RURAL HOUSING POLICY IN INDIA: ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

Isha Nilesh Gawande
Department of Home Economics, Late Bhaskarrao Shingne Arts Prof.Narayanrao Gawande Science & Ashalata Gawande Commerce College, Sakharkherda

ABSTRACT

Housing is a fundamental human need and an essential prerequisite for healthy, secure, and dignified living. Adequate and affordable housing contributes significantly to the physical, social, and economic well-being of individuals and communities. Despite constitutional recognition of the right to adequate shelter under Article 21, a significant proportion of India's rural population continues to face inadequate housing conditions. As a signatory to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), India is committed to reducing poverty and inequality and ensuring access to safe, adequate, and affordable housing for all. In this context, the Government of India has introduced various rural housing programmes to improve the living conditions of economically disadvantaged households. The effectiveness of these policies is influenced by demographic and economic factors, including population growth, migration, family structure, employment, household income, banking access, and availability of institutional credit. This study examines rural housing policies in India, highlighting their achievements, implementation challenges, and contribution to sustainable rural development, with particular reference to Maharashtra.

KEYWORDS: Rural Housing, Government Programmes, Housing Policy, Poverty, Rural Development, Maharashtra, India

INTRODUCTION

Housing is one of the fundamental necessities of human life, along with food and clothing. In India, the significance of housing has long been reflected in the popular expression *"Roti, Kapda aur Makan,"* which became an important part of political and development discourse during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Adequate housing provides not only physical shelter but also security, privacy, dignity, and a foundation for social and economic well-being. Recognizing its importance, successive governments have introduced various policies and programmes to address housing shortages in both rural and urban areas. However, despite these initiatives and the constitutional recognition of the right to live with dignity under Article 21, a substantial proportion of the rural population continues to live in inadequate housing conditions.

Housing requirements are influenced by several demographic, economic, and social factors. Population growth, migration, rural–urban composition, household size, and changes in family structure affect the demand for housing. Similarly, occupational structure, household income, access to banking facilities, availability of institutional credit, and changes in employment opportunities influence the ability of households to obtain adequate housing. Therefore, rural housing policy needs to address not only the quantitative shortage of houses but also their affordability, quality, durability, location, and access to essential amenities.

India's commitment to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) has further strengthened the importance of adequate and affordable housing. The SDGs emphasize poverty reduction, social inclusion, reduction of inequality, and the development of safe and sustainable human settlements. In this context, the Government of India has continuously formulated and revised housing policies to reach economically and socially disadvantaged households.

Historical Development and Present Status

Following independence, the Government of India established the Planning Commission in 1950 to formulate systematic economic and social development plans. The Five-Year Plans emphasized economic development, poverty reduction, social transformation, and greater equity. The evolution of housing policy can broadly be divided into three phases. The first phase, from 1950 to 1965, was characterized by the government playing a major role as the provider of housing. The second phase, from 1966 to 1990, witnessed an expansion of government intervention through the introduction of several housing schemes and institutions. The third phase, beginning in 1991, emphasized an enabling role for government and greater participation of private and public-sector institutions.

Rural housing received increased policy attention during the early 1980s with the introduction of **Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY)** as a major rural housing programme. Subsequently, rural housing policies were expanded and restructured to improve access to permanent and affordable housing for economically weaker households. Although significant progress has been achieved, housing shortages and poor-quality housing remain important development concerns. Census and government estimates indicate substantial disparities in housing availability and quality between different socio-economic groups.

Need for Public Policy

Public policy plays a crucial role in addressing social and economic problems that cannot be adequately resolved through individual efforts alone. Housing is directly connected with policies relating to land, regional and urban planning, finance, credit, infrastructure, employment, and social welfare. Effective public policy is therefore necessary to ensure that vulnerable households receive appropriate support to obtain safe and adequate shelter.

The policy-making process involves identifying social problems, formulating appropriate interventions, implementing programmes, and evaluating their outcomes. Political scientists such as Almond and Easton have emphasized the role of political systems, inputs, government decisions, and policy feedback in shaping public policy. In the context of rural housing, these processes are particularly important because ineffective implementation, inadequate financial assistance, lack of land, and limited access to infrastructure can reduce the effectiveness of otherwise well-designed programmes.

