State of Living Condition in Noida City, Uttar Pradesh

Sudhir Kumar Sinha

Associate Professor, Department of Geography, Shaheed Bhagat Singh (Eve.) College,
University of Delhi, New Delhi.

ABSTRACT   *Urbanization is taking place rapidly in world. Cities have emerged as engines of growth and vehicles of societal change. It offers opportunities to people not available in rural areas. However, the opportunities available to urban dwellers is unequal. On the one hand, there are a small section of rich who corner all benefits which the city offers and on the other extreme are slum dwellers who are condemned to live inhuman life and are denied these opportunities. The social and spatial segmentation of city is quite evident. This creates an urban divide which creates social tension and is not conducive to sustainable development. The present paper examines the state of living conditions in Noida city of Uttar Pradesh. The study reveals that there is wide spatial disparity within the city with respect to infrastructure and amenities. The study concludes that there is need for rapid infrastructure development, scientific management of resources and inclusive city for equitable quality of life and sustainable urban development.*

Keywords: Urbanization, Urban Divide, Spatial Segmentation, Sustainable Development, Inclusive City.

Introduction

The world is increasingly becoming urban. By 2030, urban population in all developing regions of the world including Asia and Africa will become more than their rural population. Cities are vehicles of societal change and offer opportunities to people not available in rural areas. However, we find that urban spaces are highly segregated. There are localities of rich featuring significant infrastructure and amenities. In contrast there are areas of poor which even lack basic amenities. The condition of slum is worst (Aldrich and Sandhu, 1995; Satterthwaite, 1989; Kumar,2010). Thus, only a small section benefits from the economic and social progress that urbanization offers, whereas a large majority of population is denied these benefits. This creates an urban divide between "haves" and "have nots" in the city. According to UN-Habitat (2008)"the urban divide is the face of injustice and symptom of systemic dysfunction. A society cannot claim to be harmonious or united if large number of people cannot meet their basic needs while others live in opulence. A city cannot be harmonious if some groups concentrate resources and opportunities while others remain impoverished and deprived". This urban divide creates a gap or even at times chasm in the society which produces social instability. For healthy and sustainable development of the city this urban divide must give way to "inclusive city" or a "city for all" to provide equitable social and economic benefits to every individual living in the city.

The present paper examines the existence of this urban divide in Noida city of Uttar Pradesh by looking at inter sectoral differences in the state of living conditions of the people.

Review of Literature

The question of "who gets what where and how" or who should get what where and how has been of paramount interest to geographers. There has been a number of studies addressing the question of urban divide or social and spatial inequalities within city. Pacione(1990) has observed that "we must be aware of the danger that the rich and powerful can seek to impose their view of what is right on the poor and weak, it is equally evident that all human beings have certain universal basic rights". Similarly, Nangia and Thorat (2000) have stated that the right to live in dignity is a basic human right. UN-Habitat (2008) has discussed this issue of urban divide in detail. A number of studies have found the existence of inequality in cities with the worst conditions prevailing in slums (Breese, 1969; Aldrich and Sandhu, 1995; UN–Habitat, 2003; and Kumar 2010).

Database and Methodology

The present study is based upon primary data. A questionnaire survey was carried out in the Noida city in 2016 to analyze the inter sectoral differences in the city. Eight localities/sector and 30 respondents in each locality were selected through stratified random sampling technique. The selected localities include one slum area (Sector 10), two urbanized villages (Mamura and Chalera), one high density middle class (Sector 12), one medium density middle class (Sector 26) and three medium density high class (sector 44,52,105)

residence localities. Thus, the localities selected and a total of 240 respondents represents cross section of universe (Sinha,2017).

State of LivingConditions in Noida City

Urban amenities such as water, electricity, sewerage, drainage, and solid waste disposal has been selected as indicators to enquire into living conditionsof people in study area as these indicators significantly affects quality of life and urban sustainability. Attempt has been made to analyse inter sectoral/locality disparities in these amenities in Noida.

Water

Water is the most important amenity without which one cannot live. It significantly affects the health and hygiene of people. In the survey, enquiry was made with regard to sources of water supply, duration of water supply, quantity of water supply and quality of watersupply.

a) Sources of Water Supply: In Noida, water is supplied to houses by pipes by NOIDA Authority. However, it was found that pipedwater supply has not been provided in the slum of Sector 10 and Chalera village. In these two localities people get water through boring (Table 1). In the rest of the surveyed localities water is supplied by the NOIDA Authority twice a day for about two hours each time. A number of houses in these localities have also developed boring as an additional source of water. People have developed boring for a number of reasons such as to get water in case of failure of piped water supply; in some cases, it was developed before good piped supply system was evolved, and some high-income families have developed it for the ease of convenience. It was reported by respondents that a reliable water supply system has evolved in localities served with piped water and failure of system is veryrare.

