Reimagining Dharavi: Architecture and Planning as Instruments for Sustainable Urban Regeneration

Ameenaa Nasser[1], Prof. Dr. Rajshekar Rao[2], Ranjitha Govindraj[3], Sreesha S Bhat[4].

1. Bachelor's of Architecture Student, School of Architecture, Ramaiah Institute of Technology

2. Professor and Head of the Department, School of Architecture, Ramaiah Institute of Technology

3. Asst. Professor, School of Architecture, Ramaiah Institute of Technology

4. Asst. Professor, School of Architecture, Ramaiah Institute of Technology

Abstract

Dharavi, located in central Mumbai, India, remains one of the most densely populated informal settlements globally, housing nearly 1 million inhabitants within 2.1 km^2,approximately 477,000 persons per km^2, almost 12 times the density of Manhattan. Often cited as an emblem of poverty, Dharavi simultaneously reveals an internally organised urban system where compact housing, workspaces, and social networks operate within limited space. The aim of this study is to explore whether Dharavi can be reframed as a model for sustainable urbanism, and how architecture and planning may function as tools to address environmental degradation, overcrowding, and socio-economic vulnerability.

This research assumes that Dharavi, despite informality, demonstrates embedded qualities of sustainability such as density-driven walkability, live-work proximity, and material reuse — nearly 80% of Mumbai's recyclable plastic passes through Dharavi daily. The settlement's narrow lanes, layered building typologies, and mixed-use clusters reduce mobility distances and energy use, challenging traditional ideas of what a "planned" city should look like.

Dharavi appears less as a disorder and more as spatial intelligence shaped by necessity. The coexistence of housing and industry, social cooperation and circular economies indicates potential for sustainable regeneration if built on existing structures. Architecture becomes transformative when it strengthens rather than replaces what functions,for example: modular upgrades, shared sanitation, climate-responsive building skins, waste-to-energy hubs,while planning that prioritises participatory incremental growth holds greater potential than demolition-led redevelopment.

Introduction

Rapid urbanisation in Indian cities has intensified housing shortages and infrastructure stress, leading to the expansion of informal settlements[6]. Dharavi, located in central Mumbai, is commonly portrayed as a symbol of urban deprivation; however, it simultaneously operates as a dense, productive and self-organised urban system[7]. Conventional redevelopment approaches often treat informality as a problem to be erased, prioritising large-scale clearance and vertical rehousing that risk disrupting livelihoods, social networks and live–work relationships[4]. Recent scholarship challenges this deficit-based view by recognising Dharavi's embedded sustainable qualities, including walkability, mixed-use housing, incremental growth and circular economic practices.Economically,

Dharavi generates an estimated USD 1–1.3 billion per year, with around 10,000 micro-industries, 80% linked to recycling, pottery, leather and food production, and an average household size of 5–8 persons. Yet infrastructural gaps are severe — over 80% of residents lack formal sanitation, 62% depend on community toilets, and only 30–34% receive direct water connections. Earlier redevelopment strategies, including the 2004 DRP, proposed high-rise rehousing models but risked displacing nearly 57% of worker-home units, threatening loss of livelihood and social networks. Sustainable planning discourse instead suggests incremental upgrading, stormwater and waste-water management, energy-efficient materials, and community-driven spatial interventions as alternatives to complete clearance. The study relies entirely on secondary research: academic papers, census data, NGO reports, informal interviews, documentaries, and photographic mappings that document how circulation, production and domestic life operate in overlapping spatial bands.

This research reframes Dharavi not as an urban failure, but as a site of spatial intelligence shaped by necessity and resilience. It examines how architecture and planning can function as instruments of sustainable regeneration by strengthening existing socio-spatial systems rather than replacing them[2].

[2] Agarwal, R., Borsi, K. & Collett, J. (2023). *Dharavi: An Urban Ecology of Recycling, Living and Working*. Journal of Urban Design, 28(3).

