International Journal of Advance Research in Science and Engineering
Volume No. 13, Issue No. 08, August 2024
www.ijarse.com
IJARSE
ISSN 2319 - 8354

# Role of Urban Local Bodies in Urban Renewal Case Study of JNNURM

**Shaleen Sharma, Dr. Sanjay Gupta**

**Abstract:**

The Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM), initiated by the Government of India in 2005, sought to drive urban transformation and empower Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) in urban development. Despite its ambitious objectives, the mission encountered notable challenges in effectively bolstering the capabilities of ULBs. This paper adopts a qualitative approach, thoroughly reviewing the literature, policy documents, and expert perspectives. The analysis identifies several critical factors that hindered the mission's success in strengthening these bodies. These factors include inadequate capacity-building measures, insufficient financial autonomy, and a lack of alignment between mission goals and urban bodies' needs. The findings underscore the importance of addressing these issues to enhance the effectiveness of future urban development initiatives. By understanding and learning from the shortcomings of the mission, future such missions can better support urban bodies, ensuring more robust urban governance and sustainable development.

## History of Urban Local Bodies

Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) have been integral to the Indian urbanization process since the 17th century. The first municipal corporation in India was established in 1688 in Madras (now Chennai). This corporation consisted of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses and was empowered to collect taxes from individuals and use them for development and maintenance purposes.

During British rule, urban bodies struggled to flourish due to ineffective decentralization principles. Despite Lord Mayo’s 1870 reforms, which included provisions for one-third official representation and an election process for constituting the bodies, the local bodies’ effectiveness remained limited. The Indian Constitution did not initially include provisions for urban bodies under its two-tier federal system. It was only with the Constitution Amendment Act of 1992 that urban bodies were recognized as the third tier of government, gaining enhanced administrative and financial powers to better serve citizens. This amendment enabled ULBs to raise revenue and make investment decisions through their elected representatives.

## Role of ULBs

According to Rondinelli, ULBs are tasked with performing "basic municipal tasks." These tasks include:

1. Providing essential urban infrastructure.
2. Offering services that enhance human resources, productivity, and living standards.
3. Regulating private activities that impact community welfare, health, and safety.
4. Supporting productive activities and enabling private enterprises to function efficiently in urban areas.

ULBs rely heavily on financial resources to operate efficiently. State legislation grants them the authority to generate funds both internally, through tax collection from citizens, and externally, through grants and loans from central and state governments. These funds are used for administration, operations, and maintenance. Strategic planning and skilled knowledge are required for effective financial management. Urban Public Private Partnerships (PPP) play a vital role by advising ULBs, designing policy frameworks, and researching competency development. These PPPs may include development organizations, private advisory firms, and research institutes.

## Types of ULBs

In India, Urban Local Bodies are broadly classified into several types:

1. Municipal Corporation: Established through state or central legislation, municipal corporations govern large urban areas. They are structured into three main authorities: the corporation council, the standing committees, and the Municipal Commissioner. The council, led by the Mayor and Deputy Mayor, is elected directly by the residents. The standing committees oversee specific functions such as health and public works, while the Municipal Commissioner, a government officer, is responsible for implementing the council's decisions.
2. Municipalities: Also referred to as Municipal Boards or Councils, municipalities are set up by state legislation for smaller cities or towns. They consist of the municipal council, standing committees, and the Chief Municipal Officer, who is appointed by the state government.
3. Notified Area Committee: This committee is formed through a notification from the state government for rapidly growing towns that do not qualify as municipalities. It is not a statutory body; its members and chairman are nominated by the government.
4. Town Area Committee: This committee handles limited functions such as street lighting and drainage in smaller towns. It may be composed entirely of elected members, entirely nominated members, or a combination of both.
5. Cantonment Boards: Managing municipal functions for civilian populations in cantonments or military areas, Cantonment Boards were established under the Central Act of 1924. They operate under the Ministry of Defence, with the military officer commanding the cantonment station serving as the ex-officio chairman.
6. Townships: Created by public sector undertakings (PSUs) to offer amenities to their employees, townships are managed by a Town Administrator appointed by the PSU.
7. Port Trusts: Formed by Acts of Parliament, Port Trusts oversee port management and provide civic amenities in port areas. They are led by officials appointed by the central government.
8. Special Purpose Agencies: These agencies are established by state governments to handle specific municipal functions, such as Housing Boards or Urban Development Authorities. They operate independently from municipalities, either through state legislation or executive orders.

