

Exclusionary Urban Space

Class, Gender and Marginalities in Delhi



Bhim Reddy and Manoj B. Balsamanta

Institute for Human Development, New Delhi



‘Exclusionary urbanisation’ in Delhi?

- **Decline in the share of slum population**
(Census: 14.65% in 2001 to 10.65% in 2011; evictions and strict regulation on encroachments; bias towards ‘unauthorised’ colonies)
- **Decline in the share of households living in single rooms**
(one room: 38% to 31% ; three & more rooms: 35% to 38%)
- **Increase in no. of households living in ‘no exclusive room’ & homeless population**
(without exclusive room: 0.9% to 1.3%; houseless households: 0.28%)



‘New spatialisations of poverty’ ?

- **Varying definitions of ‘slum’ and varying slum population**
(Census 2011: 10.65%; NSSO 2012: 30% households)
- **Poor beyond slums – dispersed households**
(a significant section in non-slums share many features of slum households)
- **Slummisation of old ‘resettlement colonies’, ‘urban villages’ and ‘unauthorised colonies’**



Overview

- Infrastructural inadequacy in poor localities and the way it marginalizes in a double sense
- Eviction and displacement
- Street vendors
- Women, safety concerns and access to public space

Methodology

- Both survey as well as qualitative techniques were used to collect data
- 2037 households were surveyed



Spatial inequality in infrastructure and access

Households grouped based on their spatial location: 1. 'authorised' colonies (AC), 2. 'unauthorised' colonies(UC), 3. 'resettlement' colonies(RC), 4.'urban villages'(UV) and 5. 'slums'

- **Disparity in infrastructure between types of residential settlements**
- **Marked inequality in housing condition, access to basic amenities and assets**

Spatial inequality (cont.)



For example.. (locality wise % of households)

- **Living in 1 room: Slums-49%, AC-17%, UC- 25%, UV-25; RC-25%**
- **Without a separate/enclosed kitchen: Slums-78, AC-10, UC-29, UV-20; RC-15**
- **With private toilets: Slums-39, AC-99, UC- 97, UV-99; RC-100 (for female members)**
(in slums: public toilets-56; open defecation-3.2)
- **Main source of water within premises: Slums-29, AC-97, UC-58, UV-98; RC-92**
- **Access to piped water: Slums-57, AC-94, UC- 52, UV-93; RC-84 (water tankers: slums-17;UC-25)**



Inadequate access /functional infrastructures in poor localities

- **Access to sufficient water: Slums-26, AC-62, UC- 46, UV-53; RC-64 (27 in slums and 40% in UC purchase water)**
- **Public toilets: 82% using in slums feel the no. is insufficient'; long queues, dirty, fixed timings**

Infrastructural violence: conflicts around scarce resources

- **Involved in disputes: slums -15% around toilets and open defecation; 20 % around drainage issues; 11 % around garbage; and 17% percent related to water; UC- 18% related to water; 12% around garbage**



Viklang Colony and Displacement

- Exclusionary practices**
- Repeat forced demolitions**
- Identity proofs, but still illegal occupants**
- No rehabilitation and land, despite promises**
- What aids exclusion: Multiple governance structures**
- Self-inclusion, resistance and everyday negotiations**
- Collective response and citizenship practices**



Street Vendors

- Tyranny of the state agencies at the local level- police and Municipal officials
- Organised extortion: Rendering livelihood activity as illegitimate and exercising control
- Everyday violence: intimidation, evictions and confiscation of goods

Vendors constraints and strategies

- Acute competition kills collective initiatives
- Individualized responses to collective problems
- Bribing and befriending state officials and passing information to them as self-inclusion strategies



Women and access to urban spaces

- **Increased awareness and assertion of rights and entitlements; higher reporting of crime: post- Delhi gang rape**
- **Safety perceptions: Locality is relatively safe (80), City unsafe (63%)**
- **No change in security situation of women (75%)**
- **Curtailing physical mobility and women's access to public space**
- **Complicity of family, neighbours and state**
- **Class and differential experiences and perceptions of risk and risk zones**



- **Exclusion as enmeshed: state's, apathy, arbitrariness and excessive negative penetration are enmeshed**
- **Multiple sites of exclusion**
- **Infrastructural and institutional violence**
- **Crimes, patriarchy and safety concerns are entangled to produce women's marginalities**



Policy

- Infrastructure is key
- Mechanisms to curb police informality
- Institutionalizing fear reduction