ISSN-2394-5125 VOL 7, ISSUE 06, 2020

Present Housing Scenario of Thiruvananthapuram District

Vijeesh V.J.

Research Scholar (Reg. No. 19213161031031)

Post Graduate and Research centre, Department of Economics,
Scott Christian College (Autonomous) Nagercoil-629003, Tamil Nadu

Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,
Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli – 627012, Tamil Nadu

Email: vijeeshvijayan600@gmail.com

Dr. B. Mary Sahela

Assistant Professor

Post Graduate and Research centre, Department of Economics, Scott Christian College (Autonomous) Nagercoil-629003, Tamil Nadu Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli – 627012, Tamil Nadu Email: sahelarajan50504@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study mainly focuses on present rural-urban housing scenario of Thiruvananthapuram district of Kerala. There are two objectives of this study, they are (i) To know Rural-Urban ownership status of houses and availability of dwelling rooms. (ii)To analyze physical condition of houses in Thiruvananthapuram District in the study area. This study is based on the secondary data. The data have been collected from census 2011, The study found that, Owned houses are more in rural area than in urban area. The rural area households are with a greater number of one dwelling room and no exclusive room houses. Households with no exclusive room and one dwelling room are more in rural area than urban area. The permanent households are more in urban area than rural area, semi-permanent and temporary houses are more in rural area compared to urban area.

Keywords

Housing; Households; Dwelling Rooms; Rural and Urban;

Introduction

India is one of the fastest growing economy. India is now the fifth-largest economy in the world in terms of GDP. Even after 72 years of independence, India still struggles with rural developments. Homelessness is one of the major problems in India. Housing or Shelter is the basic human requirement for living, and many people in India do not have proper or safe houses. There are many rural housing schemes which have been launched by both state and central government. The two major housing schemes are LIFE Mission Kerala and Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana -Gramine (PMAY-G).

LIFE Mission Housing Scheme

LIFE Mission is an initiative of government of Kerala aimed at providing affordable housing to the homeless and economically disadvantaged population in the state. "LIFE" stands for "Livelihood, Inclusion, and Financial Empowerment." The scheme was launched with the goal of ensuring that every family in the state has access to safe and adequate housing. The scheme aimed to construct houses for those who were living in inadequate housing conditions, as well as for families that were homeless or at risk of homelessness. It was part of the government's broader efforts to address housing shortages and improve the living conditions of the marginalized sections of society. The scheme had multiple components, including financial assistance for constructing houses, land allotment, and other related support. It was designed to cater to various income groups, including Scheduled

ISSN-2394-5125 VOL 7, ISSUE 06, 2020

Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and other economically weaker sections of the population. The Unit assistance is 4 lakh rupees.

Beneficiaries of the scheme

- ➤ Homeless households with land
- Those who cannot complete housing construction or have unlivable housing
- ➤ Houses in offshore or in the coastal zone; Those who have temporary housing in the plantation area.
- ➤ Landless-homeless households

Priority

- ➤ Mentally Challenged/Blind/Physically Impaired.
- > Persons with disabilities
- > Transgenders
- Critically/terminally ill
- > Single mothers
- ➤ Those unable to earn income due to illness/accident
- ➤ Widows

Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana -Gramine (PMAY-G) Scheme

Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana -Gramine (PMAY-G) is an initiative by Government of India. Government has committed to provide "Housing for All" by 2022. This scheme started in 1st April 2016. the immediate objective is to cover one crore households living in kutcha house/dilapidated houses in three years from 2016-17 to 2018-2019. It has two components: Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (Urban) (PMAY-U) for the urban poor and Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana (Gramin) (PMAY-G and also PMAY-R) for the rural poor. Pradhan Mantri Gramin Awas Yojana previously known as Indira Awas Yojana (IAY). It started in January 1996. This scheme was launched by Ministry of rural development. IAY addressed the housing needs in the rural area ,certain gaps were identified during the concurrent evaluation and performance audit by Comptroller and Auditor General(CAG) of India in 2014. This gap that is non-assessment of housing shortage ,lack of transparency in selection of beneficiaries, low quality of house, and lack of technical supervision were the limiting the impact of Indira Awas Yojana (IAY)