## JNNURM and ULBs

The Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM), launched on December 3, 2005, aimed to address urban challenges with an investment exceeding one lakh crore rupees. It sought to fast-track, the reform-driven, rights-oriented, demand-led, and partnership-based development of cities. Recognizing the crucial role of urban bodies, the mission aimed to strengthen their capacity to plan, finance, and implement urban infrastructure and services.

The mission emphasized decentralization and empowerment by granting urban bodies greater autonomy and authority in urban planning and governance. It included capacity-building initiatives through training programs and technical assistance for urban bodies officials and staff. Financial reforms were introduced, providing significant funds to urban bodies to address urban deficiencies and improve financial sustainability. This involved strengthening revenue collection, implementing e-governance systems, and promoting cost recovery.

The mission also emphasized the preparation of City Development Plans (CDPs) by urban bodies, encouraging a participatory approach involving various stakeholders. urban bodies were responsible for project implementation, including project identification, feasibility studies, and monitoring. The mission aimed to enhance accountability and governance within urban bodies by promoting transparency and citizen participation.

## Role of JNNURM

This renewal mission has played a significant role in urban development policy. It has encouraged reforms as catalysts for development, focusing on efficiency in urban infrastructure provision, service delivery, community participation, and accountability of urban bodies and related agencies. The mission includes three main components: governance reforms, infrastructure improvement, and services for the poor.

## Salient Features of JNNURM

This mission is characterized by several features:

It is defined by several key features designed to enhance urban development. Central to the scheme is the allocation of additional central funding for specified sectors, reflecting the government's commitment to addressing critical urban challenges. To ensure a shared financial responsibility, states and Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) are required to contribute between 10% and 50% of the project costs, depending on the project type. This co-funding approach not only distributes the financial burden but also encourages local stakeholder involvement. Importantly, the release of central funds is contingent upon the successful implementation of prescribed reforms. This linkage ensures that financial support is tied to the adoption of best practices and effective resource utilization. Additionally, the mission emphasizes the importance of convergence with other projects. By promoting synergy among various initiatives, the mission seeks to avoid duplication of efforts and maximize the impact of investments, thereby fostering a more integrated and efficient approach to urban development. Overall, these features collectively aim to drive sustainable urban growth through a combination of central support, local contribution, reform adherence, and strategic alignment with other projects.

## Objectives of the Mission

It aims to foster the development of cities into economically productive, efficient, equitable, and responsive urban centers. Its objectives include ensuring the planned development of both cities and peri-urban areas, aiming for self-sustainability, and addressing regulatory barriers that impede growth. The mission emphasizes the integration of infrastructure development with effective asset management and investment strategies to ensure long-term sustainability. It seeks to enhance the delivery of civic amenities with a focus on universal access and to provide essential services to the poor. Additionally, it is dedicated to the renewal and redevelopment of inner cities, mobilizing resources through strategic partnerships, and introducing information technology to improve urban governance. A crucial goal is the conservation of natural resources, ensuring that urban growth aligns with environmental sustainability. Together, these objectives are designed to create vibrant, well-managed urban areas that can thrive economically while addressing the needs of all residents and fostering a sustainable urban future.

**JNNURM Strategy**

The strategy includes:

The mission incorporates several strategic actions to ensure comprehensive urban development and sustainability. One of the key initiatives is the preparation of City Development Plans (CDPs), which are crafted with a long-term perspective of 20 to 25 years. These plans outline a framework for urban growth, detailing policies, programs, strategies, and financing plans that are essential for guiding future development. The CDPs serve as a roadmap for transforming urban areas into economically viable and well-managed cities.

A critical aspect of this mission is the identification of priority projects, which are vital for achieving the objectives outlined in the CDPs. For each of these priority projects, Detailed Project Reports (DPRs) are prepared. DPRs provide a thorough analysis and documentation of the project scope, design, implementation strategy, and financial requirements, ensuring that projects are well-planned and feasible.

Timelines for the implementation of reforms are also established to ensure that progress is made in a systematic and timely manner. These timelines help in monitoring the execution of reforms and ensuring that urban development aligns with the mission's goals.

