

Urban Development and Its Assessment with Reference to QOL

Samrat Pandit, Research Scholar, Department of Geography, CMJ University, Jorabat, Meghalaya, India.
Dr. Hamidul Hassan (Assistant Professor), Research Guide, Department of Geography, CMJ University, Jorabat, Meghalaya, India.

Abstract

In order to find fresh and fruitful avenues of academic inquiry, it is urgently necessary to break away from the standard practise that has been established. Urban scholars will need to concentrate a larger emphasis on the study of current urban difficulties in the United States, which are fundamentally distinct from urban problems seen in other parts of the world, due to the distinctive features of our social, economic, and political institutions. Even though the researcher has never called Midnapore home, she has spent her whole life observing the changes that have taken place in the city. Midnapore was a traditional city in the past, but it has seen rapid and unprecedented urbanisation as a result of advances in a variety of sectors, including population density, city expansion, housing stock, and transportation. Midnapore was elevated to the status of a Municipality in the year 1865, which played a role in the city's already fast expansion, which was a direct outcome of the general trend toward urbanisation that was occurring throughout the state. Since then, urbanisation has been steadily making its way into people's day-to-day lives, most obviously in the areas of housing and sanitation, transportation and infrastructure facilities, and relationships within neighbourhoods.

Keywords: Urbanization, quality of life, urban etc.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Urban Development in India

The twentieth century has been called the age of urbanization. At its commencement, the world was predominantly rural; only 8 per cent of the population lived in urban settlements. By 1950, the percentage had risen to 29 and by 1990 to 45. It is estimated to be around 50 at present. The current decade, 1990-2000, has seen an increase of about 83 per cent in the world urban population, and the cities have added, on an average, about 81 million people annually. Cities in India are undergoing rapid changes because of increase in population and strain on infrastructure. The Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty alleviation is entrusted with the responsibility of planning of different facets of urban development.

Urban Development is a state subject but the Ministry has the responsibility of broad policy formation and monitoring of programmes in the areas of Urban Development. The Ministry of Urban Development is formulating a National Urban Policy keeping in view the recommendations of the National Commission on Urbanization (NCU), the economic reforms and the elements of national urbanization strategy list out in the regional Action Plan on Urbanisation adopted by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) countries vide the New Delhi Declaration.

The Constitution (74th Amendment) Act, 1992 relating to Municipalities (known as the Nagar palika Act) was passed by Parliament in the Winter Session of 1992 and it received the assent of the President on 20.4.1993. This Act seeks to provide a common framework for the structure and mandate of Urban Local Bodies to enable them to function as effective democratic units of Local Self Government.

The Urban Land (Ceiling & Regulation) Repeal Act, 1999 was notified in the Gazette on 22.3.1999 in replacement of an Ordinance on the same subject. The Repeal Act has already come into force in the States of Haryana, Punjab, Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat & Karnataka and all the Union Territories. These guidelines basically emphasise the need for imposition of vacant land tax, on the land likely to be made available after the repeal of the Act and a provision for Economically Weaker Section (EWS) and Lower Income Group (LIG) category houses, while sanctioning housing projects.

The total population of the country has increased from 361 million in 1951 to 844 million by 1991, whereas, urban population increased from 62 million to 217 million, while in the same period, the number of urban agglomerations has increased to 3768 from 2843. This indicates that the increase in urban population was 250% whereas increase in urban agglomerations was only 32%. To improve the economic and physical infrastructure and to provide essential

facilities and services the Centrally sponsored, scheme of Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns (IDSMT) was initiated in the year 1979-80 and is being continued with timely amendment and modifications.

2. QUALITY OF LIFE

Quality of life is a very complex concept as it involves the satisfaction of the emotional needs and social aspiration of the community or society as well as the society's ability to meet the basic needs. Quality of life may also be defined as the way of living with happiness and satisfaction by fulfilment of basic needs as well as other social, cultural and psychological needs. It also means life style full of happiness and satisfaction that fulfils socio-cultural, psychological and emotional needs including survival needs.

2.1 Concept of Quality of Life

Quality of Life is tied to perception of 'meaning'. The quest for meaning is central to the human condition, and we are brought in touch with a sense of meaning when we reflect on that which we have created, loved, believed in or left as a legacy (Frankl, 1963).