Key features of PMAY-G

- ➤ Providing assistance for construction of one core houses in rural areas over the period 2016-2017 to 2018-2019.
- ➤ The minimum size of the house has been increased to 25sq.mt from 20 sq.mt with hygienic cooking space.
- ➤ The unit assistance has been increased from Rs.70000 to 1.20 lakh in plain area and from Rs.75000 to Rs.1.30 lakh in hilly state and difficult areas.
- ➤ The cost of unit assistance is to be shared between central and state governments in the ratio 60:40 in plain areas and 90:10for North Eastern states and three Himalayan states they are Jammu & Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh and Uttarakhand.
- ➤ Provision of assistance Rs.12000 for toilet through convergence with Swacch Bharath Mission-Gramin (SBM-G)

Review of Literature

Mahadeva M (2006) makes it clearly states that the major challenges in the housing sector is the growing incidence of substandard houses whose walls or roofs were not constructed with the quality building materials. Rural India has a major share in the total substandard housing stock with 66 million as against 39.8 million. Disappointingly the share of substandard housing unit in the total stock in rural areas also increased from 37 per cent in 1991 to 49 per cent in 2001. He added that rural areas being the largest responsibility of total housing have been experiencing a declining trend in the incidence of dilapidated houses. The

ISSN-2394-5125 VOL 7, ISSUE 06, 2020

declining incidence of dilapidated houses in rural areas could be one of the reasons for the increasing stock of substandard units. The various state sponsored social housing schemes have bought about the needed change in the rural areas. These schemes successfully reduced the incidence of dilapidated houses by over 26 million units and their share in the total stock in rural areas substantially during 1991 to 2001.

Mahadeva M (2006) states that the development of rural housing in the country has been unfortunately unsatisfactory due to three reason, government failure to provide adequate and timely finance, lack of market presence (to provide financial service) in rural areas and absence of participation of the houseless families in the mitigation of the problem.

It is inferred from the analysis of **Abhiroop M and Indira R** (2012) that a substantial improvement was occurred in the housing condition on rural areas, with Kutcha structures reduced from 31 percent to 17 percent over 15 years from 1993 to 2009, and pucca structures increased from 32 per cent to 55 per cent. In 2002 during the 58th round of NSS data, roof of tile/ slate is assigned out of the pucca category into semi-pucca, the share of pucca structures goes down substantially from 48 percent to 36 percent.

Arjun Kumar (2014) in his study finds that, households living in temporary houses and in congested conditions are mainly responsible for the rural housing shortage in India. The study estimates the rural housing shortage as 62.01 million in 2012.

Objectives of the Study

- 1. To know Rural-Urban ownership status of houses and availability of dwelling rooms in Thiruvananthapuram District
- 2. To analyze physical condition of houses in Thiruvananthapuram District in the study area

Methodology

This study is based on the secondary data. The data related to ownership status, availability of dwelling rooms, physical condition of houses have been collected from census 2011. Tables have been used to present data and percentage analysis is used in this study.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table-1
Households by Ownership Status in Thiruvananthapuram District

Sl. No.	Overnanskin Status	Rural Households		Urban H	Iouseholds	Total Households					
51. 110.	Ownership Status	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage				
1	Owned	363905	93.16	363513	82.96	727418	87.77				
2	Rented	19107	4.89	64876	14.81	83983	10.13				
3	Other	7595	1.94	9778	2.23	17373	2.09				
Total		390607	100	438167	100	828774	100.00				

