



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TRENDS IN EMERGING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Volume 2; Issue 1; 2024; Page No. 352-356

Received: 08-10-2023

Accepted: 18-12-2023

Urbanization and Regional Development Dynamic In Uttar Pradesh: Challenges and Strategies

¹Geetanjali Chauhan and ²Dr. Babita Singh

¹Research Scholar, Department of Geography, Maharaja Agrasen Himalayan Garhwal University, Uttarakhand, India

²Professor, Department of Geography, Maharaja Agrasen Himalayan Garhwal University, Uttarakhand, India

Corresponding Author: Geetanjali Chauhan

Abstract

Uttar Pradesh, the most populous state in India, has low urban growth but a high rise in census towns, according to the 2011 census. The increase was tripled from 2001. There are more smaller census towns in the eastern half of the state than in its more commercialized, industrialized, and urbanized western equivalent. These towns account for 8% of the state's total urban area, while being managed as rural villages. The Ministry of Urban Development should give the states priority in converting these census towns into statutory towns with urban local bodies. In order to provide basic services to a significant section of the population, the state government seems dedicated to expanding its urban network. In the last ten years, over 80 new municipalities have been created, but only a few hundred census towns have been converted to statute towns. The existing statutory towns should merge with census towns that are next to them. Converting heavily populated census towns in the west into statute towns with municipalities ought to be given priority.

Keywords: Dimension, Hidden Urbanization, Visible Urbanization, Increased Revenue

Introduction

Uttar Pradesh is the most populated state in the country, home to 16.4% of the total population. With 2,43,290 square Kilometers, or 6.88 percent of the country's total land area, it is also the fourth largest state. The process of urbanization in the state is still relatively young. The pace of urbanization has been slower than in the majority of the country's states. The number of urban centers having a population of one lakh or more has gradually grown during the last three decades. However, in the western part of the state, the number of urban centers with fewer than 5,000 residents has grown more significantly, and these centers have spread farther.

Nonetheless, a heavy-up bias is indicated by the urban population's concentration in larger metropolitan centers. Furthermore, the massive expansion of Census Towns (CTs), which increased from 43 in 1991 to 66 in 2001 and then to 267 in 2011 (Census: 2011), has brought up additional, but accepted, management complications that urban planners and policy makers have not yet recognized. The demographic data for the state is compiled in Table 1.

Table 1: Uttar Pradesh: Demographic Profile, 1901-2011

| Year | Population (crore) | Decadal Growth (%) | Urban Population (crore) | Decadal Growth (%) | Level of Urbanization (%) |
|-------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| 1901 | 4.86 | | 0.54 | | 11.09 |
| 1911 | 4.82 | (-)0.97 | 0.49 | (-)8.98 | 10.19 |
| 1921 | 4.67 | (-)3.08 | 0.49 | 0.61 | 10.58 |
| 1931 | 4.98 | 6.66 | 0.56 | 12.81 | 11.19 |
| 1941 | 5.65 | 13.57 | 0.70 | 26.00 | 12.41 |
| 1951 | 6.03 | 6.61 | 0.86 | 22.93 | 14.31 |
| 1961 | 7.38 | 22.37 | 0.95 | 9.90 | 12.85 |
| 1971 | 8.83 | 19.78 | 1.24 | 30.68 | 14.02 |
| 1981 | 11.09 | 25.49 | 1.99 | 60.54 | 17.94 |
| 1991 | 13.21 | 19.12 | 2.60 | 36.63 | 19.67 |
| 2000* | 16.62 | 25.85 | 3.45 | 26.82 | 20.78 |
| 2011 | 19.98 | 20.23 | 4.45 | 28.75 | 22.28 |

Source: Compiled from different Census Reports; Population of Uttar Pradesh retrieved from Statistics Times.com on August 29, 2019.

*A new state of Uttarakhand (comprising hilly region) was created out of Uttar Pradesh in 2000.

Of the 915 towns in Uttar Pradesh, 648 are statutory towns,

which make up about 92% of the state's total urban population, and 267 are community trusts, which house 8% of the state's total urban population, according to the 2011 census. See Table 2. The statutory towns are made up of thirteen towns under the Cantonment Board's supervision, 630 municipal towns, and five industrial townships, which combined make up a pathetic 0.21 percent of all urban population or 0.23 percent of all people contained under statutory towns. With the establishment of numerous new municipalities of various types since then, there are now 707 municipal towns overall (as of November 2020). Numerous suggestions for the establishment of new municipalities are being examined by the state government. Eight percent of the urban population residing in these state census towns is administratively exempt from city regulations and is nonetheless subject to rural rules.