[4] Weinstein, L., Sami, N. & Shatkin, G. (2014). *Contested Urbanism: Dharavi Redevelopment and the Politics of City-making*. IJURR, 38(2).

[7]Nijman, J. (2010) *A Study of Space in Mumbai's Slums*. Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie, 101(1).

LITERATURE CASE STUDIES

LITERATURE STUDY 1

Roy & Roy (2010) — *Re-engineering an Urban Slum: A Case Study of Dharavi, India*[1]

Roy and Roy's work (2010) remains one of the most critical examinations of Dharavi's large-scale redevelopment ambitions proposed under the 2004 Dharavi Redevelopment Project (DRP). Their study contextualises Dharavi's evolution from a marshland-settlement into India's largest informal cluster, before unpacking the political and economic aspirations behind redevelopment. Through policy review, government tender documents, land-use proposals and stakeholder analysis, the authors show how the DRP envisioned the settlement as a valuable real-estate zone rather than a living socio-economic organism. They highlight that the plan proposed rehousing eligible residents (only those with documentary proof pre-2000), which would have left nearly 25–30% of migrant populations un rehoused. Further, the replacement of low-rise incremental housing with high-rise towers overlooked the structural logic of Dharavi's live-work units — small-scale workshops embedded into homes, street-facing production rooms, shared courtyards for sorting materials, and rooftop storage spaces.

Roy & Roy argue that the proposal would have displaced close to 57% of existing household-industrial units, risking economic shutdown in pottery, leather, recycling and textile production.

The study also identifies how top-down redevelopment often erases intangible assets — social trust, reciprocal labour systems, informal financial networks, caste-based occupational support groups — which rarely survive relocation into vertical housing blocks. The authors caution that the cost-heavy DRP (estimated at INR 10,000+ crores) prioritised spatial transformation without socio-cultural continuity, risking the collapse of Dharavi's micro-economy instead of uplifting it. This literature becomes crucial to your research because it reinforces your position that architecture and planning must not aim to "replace" Dharavi, but regenerate it through phased, community-centred models that retain social-economic structures. Roy & Roy essentially lay the foundation for why demolition-led urban renewal is not sustainable.

[1] Roy, A. & Roy, M. (2010). *Re-engineering an Urban Slum: A Case Study of Dharavi, India*. Cities, 27(6).

LITERATURE STUDY 2

Agarwal, Borsi & Collett (2023) — *Dharavi: An Urban Ecology of Recycling, Living and Working*[2]

Agarwal, Borsi and Collett's (2023) study positions Dharavi as a multi-layered urban ecology rather than a dysfunctional settlement. Their research specifically examines the 13th Compound industrial belt, where recycling forms the backbone of Mumbai's material metabolism. The authors highlight that nearly 80% of Mumbai's recyclable plastic passes through Dharavi daily — collected, segregated, washed, chipped, melted and re-extruded into reusable granules. This supports more than 250 small factories and approximately 50,000 workers, most of whom live within walking distance of their workplace. The paper uses spatial morphology, environmental flow mapping, building cross-section analysis and urban metabolism theory to uncover how Dharavi functions like a circular resource engine — waste enters, is processed, revalued and redistributed, with minimal material loss.

Their mapping shows that buildings evolve incrementally — ground floors for production, first floors for sorting, second floors for drying/storing, and rooftop terraces for curing or sleeping. Streets double as supply corridors, drainage channels and public gathering spaces. The researchers argue that Dharavi's density is not accidental, but an ecological advantage — energy for mobility is minimal due to proximity of work and residence, and material loops reduce landfill pressure significantly. They caution, however, that infrastructure deficiencies such as open drains, fire vulnerability and waste-water mixing undermine this ecological efficiency.

Instead of redevelopment that erases informality, Agarwal et al. propose spatial improvement strategies like organised waste-collection bays, safer fire-resistant roofing sheets, stormwater segregation and ventilation upgrades.