Source – District Census Handbook Thiruvananthapuram-2011

Table households number one discloses the by ownership status Thiruvananthapuram district. In the rural area out of 390607 households 363905 (93.16 %) live in owned houses. Remaining 19107 (4.89 %) and 7595 (1.94 %) households live in rented houses respectively. In the urban area out of 438167 households 363513 (82.96 %) live in owned houses. There are 64876 (14.81 %) households live in rented and 9778 (2.23 %) live in other ownership houses. In the Thiruvananthapuram district 727418 (87.77 %) households out of 828774 live in owned houses. The remaining 83983 (10.13 %) and 17373 (2.09 %) households live in rented and other ownership houses respectively. Majority of the households both in rural and urban areas have owned houses. But a comparison of households by ownership status shows that owned houses are more in rural area (93.16%) than in urban area (82.96%). As for as rented households are concerned rural areas have only marginal per cent (4.9%) while urban areas have 14.8 per cent of rented houses. Only

ISSN-2394-5125 VOL 7, ISSUE 06, 2020

negligible per cent (2.09%) of the households have other ownership status both in rural and urban areas.

Table-2 Households by Number of Dwelling Rooms in Thiruvananthapuram District

•	Number	Rural Households		Urban Households		Total Households	
Sl. No.	of dwelling Rooms	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1	No exclusive Room	5,774	1.48	5,209	1.19	10,983	1.33
2	One room	34,931	8.94	35,169	8.03	70,100	8.46
3	Two room	100,669	25.77	104,823	23.92	205,492	24.79
4	Three Room	128,042	32.78	139,606	31.86	267,648	32.29
5	More than three Rooms	121,191	31.03	153,360	35.00	274,551	33.13
Total		390,607	100.00	438,167	100.00	828,774	100.00

Source – District Census Handbook Thiruvananthapuram-2011

Table number two represents the households by number of dwelling rooms in Thiruvananthapuram district. In the rural area 128042 (32.78 %) households have three dwelling rooms followed by 121191 (31.03%) with more than three dwelling rooms and 100669 (25.77 %) with two dwelling rooms. There are 34931 (8.94 %) households have one dwelling room and 5774 (1.48 %) have no exclusive room in the house. In the urban area 153360 (35%) households have more than three dwelling rooms followed by 139606 (31.86%) with three dwelling rooms and 104823 (23.92 % with two dwelling rooms. There are 35169 (8.03%) households have one dwelling room and 5209 (1.19 %) households have no exclusive room in the house. In the Thiruvananthapuram district out of 828774 households 274551 (33.13 %) with more than three dwelling rooms, 267648 (32.29 %) with three dwelling rooms and 205492 (24.79 %) with two dwelling rooms. There are 70100 (8.46 %) households with one dwelling room and 10983 (1.33 %) households do not have exclusive room in the house. Most of the households (32.78 %) in rural area are with three dwelling rooms whereas most of the households (35%) in urban area are with more than three dwelling rooms. About nine per cent households in both rural (8.94 %) and urban (8.03 %) have one dwelling room. More than one per cent households in both rural (1.48 %) and urban (1.19 %) do not have exclusive room. It shows rural area households are with more number of one dwelling room and no exclusive room houses.

Table-3
Households by Number of Dwelling Rooms in Owned Houses in
Thiruvananthapuram District

	1 m u vanantnaparam District								
Sl.	Number	Rural Ho	ouseholds	Urban Households		Total Households			
No ·	of dwelling Rooms	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage		
1	No exclusive room	5,141	1.41	4,206	1.16	9,347	1.28		
2	One room	30,505	8.38	26,369	7.25	56,874	7.82		
3	Two room	92,698	25.47	83,630	23.01	176,328	24.24		
4	Three Room	120,412	33.09	114,982	31.63	235,394	32.36		
5	More than three Rooms	115,149	31.64	134,326	36.95	249,475	34.30		
	Total	363,905	100.00	363,513	100.00	727,418	100.00		