Table 2: Towns In Uttar Pradesh

| Year | Statutory Towns | | Census Towns | | Total | |
|------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------|---------------|
| | Number | Variation (%) | Number | Variation (%) | Number | Variation (%) |
| 1991 | 710 | | 43 | | 743 | |
| 2001 | 638 | (-)10.14 | 66 | 53.49 | 704 | (-)5.25 |
| 2011 | 648 | 1.57 | 267 | 304.55 | 915 | 29.97 |

*Including Uttarakhand, created in 2000. Source: Census of India, Town Directory of Uttar Pradesh; Population Statistics 1991, 2001 and 2011.

Emergence of Census Towns

There aren't many definitions of "urbanization" in India. It is the only country that combines economic type, population density, and population criterion. In addition to India's "hidden" urbanization (Mukhopadhyay et al., 2016) [3], the country's consecutive census reports after independence have highlighted a new facet of its urbanisation: the rise of communities known as Census Towns (CT). A minimum of 5,000 people, a population density of 400 people per square Kilometer, and a workforce consisting of at least 75% male primary workers in the non-farm sector (making their living from non-agricultural activities) were the three criteria used by the Registrar General of India Census Operations to define an urban area. These criteria are met by Census Towns, which contribute to India's "visible" urbanization (Mukhopadhyay, 2016) [3]. Since the number of CTs increased significantly between 2001 and 2011, many settlements were categorized as urban due to changes in the state's workforce and demographic characteristics. Counties Towns are areas that have urban features but lack an urban local body and are not considered towns by the census system. The shift of rural populations from agriculture to non-agricultural sectors including manufacturing, trading, and construction is responsible for the growth of CTs, claims Kumar (2019) [4]. As a result, only Uttar Pradesh has seen the establishment of multiple new census towns despite moderate urban growth. However, given that it is one of the states with the most districts and inhabitants, its sheer vastness can help to explain it.

The administrative dimension distinguishes Statutory Towns, which are governed by various Urban Local Bodies (ULBs), Cantonment Boards (CBs), and Industrial Townships (ITs), from villages, which are governed by village councils (gram panchayats). The 73rd (rural) and

74th Acts of 1992, two separate constitutional amendments, control the two forms of local governments in the nation. As a result, among settlements, Census Towns (CT) are a specific subset that is governed by rural governance but is categorized as urban by the Indian Census. These settlements are now separated into rural and urban zones, which is inconsistent with their true economic and spatial composition. From creating plans to increase the effectiveness of District Planning Committees (DPCs) to taking more drastic measures like eliminating the decentralized binary status of rural and urban established by the 73rd and 74th Constitution Amendments, there are several options that could entail some degree of intervention (Roy & Pradhan: 2019) [6].

The attributes of Uttar Pradesh's census towns

- 1. Location of CT'S:** Currently, Uttar Pradesh is divided into 75 districts for administrative purposes. The analysis shows that only 54 districts in the state have Census Towns (Table 3). The eastern district of Varanasi has the most, with 34, followed by the eastern district of Prayagraj, formerly known as Allahabad, and the western district of Ghaziabad. There are no CTs in the other twenty-one districts, which are the least urbanized.
- 2. Classification by economic region:** Bundelkhand (sparsely urbanized and less developed), Central (urbanized, with big urban centres, industrialized and developed), and Western (most urbanized, industrialized, and developed) are the four economic regions into which the state is typically divided. Further research reveals that the largest percentage of census towns is found in the Eastern Zone (about 49%) and the Western Zone (approximately 41%). The lowest is in Bundelkhand, at a pathetic 2%. The districts of Varanasi and Ghaziabad are at the top of the Eastern and Western zones, respectively.

