

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Ar. Manish Kumar Chitranshi

Assistant Professor

Amity School of Architecture & Planning

Country Amity University Madhya Pradesh, Gwalior, India

ABSTRACT: This is very important issues in all developing countries. Every country emphasizes on this issues from the mid of 20th centuries, gave importance to citizen participation in urban development and urban planning process. In India citizen participation is very poor because of un-awareness, and illiteracy etc. In this seminar we study the role of citizen participation in urban development and understand the importance and difficulty of citizen participation in India, face by urban local bodies (ULBs), Non-government organization (NGOs) and we also study polices for citizen participation urban development. In India the citizen's participation in urban development process is regulated in the Indian constitutional Building Law Code. Participation by men and women, old and young is an indispensable basis of good governance. Though some countries have tended to encourage the inherent capacity of public discussion on matters of governance, there has often been a dearth of instrument for pursuing the outcome of the discussions to the right conclusion.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the economic and political conditions prior to 1960, urban planning was taken into consideration by government, especially on its economic and management aspects, so it had imperative and top-down characteristics. On the other hand, growing trend of industrialization and urbanization caused the domination of scientific and technocratic elites especially engineers and Architects in this scope.

From 1960 on, vast critical reactions impacted this situation and caused urban planning change from imperative and technocratic to participatory and democratic shape. Sustainable development, rapid growth of democracy and human rights, development concepts of civil society and present cultural reactions placed urban planning in a critical situation in a type of theoretical and practical difficulties. In order to release from this critical situation, urban planning begins with democratic methods, searching justice and human aims. In fact, urban planning and design in the beginning of 21st century goes to a revolution in duties, aims and methods.

Some researchers and specialists believe that we ought to speak about 'planning through debate' and 'communicative turn' in planning theory. Most practical and theoretical efforts that have been done in this field are based on a combination of methods and principles of planning to democracy, public and private sector participation, defense of poor people and protection of cultural values, this providing justice and social welfare (Campbell, 1997).

In his recent contribution to communism planning theory, Sager (1994) elaborates two planning models—rational-scientific planning and dialogical incrementalism—which are in opposition to each other concerning the relation between knowledge and communication. The differences can be summarized as follows: rational-scientific planning accepts the means-end scheme and relies strongly on analytical technique, whereas incremental planning rejects the means-end scheme and depends heavily on communication. The planners in the synoptic process have nearly unlimited calculative capacity, and the planners in the dialogical incremental process nearly unlimited communicative capacity. Therefore, synoptic and incremental planning can be viewed as opposites with regard to information, knowledge and communication. To Habermas's (1984) terms, synoptic planning involves a strategic rationality whereas dialogical incrementalism involves a communicative rationality. Obviously, one single form of planning has rarely been entirely adhered to in reality. However, through this ideal type of formulation, Sager creates fixed reference points for discussing communicative aspects of planning.

Therefore, one of the most Important characteristics of the new urban planning theories and international program is the concept of citizen participation in decision-making process.

II. FUNCTIONS OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Planning academics and practitioners call widely for citizen participation in planning decisions. The literature provides and practical functions and reasons for this emphasis on citizen participation.

- In the communicative planning paradigm, for example, participation is at the core of deliberation among agencies, stakeholders, and the public at large.
- In practice, there are two kinds of normative and instrumental functions for citizen

The normative functions of participatory planning are related to demands for direct (or indirect) democracy. One of the arguments is that in an active democracy the voice of citizens should be listened to. Another argument is that participation is necessary to enlarge the

legitimacy of the decision-making process. Participation is also valuable as a political goal, because it increases social capital and empowers citizens as they seek a stronger voice in decision that affects their lives. Participatory planning is seen as central to the promotion and protection of their interests.

III. LIMITS TO CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:

Citizen involvement in urban planning process has suffered from a number of problems and limits. Researchers and planners have resolved some of these limits, while others have remained unresolved. Here, I refer to the main issues that planners face.

Lack of resources and staff are likely to be a major constraining factor on both local authorities and other organizations that are involved in process at a local level. Good quality participation demands administrative support and other resources. Although, citizen participation gains time and money in long-term, but it needs financial resources and time in short-term. A second problem is lack of clear guidance from government about the relationship of citizen participation to other areas of activity of local government (Caner and Darlow, 1997). More importantly, citizen participation rarely reached a good-quality level where citizens had some power to influence decision-making (Wang and Van Loo, 1998). Logically, continuous lack of good quality of citizen participation can create the citizens' apathy. Sometimes local planners and politicians have no incentive to make an effort to maximize citizen participation (Vang and Van Loo, 1998). The need to achieve consensus in the participation process is another major problem. How should this be achieved when views are directly conflicted?