Source – District Census Handbook Thiruvananthapuram-2011

ISSN-2394-5125 VOL 7, ISSUE 06, 2020

The table number three explains the households by number of dwelling rooms in owned houses in Thiruvananthapuram District. In the rural area out of 363905 households 120412 (33.09%) with three dwelling rooms followed by 115149 (31.64%) with more than three dwelling rooms and 92698 (25.47%) with two dwelling rooms. There are 30505 (8.38%) households with one dwelling room and 5141 (1.41 %) households have no exclusive room in the houses. In the urban area out of 363513 households 134326 (36.95%) with more than three dwelling rooms followed by 114982 (31.63 %) with three dwelling rooms and 83630 (23.01 %) with two dwelling rooms. There are 26369 (7.25 %) households with one dwelling room and 4206 (1.16 %) households have no exclusive room in the house. In the study area out of 727418 households 249475 (34.30%) with more than three dwelling rooms followed by 235394 (32.36%) with three rooms and 176328 (24.24%) with two rooms. There are 56874 (7.82 %) households have one dwelling room and 9347 (1.28 %) have no exclusive room in the house. It indicates that majority of households with more than three rooms in urban area than rural area. Households with three dwelling room houses are more in rural area than urban area. Households with no exclusive room and one dwelling room are more in rural area than urban area.

Table-4
Households by Number of Dwelling Rooms in Rented Houses in
Thiruvananthapuram District

Sl.	Number of	Rural Households		Urban Households		Total Households	
No.	Dwelling Rooms	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1	No exclusive Room	218	1.14	675	1.04	893	1.06
2	One room	2,405	12.59	6,394	9.86	8,799	10.48
3	Two room	5,955	31.17	18,560	28.61	24,515	29.19
4	Three Room	5,787	30.29	22,225	34.26	28,012	33.35
5	More than three Rooms	4,742	24.82	17,022	26.24	21,764	25.91
Total		19,107	100.00	64,876	100.00	83,983	100.00

Source – District Census Handbook Thiruvananthapuram-2011

The table number four indicates households by number of dwelling rooms in rented houses in Thiruvananthapuram District. In the rural area out of 19107 households 5955 (31.17%) with two dwelling rooms followed by 5787 (30.29%) with three dwelling rooms and 4742 (24.82%) with more than three dwelling rooms. There are 2405(12.59%) households have one dwelling room and 218 (1.14%) households have no exclusive room in the houses. In the urban area out of 64876 households 22225 (34.26%) with three dwelling rooms, 18560 (28.61%) with two dwelling rooms and 17022 (26.24%) with more than three dwelling rooms. There are 6394 (9.86%) households have one dwelling room and 675 (1.04%) households have no exclusive room in the houses. In the study area out of 83983 households 28012 (33.35%) with three dwelling rooms followed by 24515 (29.19%) with two dwelling rooms and 21764 (25.91%) with more than three dwelling rooms. There are 8799 (10.48%) have one exclusive room and 893 (1.06%) households have no exclusive room.

ISSN-2394-5125 VOL 7, ISSUE 06, 2020

Table-5
Households by Number of Dwelling Rooms in Other Ownership Status Houses

Sl.	Sl. Number of		Iouseholds	Urban Households Total Hou			louseholds
No.	dwelling Rooms	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1	No exclusive room	415	5.46	328	3.35	743	4.28
2	One room	2,021	26.61	2,406	24.61	4,427	25.48
3	Two room	2,016	26.54	2,633	26.93	4,649	26.76
4	Three Room	1,843	24.27	2,399	24.53	4,242	24.42
5	More than three Rooms	1,300	17.12	2,012	20.58	3,312	19.06
	Total	7,595	100.00	9,778	100.00	17,373	100.00

Source - District Census Handbook Thiruvananthapuram-2011

The table number five shows households by number of dwelling rooms in other Ownership houses in Thiruvananthapuram district. In the rural area out of 7595 households 2021 (26.61 %) with one dwelling room followed by 2016 (26.54 %) with two dwelling rooms, 1843 (24.27 %) with three dwelling rooms and 1330 (17.12 %) with more than three dwelling rooms. There are 415 (5.46 %) households have no exclusives room in the houses. In the urban area out of 9778 households 2633 (26.93 %) with two dwelling rooms followed by 2406 (24.61%) with three dwelling rooms and 2012 (20.58 %) with more than three dwelling rooms. There are 328 (3.35 %) households have no exclusive room. In the study area out of 17373 households 4649 (26.76 %) with two dwelling rooms followed by 4427 (25.48 %) with one dwelling room, 4242 (24.42 %) with three dwelling rooms and 3312 (19.06 %) with more than three dwelling rooms. There are 743 (4.28 %) households have no exclusive room in the other ownership houses.