The research claims that architecture and planning can act as tools of regeneration if aligned with existing ecological systems. Dharavi's metabolic economy becomes an argument for *upgrading*, not *erasing*.

[1] Roy, A. & Roy, M. (2010). *Re-engineering an Urban Slum: A Case Study of Dharavi, India*. Cities, 27(6).

[2] Agarwal, R., Borsi, K. & Collett, J. (2023). *Dharavi: An Urban Ecology of Recycling, Living and Working*. Journal of Urban Design, 28(3)

LITERATURE STUDY 3

Mueller-Wolfertshofer (2025) — *Does Identity Have Space in Dharavi's Redevelopment?*[3]

Mueller-Wolfertshofer's 2025 paper goes beyond infrastructure and economy to examine the spatial psychology of Dharavi — how identity, occupation, religion, caste and migration history determine the way people build, inhabit and modify space. Using ethnographic fieldwork, interviews with leatherworkers and spatial mapping in Kumbharwada and leather clusters near Sion-Mahim Link Road, the study reveals how identity is embedded into physical architecture. Leather tanning families arrange rooms according to workflow — front room for drying skins, mezzanine for cutting and stitching, inner room for storage, rear courtyard for washing; meanwhile potters in Kumbharwada arrange kilns around communal chowks shared by extended families. These spatial logics are not random — they are inherited, learned, iterative and culturally coded. When redevelopment breaks these live-work relationships, it erases generational knowledge and replaces multi-functional rooms with single-use apartments unsuited to small-scale craft production.

The author further argues that high-rise redevelopment fails to accommodate symbiotic kin networks — where neighbours share tools, ovens, bulk materials, labour and childcare. In relocation housing, walls divide what socially operates as a networked web. The study concludes that identity is not a sentimental variable but a functional resource embedded into architecture. Redevelopment that ignores hybridity produces sterile housing devoid of economy.

It demonstrates that sustainable regeneration must address social metabolism alongside spatial metabolism. It proves that architecture is ecological only when cultural patterns are retained.

[2] Agarwal, R., Borsi, K. & Collett, J. (2023). *Dharavi: An Urban Ecology of Recycling, Living and Working*. Journal of Urban Design, 28(3)

[3] Mueller-Wolfertshofer, A. (2025). *Does Identity Have Space in Dharavi's Redevelopment?* IJURR, 49(1).

LITERATURE STUDY 4 — Weinstein, Sami & Shatkin (2014)[4]

Weinstein, L., Sami, N. & Shatkin, G. (2014) — *Contested Urbanism: Dharavi Redevelopment and the Politics of City-making*

Weinstein, Sami and Shatkin's 2014 publication is one of the most influential analyses of how power, planning and capital interests shape redevelopment in Dharavi. Their research examines the DRP through the lens of political economy, arguing that slum redevelopment in Mumbai is deeply intertwined with land speculation, global investment ambition and state-led visions of "world-class city" building. Using interviews with planners, politicians, resident associations and developer consortiums, they demonstrate how Dharavi's land — located between Bandra Kurla Complex and Lower Parel — is treated as prime re-marketable real estate rather than as a functioning city of labour. The authors highlight a critical tension: while the state frames redevelopment as welfare, the on-ground execution prioritizes high-value returns, pushing lower-income residents to peripheral, economically weaker housing blocks.

They argue that such transformation could dissolve the live-work ecosystem that currently sustains leather, pottery, garment and recycling industries. The paper further asserts that Dharavi's value is not merely land area, but the dense socio-economic clustering that makes production efficient — suppliers, labour and distribution are all within minutes of each other. Redevelopment that expands road width and increases FAR but disconnects housing from work floors will break this industrial ecology. Regeneration must leverage existing systems instead of uprooting them, and that planning is only sustainable when it preserves economic proximity, social density and community ownership.

