

# Appraisal of City Development Plan Mysore

September 2006



**National Institute of Urban Affairs**

Core 4B, India Habitat Centre  
Lodhi Road, New Delhi 110003

In case of any query, please contact Ms. Usha Raghupathi (email: [uraghupathi@niua.org](mailto:uraghupathi@niua.org))

## **Appraisal of City Development Plan of Mysore**

The City Development Plan (CDP) of Mysore has been appraised using the guidelines given in Toolkit 2.

The first part of the CDP of Mysore contains the background of the regions, the existing situation analysis, the vision, the implementation of the vision and the financial sustainability analysis. The CDP has not fully followed Toolkit 2 and does not give much importance to the existing situation analysis. It concentrates more on the vision, the projects and the financial plan, which should be based on the existing situation. The CDP has not been structured well and is fragmented.

Chapter 1 of the CDP, which deals with the background of the Mysore Urban Region, gives a reasonably clear overview of the importance and the main attractions of the city. It also gives a very brief description of the economy, transport, educational and research institutions in the city and spiritual tourism.

Mysore is an educational, commercial and administrative centre and also an important tourist and heritage centre. The economy of the city is largely centred on tourism, industry and commerce.

The section on Governance in this chapter (p. 15-21) gives the institutional responsibility of each agency that plays a role in the governance of the city. It discusses the role of the Mysore City Corporation (MCC), the Mysore Urban Development Authority (MUDA), the Karnataka Urban Water Supply and Drainage Board (KUWSDB), the Karnataka State Road Transport Corporation (KSRTC), the Public Works Department, the Zoo Authority, the Department of Archaeology and the Lake Development Authority. While discussing the functions of MCC, this section does not clearly indicate which of the functions listed in the Twelfth Schedule of the 74<sup>th</sup> Constitution Amendment have been transferred to MCC.

### **Existing Situation Analysis**

Chapter 2 on Analysis of Existing Urban Situation gives an extremely brief overview, like an executive summary, of the existing situation. There is hardly any analysis done of the present situation. From this section one does not get a clear idea of what is available in the city, what is lacking, where the deficits are and what are the reasons for the deficits.

### **Demography**

“Demography” on p. 23 gives the population from 1901 to 2011 with growth rates. The methodology used for population projection has not been stated in the CDP. There are no figures given for population increase due to natural causes, migration and jurisdictional changes. There is no analysis of population growth of the city and the surrounding areas. This needs to be given. The graph on population forecast needs to be redone as the titles on X and Y axis are blacked out.

### **Land-use**

The CDP provides no analysis of land use pattern of Mysore and surrounding areas. Three maps on land-use have been given on p. 23 and 24 for the years 1972, 2001 and 2011. The maps make no sense as nothing is visible in these maps. These maps which were originally in colour and

were very big, have been reduced to very small size, so the maps have become meaningless. While the land-use maps are given on p. 23 & 24, the table on land-use is given on p.38. The table and text should go together. A full discussion on land-use should be given with analysis and with visible maps for the city and the surrounding areas.

### **Urban poor**

Only one paragraph on urban poor is given in chapter 2, p. 24, which hardly gives an idea of the urban poor in the city. Some more coverage of urban poor is available in Chapter 4 on Basic Services to Urban Poor (p. 54 to 60). However, even this chapter does not give a comprehensive picture of the urban poor and their living conditions at present.

There is confusion in the number of slums in the state and the city. In column two of p. 54, it is stated “Out of total 1957 slums declared in the State, 219 declared slums are in Bangalore city.....”. In the paragraph just below this it is stated, “There are over 4000 slums in the State. Of them, over 1000 slums are in Bangalore while there are 82 slums in Mysore where 49 slums exist in the city corporation limits”. In Annexure 7, p. 62, the table gives the number of declared slums in Mysore city as 20 and the undeclared slums as 17. It needs to be clarified as to how many declared and undeclared slums are there in the state of Karnataka, in Bangalore and in Mysore.

On p. 57 it is stated that 36,100 houses are required for the urban poor in the city. This is based on the assumption that the BPL population would be 19% of the total population. However, the basis for arriving at this percentage of BPL population is not given. The population of the urban poor in the city, the trends and the projections need to be given and analysed in this section.