Quality of life can be defined in many ways. Every definition agrees that the quality of life is basically successful and happy life. But it is very difficult to define it because the success and happiness mean different to everyone and thus is very subjective. Dictionaries too always define quality of life is both objective and subjective.

The quality of life is a complex, multidimensional concept, which includes the satisfaction with material and immaterial needs, thus the good standards of living, which is coupled with peoples' subjective feeling of wellbeing (Madarász, 2011). Quality of Life is the product of the interplay among social, health, economic and environmental conditions which affect human and social development (Barman, 2015).

In general, quality of life can be defined as a multidimensional construct that includes performance and enjoyment of social roles, physical health, intellectual functioning, emotional state, and life satisfaction or wellbeing. According to Ontario Social Development Council (Sookner, 1997), Quality of Life is about a persons' emotional state and personal life. One may live in the highest ranked city in terms of quality of living and still have a very bad quality of life because of unfortunate personal circumstances. Quality of Life is the product of the interplay among social, health, economic and environmental conditions which affect human and social development (UNDP, 1997). The Human Development Report examines the health, education and wealth of each by measuring life expectancy, educational achievement and standard of living. Quality of life may involve a subjective assessment or opinion as well as objective way of measuring quality of living.

The concept of quality of life broadly encompasses how an individual measures the goodness of multiple aspects of their life. These evaluations include one's emotional reactions to life occurrences, disposition, sense of life fulfilment and satisfaction, and satisfaction with work and personal relationships (Diener et al., 1999). In the literature, the term quality of life is also often referred to as well-being. However, there are a number of challenges in developing a meaningful understanding of quality of life and or well-being. The first is to ascertain what, exactly, the terms mean (Clarke et al., 2000 and Farquhar, 1995).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

The current research seeks to determine the citizens of Midnapore Municipality's perspectives on urbanisation as well as the urban quality of life and the factors that influence it, as well as its variables.

3.2 DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

The researcher made use of the main sources of information which were obtained via the direct implementation of the self-prepared interview schedule as well as the standardised rating scales. In accordance with the sampling strategy that was selected for the investigation, the researcher travelled to each of the zones in order to gather the information from the 250 respondents. The data gathering was place throughout the months of January and April of 2020.

3.3 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE STUDY

The researcher has provided an overview of the most important results obtained from the current investigation in the form of tables and graphs in this chapter. It also includes information about the relationships between the selected socio-demographic variables and the study variables, such as Attitude towards Urbanization, Perceived Urban Quality of Life (UQoL), and Perceived Urban Quality of Life Variables through the use of the appropriate statistical tools. The results on the testing of hypotheses have been reported by the researcher at the conclusion of the chapter.

Table 1 Zone

Zone	No. of Respondents(n:250)	Percentage
Rabindra Nagar (zone IV)	125	50.0
Saratpally (Zone I)	125	50.0

From what can be seen in the table above, it can be deduced that both zones each provide 50% of the total representation.

Table 2 Gender

S. No.	Gender	No. of Respondents (n:250)	Percentage
1	Male	95	37.7
2	Female	151	60.7
3	Third Gender	4	1.7

According to the data shown in the table above, the vast majority of the respondents were females (60.7%), while more than one-third of them were men (37.7%), and a very small minority (1.7% of them) identified as belonging to a third gender.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

The table shows that majority (68.7%) of the respondents have reported that they have drinking water facility available inside their home. When they were asked what kind of water they are subscribed to, vast majority (83.0%) of them said they have corporation water (Cauvery). For those who do not have drinking water facility at home (31.3%), majority (81.9%) of them take water from street pipes. Further, when they were asked how often they get water, majority (81.9%) of them get water on daily basis.

Table 2 Drinking Water Facility

S. No	Drinking Water Facility	No. of Respondents (n:250)	Percentage
1.	Have drinking water facility at Home?		
	Yes	171	68.7
	No	79	31.3
2.	If yes, kind of water?	(n:171)	
	Corporation (Cauvery) Water	142	83.0
	Bore	28	16.0
	Others	1	1.0
3.	If no, where would you collect water?	(n:79)	
	Street pipe	66	81.9
	Lorry water	2	3.2
	Filtered water	6	8.5
	Others	5	6.4
4.	How often do you get water?	(n:79)	
	Always	4	5.3
	Daily	65	81.9
	Every two days	5	6.4
	Others	5	6.4

With regard to chlorination of water, it is inferred from the above table that majority (54.0%) of the respondents have reported that chlorination is not done to prevent communicable diseases. It is also inferred from the above table that more than three-fourth (75.7%) of the respondents have reported that vaccination is not done during rainy season to prevent diseases like cholera, malaria and others It is noted from the above table that majority

(65.7%) of the respondents have said their streets have sewage facility. With regard to underground sewage facility, it is inferred from the above table that majority (57.3%) of the respondents have said its available. Further, when they were asked if their sewage is connected to the underground sewerage, majority (74.4%) of them agreed that it's connected.