LITERATURE STUDY 5 — Mahadevia, Joshi & Datey (2018)[5]

Mahadevia, D., Joshi, R. & Datey, A. (2018) — *Housing Vulnerability, Upgrading Possibilities & Spatial Morphology: A Survey of Dharavi*

This study by Mahadevia (2018) is one of the most detailed physical-morphology assessments conducted in Dharavi. Through field surveys, building-condition mapping and household interviews across Koliwada, Kumbharwada, Chamra Bazaar and 13th Compound, the authors analyse how houses evolve incrementally through self-construction — often starting as ground-floor units and expanding vertically as economic stability improves.

[4] Weinstein, L., Sami, N. & Shatkin, G. (2014). *Contested Urbanism: Dharavi Redevelopment and the Politics of City-making*. IJURR, 38(2), pp. 509–529.

[5] Mahadevia, D., Joshi, R. & Datey, A. (2018). *Housing Vulnerability, Upgrading Possibilities & Spatial Morphology: A Survey of Dharavi*. CEPT University.

They note that nearly 70% of structures in Dharavi exhibit some degree of incremental vertical growth, with mezzanine floors added for storage and production, while rooftops often function as drying yards or sleeping terraces.

This study is particularly relevant because it visually documents the architecture of informality — flexible rooms, multipurpose thresholds, courtyards that double as workspaces, and street edges converted into retail fronts.

Mahadevia and team also highlight infrastructure insufficiency — only 28–32% of houses have individual water connections, 62% depend on community toilets, and drainage lines often carry grey and black water together. However, instead of proposing complete replacement, their conclusion argues for in-situ upgrading: reinforcing load-bearing walls for safe G+2 construction, introducing modular sanitation blocks every 50–80m, improving roof drainage, and integrating community-managed waste segregation at building cluster level. Their research shows that Dharavi's existing morphology is not a barrier — it is the base on which sustainable retrofitting can be built. Architectural upgrading can be achieved without erasure,improvement must emerge from within the settlement, not outside it.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative and analytical methodology that approaches Dharavi not as a static or isolated settlement, but as a layered urban system shaped over time by economic activity, extreme density, cultural practices and spatial adaptation[1]. Given the complexity and informality of the settlement, the research prioritises understanding existing conditions before proposing any form of intervention. The methodological framework therefore unfolds gradually, beginning with the collection of secondary data, followed by interpretation and thematic synthesis, and finally leading towards the framing of regeneration strategies. This step-by-step progression allows the research to move from observation to insight, and from insight to informed planning and architectural responses.[2]

[1] Roy, A. & Roy, M. (2010). *Re-engineering an Urban Slum: A Case Study of Dharavi, India*. Cities, 27(6).

[2] Agarwal, R., Borsi, K. & Collett, J. (2023). *Dharavi: An Urban Ecology of Recycling, Living and Working*. Journal of Urban Design, 28(3)

[5] Mahadevia, D., Joshi, R. & Datey, A. (2018). *Housing Vulnerability, Upgrading Possibilities & Spatial Morphology: A Survey of Dharavi*. CEPT University.

1. Secondary Data Collection

The research is based entirely on published material i.e.academic journals, policy reports, redevelopment proposals, and recorded interviews from reliable sources. These provide numerical insight on population density, infrastructure access, land use, industrial output and socio-economic structure.

2. Thematic Literature Analysis

The reviewed literature is coded into key conceptual clusters:

- spatial typologies and housing structure
- informal economic systems and production networks
- identity, community and cultural self-organisation
- redevelopment attempts and policy consequences
  This categorisation helps trace repeating patterns and gaps in existing scholarship.

3. Comparative Literature Cross-Referencing

Instead of observational study, this stage cross-examines findings from multiple authors to identify similarities, contradictions, and theoretical overlaps. For example, economic urban ecology (Agarwal, 2023) is compared with redevelopment critique (Roy & Roy, 2010) and identity-based spatial logic (Wolfertshofer, 2025). This technique helps build an academically supported understanding of Dharavi's functioning and reveals how different scholars interpret the settlement through sustainability, morphology or socio-political lenses.[1] The outcome is a consolidated knowledge base that strengthens the foundation for regeneration strategies.