The discussion on urban poor in the CDP is more theoretical indicating what should be done but does not give hard facts and figures. This section should give quantitative and qualitative information on the situation as it is found in the city at present.

### **Service levels**

The information on service levels is fragmented. The section on Service Indicators (p. 25) does not give service delivery levels – it gives only weightages and scores. Some information on service levels is available on p. 48 in Chapter 3 on Vision. The information on cost recovery in urban infrastructure is given on p. 37. The CDP does not give consolidated information on service levels and their finances in one place and this makes it difficult to understand the present status of these services.

The discussion of water supply, sewerage and storm water drainage, on p. 26 & 27, does not give much idea of these services in the city. On p. 67 & 68 of the CDP, in the chapter on Implementing the Vision (Chapter 5), the activities for improving water and sewerage services are given. The items given on p. 67 & 68 should be first discussed in detail in the section on existing situation, only then the improvement envisaged can be understood.

It is not clear, from p. 28, why the disposal of wastewater is only 15.25 mld when the wastewater generated is 128 mld and 57% of the households are connected to the sewerage system. While the capacity of the STPs adds up to 157.65 mld, the present operating capacity is mentioned as 15.8 mld only. The percentage of households connected to the sewerage system needs clarification as the table (on p. 28) indicates 57% and the text directly below the table indicates

70% coverage. The coverage of households by sewerage system and the wastewater generated do not match. This needs to be clarified.

Similarly, the very brief write up on solid waste management, on p.27, does not give any idea of how the service is being managed at present. A detailed discussion needs to be provided on the items indicated on p. 70, which includes collection, transportation, treatment and disposal.

Roads and bridges are briefly discussed on p. 28 & 29, but there is no discussion on transport. Projects have been proposed for transport on p. 64, 65 & 66 without any discussion of the existing situation.

### **Institutional Responsibility**

The institutional responsibility matrix (p. 26) indicates the institutions responsible for various services and functions. However, there is no discussion on the overlapping functions of agencies, if any, and the problems in management due to these. The discussion on Governance, p. 15-21, could have been brought under this section.

### **Finances of MCC**

The financial profile of MCC is given in tables on p. 36 & 37 with no analysis. Comments on the finances of MCC are provided in Chapter 6 on pages 78 to 84.

#### **Revenue and Expenditure of MCC**

(Rs. lakhs)

<b>Year</b>	<b>Revenue</b>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>Surplus/deficit</b>
2001-02	7748.95	7845.06	-96.11
2002-03	7132.96	7355.97	-223.01
2003-04	6984.25	7048.17	-63.92
2004-05	7537.30	8110.26	-572.96
2005-06	9036.00	9076.66	-40.66

The CDP indicates that the financial position of MCC has not been very robust in the past and the Corporation's budget has been running in deficit.

Figures obtained from the Budget Estimates of Mysore Mahanagar Palike indicate that all the figures of revenue and expenditure used in the CDP are estimates and not actuals. Since the actuals would be available upto 2004-05, these figures should be used and the entire set of tables on MCC's finances redone and the analysis re-written accordingly.

As per the figures available in the CDP (for 2003-2006) property tax formed about 17-19 % of the total revenue of MCC, followed by other property based receipts (18-20%) and water charges (15-16%). Funds from the State Finance Commission formed about 21-24% per cent of the total revenue while grants and contributions formed 18-22%. Revenue receipts from all the sources have shown fluctuation in the last five years, but the reasons for this has not been given. As per the CDP, the share of grants in the total revenue has been decreasing over the years while the collection from property tax has been rising.

“Repair and maintenance” accounts for about 16-17% of the total expenditure. However, about 70-80% of the expenditure on this head is electricity charges and city cleaning expenses. The expenditure on this head has increased mainly due to an increase in electricity charges.

### **Stakeholder Consultations**

Chapter 3 of the CDP indicates that stakeholder consultations were held from December 2005 to April 2006. Annexure 2, p. 4, gives the list of stakeholders. However, this list needs correction as it gives both the list of stakeholders and also some action areas. Annexure 3, p. 6-13, gives the “stakeholders key responses”, but the responses are not easy to comprehend. There is no consolidated list of responses available in the CDP. This needs to be given. The discussion on stakeholder consultations should give the number of meetings held, the number of people attending these meetings and the consolidated list of responses it generated. It should also indicate if all sections of society were covered and what were the priorities of people with respect to services and infrastructure.