Table 1: Sources of Water Supply (in per cent)

Localities	Piped	Boring	Piped + Boring
Mamura	63.33	6.667	30
Sector 10	0	100	0
Sector 12	86.67	0	13.33
Sector 26	76.67	0	23.33
Sector 44	53.33	0	46.67
Sector 52	43.33	0	56.67
Chalera	0	100	0
Sector 105	100	0	0
Total	52.92	25.83	21.25

Source: Sinha, 2017

b) Quantity of Water supply: Overall respondents were satisfied with the quantity of water supplied across all the localities where piped water is supplied by NOIDA Authority (Table 2). Some respondent in Mamura reported that they do not get sufficient quantity of water as some respondent have installed motor to extract water from pipe which results into low pressure.

Table 2: Quantity of Water Supply in Noida(in per cent)

Localities	Sufficient	Insufficient	
		Always	At times
Mamura	70	10	20
Sector 10	NA	NA	NA
Sector 12	80	0	20
Sector 26	90	0	10
Sector 44	100	0	0
Sector 52	100	0	0
Chalera	NA	NA	NA
Sector 105	100	0	0
Total	90	1.67	8.33

Source: Sinha, 2017

c) Quality of piped water: On the one hand respondents were happy with the quantity of water supplied, on the other they were almost unanimous that the quality of water supplied is poor for drinking and cooking purposes (Table 3).

Table 3: Quality of Water Supply in Noida (in per cent)

Localities	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor
Mamura	0	40	36.67	23.33
Sector 10	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sector 12	0	26.67	73.33	0
Sector 26	0	10	90	0
Sector 44	0	0	100	0
Sector 52	0	0	100	0
Chalera	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sector 105	0	0	100	0
Total	0	12.78	83.33	3.889

Source: Sinha, 2017

All respondents from the selected survey localities reported that they do not drink piped water supplied to them directly. Respondents from high income Sectors (44, 52 and 105) purify the supplied water through RO or other purification techniques and then use it for drinking and cooking. Sectors 12and26respondentsalsowereusingsomepurificationtechniques(suchascandle) to purify water before drinking and cooking. Some respondents were also buying packaged water for drinking. In sector 10 (slum) Mamura and Chalera, most of the respondents were buying packaged water for drinking purposes.

Electricity

All the 240 household surveyed reported that they have electricity connection in their houses. Therefore, non-availability of electricity connection is not a problem in the study area. However, power cut is a problem as power cut is a recurrentfeature in the study area. An analysis of Table 4 indicates that power situation in summer is worst in comparison to winter season. During summer, most of the localities have power cut of 2 to 4 hours per day. Power cut is more (4-6 hour per day) in Sector 10 slum and two urban villages and least in high income residences (Table 4). It is ironical that power cut in high income localities is comparatively less who can afford alternative means of power supply (inverter and generator) than those who (slum and urban villages) cannot afford these alternative means. So, again the worst victims of power cut are the residents of Sector 10 slum, Mamura and Chalera. Infact, high income families hardly feel the pinch of power cut due to availability of power through alternatesources.

In winter the power situation is much better as power cut is less than 2 hours in most of the localities except houses in Chalera which reported a power-cut of 2-4 hours. Also, whereas power cut is almost a daily feature during summers, in winters it is notfrequent.

Table 4: Supply of Electricity in Various localitiesof Noida (in percent)

Localities	Summer Season			Winter Season		
	0-2 hours	2-4 hours	4-6 hours	0-2 hours	2-4 hours	4-6 hours
Mamura	0	36.67	63.3	86.67	13.33	0
Sector 10	0	30	70	93.33	6.67	0
Sector 12	33.33	60	6.67	93.33	6.67	0
Sector 26	43.33	56.67	0	96.67	3.33	0
Sector 44	70	30	0	93.33	6.67	0
Sector 52	80	20	0	100	0	0
Chalera	0	13.33	86.7	26.67	73.33	0
Sector 105	90	10	0	96.67	3.33	0
Total	39.58	32.08	28.3	85.83	14.17	0

Source: Sinha, 2017

Sewage Disposal

Sewage is disposed in three ways in the study area. In the developed sectors of Noida (12, 26, 44, 52 and 105) all forms of sewage (latrine, bathroom kitchen and rain water) is connected to main sewer line (Table 5). In these sectors there is no problem of sewage disposal due to good seweragesystem.

