

Figure 6. City-like grid layout of the relocated villages designed by the engineers had no relation to the spatial pattern of traditional villages.



Most of the relocated villages were adopted by various public and private agencies. The entire reconstruction activity was primarily contractor-driven, where contractors and labour were hired by donor agencies from outside the region to undertake reconstruction.

Initially, there were ten category B villages that were supposed to be reconstructed *in situ* (GoM, 1993), but due to social and political pressure and lawsuits filed by *panchayats* (village assemblies), the number rose to about 22 villages. Ultimately the GoM decided to relocate these villages to new sites (Nikolic-Brezev *et al.*, 1999). As a result, by 2001, the number of relocated villages increased from 52 to 74. In fact, only two category B villages – Tembhe and Pardhewadi – were reconstructed *in situ*.

In category C villages, strengthening and retrofitting of existing houses was undertaken by the government with the support of NGOs. In these villages, a publicity campaign for ‘model houses’ was launched by the government, which advocated the use of reinforced concrete bands at plinth-, lintel- and roof-levels. It is noteworthy that in these villages, where households were to have retrofitted local buildings, over 99 percent of the work was in the form of new concrete and brick additions (Nikolic-Brezev *et al.*, 1999).