There are also a number of problems due to the participants themselves. For example, most of the participants are from a restricted social spectrum—middle class and well educated—that implies an unrepresentative process (Bedford et al, 2002). Similarly, it is hard to gain lower and lower middle-income residents' participation, because they see development matters as threats and possibly costly (Wang and Van Loo, 1998). More importantly, it seems inevitable that objectors will be those with a personal interest in an area, because this is where the planning system manifests itself in the reality of people's everyday lives and is the point at which personal interests need protection. Objector's opinions contrary to those of the planning officer are likely to be rejected on grounds. These groups of people try to legitimize their concerns by supplementing them with less self-interested reason for objection (Bedford et al, 2002).

Finally, although there are rational reasons for public participation in planning, power structures have a rationality of their own in the form of networks of interests of authority developers. Citizen participation programmes will no longer be successful if the roles and the structures of power are not aptly recognized and considered.

IV DEFINITION OF CONCEPT

In this section, a number of concepts related to the subjects such as democracy, citizen participation, participatory democracy, collaborative planning and informal settlement have been defined. Moreover, I will discuss the difference between direct and indirect participation.

IV.1 DEMOCRACY

The word 'democracy' is used in contemporary debate in a wide and confused range of meanings. An argue for a notion of democracy based on the principle of autonomy in both political and economic sphere* in a system which promotes "discussion, debate and competition" among many divergent views. Within this conception, open debate, access to power centre* and general political participation are key requirements for democratic public life (Held, 1996).

IV.2 PARTICIPATION

Citizen participation can be defined as "providing citizens with opportunities to take part in governmental decision or planning process", but a desirable participation, is one that enables citizens to shape planning decisions and outcomes while increasing their levels of social and political empowerment. It is therefore more than simply encouraging local inputs, it is about the capacity of groups and individuals to assert degrees of influence and power. As Ipsen (2003) aptly stated, "participation today no longer means that the population is merely informed or that it has a formal right of objection, but is rather evolving into conflict management in order to overcome the blockage of developments and to actively participate in designing future developments".

IV.3 PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY

A theoretical consideration of participatory planning is closely related to the concept of democracy. Direct (participatory) and indirect (representative) democracy are two separate democratic perspectives. Generally, people that are actively involved in planning situations have different conceptions about the function, necessity and range of participation within democratic decision-making. An important feature includes the directness of democracy. This feature—and other features which will not be discussed here—reflects different types of democracy (Held, 1996).

In direct democracy, citizens make decisions by themselves. The direct participation of all members of society is central to democracy types such as deliberative democracy and plebiscitary democracy. Indirect democracy, on the other hand, refers to a type of involvement by citizens and other groups where, eventually, representatives decide. Indirect participation matches with representative democracy. In representative democracy, delegates represent their people and use their skills to speak for people. Consensus democracy, for example, is a type of representative democracy, usually aiming at getting a broadly-based consensus to support its decisions. It involves the participation of citizens via representatives or delegates. In indirect democracy, participation occurs by means of elections or via established interest groups. With the "communicative turn" the emphasis on representation has shifted towards an emphasis on direct involvement. Direct democracy means that people speak for themselves. Planning processes are then no longer run by representatives who represent the absent; these absentees are actually present.

IV.4 GOVERNANCE

In theory Governance means a more bottom-up approach with a much wider input from as many stakeholders as possible.

IV.5 COLLABORATIVE PLANNING

As Healey discussed this term in her book (Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies, 1997), the term was used to explain the process, in which the stakeholders and interest groups and participants, try to reach consensus on actions that express their mutual benefits and interests.

V THE ROLE OF CITIZENS IN DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

Placing citizens at the center of administrative and decision-making processes of the government is the hallmark of a living and thriving democracy. It is inextricably linked to a development paradigm that works to create an inclusive environment where people can develop to the fullest of their capacities, with people having efficient and equitable access to public services. Indian democracy has extensive legal and institutional provisions at various levels of administration to include citizens in the processes of governance.