Against this background, the present study focuses on evaluating rural housing policies implemented in India since independence. It examines major government initiatives, their achievements, implementation challenges, and their contribution to improving rural living conditions. The study also seeks to identify policy gaps and suggest measures for developing a more inclusive, effective, and sustainable rural housing framework capable of advancing the broader objective of adequate shelter for all.

AIM, OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

Aim of the Study

The primary aim of this study is to critically review the evolution of rural housing policies in India since independence and to examine the major changes in policy approaches over different periods. The study seeks to assess the effectiveness of various rural housing programmes implemented by the Central and State Governments and to identify the major achievements, shortcomings, and implementation challenges associated with these initiatives. It also attempts to identify critical areas requiring policy intervention for improving access to adequate, affordable, and sustainable housing in rural India.

Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study are:

1. To examine the evolution of rural housing policies and programmes in India since independence.
2. To trace major changes and shifts in government approaches towards rural housing.
3. To review the major rural housing schemes implemented by the Central and State Governments.
4. To compare selected rural housing programmes across different states and identify similarities and differences in their design and implementation.
5. To assess the achievements and limitations of major rural housing initiatives.
6. To identify the institutional, financial, administrative, and implementation-

related challenges affecting rural housing programmes.

7. To examine selected good practices and successful approaches adopted by different states.
8. To identify critical areas for policy intervention and suggest measures for strengthening rural housing policy in India.

Methodology

The study is primarily based on secondary data and documentary analysis. Relevant information has been collected from the Census of India, National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) reports, government publications, Five-Year Plan documents, Ministry of Rural Development reports, policy documents, research studies, and available records relating to rural housing schemes. These sources have been examined to understand the evolution, coverage, implementation, and outcomes of rural housing policies.

In addition to secondary sources, qualitative insights were obtained through discussions with stakeholders involved in the implementation of rural development and housing programmes. These included government officials at the taluka, district, and state levels and representatives of public-sector institutions such as the National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD) and the Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUDCO). Such interactions provided insights into administrative procedures, institutional coordination, implementation constraints, and the practical difficulties faced during programme delivery.

A comparative review of selected rural housing schemes, flagship programmes, and good practices adopted by different states has also been undertaken. This approach helps explain why a programme that performs effectively in one state may produce different outcomes elsewhere because of variations in socio-economic conditions, institutional capacity, geographical characteristics, and administrative arrangements.

Public Policy Perspective

The study views rural housing within the broader framework of public policy and rural development. Since independence, India has introduced several policies intended to improve rural livelihoods and reduce poverty. The Community Development Programme and successive Five-Year Plans represented important early efforts to promote comprehensive rural development. The Community Development Programme emphasized economic progress, multipurpose development, village-level administration, and community participation, and subsequently provided a foundation for several rural development initiatives.

Over time, rural development expenditure increased substantially, reflecting the growing importance attached to rural transformation. Programmes such as the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) also demonstrated the importance of rural connectivity in improving access to employment and economic opportunities. However, studies have pointed to problems such as weak coordination among implementing agencies, delays in financial assistance, inadequate appraisal, and limited convergence among complementary schemes.

The effectiveness of public policy also depends on local participation, institutional capacity, and sensitivity to socio-economic conditions. Experiences involving land acquisition and development projects demonstrate that policies may encounter resistance when they adversely affect local communities. These experiences highlight the importance of participatory planning, transparency, institutional coordination, and consideration of local needs in policy formulation and implementation.

Thus, the present study combines documentary analysis, stakeholder perspectives, and comparative examination of programmes to evaluate rural housing policy in India and identify measures for more effective and inclusive policy implementation.

HOUSING POLICY: DOWN THE AGES

Rural housing refers to residential structures characterized by their location, quality, durability, availability of basic services, and overall living conditions. Adequate housing is an essential component of social welfare, poverty reduction, and sustainable rural development. Recognizing the importance of housing, the United Nations General Assembly in 1970 encouraged developing countries to improve housing facilities in both rural and urban areas. In India, the government introduced several initiatives to address housing shortages, including the Subsidized Housing Scheme for Plantation Workers in 1956 and the Village Housing Projects Scheme in 1959.