Table 5: Sewage disposal in Noida (in per cent)

Localities	Sewage pipe	Sewage pipe + open drain	Septic tank + open drain
Mamura	-	100	-
Sector 10	-	-	100
Sector 12	100	-	-
Sector 26	100	-	-
Sector 44	100	-	-
Sector 52	100	-	-
Chalera	-	-	100
Sector 105	100	-	-
Total	62.5	12.5	25

Source: Sinha, 2017

In Mamura, recently sewer of latrines has been connected to sewer-line. However, bathroom, kitchen and rain water is disposed through opendrains. The drains are dirty, unhygienic and get frequently clogged. Consequently, the dirty water overflows on roads and area faces problems of water logging. Situation is worst during rainy season when almost for days the roads are water logged which gives a foul smell to whole locality. Situation in Sector 10 slum and in Chalera is almost identical except that in these two localities NOIDA Authority has failed to lay sewer line and thus for disposal of latrine the respondents have built septic tank. Thus, sewage disposal in Sector 10 slum, Mamura and Chalera is extremely unhygienic and unhealthyandisbreedinggroundformanyofthediseasesandoutbreakofepidemics.

Solid Waste Disposal

The disposal of solid waste has become an important issue in sustainable urban development. Thousands of tonnes of solid waste are generated everyday by the city. Disposal of this waste in hygienic and efficient manner is a challenging task for city planners. If wastes are not removed from the localities regularly, the area becomes unhygienic with severe implications on health and well-being of people living in the area. The garbageindevelopedsectorsofNoida(12,26,44,52and105)iscollectedfrom door to door and then deposited at the designated sites from where NOIDA Authority removes the garbage (Table 6). It was reported that solid waste disposal from the localities by the NOIDA Authority is very regular and efficient in high income sectors (44, 52 and 105). Whereas in Sectors12 and26 waste disposalis not as efficient as in high class localities although satisfactory. In Sector 12 and 26 at times the garbage is not removed for few days. Also door to door garbage collection services are not provided by NOIDA Authority. Rather this is done at the initiative of residents of the locality. It was reported that garbage collection is a paid service for which residents pay between Rs. 50 to Rs. 100 per month to private contractors or it being part of monthly maintenance charge to residence welfare association (RWA). Few respondents in Sector 12 and 26 do not avail the service of door to door garbage collection as it is a paid service. They dump their garbage nearby roadside at the designated places themselves. Overall, the developed sectors have an efficient system of waste disposal from individual houses as well as fromlocality.

However, situation in Sector 10 slum and Chalera is totally in contrast to developed sectors. The respondents in these two localities dump their garbage roadside. The garbage is not removed regularly by NOIDAAuthority and thus creates a scene of filth and squalor. At times garbage are not removed for days together and one can witness mounds of garbage scattered all over the locality making the locality stink. The condition of Mamura is almost similar to Sector 10 and Chalera except that majority of residents get their garbage removed from house (door to door) by paying a monthly charge of Rs. 50 to private contractor. Also, a large number of residents dump their garbage along roadside like Sector 10 orChalera.

Table 6: Solid waste disposal in Noida (in per cent)

Localities	Door to door	Road side dumping
Mamura	60	40
Sector 10	0	100
Sector 12	80	20
Sector 26	93.33	6.67
Sector 44	100	0

Sector 52	100	0
Chalera	0	100
Sector 105	100	0
Total	66.67	33.33

Source: Sinha, 2017

Conclusion

The questionnaire survey result indicates that there is wide disparity in the living condition of people. The "urban divide" is clearly evident in the inter sectoral differences with respect to water, electricity, sewage and solid waste disposal. The condition of slum is the worst. The situation is not conducive for healthy and sustainable development of city. The infrastructure and amenities in many respects is wanting even at the present level of population and as the projected population of Noida is 25 lakhs by 2031, there is need for rapid infrastructure development, scientific management of resources and "inclusive city" for better and equitable quality of life and sustainable urban development.

References

1. Aldrich B. C., Sandhu R (1995). Housing the urban poor: Policy and Practice in Developing Countries. Vistaar Publication, New Delhi.
2. Breese, G. W. (1969). The city in newly developing countries: readings on urbanism and urbanization. Prentice Hall.
3. Kumar, P. (2010). Socio Economic Profile of Slums in India: An Analysis of Socio-Economic Characteristics of slums Across Wards of Select Million Plus Municipal Corporations. Urban India 30(2).
4. Nangia, S. and Thorat, S. (2000). Slum in a metropolis: the living environment. Shipra Publications, Delhi.
5. Pacione, M. (1990). Urban Problems: An Applied Urban Analysis. Routledge, London.
6. Satterthwaite, D., and Hardoy, J. E. (1989). Squatter Citizen, Life in the Urban Third World. London, Earthscan.
7. Sinha, S. K. (2017). Urban Sprawl in Gautam Budh Nagar, Ph.D Thesis, Department of Geography, University of Delhi. [Unpublished].
8. UN-Habitat (2003). The Challenge of Slums. Earthscan.
9. UN-Habitat (2008). State of the world's cities 2010/2011: bridging the urban divide. Earthscan.