the continuance of corrupt administrative practices. Centralized decision making had created impregnable power centers that looked down upon participatory processes and encouraged proliferation of corrupt practices in urban plan formulation and implementation. However, the officials held a conflicting opinion. According to them, centralization was done with a view to curb massive corruption in urban
planning activities. The control over urban planning processes was, therefore, placed under a single authority i.e. the Chief Minister (See discussion on p.)

IV. **Inadequate modes of Communication and Decision-Making**

The modes of communication and decision-making have been one of the crucial dimensions of institutional design. It specifies how the participants shall interact during public discussions and decisions. In SAS Nagar, such modes of communication and decision-making were found to be missing in urban planning administration. The respondents told that GMADA had not developed any advanced modes of communication such as exploration & development of preferences during discussions, aggregation & bargaining and deliberations & negotiations. No public discussions or public hearings were held before and during urban planning process. It was therefore, found that more commonly aggrieved citizens’ approach the Authority for seeking information about some project or policy. This again is a least intensive form of participation and did not allow any participation in decision-making.

Thus, the Authority did not resort to such modes of communication and decision-making which could translate views and perceptions of participants into collective views and decisions and allow them to take part in decision-making processes.

V. **Indifferent Attitude of Officials**

For institutionalization of people’s participation processes, supportive attitude of concerned officials is very important. They should communicate and coordinate with the multiple actors at the lower level. This bottom-up approach, in reality, was found missing. The respondents told the researcher that the officials themselves evaded adoption of participatory approaches. Ostensibly, because increased participation would call for information sharing; resulting in greater transparency and accountability. The officials were by and large indifferent towards people’s queries and opinion. Also, the officials believed that urban plan formulation and implementation is completely a technical arena and people lack sufficient knowledge and expertise to participate in the urban planning processes. Thus, an unapproved and unfriendly attitude of officials has been a major stumbling block in encouraging people’s participation.
VI. Absence of Feedback Mechanism

The system model of policy making and implementation advocates that policy making process is cyclical and element of feedback is indispensable for gauging people’s perceptions and expectations. As explained in figure 6.1, the evaluation/validation generates public opinion and enables formulation of people’s friendly urban plan.

However, in practice, this element was absent in urban planning administrative system. In SAS Nagar, absence of effective feedback mechanism was another impediment in securing meaningful peoples’ participation. The respondents told that seeking feedback from general public was essential for overcoming the planning gaps existing in already developed areas of the city. Further, generation of feedback would definitely provide another participatory venue to common man; who otherwise has to run from pillar to post to ventilate his grievances.

VII. Passive Nature of Participation

The impact of public participation on administrative decision making is an important indicator of the nature of participation. The nature of participation could be gauged from the five categories of participatory influence namely personal benefits, communicative influence, advice & consultation, co-governing partnerships and direct authority. In SAS Nagar, it was found that nature of participation of people in urban planning and administration was passive in nature. The respondents said that since no mechanism was developed to encourage participation, people had no definite participatory fora to express their opinions and preferences. Generally, participants, either individually or in a group belonging from a particular sector, would seek personal benefits by expressing their preferences and ventilating their grievances.

Further, it was found that people exerted communicative influence on official on very few occasions or issues i.e. issues relating to land acquisition, allotment of plots, issues relating to unfair practices during draw of plots and so on. However, these did not relate directly to urban plan formulation and implementation issues such as land use zoning, establishment of independent neighborhood councils, authority to control, plan or implement sub local
development projects and so on. The participation, therefore, did not exert significant enough influence to direct the future development of the city.

Thus it can be concluded that the status of peoples’ participation in administration of urban planning in SAS Nagar. Peoples’ participation was found to be suffering due to absence of requisite urban policy both at the national and state levels. Further, implicit provisions for peoples’ participation in the 2006 Act, centralized administrative structure, inadequate modes of communication and decision-making, indifferent attitude of officials, absence of feedback mechanism and passive nature of participation had curbed the initiatives for undertaking participatory planning approach. Thus, absence of participatory, bottom-up approach had created opaque administrative structures of urban planning.

6.6 CONCLUSION

Good governance and citizen centric administration are intimately connected. Citizen centricity with the aim of ensuring citizens’ welfare and citizens’ satisfaction is critical for any government, local, state or national which aims to provide good governance. The various initiatives at international level have provided the much needed support to adoption of participatory approaches in administrative processes. In India, people-centred development became the loci of development from the Eighth five years plan onwards. Similarly, urban planning processes also experienced a shift from technocratic approach to democratic approach. Peoples’ participation, in urban planning facilitates identification of popular needs, plan formulation, implementation and evaluation. Thus, sustainable urban planning calls for development of a continuous, integrated and participative planning process.

However, in SAS Nagar, administration of urban planning was found to be wanting for active peoples’ participation. Public-private partnerships were found to be restricted to development of urban estates and infrastructure; participation of NGOs was not appreciated by urban development authorities and mass media was not utilized for connecting to various stakeholders in urban planning. Further, meaningful participation could not be secured because of legislative, administrative and attitudinal obstacles i.e. participation of people suffered on account of absence of requisite policy framework, implicit provisions for peoples’ participation in urban planning legislation,
centralized administrative structure, inadequate modes of communication and decision-making, indifferent attitude of officials, absence of feedback mechanism and passive nature of participation.