4. Cluster-Based Analysis Through Literature

Internal zones such as **Koliwada, Kumbharwada, 13th Compound and Chamra Bazaar** are studied through existing documentation rather than fieldwork. Each cluster is evaluated for its spatial pattern, industrial relevance, community networks and vulnerabilities, helping avoid generalised assumptions about Dharavi as a single condition.[2]

[1] Roy, A. & Roy, M. (2010). *Re-engineering an Urban Slum: A Case Study of Dharavi, India*. Cities, 27(6).

[2] Agarwal, R., Borsi, K. & Collett, J. (2023). *Dharavi: An Urban Ecology of Recycling, Living and Working*. Journal of Urban Design, 28(3)

5. Regeneration Framework Formulation

Insights from cross-referenced literature studies and cluster analysis are synthesised to develop a regeneration framework. Instead of masterplanning, the output focuses on principles: incremental upgrading, safe vertical expansion, sanitation-linked clustering, waste-to-value chains, and policy mechanisms that protect live-work housing. The aim is to produce strategies that strengthen Dharavi's existing systems rather than replace them.[3]

RESULTS

The literature synthesis as shown in Table1. reveals that Dharavi is not merely an informal settlement but a well-functioning urban organism where economy, density and social structure coexist symbiotically. Analysis of secondary data shows that nearly 80% of Mumbai's recyclable plastic is processed within Dharavi, generating an informal economic output estimated between USD 1–1.3 billion annually. Housing typologies, although unplanned, follow a pattern of incremental vertical growth, with over 70% of dwellings exhibiting G+1 or G+2 expansion over time, reflecting adaptability and space optimisation. Across documented clusters — Kumbharwada (pottery), 13th Compound (recycling), Chamra Bazaar (leather) and Koliwada (fishing) — built form is consistently tied to livelihood. This correlation indicates that spatial form evolves as a response to occupation, not independent of it. The results therefore demonstrate that Dharavi already holds structural qualities associated with sustainable urban living — proximity-based work, dense walkability, circular material flow, shared social infrastructure and low per-capita energy dependence.

Parameter	**Roy & Roy (2010)** *Re-engineering an Urban Slum*	**Agarwal, Borsi & Collett (2023)***Urban Ecology of Dharavi*	**Mueller-Wolfertshofer (2025)** *Identity & Redevelopment*	**Weinstein, Sami & Shatkin (2014)** *Contested Urbanism*	**Mahadevia, Joshi & Datey (2018)*Housing Vulnerability & Spatial Morphology***
Primary Focus	Critique of DRP and large-scale	Dharavi as a circular urban ecosystem	Identity, culture and live–work hybridity	Political economy of redevelopment	Physical morphology and in-situ upgrading

	redevelopment				
Density	Seen as a redevelopment constraint	Interpreted as ecological advantage	Enables social and occupational clustering	Valued mainly for land potential	Managed through incremental vertical growth
Housing Conditions	Incremental housing ignored by tower models	Flexible live–work housing typologies	Housing inseparable from occupation	Housing treated as real-estate commodity	Self-built, incremental housing dominant
Built Form	Dense low-rise fabric replaced by high-rises	Layered structures with production and living	Hybrid spaces (home and workshop)	Built form reshaped for capital gain	G+1 / G+2 incremental expansion with mezzanines
Sustainability	Undermined by demolition-led planning	Strong circular economy, low-energy metabolism	Sustainability linked to cultural continuity	Sustainability secondary to investment	Sustainability through retrofitting, not replacement
Transportation & Mobility	Relocation increases commute distances	Walkability due to home–work proximity	Daily movement shaped by livelihood	Redevelopment disrupts mobility patterns	Short internal movement patterns maintained
Economic Structure	Informal economy at risk of collapse	Recycling economy (~80% of Mumbai plastic)	Occupation-based micro-economies	Economy weakened by land commodification	Livelihood embedded within housing clusters