Beginning of Rural Housing Policy

During the **First Five-Year Plan (1951–1956)**, the government assumed a dominant role in housing provision. Housing was primarily viewed as a welfare responsibility rather than an economic commodity, and economically weaker sections were considered eligible for state assistance. Institutional infrastructure for housing was strengthened at the central and state levels, while housing for weaker sections and migrants received priority. However, rural housing received relatively limited attention during this period.

The **Second Five-Year Plan (1956–1961)** marked a significant expansion of government intervention in rural housing. Greater emphasis was placed on rural housing, industrial housing, slum clearance, and housing for sanitation workers. The **Village Housing Scheme** was introduced as part of the rural reconstruction programme, emphasizing community participation and self-help. Financial assistance was provided through low-interest loans to selected rural households and communities. The scheme continued during the **Third Five-Year Plan (1961–1966)**, with greater attention to land acquisition as an essential prerequisite for successful housing development. Nevertheless, progress remained limited because of inadequate financial resources, shortage of suitable land, unclear land titles, and the widening gap between housing demand and supply.

Expansion and Institutional Development

The **Fourth Five-Year Plan (1969–1973)** introduced schemes for providing house sites to landless agricultural labourers. The Minimum Needs Programme, initiated in 1972, aimed to provide house sites to rural landless households. During the **Fifth Five-Year Plan (1974–1979)**, these initiatives were extended to rural artisans, along with construction assistance. The government increasingly recognized the need to integrate housing with rural development, water supply, employment, locally available construction materials, and land tenure.

The **Sixth Five-Year Plan (1980–1985)** continued housing assistance and promoted decentralized mechanisms for distributing housing subsidies. Financial institutions such as HUDCO and other agencies increasingly supported rural housing through institutional credit. The **Seventh Five-Year Plan (1985–1990)** emphasized self-help housing, housing finance, free house sites, and the use of local materials. However, high construction costs, limited access to formal credit, and inadequate institutional support restricted the benefits reaching the poorest households.

Indira Awaas Yojana and Policy Transformation

A major milestone was the introduction of **Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY)** as a flagship rural housing programme targeting economically disadvantaged households. The programme provided financial assistance for constructing safe and durable houses and contributed significantly to increasing the rural housing stock. However, problems such as inadequate transparency in beneficiary selection, delays in fund disbursement, limited technical supervision, and weak convergence with other development programmes affected its effectiveness.

During the 1990s, housing policy gradually shifted from direct government provision towards a **facilitator-based approach**, encouraging institutional finance and private-sector participation. The **National Housing Policy, 1994** emphasized reducing homelessness and improving the quality of shelter, while the **National Housing and Habitat Policy, 1998** promoted housing development through public–private partnerships.

Despite these policy changes, private-sector participation remained limited in rural areas because of dispersed demand and lower profitability. Some states developed innovative institutional mechanisms; Gujarat, for instance, established a Rural Housing Board to address rural housing requirements. Overall, Indian rural housing policy has evolved from direct state provision and subsidy-based approaches towards self-help, institutional finance, community participation, and public–private partnerships. Nevertheless, land availability, affordability, access to credit, infrastructure, transparency, and effective implementation remain major challenges in achieving adequate and sustainable housing for rural households.

LIBERALISATION AND PRIVATISATION: EMERGENCE OF PUBLIC–PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP (PPP)

The economic reforms initiated in India in 1991 brought significant changes in the approach towards housing and infrastructure development. Liberalisation and privatisation encouraged greater participation of the private sector, financial institutions, and other non-governmental agencies in housing provision. After liberalisation, greater emphasis was placed on urban infrastructure, housing finance, and the development of institutional mechanisms for mobilising private investment. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) was gradually encouraged in the real-estate sector with the objective of increasing housing supply and accelerating infrastructure development. At the same time, the government increasingly shifted from being a direct provider of housing to acting as a facilitator and regulator.