In addition, it encourages the involvement of the private sector through Public Private Partnerships (PPPs). By integrating private sector expertise in infrastructure provision, management, and financing, the mission leverages additional resources and innovative approaches to enhance urban infrastructure.

Financial management under this mission involves the allocation of funds from the nodal agency to Urban bodies either as grants or loans. This financial support is crucial for facilitating additional resources from capital markets, thus expanding the funding base for urban projects.

Furthermore, it establishes a Revolving Fund designed to meet the ongoing operation and maintenance requirements for newly developed infrastructure. This fund ensures that urban assets are maintained effectively over time, thereby supporting the long-term sustainability and functionality of urban projects.

Together, these strategic actions form a robust framework for urban development under this mission, combining long-term planning, detailed project analysis, reform timelines, private sector involvement, innovative financing, and sustainable maintenance practices. created assets.

**Expected Outcomes from JNNURM**

Upon completion the expected outcomes include:

MIssion aims to revolutionize urban governance and service delivery through a series of strategic reforms. One of its core objectives is the implementation of modern and transparent budgeting, accounting, and financial management systems. These systems are designed to enhance efficiency and accountability in the management of

IJARSE
ISSN 2319 - 8354

urban services and governance. By establishing a city-wide planning and governance framework, the mission ensures a coordinated approach to urban development that integrates various aspects of city management.

A fundamental goal of this mission is to guarantee access to basic urban services for all residents, thereby addressing disparities and improving overall quality of life. To support this, the mission focuses on creating financially self-sustaining agencies responsible for urban governance and service delivery. This is achieved through revenue reforms that enable these agencies to generate and manage their funds effectively.

Transparency and accountability are central to the mission's objectives. It mandates that local services and governance structures operate with a high degree of openness, which helps build trust and ensures that resources are used appropriately. To further enhance efficiency, the mission promotes the introduction of e-governance applications in core Urban Local Body (ULB) functions. These digital solutions streamline processes, reduce service delivery costs, and shorten the time required to provide services, ultimately improving the overall effectiveness of urban management.

By integrating these modern practices, the mission aims to create a more efficient, transparent, and accountable urban governance framework that not only meets the immediate needs of residents but also supports sustainable and equitable urban development in the long term.

## Responsibilities of ULBs under JNNURM

According to the Twelfth Schedule of the 74th Constitutional Amendment Act (CAA), Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) are entrusted with a broad range of functions to ensure comprehensive urban management and development. These responsibilities include:

1. Urban Planning, Including Town Planning: Urban bodies are tasked with formulating and implementing urban and town planning strategies. This includes preparing master plans, zoning regulations, and land-use policies to guide the orderly development of urban areas. Effective planning ensures sustainable growth, reduces congestion, and promotes well-organized infrastructure.
2. Regulation of Land Use and Construction: Urban bodies oversee the regulation of land use and construction activities within their jurisdiction. This involves enforcing building codes, issuing permits, and ensuring that developments comply with zoning laws and land-use policies to maintain urban aesthetics and functionality.
3. Economic and Social Development Planning: Urban bodies are responsible for planning and implementing strategies aimed at economic and social development. This includes fostering local economic growth, improving employment opportunities, and addressing social inequalities through targeted programs and initiatives.
4. Roads and Bridges: The maintenance and development of roads and bridges fall under the purview of Urban bodies. This includes construction, repair, and upgrading of road infrastructure to ensure smooth transportation, connectivity, and the safety of urban commuters.
5. Water Supply for Various Purposes: Urban bodies manage the provision of water supply for domestic, industrial, and recreational uses. This involves ensuring a reliable and safe water supply, maintaining infrastructure, and addressing issues related to water quality and distribution.

6. Public Health, Sanitation, and Solid Waste Management: Ensuring public health through effective sanitation and solid waste management is a key function of Urban bodies. This includes waste collection, treatment, disposal, and promoting sanitary practices to maintain cleanliness and prevent health hazards in urban areas.

7. Fire Services: Urban bodies are responsible for providing and maintaining fire services, including establishing and operating fire stations, equipping firefighting personnel, and implementing fire safety measures to protect urban residents and property from fire hazards.