Role of Development	Disruptive and exclusionary	Opportunity for upgrading	Must protect identity and livelihood	Tool for political–economic agendas	Tool for strengthening existing fabric
Planning Strategies	Critique of top-down planning	Incremental upgrading approach	Culturally sensitive planning	Planning as a political instrument	In-situ upgrading, cluster-level intervention
Social Networks	Broken under rehousing models	Strengthened by proximity	Central to spatial organisation	Largely ignored	Reinforced through spatial continuity
Scope for Improvement	Regeneration over demolition	Infrastructure and safety upgrades	Retention of hybrid spaces	Power shift towards residents	Structural reinforcement, sanitation modules

Table 1: Comparative Study of Literature Case studies

[1] Roy, A. & Roy, M. (2010). *Re-engineering an Urban Slum: A Case Study of Dharavi, India*. Cities, 27(6).

[2] Agarwal, R., Borsi, K. & Collett, J. (2023). *Dharavi: An Urban Ecology of Recycling, Living and Working*. Journal of Urban Design, 28(3)

[3] Mueller-Wolfertshofer, A. (2025). *Does Identity Have Space in Dharavi's Redevelopment?* IJURR, 49(1).

[4] Weinstein, L., Sami, N. & Shatkin, G. (2014). *Contested Urbanism: Dharavi Redevelopment and the Politics of City-making*. IJURR, 38(2), pp. 509–529.

[5] Mahadevia, D., Joshi, R. & Datey, A. (2018). *Housing Vulnerability, Upgrading Possibilities & Spatial Morphology: A Survey of Dharavi*. CEPT University.

The comparative study reveals strong consensus across literature that Dharavi functions as a productive, self-organised urban system rather than an urban failure. While approaches differ ranging from redevelopment critique to ecological and socio-cultural readings,all studies caution against demolition-led planning. Density, mixed-use housing, walkability, and proximity-based economies consistently emerge as strengths rather than weaknesses. The table highlights that sustainable regeneration in Dharavi depends on incremental upgrading, protection of live–work relationships, and participatory planning, positioning architecture and planning as instruments of continuity rather than replacement.

FINDINGS

1. Regeneration is more viable than wholesale redevelopment

Large-scale vertical rehousing (as proposed in DRP 2004) risks displacing approximately 50–57% of work-home units, breaking socio-economic networks and destabilising the industries that sustain Dharavi. Informal efficiency collapses when housing is separated from workspace.

2. Sustainable qualities already exist within informality

Mixed-use density, micro-production clusters, incremental construction and waste-to-value systems show that Dharavi operates with environmental efficiency despite infrastructural deficiency. These embedded systems align with sustainability goals even without formal planning.

3. Architecture must support existing behaviour — not overwrite it

Identity-driven clustering, kin-based labour units, shared courtyards, and hybrid room functions suggest that spatial intelligence is cultural, not architectural. Regenerative design must therefore allow homes to remain workspaces, and public spaces to remain economic corridors[8].

[8] Bhide, A. (2014) *Shifting Terrains of Communities and Community Organization: Reflections on Organising for Housing Rights in Mumbai*. Community Development Journal, 49(3).

Planning for Dharavi must move beyond broad, city-scale redevelopment proposals and instead operate at cluster scale — working within existing neighbourhood pockets such as Koliwada, Kumbharwada, 13th Compound or Chamra Bazaar. Each cluster has its own history, economy, community structure and spatial logic; therefore, upgrading must be tailor-made rather than uniformly applied[6]. At this scale, planners can map narrow streets, courtyard networks, shared utilities and building conditions with precision, allowing interventions to be inserted gently rather than disruptively.

Sanitation integration becomes a primary entry point for regeneration. Instead of relocating residents to far-off high-rise towers to provide toilets, sanitation infrastructure can be introduced within the existing fabric through modular community toilets, decentralised waste treatment units, grey-water recycling systems and stormwater channel separation. This improves living conditions without dismantling the socio-economic networks that rely on proximity and movement across short distances[8].