### **Vision for the City**

“Enhancing the glory of Mysore, and enabling it to forge ahead as the cultural, tourism, educational, and wellness hub” is the vision of Mysore. The key elements of vision (p. 41) are given as urban space, economy, heritage, and governance.

The CDP indicates that the city would specifically focus on tourism, which would include a focus on heritage and monuments, and palaces in Mysore, handicrafts/ sericulture, and information technology/ biotechnology. The specific service and infrastructure targets to be achieved in the short-term, medium-term and long-term are given on p. 48 & 49. These include targets for water and sanitation, urban roads, solid waste management, and basic services to the urban poor. The years to which short, medium and long term refer to is not given in the tables on p. 48& 49. This should be given.

### **Priorities**

Infrastructure priorities are given in a table on p. 53. Since specific priorities are not mentioned, it is assumed that roads, road related infrastructure, water supply and sewerage, municipal solid waste management, urban poor and tourism are the priority areas, in that order. The columns in this table need further explanation as to what it is trying to depict.

### **Strategies**

The strategies for achieving the vision are given in Chapter 5 – Implementing the Vision (The CIP). The investments proposed in this chapter give the capital expenditure, O&M, and land acquisition cost, wherever applicable. Due emphasis has been laid on O&M while formulating the projects. However, there is no mention in the CDP of how the O&M costs will be met. The project cost indicated for funding under JNNURM excludes the O&M and land acquisition cost. The projects proposed are for the time periods 2007-12, 2013-17, 2018-22, 2023-27 and 2028-31, however, JNNURM funding is being sought only for the 2007-12 period.

The project cost, though excludes O&M/ land acquisition cost, in some cases these have been included. Therefore, the project cost has been recalculated to include only the capital expenditure and this has made a difference of Rs. 409 crores. The project theme wise cost is presented below.

(Investment in Rs. Crore)

Project Themes	2007-12	
	As given in CDP	Recalculated during appraisal
Roads	311	311
Transport related infrastructure	428	378.5*
Water and Sewerage	529	418
Solid Waste Management	34	10
Urban Poor	194	169
Tourism	307	113**
Urban Spaces	31	25.5
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1834</b>	<b>1425</b>

Note: The following ineligible components have been deducted from the totals:

\* excludes airport upgradation project for Rs. 90 cr.

\*\* excludes projects for Convention centre and Golf course for Rs. 150 cr. , and Budget hotel for Rs. 20 cr.

### Road and Transport projects

Mysore is examining the feasibility of providing mass transport systems such as Bus Rapid Transit, Electric Trolley Buses or Light Rail System (p. 65). This is one of the priorities for improving the transport facilities in the city. MCC/ MUDA have identified corridors for road improvement along with related infrastructure; providing for comfortable pedestrian movement is one of the considerations. Development of pedestrian/ cycling zones is one of the projects proposed for funding (for Rs. 2 cr.).

Planning of roads should consider safety concerns of cyclists and pedestrians, and projects for this should be developed through wide ranging consultations with concerned stakeholders. This has to be ensured and evidence provided of such consultations in the CDP.

Mysore has a small airport, called Mandkalli Airport, approx. 4 miles from the city. The airport is currently inoperative. There is a plan to redesign and extend the airport for making it operational for small aircraft. Therefore, an airport upgradation project for Rs. 90 cr. has been proposed in the CDP. However, this is an ineligible component and hence cannot be considered for funding under JNNURM.

### Tourism related projects

Under this head, the infrastructure around the existing attractions will be upgraded. The city has already prepared a list of all the heritage buildings/ monuments/ attractions and the respective agencies are expected to prepare the rehabilitation/ conservation plans. A project has been proposed for the Renovation of Heritage Buildings for Rs. 50 crores. The CDP, in Annexure 2, p. 106, gives a list of Heritage and other important buildings in Mysore, consisting of 32 buildings. However, pages 107 to 112 give a list of 138 buildings. It is not clear what these two lists are.