8. Urban Forestry, Environmental Protection, and Ecological Promotion: Urban bodies oversee urban forestry and initiatives aimed at environmental protection and ecological sustainability. This involves managing green spaces, promoting biodiversity, and implementing measures to mitigate environmental degradation and enhance urban ecosystems.

9. Safeguarding the Interests of Vulnerable Groups: Urban bodies work to protect and support vulnerable groups, including marginalized communities, the elderly, and disabled individuals. This includes implementing policies and programs that address their specific needs and promote their well-being and inclusion.

10. Slum Improvement and Upgrading: Addressing the needs of slum dwellers through improvement and upgrading initiatives is a critical responsibility. Urban bodies work to enhance living conditions in slums by providing better infrastructure, housing, and access to basic services.

11. Urban Poverty Alleviation: Urban bodies are engaged in strategies to alleviate urban poverty. This includes developing programs that provide economic opportunities, social support, and essential services to low-income populations to improve their quality of life.

12. Provision of Urban Amenities Like Parks and Playgrounds: The creation and maintenance of urban amenities, such as parks, playgrounds, and recreational facilities, are managed by ULBs. These amenities enhance the quality of urban life by providing spaces for leisure, sports, and community activities.

13. Promotion of Cultural, Educational, and Aesthetic Aspects: Urban bodies play a role in promoting cultural, educational, and aesthetic aspects of urban life. This includes supporting cultural events, managing educational institutions, and ensuring that urban spaces are aesthetically pleasing and culturally enriching.

14. Management of Burial and Cremation Facilities: Urban bodies are responsible for managing facilities for burial and cremation. This includes ensuring that these facilities are adequately maintained, accessible, and meet the needs of the community by cultural and religious practices.

15. Cattle Pounds and Animal Cruelty Prevention: Urban bodies oversee the establishment and management of cattle pounds and implement measures to prevent animal cruelty. This involves ensuring proper treatment of stray animals, enforcing regulations, and promoting humane practices.

16. Vital Statistics, Including Registration of Births and Deaths: The registration of vital statistics, such as births and deaths, is managed by urban bodies. This includes maintaining accurate records, issuing certificates, and ensuring that vital statistics are systematically recorded and accessible.

17. Public Amenities Such as Street Lighting and Parking: Urban bodies are responsible for providing and maintaining public amenities like street lighting and parking facilities. This includes ensuring adequate

illumination for safety and convenience and managing parking infrastructure to accommodate urban transportation needs.

18. Regulation of Slaughterhouses and Tanneries: Urban bodies regulate slaughterhouses and tanneries to ensure that they operate in compliance with health and environmental standards. This involves monitoring operations, enforcing regulations, and addressing issues related to waste management and public health.

### Implementation Process of JNNURM

For each city selected under the mission, a City Development Plan (CDP) is prepared and submitted through the state for approval by the Ministry of Urban Development (MOUD). Urban bodies then create Detailed Project Reports (DPRs) for projects identified in the CDP. These DPRs are reviewed by the general counsel of the ULB and then submitted to State Level Nodal Agencies. After technical review by the Central Sanctioning Committee (CSMC) of JNNURM, the project is approved. The government grants funding between 35-80% based on the ULB's size. For projects below 100 crore rupees, the grant is sent to the Finance Ministry. For projects between 100-500 crore rupees, the grant is provided as Additional Central Assistance (ACA), disbursed in instalments based on project progress.

### Work Completed under JNNURM

As per work completed under the mission (MoUD, GoI, JNNURM- Reform Primers, 2005) The status of achievement of reforms under the mission till July 2013 is summarised in the Table. Five states led by Karnataka (94%), AP (93%), HP (92%), and Maharashtra (91%) achieved 90% or more of their target under the scheme. The least utilization was done by the states of Arunachal (40%), Sikkim, and Manipur (49%). The other states achieved between 65%- 89% of the target.

Urban bodies have reduced the manpower and not filled up vacant positions, but this was not intended in the reform. The Urban bodies were supposed to employ additional staff, train the existing staff, and use IT solutions to streamline processes for cost efficiencies, etc. Instead, the urban bodies reduced the manpower and did not fill up the vacant positions. This led to most of the urban bodies.