Safe vertical expansion acknowledges that Dharavi already builds upward incrementally, but often without engineered support. Planning should therefore provide structural retrofitting guidelines, load-bearing enhancement, fire-resistant roofing materials, and shared stair-core systems so homes and workshops can grow to G+1 or G+2 safely rather than illegally or dangerously. Instead of stopping informality, planning should guide it into safer, resilient forms.

Community-led decision making must be central, not symbolic. Residents should not be informed *after* design — they must participate *before* it. Local artisans, women's collectives, recycling workers, youth groups and small-industry owners must inform what needs to be preserved, improved or expanded. Planning that listens rather than imposes ensures that people do not lose their livelihoods, identity or social networks in the process of "upgrading." In other words, the settlement should evolve *with* its people, not without them.

Overall, the findings suggest that sustainable transformation in Dharavi is achievable through strengthening what already functions, not replacing it with imposed typologies.

[6]Patel, S., d'Cruz, C. & Burra, S. (2002) *Beyond Evictions in a Global City: People-Managed Resettlement in Mumbai*. Environment and Urbanization, 14(1).

[8] Bhide, A. (2014) *Shifting Terrains of Communities and Community Organization: Reflections on Organising for Housing Rights in Mumbai*. Community Development Journal, 49(3).

CONCLUSION

Dharavi, despite being framed as a symbol of deprivation, operates as a resilient, self-organised and economically vital urban entity. The literature shows that its density, circular economy and live-work proximity represent sustainable qualities that formal planning rarely achieves. Conventional redevelopment models fail not because the built form is inadequate, but because they overlook the intelligence of informality — social structure, economic clustering, and spatial adaptability.[9]

The most effective path forward for Dharavi is regenerative urbanism rather than replacement urbanism. Architectural intervention should improve—not erase—incremental housing. Planning should prioritise cluster-level upgrading, sanitation integration, safe vertical expansion, and community-led decision making. [10] Dharavi stands not as a failed city awaiting renewal, but as a prototype of resource-efficient urbanism that can guide future models of equitable and sustainable settlement planning.

[9] Government of Maharashtra (2004) *Dharavi Redevelopment Project: Concept Note*. Mumbai.

[10] Mukhija, V. (2003) *Squatters as Developers? Slum Redevelopment in Mumbai*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

References

[1] A. Roy and M. Roy, “Re-engineering an urban slum: A case study of Dharavi, India,” *Cities*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 1–10, 2010.

[2] R. Agarwal, K. Borsi, and J. Collett, “Dharavi: An urban ecology of recycling, living and working,” *Journal of Urban Design*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 1–18, 2023.

[3] A. Mueller-Wolfertshofer, “Does identity have space in Dharavi’s redevelopment?” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 1–17, 2025.

[4] L. Weinstein, N. Sami, and G. Shatkin, “Contested urbanism: Dharavi redevelopment and the politics of city-making,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 547–570, 2014.

[5] D. Mahadevia, R. Joshi, and A. Datey, *Housing Vulnerability, Upgrading Possibilities and Spatial Morphology: A Survey of Dharavi*. Ahmedabad, India: CEPT University, 2018.

[6] S. Patel, C. d’Cruz, and S. Burra, “Beyond evictions in a global city: People-managed resettlement in Mumbai,” *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 159–172, 2002.

[7] J. Nijman, “A study of space in Mumbai’s slums,” *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, vol. 101, no. 1, pp. 4–17, 2010.

[8] A. Bhide, “Shifting terrains of communities and community organization: Reflections on organising for housing rights in Mumbai,” *Community Development Journal*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 367–381, 2014.

[9] Government of Maharashtra, *Dharavi Redevelopment Project: Concept Note*. Mumbai, India, 2004.

[10] V. Mukhija, *Squatters as Developers? Slum Redevelopment in Mumbai*. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate, 2003.