The **73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendment Acts** strengthened local self-government by giving greater responsibilities and resources to Panchayati Raj Institutions and Urban Local Bodies. This decentralisation created opportunities for local institutions to participate more actively in housing and infrastructure planning. While programmes such as the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) concentrated primarily on urban development, rural development programmes continued to emphasize poverty reduction, employment generation, connectivity, and housing.

Indira Awaas Yojana and the Post-Liberalisation Period

The **Eighth Five-Year Plan (1992–1997)** witnessed continued emphasis on rural housing through Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY), a centrally sponsored programme of the Ministry of Rural Development. IAY emerged from earlier wage-employment programmes and was designed to provide subsidised housing assistance to rural households living below the poverty line, particularly Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, freed bonded labourers, and other economically vulnerable groups. The programme aimed not only to increase housing availability but also to enable poor households to participate in broader rural development initiatives.

During subsequent plans, IAY was modified to improve its coverage and effectiveness. Under the **Ninth Five-Year Plan (1997–2002)**, the programme incorporated two major components: construction of new houses and upgradation of kutcha and unserviceable houses. A Credit-cum-Subsidy Scheme was also introduced to extend housing assistance to eligible households above the poverty line through a combination of subsidy and institutional credit.

The **Tenth Five-Year Plan (2002–2007)** strengthened institutional financing for rural housing, with HUDCO receiving increased support for rural housing programmes. During the **Eleventh Five-Year Plan (2007–2012)**, the government recognized the continuing shortage of rural housing and proposed several modifications to IAY, including preference for allotment in the name of women or jointly with spouses, improved sanitation facilities, smokeless cooking arrangements, and provision of homestead sites. Greater emphasis was also placed on affordable housing finance, interest subsidies, productive housing, and incentives for lending institutions.

The **Twelfth Five-Year Plan (2012–2017)** continued the focus on reducing rural housing shortages and emphasized structured access to land and appropriate housing finance. However, inadequate infrastructure, limited formal banking outreach, insufficient convergence among programmes, and regional disparities continued to constrain the effectiveness of rural housing policies.

Emergence of PMAY-G

A major policy transformation occurred when **Indira Awaas Yojana was restructured as Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana–Gramin (PMAY-G) from 1 April 2016**. The programme aimed to provide pucca houses with basic amenities to houseless rural households and families living in kutcha or dilapidated houses. The minimum dwelling size was increased from 20 to 25 square metres, while financial assistance was enhanced. The programme also promoted convergence with sanitation and employment programmes such as Swachh Bharat Mission–Gramin and MGNREGS.

Importantly, beneficiary identification was shifted from conventional BPL lists to housing-deprivation indicators derived from the **Socio-Economic and Caste Census (SECC) 2011**, thereby seeking to make selection more transparent and evidence-based.

Thus, liberalisation marked a transition from predominantly state-led housing provision towards a broader institutional framework involving government, financial institutions, private agencies, local bodies, and community participation. Although PPP and private investment created new opportunities, their benefits remained uneven, particularly in rural areas where low profitability, dispersed demand, inadequate infrastructure, and limited access to formal finance continued to restrict private-sector participation. The future success of rural housing policy therefore depends on effective public–private cooperation combined with strong government support for vulnerable households.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

Rural housing is an important component of poverty reduction, social security, and sustainable rural development. The review of rural housing policies in India since independence indicates that substantial progress has been made in expanding the rural housing stock and improving access to basic shelter. Programmes such as the Village Housing Scheme, Minimum Needs Programme, Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY), and subsequently Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana–Gramin (PMAY-G) demonstrate the gradual evolution of government policy from direct provision towards a more participatory and facilitative approach.

Despite these achievements, several structural and implementation-related challenges continue to restrict the effectiveness of rural housing programmes. **Insufficient and inflexible financial resources** remain a major concern. Under earlier schemes, central allocations were largely determined according to the estimated population of vulnerable or below-poverty-line households. However, better-performing states did not necessarily receive additional resources or incentives, thereby reducing the motivation for innovation and improved implementation.