Table 3: Districts With Census Towns (2011)

| No. of CT's & Districts | Name of the Districts |
|-------------------------|---|
| 34 (1) | Varanasi |
| 15(2) | Ghaziabad, Prayagraj |
| 13(1) | Agra |
| 12(1) | Aligarh |
| 10(1) | Bareilly |
| 08(4) | Azamgarh, Bijnor, Sonbhadra, Mathura |
| 07(3) | Gautam Buddha Nagar, Mau, Muzaffarnagar |
| 06(2) | Chandauli, Gorakhpur |
| 05(5) | Jaunpur, Mirzapur, Moradabad, Saharanpur, Sultanpur |
| 04(6) | Bulandshahr, Gonda, Kanpur Nagar, Kheri, Meerut, Sant Ravidas Nagar |
| 03(7) | Ayodhya, Barabanki, Ferozabad, Hathras, Jhansi, Kanpur Dehat, Unnao |
| 02(13) | Ambedkar Nagar, Auraiya, Ballia, Balrampur, Farrukhabad, Kaushambi, Lalitpur, Lucknow, Pratapgarh, Pilibhit, Rampur, Sant Kabir Nagar, Siddharthnagar |
| 01(8) | Amroha, Bahraich, Chitrakoot, Etah, Kasganj, Kushinagar, Maharajganj, Sitapur |
| 0-no census | 21 Districts |

Source: Analysis done on the basis of Town Directory, UP, 2011. Figure in () denotes number of districts

With four Census Towns, Kanpur Nagar is the most populous district in the Central area, whereas Jhansi district has the most in the Bundelkhand region (Table 4).

On the other hand, the content-wise analysis is quite informative. In 2011, the western area with the second-highest number of CTs shared over half (more than 58

percent) of these towns' total population. This illustrates the census towns in the western zone's dense population and solid industrial and commercial base. NOIDA and Greater NOIDA provide as examples. The CTs in the eastern region make up less than one-third of the overall population due to their tiny size and sparse population.

Table 4: Distribution of CTs by economic regions (2011)

| Economic Region | Number | Population | Percentage Districts | | Districts having highest number of CT's in the region |
|-----------------|--------|------------|----------------------|------------|---|
| | | | Numbers | Population | |
| Eastern | 130 | 1153,463 | 48.67 | 32.23 | Varanasi (34) |
| Central | 21 | 300,841 | 7.89 | 08.41 | Kanpur Nagar (4) |
| Western | 110 | 2079,513 | 41.20 | 58.12 | Ghaziabad (14) |
| Bundelkhand | 06 | 44,318 | 02.24 | 01.24 | Jhansi (3) |
| STATE | 267 | 3578,155 | 100.00 | 100.00 | |

Source: Calculated on the basis of Town Directory, UP, 2011. *Details are given in Endnotes of this paper

The village hamlets there are altering the kind of their livelihood because of the state's modest agricultural holdings and the ability of the inhabitants to rely only on agriculture because of their lack of urbanization and weak commercialized basis.

Classification by Population-size: In terms of content, the analysis is intriguing. Approximately 63% of census towns are small, having fewer than 15,000 residents. Surprisingly, certain towns (a total of 21) have less inhabitants than the Registrar General of Census Operations deems suitable for their census town designation. These small, close-knit communities may be situated outside of the major village. In fact, these should be classified as "ignored" CTs. Two-fifths (40%) of the state's Census Towns are just 22 towns with 20,000 or more population (Table 5).

Distribution by Region and Population size: According to the statistics in Table 6, the eastern part of the state is home to the majority of minor Census Towns (about 77%) with populations of at least 5,000, as required by the Census Operations. The western area is home to about 18%, or just under one-fifth. Surprisingly, there are less than 1,000 inhabitants in the Ghaziabad area, with only 757 residing in a single town. Roughly 8% of all CTs are these little settlements. These communities seem to be remote from the main village and depend on non-agricultural revenue streams.

About 55% of CTs are categorized as falling between 5000 and 10,000. The majority (53%) of these are found in the eastern area.

Table 5: Distribution Of CTs By Population Size (2011)

| Population | Number | Population | Percent to total numbers | Percent to total Population |
|-----------------|--------|------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Less than, 5000 | 22 | 89,113 | 08.24 | 02.50 |
| 5000-10000 | 147 | 1041,622 | 55.06 | 29.11 |
| 10000-15000 | 58 | 697,207 | 21.72 | 19.49 |
| 15000-20000 | 18 | 316,143 | 06.74 | 08.84 |
| more than 20000 | 22 | 1433,471 | 08.24 | 40.06 |
| STATE | 267 | 3578,155 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