Table-6 Households living in Permanent, Semi Permanent and Temporary houses in Thiruvananthapuram District

Sl.		Rural H	louseholds	Urban Households		Total Households	
No		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1	Permanent	265,929	68.85	351,200	80.78	617,129	75.17
2	Semi-Permanent	92,619	23.98	64,401	14.81	157,020	19.13
3	Temporary	27,680	7.17	19,152	4.41	46,832	5.70
Total		386,228	100.00	434,753	100.00	820,981	100.00

Source – District Census Handbook Thiruvananthapuram-2011

The table number six represents households living in permanent, semi-permanent and temporary houses in Thiruvananthapuram district. In the rural area, out of 386228 households 265929 (68.25 %) live in permanent houses, 92619 (23.98 %) live in semi-permanent houses and 27680 (7.17 %) live in temporary houses. In the urban area out of 434753 households, 351200 (80.78 %) live in permanent houses, 64401 (14.81 %) live in semi-permanent houses and 19152 (4.41 %) live in temporary houses. In the study area out of 820981 households 617129 (75.17 %) live in permanent house, 157020 (19.13 %) live in semi-permanent houses and 46832 (5.70 %) live in temporary house. It is clear from this table permanent households are more in urban area than rural area, semi-permanent and temporary houses are more in rural area compared to urban area.

Findings

Owned houses are more in rural area (93.16%) than in urban area (82.96%). As for as rented households are concerned rural areas have only marginal per cent (4.9%) while

ISSN-2394-5125 VOL 7, ISSUE 06, 2020

- urban areas have 14.8 per cent of rented houses. Only negligible per cent (2.09%) of the households have other ownership status both in rural and urban areas.
- About nine per cent households in both rural (8.94 %) and urban (8.03 %) have one dwelling room. More than one per cent households in both rural (1.48 %) and urban (1.19 %) do not have exclusive room. The rural area households are with a greater number of one dwelling room and no exclusive room houses.
- In owned houses majority of households with more than three rooms in urban area than rural area. Households with three dwelling room houses are more in rural area than urban area. Households with no exclusive room and one dwelling room are more in rural area than urban area.
- ➤ The permanent households are more in urban area than rural area, semi-permanent and temporary houses are more in rural area compared to urban area.

Conclusion

The rural households are suffering than urban households in terms of number of dwelling rooms and physical condition of house in Thiruvananthapuram district. This will affect the standard of living of the rural households. The government must help needy households to construct house through various state and Central government schemes. The local government take necessary steps to identify the actual beneficiaries based on the their housing condition.

Reference

- 1. Mahadeva, M 2006, 'Reforms in housing sector in India: impact on housing development and housing amenities', Habitat International, vol. 30, pp. 412-433.
- 2. Mahadeva, M 2006, 'Poverty of Housing in Rural India: Issues and Policy Options', Review of Development and Change, vol. 8, no.2, pp.137-157.
- 3. Abhiroop, M & Indira, R 2012, 'Rural Housing Quality as an Indicator of Consumption Sustainability', Economic and Political Weekly, vol.47, no.12, pp.63-67.
- 4. Arjun, K 2014, 'Estimating Rural Housing Shortage', Economic and Political Weekly, vol.49, no.26&27, pp.74-79.
- 5. District Census Handbook Thiruvananthapuram-2011, Director of Census Operation, Kerala, Serese-33 Part- XII –A.
- 6. District Census Handbook Thiruvananthapuram-2011, Director of Census Operation, Kerala, Serese-33 Part- XII –B.