Two tourism related projects are ineligible for funding under JNNURM. These are 'Convention Centre and Golf Course' for Rs. 150 crores and a 'Budget Hotel' for Rs. 20 crores.

## **Financial Sustainability**

The Mysore City Corporation has been showing a deficit on its revenue account for the past five years i.e., from 2001-02 to 2005-06 (p. 80). However, the financial operating plan for 2006-07 shows a surplus of Rs. 317 crores and a surplus of Rs. 2226 crores for 2007-08. This does not seem very realistic. One of the assumptions on which these projections are based states that the property tax rates would be revised upward by 20% every 5 years and the collection efficiency would go up to 60% in the first year and 70% in the second year. However, the CDP is silent on the present collection efficiency and when the property tax rate was last revised. Similarly, the other assumptions given on p. 81 are not backed by an analysis of the present situation, which would have given an idea of how realistic these assumptions are. Therefore, the statement on p. 84, "...the MCC could meet up to Rs. 106 crores out of the budgetary surplus..." does not seem very accurate. The above points need to be explained.

Overall, the CDP does not fulfil all the requirements of Toolkit 2. Based on the comments given above, the CDP will have to be redrafted. The city may also have a look at the structure of CDPs of Gujarat (Ahmedabad, Surat, Vadodar and Rajkot) and the CDPs of Andhra Pradesh (Hyderabad, Vishakhapatnam and Vijayawada), available on the Internet, for assistance.

Mysore is a Heritage City and the Ministry of Urban Development has prepared separate guidelines for the preparation of CDPs of these cities. The guidelines are attached as Annex 1 for ready reference. While the present CDP has covered some of the information required for Heritage cities, a lot of additional information is still required to be given. These may be done in order to comply with the requirements of CDP for Heritage cities.

### **Additional Points raised on Mysore CDP**

1. Since most of the sections indicate the goals and visions for the mission period and for a later period, the same can be given for water supply also, which is not given at present.
2. In the Annexures, pages 2 & 3 give the name of 22 stakeholders consulted and page 6 & 7 give the name of another 25 stakeholders. This makes a total of 47 stakeholders consulted. Is that all? If more stakeholders have been consulted, then please give the total number of participants in each of the meetings held. Also two pages of photographs would be more than enough, details of the stakeholders and what emerged is more important than the photographs.
3. Can inter-sectoral prioritisation be spelt out more clearly on p. 81?
4. None of the tables have a title or number. This makes it difficult to refer to the table. So the following comments are written in a strange way. The tables should be numbered with titles.
5. On p. 48, the table's third row states 'not fully covered' against the item on metering - what is meant by this? What % of households are covered by metering? On p. 53 the table on sewerage states that 57% households are connected to the sewerage system. So this type of figure should be available for water supply too.
6. On p. 49 (water supply section), the second table's third row's third column gives a figure of 4 - what is the unit of this figure?
7. On p. 77, it is stated that the income from water supply and sewerage services has increased by 105% between the FY 2002 and 2005, but there is no explanation given for this increase. The table also indicates that the Expenditure has fallen since FY 2002 - this needs to be explained. The table further shows that the income from water supply was three times the expenditure in FY 2002 and has gone up to almost seven times in FY 2005 - this too needs to be explained. How is Mysore making so much surplus on water supply and sewerage head. A break-up of the figures by heads needs to be given. It would also be useful to give the tariff for these services.
8. Since the CDP gives a table for Municipal Capital Receipts, a table for Municipal Capital Expenditure may also be given.
9. On p. 78, the second table does not indicate the year to which the figures belong. This table needs to be given for the FY 2001 to 2005.

10. Since most of the sections indicate the goals and visions for the mission period and for a later period, the same can be given for water supply also, which is not given at present.
11. In the Annexures, pages 2 & 3 give the name of 22 stakeholders consulted and page 6 & 7 give the name of another 25 stakeholders. This makes a total of 47 stakeholders consulted. Is that all? If more stakeholders have been consulted, then please give the total number of participants in each of the meetings held. Also two pages of photographs would be more than enough, details of the stakeholders and what emerged is more important than the photographs.
12. Can inter-sectoral prioritisation be spelt out more clearly on p. 81?

These are the concerns based on our earlier comments. Please address these concerns also in the revised CDP.