Source: Calculated on the basis of Town Directory, UP, 2011

Table 6: Distribution of CTs By Region and Population Size

| Region | Population Size | | | | | Total |
|-------------|-----------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------|
| | Less than 5000 | 5000-10000 | 10000-15000 | 15000-20000 | More than 20000 | |
| Eastern | 17 | 78 | 21 | 07 | 07 | 130 |
| Central | | 06 | 11 | - | 04 | 21 |
| Western | 04 | 59 | 25 | 11 | 11 | 110 |
| Bundelkhand | 01 | 04 | 01 | - | - | 6 |
| STATE | 22 | 147 | 58 | 18 | 22 | 267 |

Source: Calculated from data compiled in Town Directory, UP, 2011

In higher demographic groups, the picture is somewhat different. The western zone has a little edge, but the eastern and western sectors contribute almost equally. This confirms the preceding assertion that there are more census towns overall but less residents in the eastern portion of the state, which is less developed, less urbanized, and less industrialized. In contrast, there are fewer census towns overall but more people residing in the more developed, industrialized, and urbanized western portion of the state. The eastern and western zones have smaller and larger census towns, respectively. The western zone is more developed and commercialized because it is part of the National Capital Region.

Existence of Civic Service Since Census Operations

The primary criteria used by census operations to differentiate these communities from rural villages are population density and the means of subsistence. It is predicted that the level of basic amenities would remain extremely low in terms of service provision because there is no criterion at all for service availability. Even in the absence of notable economic changes, CTs appear to be becoming centralities in their respective regions in addition to having increasing population densities. Since these CTs are places where more people live and work, public investment is necessary to guarantee that higher levels of service provisioning, such as water and sanitation, are given there. These towns' expanding local markets have raised expectations for improved services, such as solid waste

management and street lighting, which are currently mainly nonexistent (WB: 2016). Across India, it is shown that villages are becoming more urbanized, but to differing degrees.

Approximately 78% of Uttar Pradesh's population still lives in rural regions. Despite limited urbanization, the number of CTs in the state has increased dramatically, from 26 in 1981 to 43 in 1991 to 66 in 2001 and even higher to 267 in 2011. This necessitates a careful analysis and an appropriate plan to deal with this hidden, unrecognized, and ignored urbanization in the most populated state in the country.

Approach

Future discussions about CTs highlight the necessity of paying more attention to the factors that lead to the expansion of this urban population under rural governance. Many issues are important in this regard. The economy and society in these areas are evolving. One of these important motivators is the availability of infrastructure (Asher, 2016) [7]. Another booming industry in these areas is construction and home investment. Supporting rural housing and reducing the differences in the quality of basic services provided to regions that are counted and ruled as urban (STs and CTs) and governed as urban can help to strengthen this. The rise of towns as a result of rural areas changing is unquestionably a major aspect of India's urbanization process. The population growth and diversity of activity in rural regions are intrinsic elements of this transition process. However, there is ample data that suggests a substantial fraction of the activities in the rural non-farm economy are not only driven by demand-side variables. Numerous factors, such as agricultural stagnation, small land holdings, especially in the state's eastern region, and a lack of opportunities to supplement productive employment opportunities in the agriculture sector, may contribute to a residual absorption of labor in low-productivity non-farm activities. Due to a lack of industrialization, the "employment problem" in rural areas seems to have become worse. According to Mitra and Kumar (2015) [5], these census towns generally don't appear to have developed in reaction to agricultural prosperity.

These rising new urban centers, called census towns, have a significant impact on India's urban development. In order to improve market-based agriculture and the links between rural and urban areas, small towns might be extremely important. They also promote non-farm-related employment. Planned urban development requires Census Towns to become officially recognized Urban Local Bodies (ULBs). According to the rules established by the Fourteenth Finance Commission of the Ministry of Finance, the size of urban centers within a state is given weight. When distributing funding among the states, the number of STs in a state shall receive 50% of the total weight, according to the standards set forth by the Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT). When Census Towns become statutory ULBs, states are eligible for central aid. In May 2016, the states were asked to take the required actions to convert Census Towns into Statutory Towns by the Ministry of Urban Development.