Most of the urban bodies have involved private sector participation in the solid waste management sector followed by the transport sector. Out of 65 cities, 42 cities have achieved this reform. In 13 cities though the PPP cell and policy framework is not in place, the projects have been initiated. In Jammu and Srinagar, the PPP Cell and the policy are in place but no project has been initiated. Imphal City has not initiated this reform yet.

The reform on the revision of building bylaws to make rainwater harvesting mandatory in all buildings was achieved in 57 cities and the remaining cities are near completion. Kohima in Nagaland has not initiated the reform yet. The majority of the urban bodies have made amendments to the building bylaws to make rainwater harvesting mandatory in all buildings but they lack technical expertise and monitoring capability for the operational efficacy of the reform. Mission dictates that the process of registration of land and property be computerized by all states during the mission period. So far 46 cities have achieved the reform. The bylaws of Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh have yet to initiate this reform. Some of the bylaws have undertaken this reform under e-governance.

Most of the Urban Bodies have made changes in the process of approval for site development and construction of buildings and have reduced the time for sanction. A system of online approval is also being examined by the Urban Bodies to expedite the process. As many as 54 Urban Bodies have achieved the reform. Kohima and Gangtok have yet to initiate it. Some of the Urban Bodies have already adopted the automatic system of AutoDCR. AutoDCR is a unique and innovative e-governance solution for the automation of building plan scrutiny and approval.

Very few Urban Bodies have achieved or are in the process of implementing the introduction of property title certification reform. As many as 43 ULBs have yet to initiate the reform. Most of the Urban Bodies have not been able to progress this reform because of the complexities of issues related to the existing land records and it requires multi-department participation.

The reform on earmarking 20-25% developed land in all housing projects for EWS and LIG was introduced with the objective to increase the supply of affordable land for housing the poor with adequate access to basic services. The reform intended that Urban Bodies will take necessary actions to increase the supply of land and affordable housing for the poor. Chandigarh adopted the reform before the launch of the mission. Bihar and Kerala have yet to initiate the reform. The reform is achieved in 35 cities on paper. Urban Bodies do not have the mechanism to monitor the implementation of the earmarking of plots and housing. Public agencies, by and large, follow the guidelines but the same cannot be said for the private sector. Even if the private sector is following the guidelines the land and house may not be affordable by the EWS and LIG groups.

The Mission focuses on the empowerment of Urban Bodies and the fast-track implementation of projects. To achieve the latter, the choice of agency for the allocation of projects is left to the state which leads to ambiguity. Parastatal agencies were made project implementing agencies thus marginalizing the role of Urban Bodies. Preparation of the City Development Plan (CDP) was a pre-requisite and was to be endorsed by parastatals. Most of the smaller Urban Bodies cannot prepare CDP but endorse it notionally so that projects can be submitted to the center and funds can flow to the city (Sivaramakrishnan K.C. 2011).

Implementation of the 23 reforms in a span of five to seven years was a challenge for many of the Urban Bodies. The Urban Bodies cannot implement some of the reforms such as encouraging public-private partnerships and structural reforms. To access funds, most of the states and cities were in a hurry to pass legislation and office orders to introduce the reforms without having much how as regards the reform per se or their long-term consequences. States were expected to design reforms in collaboration with Urban Bodies, but the exercise became one of the satisfying technicalities of reform for drawing funds from the central government. There is also an overlap in the jurisdiction of Urban Bodies and various parastatal agencies. Also, these parastatal agencies are responsible for the provision of basic services and are receiving grants under the mission but are not required to implement reforms.

The monitoring of the reforms followed a checklist approach, rather than focusing on the transformative outcomes of the reforms. There was a lack of clarity in the nature, specification, and processes to follow the implementation of the reforms.

All parastatals were mandated to implement the same set of reforms ignoring the fact that ULBs differ in terms of their level of evolution, size, capacity, and willingness.

### Reasons for Slow Progress

The slow progress of reforms in Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) despite the enactment of the 74th Constitutional Amendment Act (CAA) can be attributed to several interrelated factors that hinder the effective functioning and empowerment of these local institutions. One of the primary issues is the limited understanding of reforms within cities and states. Without a comprehensive grasp of the reform objectives and processes, both urban administrators and political leaders struggle to implement necessary changes effectively.