Non-availability of suitable land is another critical constraint. Many rural households, particularly landless families, lack legally recognized land on which to construct houses. Government-owned land may be unavailable in suitable locations, while traditional land rights and informal ownership arrangements are often not adequately recognized by formal financial institutions. Consequently, eligible households may be unable to obtain housing assistance or institutional loans. Moreover, housing institutions have historically demonstrated an urban orientation, although institutions such as NABARD have played a more significant role in supporting rural areas.

Another major challenge is the **fragmentation of programmes and implementing agencies**. Despite efforts towards convergence, different departments and institutions frequently operate independently, resulting in administrative delays and inefficient delivery of services. Strong partnerships with civil society organizations, self-help groups (SHGs), cooperatives, and NGOs can improve outreach and participation. Experiences associated with community-based programmes demonstrate the potential of grassroots institutions in achieving better outcomes.

The government-driven approach to house construction also presents limitations. Standardized designs and rigid construction norms may not adequately reflect local climatic, cultural, occupational, and household requirements. Rural households often express greater satisfaction with self-built houses because such housing provides flexibility and allows families to modify structures according to their needs. However, limited access to liquid financial resources remains a major obstacle.

Recommendations

First, beneficiary identification should adopt a **dynamic, demand-based system** that is regularly updated using verified socio-economic information. Digital beneficiary records may be integrated with appropriate identification and housing-deprivation databases to improve transparency and reduce exclusion errors.

Second, a comprehensive **rural land information system** should be developed to identify suitable government, fallow, and wasteland parcels for housing. Housing sites should preferably be provided within or near existing villages to ensure access to roads, schools, water, sanitation, and other essential services.

Third, housing programmes should permit **flexible building designs** while maintaining minimum technical and safety standards. Beneficiaries should be encouraged and supported to upgrade or expand their houses according to changing household requirements.

Fourth, local skills and technical capacity should be strengthened through collaboration with ITIs, polytechnics, engineering institutions, SHGs, and local training centres. Training rural youth in masonry, carpentry, plumbing, electrical work, and other construction skills can create employment while reducing construction costs.

Finally, the availability and affordability of **building materials and housing finance** should be improved. Local supply networks can reduce the cost of cement, bricks, steel, and other materials in remote villages. Banks should adopt flexible lending procedures suited to rural households, while housing microfinance through SHGs and cooperatives should be promoted.

Overall, rural housing policy must move beyond merely constructing houses towards creating **secure, affordable, durable, locally appropriate, and service-connected homes**. Stronger institutional coordination, community participation, flexible finance, improved land management, and effective monitoring are essential for achieving the long-term objective of adequate housing for all rural households.

REFERENCES

1. Almond, G. A. (1956). Comparative political systems. *The Journal of Politics*, *18*(3), 391–409.
2. Anderson, J. E. (2003). *Public Policymaking: An Introduction* (5th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
3. Easton, D. (1965). *A Framework for Political Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
4. Forester, J. (1993). *Critical Theory, Public Policy, and Planning Practice: Toward a Critical Pragmatism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
5. Government of India. (2011). *Census of India 2011: Household Tables*. New Delhi: Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India.
6. Government of India. (2011). *Census of India 2011: Provisional Population Totals*. New Delhi: Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India.
7. Government of India. (2016). *Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana–Gramin (PMAY-G): Framework for Implementation*. New Delhi: Ministry of Rural Development.
8. Government of India. (2017). *Socio Economic and Caste Census 2011*. New Delhi: Ministry of Rural Development.
9. Government of India. (2022). *Annual Report 2021–22*. New Delhi: Ministry of Rural Development.
10. Government of India. (2023). *Annual Report 2022–23*. New Delhi: Ministry of Rural Development.
11. Government of India. (2013). *Annual Report 2012–13*. New Delhi: Ministry of Rural Development.
12. Government of India. (1998). *National Housing and Habitat Policy, 1998*. New Delhi: Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment.
13. Government of India. (1994). *National Housing Policy, 1994*. New Delhi: Government of India.