According to the letter, "the first step towards coordinated infrastructure development, enhancement of revenues, and efficient delivery of citizen's services leading to the overall

growth of economic activities is the timely declaration of a habitat having urban characteristics as a statutory urban local body." If unplanned construction and ad hoc infrastructure provisioning are permitted to continue for an extended period of time, the chance for planned urban development may be lost (in Census Towns). "This (conversion from Census Towns to statutory ones) will not only trigger the process of preparing land use master plans leading towards planned growth but also will support provisioning urban infrastructure by leveraging resources available through various schemes/programs and devolutionary grant," the letter further states. MoUD (2016) States usually find it difficult to designate Census Towns as Statutory Towns because awarding the previous ULB status necessitates spending for infrastructure development. This has led to the haphazard growth of emerging urban centres (Census Towns), and these lack the facilities and services which are present in Statutory Towns governed by ULBs (Kumar: 2019) [4]. Opinions among urban scholars and researchers are not uniform. Some believe that the best course of action is to convert all CTs to STs. Each case should be handled separately. States differ in their minimum population content requirements. Therefore, it is unlikely that all CTs will become STs unless states exercise their prerogative power or combine settlements to reach that population threshold. For the planned governance of some of the CTs, especially the larger ones, the conversion of CTs into STs may be helpful. It is quite possible, though, that this specific mechanism will work with all CTs. For instance, it might be more beneficial to merge a CT into the city if it is located on the outskirts of a big city. Similarly, if multiple CTs lie close to each other, they can be combined together to make a larger ST (Pradhan: 2017) [9].

Conclusion

By expanding the geographic reach of already-existing urban local bodies or converting large villages into Statutory Towns with urban local bodies, the state government is dedicated to ensuring that a diverse variety of people have access to urban basic civic services. In contrast, 56 new Nagar Panchayats were created in December 2019, 41 municipalities had their borders expanded, and two Nagar Panchayats were promoted to Nagar Palika Parishads (Municipal Councils). As of right now, 14 Census Towns have been transformed into Statutory Towns with urban local bodies in order to address the state's increasing urbanization and guarantee planned development. Additionally, the establishment of 28 new Nagar Panchayats has been approved by the government. Additionally, 12 Nagar Panchayats, 9 Nagar Palika Parishads (Municipal Councils), and 2 Municipal Corporations have either expanded or are in the process of doing so (ToI: 2020). It's a good move. The state administration should take into account the seriousness of the situation, where about 10% of the state's urban population lives under rural rules and lacks access to essential urban services. The west of the state, which has populated Census Towns, is the most industrialized and urbanized area. In this section, the Census Towns should be given priority in the conversion process. However, if possible, smaller CTs in the eastern region ought to be merged with nearby STs or amalgamated to

create a statutory town with a municipality. The government should decide whether to convert them on an individual basis.

References

1. Census of India. Town Directory, Uttar Pradesh. New Delhi: Office of the Registrar General and Census Commissioner, India; c2001-2011.
2. Government of Uttar Pradesh. District, Cities and Towns - Population Statistics 1991, 2001 and 2011 [Internet]. Accessed 2020 Sep 14. Available from: <https://www.citypopulation.de/php/india-uttarpradesh.php>
3. Mukhopadhyay P, Zerah MH, Samanta G, Maia A. Understanding India's Urban Frontier: What is Behind the Emergence of Census Towns in India? Policy Research Working Paper 7923. New Delhi: World Bank, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice Group; 2016 Dec [cited 2020 Aug 14]. Available from: <https://documents.worldbank.org>
4. Kumar P. Census Towns in Uttar Pradesh: Understanding the Transformation of Rural Economy into Urban Economy. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 2019;54(33). [cited 2020 Aug 14, Dec 17].
5. Mitra A, Kumar R. New Patterns in Indian Urbanisation: Emergence of Census Towns. *Environment and Urbanization Asia*. 2015;6(1):18–27. [cited 2020 Mar 6].
6. Roy SN, Pradhan KC. India – Urban Rural Boundaries and Basic Services [Internet]. New Delhi: Centre for Policy Research; 2019. Supported by French National Institute for Sustainable Development (IRD) [cited 2020 Mar 8].
7. Asher S, Novosad P. Market Access and Structural Transformation: Evidence from Rural Roads in India. Manuscript, Department of Economics, University of Oxford; 2016. Cited in: Roy SN, Pradhan KC. India – Urban Rural Boundaries and Basic Services. New Delhi: Centre for Policy Research; c2019.
8. Chatterjee U, Murgai R, Rama M. Employment Outcomes along the Rural-Urban Gradation. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 2015;50(26):5–10.
9. Pradhan KC. What is Happening Beyond Large Cities? Understanding Census Towns in India. New Delhi: Centre for Policy Research; 2017 Dec 1 [cited 2020 Dec 18].
10. Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India. Letter by the Secretary to Chief Secretaries of States. New Delhi; c2016.
11. The Times of India. Uttar Pradesh section. Lucknow edition. 2020.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.