A significant obstacle is the lack of political consensus at both state and municipal levels regarding the reform agenda. This includes resistance to private sector participation and challenges associated with the proper pricing of services. The absence of a unified stance on these issues results in fragmented and inconsistent implementation of reforms. Furthermore, the preparation of electoral rolls for Urban Bodies is managed by the State Election Commissions (SECs), which often create separate rolls for local elections rather than adopting those prepared for state assemblies. This practice leads to administrative delays and complications in conducting timely local elections.

In many states, the power to delineate wards for Urban Bodies elections remains with the state governments. This centralization of power can delay local elections until governments complete their delimitation exercises, thereby postponing electoral processes. Instances where Urban Bodies elections have been delayed by over six months due to the reorganization of ward boundaries or extensions of limits further illustrate this problem. Additionally, in numerous states, elected Mayors lack executive powers, limiting their ability to implement reforms and manage urban affairs effectively.

The 74th CAA's 12th Schedule, which outlines the functions that should ideally be transferred to Urban Bodies, is not always adhered to. Many states have not fully transferred all the identified functions to ULBs, which restricts their ability to perform their roles efficiently. Small and medium-sized Urban Bodies, in particular, struggle to manage the extensive range of functions listed in the 12th Schedule due to limited resources and capacity.

Furthermore, the lack of regulations requiring minimum service pricing to recover costs exacerbates financial challenges. Property tax, the primary source of income for Urban Bodies, has not achieved adequate buoyancy due to factors such as rent control, inefficiencies in updating property rolls, and resistance to periodic assessments. This has resulted in a weak revenue base, compounded by low user charges and inefficient revenue collection mechanisms. Additionally, state transfers to Urban Bodies are often insufficient and unpredictable, further straining their financial stability.

Central Finance Commission support for Urban Bodies has been sporadic and not directly linked to central revenue sources, creating additional uncertainty in funding. The existing administrative structure also lacks regulations to ensure a minimum level of technical staff in ULBs, which impacts their ability to manage and execute projects effectively. The roles of parastatal bodies, such as utility boards, and Urban Bodies are often unclear, leading to confusion and inefficiencies in project planning, implementation, operation, and maintenance.

Moreover, District Planning Committees (DPCs) and Metropolitan Planning Committees (MPCs) currently play a minimal role in urban planning and investment decisions, which limits their impact on strategic urban development. In certain cases, industrial areas are exempted from setting up Urban Bodies, further complicating the overall governance and management of urban spaces. These myriad challenges collectively contribute to the slow progress of reforms and the limited improvement in the functioning of Urban Bodies, underscoring the need for a more cohesive and well-structured approach to urban governance and reform implementation.

## Limitations of ULBs under JNNURM

The reform-linked-grant conditionality has resulted in a nexus. If the reforms are not implemented the funds are not released which results in time and cost escalations of the infrastructure projects and reforms do not progress further. However, if the funds are released irrespective of the reform's achievement, then states and Urban Bodies are left with no motivation to pursue the reforms.

The Urban Bodies cannot implement some of the reforms such as encouraging public-private partnerships and structural reforms. To access funds, most of the states and cities were in a hurry to pass legislation and office orders to introduce the reforms without having much known how as regards the reform per se or their long-term consequences.

There was no financial assistance provided for the implementation of the reforms. Many Urban Bodies were not in the position to implement several reforms, for example, the accounting reforms as well as GIS-based property taxation. The reforms where multiple agencies were involved, the process of reform implementation was slow since amending different Acts related to different agencies falls beyond the purview of the Urban Development Department of the State.

The monitoring of the reforms followed a checklist approach, rather than focusing on the transformative outcomes of the reforms. There was a lack of clarity in the nature, specification, and processes to follow the implementation of the reforms. It is only in 2010 which was the fifth year of implementation that the reforms primers detailing the reforms were disseminated to the Urban Bodies. Though it was intended that handholding support will be provided to the Urban Bodies in designing and implementing the reforms, no financial support was committed. All Urban Bodies were mandated to implement the same set of reforms ignoring the fact that Urban Bodies differ in terms of their level of evolution, size, capacity, and willingness.

## Conclusion

It is observed that JNNURMs' attempts to restructure the inter-governmental organization, restructure the housing market, encourage public-private participation, tax abetments, etc were not fully met. The main reason for this is the lack of clarity among the Urban Bodies, both at the formulation stage and the implementation stage. In the case of cities that implemented the reforms, there was a lacuna in understanding the extent of the reforms. The checklist referred to is subservient to requesting funds for the next stage. The qualitative aspects of the reforms affecting the lives of the citizens were completely ignored.