Table 3 Hygiene and Sanitation Related

S. No	Water Stagnation	No. of Respondents (n:250)	Percentage
1.	Is Chlorination of Drinking Water done?		
	Yes	115	46.0
	No	135	54.0
2.	Is vaccination done during rainy days?		
	Yes	60	24.3
	No	190	75.7
3.	Does your street have sewage facility?		
	Yes	164	65.7
	No	86	34.3
4.	Underground Sewerage Facility		
	Available	143	57.3
	Not Available	107	42.7
5.	If yes, whether your sewage from your house connects to underground sewerage?	(n:143)	
	Yes	106	74.4
	No	37	25.6

CONCLUSION

The present study is a humble attempt on the part of the researcher to understand the perceptions of the three categories of urban residents viz., Slum Dwellers, General Urban Resident and Apartment Dwellers. In short, the study revealed that the perceptions of the residents depicts that the basic services like water, transport facilities, sanitation and drinking water were satisfactory, on the other hand the city lacks certain proactive measures like ensuring personal and economic security, rainwater drainage, crime and justice, which has to be taken into account seriously. Thus, the researcher would like to reproduce the basic principles of sustainability as put forth by European Union for increasing the urban QoL, as stated in the report of Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of European Continent, which was published in 2000; Promoting territorial cohesion through a more balanced social and economic development of regions and improved competitiveness, Encouraging development generated by urban functions and improving the relationship between urban and countryside, Promoting more balanced accessibility, Developing access to information and knowledge, Reducing environmental damage, Enhancing and protecting natural resources and natural heritage, Enhancing the cultural heritage as a factor for development, Developing energy resources while maintaining safety, encouraging high quality, sustainable tourism and limitation of the impacts of natural disasters.

REFERENCES

1. McCrea Rod, Tung-Kai Shyy and Robert Stimson (2006), What is the Strength of the Link Between Objective and Subjective Indicators of Urban Quality of Life? Applied Research in Quality of Life, Vol. 1, No. 1, 79- 96, DOI: 10.1007/s11482-006-9002-2
2. Das, Daisy. (2007), Urban quality of life: A case study of Guwahati. Social Indicators Research. doi: 10.1007/s11205-007-9191-6.
3. Richards, R., O'Leary, B., & Mutsonziwa, K. (2007), Measuring quality of life in informal settlements in South Africa. Social Indicators Research, 81, 375– 388. doi:10.1007/s11205-006-9014-1.
4. Santos, Luis Delfim and Martins, Isabel (2007), Monitoring Urban Quality of Life: The Porto Experience, Social Indicators Research 80: 411-425, Springer 2006 DOI 10.1007/s11205-006-0002-2

5. Rao, D.Pulla. (2008) Trends of urbanisation in Andhra Pradesh: 1901-2001, Nagarlok, Vol. 40 (4), 2008, Pp 16-28
6. Narayana, M.R. (2007), Education, Human Development and Quality of Life: Measurement Issues and Implications for India, Social Indicators Research Vol. 90, No. 2, 279-293, DOI: 10.1007/s11205-008-9258-z
7. Vashishtha, Vipin M (2009), Rising Urbanization of Poverty-A Blot on the Shining Armor: India Urban Poverty Report 2009, Indian Pediatrics, Vol. 46, Oct- 17.
8. Zebardast E. (2009), The Housing Domain of Quality of Life and Life Satisfaction in the Spontaneous Settlements on the Tehran Metropolitan Fringe, Social Indicators Research, Volume: 90, Issue: 2, Pages: 307-324 ISSN: 03038300 DOI: 10.1007/s11205-008-9260-5
9. Vaidya, Chetan (2009), Urban Issues, Reforms and Way Forward in India, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Government of India, Working Paper No.4/2009-DEA
10. Bhagat (2003), Urbanisation in India, A Demographic Reappraisal, Department of Geography, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak-124001, India

