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Urbanisation & housing: Nepal

- Nepal is one of the poorest countries in the world with a per capita income of US$ 426.
- Predominantly a rural country; only 17% people live in the urban areas and 83% population are still living in rural parts of the country.
- Average urban population growth rate at 6.65% as against 2.25% overall.
- 80% in agricultural activities but rapidly reducing – only 18% productive land.
- Urbanisation of poverty: 25% urban population under poverty line and growing.
- Mismatch in housing supply and demand.
- Between 20-50,000 population in 65 squatter settlements in 2010 and growing.
Squatter and the City

Policy context

- No specific policy re evictions or for resettlement
- National Shelter policy (1996) archaic and up for significant update
- Alignment with the global policy of ‘shelter for all’

Legal context

- Legal framework slow to respond to squatter issues
- Squatting is unlawful but not illegal

Institutional context

- Public housing was never introduced
- Owner built homes & incremental
- Private sector housing catering to middle and high income people.
- Rise of third sector to support community activism but not consistent

- Soaring land and housing prices, high rents causing affordability problems
- According to Government estimate, half a million dwellings were needed to sustain the growing population (KVTTC, 2010)
Growth of Squatter Settlements in Kathmandu Metropolitan City

Source: Joshi & Bjoness, 1987, Concerned Citizens Group
Kathmandu Squatter Site Survey, 1990, Tanaka, 1997,
Lumanti, 2000, 2005 and 2010
Kirtipur Housing Project

Evolution

- Vishnumati Link Road Project conceived first in 1969; formally launched in 1999 with ADB loan
- 5 communities affected by the road project – all without any legal title to the land or planning/building permission
- Series of eviction notices & resistance from the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Year Settled</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dhumakhel</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chagal</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khusibahil</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tankeswor</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhaukhel</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lumanti (2001)
Organisational model

NBBS, Nepal Basobas Basti Samrakchhan
NME, Mahila Ekta Samaj
Education Network
Children are at Risk
UDLE

Centre for Integrated Development
WaterAid
ACHR
UDLE
KMC

Squatter community
Financial Model

- Finance management responsibility was left to the project beneficiaries
- A revolving Urban Community Support Fund created with NRs 25 million
- Residents agreed to repay over 15 year period @ NRs 2000 per month
- Reinforces concept of cost recovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributors of Urban Community Support Fund</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slum dwellers International</td>
<td>2.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Coalition of Housing Rights</td>
<td>4.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Aid</td>
<td>9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water aid</td>
<td>0.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathmandu Metropolitan City</td>
<td>8 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kirtipur Housing Project

- 44 Pakki houses are constructed
- A modest two storied unit (row housing)
- Two wells in three filtered tanks
- Underground tanks are built to collect rain water and waste water treatment
Kirtipur Housing Project

- 3 Ropani land purchased in Paliphal, Kirtipur 7 Km from the centre of Kathmandu
- Location selected as per their needs and preference and repayment options

- Compromises made in mainly two areas: integration with existing community and impact of relocation on employment.
Is this a successful example of enablement policy?

- Systematic involvement of NGOs, advocacy campaign and subsequent support extended by all section of the society

- Close involvement of the beneficiaries at all stages of decision making

- Defines tripartite relationship ‘NGO-Community-State’ nexus
Why has not the project been repeated?

- Absence of POLICY FOLLOW UPS: There is no formalisation of institutional and legislative mechanism
- Driven by individuals/or NGO – lacking intellectual/material growth
- Lack of private sector participation: Missing ‘sustainable’ but ‘unplanned privatisation
- Return of the powerful state?
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