Limited power was entrusted to the Urban Bodies while the state government held the controlling position throughout the projects. In many cities rift between the Centre and the State or/ and the State and the Municipal body provided a hindrance to the smooth performance of reform initiatives.

The reforms were oriented towards globalizing the economy of the city. To meet the ever-growing demands of globalization the formulation of the legal framework must have adequate flexibility which the mission lacked. It becomes evident that the aims were directed toward increasing the property value, leading to gentrification. The real agenda of the reforms was oriented toward capital generation though camouflaged with social sustainability. The role of the consumer was negligible and the process adopted by the sub-state institutions and PPP was kept invisible to the consumer.

The way forward through the new generation of urban schemes must focus on:

1. Anti-gentrification
2. Consumer cooperatives
3. Neighbourhood councils as the local state.
4. More investment is directed toward community-owned property.
5. Better reproductive services like child care, recreation, education, etc.

## References

1. Ahluwalia, I. J., (2014). Planning for Urban Development in India, Paper for ICRIER.
2. Alpopi, C., & Manole, C. (2013). Integrated Urban Regeneration – Solution for Cities Revitalize. Procedia Economics and Finance, 6, 178-185.
3. Anđelić, N & Mihić M (2016). Urban Renewal Analysis. Serbian Project Management Journal, Volume 6, Issue 2, December 2016.
4. Andres, L, & Bochet, B (2010). Regenerating brownfields and promoting sustainable development in France and in Switzerland: what convergences? Rev Econ Reg Urbaine 729–746.
5. Batra, L., (2009). A review of Urbanisation and Urban Policy in Post-independent India, CSLG/WP/12, 2009.
6. Bhattacharaya, S & Bandhopadyay, G (2011). Urban Local Bodies in India- Prudent Financial Control Practices. International Journal of Governmental Financial Management pp 33- 49.
7. Bruntland, G (1987). Our common future: the world commission on environment and development. Oxford University Press, Oxford
8. Cabernet (2004). The need to consider social and cultural objectives when regenerating brownfields in Europe
9. Choguill, CL (2008). Developing sustainable neighborhoods. Habitat Int 32:41–48.
10. Couch, C., & Dennemann, A. (2000). Urban regeneration and sustainable development in Britain - the example of the Liverpool Ropewalks Partnership. Cities 17(2), 137-147.
11. Couch, C., Fraser, C., & Percy, S. (2008). Urban regeneration in Europe: John Wiley & Sons.
12. Courey, M (2019). Critical Urban Renewal: A Theoretical Construct and Case Study. The University of Western Ontario.
13. Elkington, J (1997). Cannibals with forks: the triple bottom line of 21st century business. Capstone, Oxford.

14. Harvey, D. (2012). Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to Urban Revolution. Brooklyn, NY: Verso.
15. Jenkins, R. Kennedy, L., Mukhopadhayay, P. (2014). Power, Policy, and protest: the politics of India's Special Economic Zones- Oxford.
16. Jha, G & Vaidya, C (2013). Role of Urban Local Bodies in Service Provision and Urban Economic Development: Issues in Strengthening Their Institutional Capabilities
17. Korkmaz, C (2016). Strategies for Sustainable Regeneration in Urban Areas: The Case of Barcelona. Selcuk University, Turkey.
18. Rao, PV (2017). Impact of Reforms of JNNURM in Hyderabad. Vol 8 IRJMST.
19. Reguiessé, D (2012). Towards an Urban Agenda for India.
20. Rey E, Laprise M & Lufkin S (2022). Neighborhoods in Transition: Brownfield Regeneration in European Metropolitan Areas. The Urban Book Series 77-93.
21. Sharma, P (2013). Urban Reforms under JNNURM- An Assessment. Journal Urban India, Vol 33 Issue II July-December 2013 pp 17-33.
22. United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (2018). International Guidelines on Urban and Territorial Planning (IG-UTP).
23. Vaidya, C (2009). Urban Issues, Reforms, and Way Forward in India. Department of Economic Affairs Ministry of Finance Government of India.