The Ninth and the Twelfth Reports of the Second Administrative Reforms Commission have dealt elaborately with the idea of social capital and citizen centric governance. These two processes can be seen to together answer the question: why are some governments more stable, efficient, innovative and well-managed than others? This paper has argued that there are two sides to citizen centric governance- the demand and supply sides. The demand side draws on the existing social capital to organize communities in such a manner as to become sophisticated consumers of politics. On the supply side, the aim is to reorient government organizations to make them more efficient, effective and participatory.

VI PARTICIPATION OF CITIZENS AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS IN SMART CITY PROPOSAL

In order to make the smart city proposals more participatory and inclusive, development bodies hereby invite smart suggestions and ideas from citizens to make as smart city. The resident are requested to post their suggestion pertaining to infrastructure services and smart solution such as water supply and recycling and conservation, energy management using smart grid, sanitation including solid waste management, efficient urban mobility, robust IT connectivity and digitization, safety and security of citizen particularly women elderly by use of CCTV surveillance, smart street lighting, public Wi-Fi network, parking, development of non-motorized transport, sustainable environment, intelligent traffic management, energy efficient street lights, health and education services using IT enabled smart applications , innovative use of open spaces or any other feature the citizen would like to include as part of smart city vision. The citizen is also requested to post their ideas of financing of the smart city plan and the revenue model to attract private participation etc. The recent thrust of Government of India to upgrade urban infrastructure and basic services through Urban Reforms:

- 1) JNNURM
 - a. Community participation Law (CPL)
 - b. Public Disclosure Law (PDL)

- 2) 74th Constitutional Amendment Act

VII CONTEMPORARY PLANNING VS. PARTICIPATORY PLANNING

S.No.	Contemporary Planning	Participatory Planning
1.	Centralized (from the centre to the periphery)	Decentralized (from the periphery to the centre)
2.	Vertical and imposed (from the top to the bottom)	Horizontal and agreed upon (from the bottom to the top)
3.	Technical (done by experts)	Dialogue-based (promoting discussion of different knowledge)
4.	Done by sector or industry	Integral, considers the whole picture
5.	Done to meet legal requirements (what matters is compliance)	Is seen as a real necessity (what matters is the content)
6.	Assigns who is responsible for what task but does not assume responsibility	Assigns responsibilities and social commitment
7.	Excluding	Inclusive
8.	Authoritarian	Democratic
9.	Distances State and Civil Society	Brings State and Civil Society closer
10.	Recognizes a certain population as an object that will benefit from the plan	Recognizes social actors as active subjects in their own development
11.	Responds to an intervening/controlling State	Encourages a facilitating State
12.	Is ignorant of the conditions specific to each location	Is based on a knowledge of the concrete and particular conditions of that location
13.	Creates lack of confidence in institutions	Builds relationships of confidence
14.	Promotes confrontation and the imposition of power	Promotes Political commitment and support
15.	Decreases manageability	Increases manageability and Accountability

VIII DIFFICULTIES IN IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION BY ULBS AND NGOS

- a) The major difficulties faced by ULBs
 1. The public has little knowledge about existing legal practices
 2. More education and training is required for Public/NGOs
 3. Government officials need to be trained more to manage procedure for community participation
 4. Government officials are neither open to initiate nor implement community participation provisions
- b) The major difficulties faced by NGOs
 1. Lack of Funds
 2. Poor Governance
 3. Poor Networking
 4. Poor Communications
 5. Limited Capacity
 6. Development Approaches
 7. Relationships with other Local NGOs
 8. Political Interference
 9. Lacks of Volunteers

IX. CONCLUSION

According to the principles of development of cities and towns try to achieve a socially responsible, environmental friendly and economically successful future urban growth and development. In the process of urban development citizen's participation has become an important factor not only as a result of democratic country and a method to involve people in the planning process, but also achieving to create a real inclusive planning approach. There are different tools, methods and strategies for citizen's participation. In previous decades participation often had been seen as an intervention and a restraint. But meanwhile citizen's participation is recognized and accepted as a necessary part of urban planning and development as well as a part of good urban governance. In India the citizen's participation in urban development process is regulated in the Indian constitutional Building Law Code and has to be done in two steps. First as public participation at the earliest possible stage presenting and discussing the general aims and purposes of planning and development as well as different solutions. In the second phase the urban development plan has to be published for a period of one month and everybody can make suggestions, that have to be taken into consideration in the process of balancing the public and private interests. In the land management process the citizen's participation is much more intensive, because in this phase of urban development the entire land ownership

