



DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
(Master Plan Review Section)
6th Floor, VikasMinar, New Delhi: 23379731

No.F.1 (10)/2011/ Dir. (Plg.) MPR &TC/

Dt: 08/08/2013

Subject: Minutes of the 12th meeting of Management Action Group on “Common Platform for Building Approvals” held on 31st July, 2013.

The 12th meeting of the Management Action Group on “Common Platform for Building Approvals” on mid-term review of MPD-2021 was held on 31st July, 2013 under the Chairmanship of Engineer Member, DDA at VikasMinar, New Delhi.

The following Members/Special Invitees attended the meeting.

Members

- Engineer Member, DDA - Chairman
- Addl. Commissioner (Plg.)MPR& AP, DDA
- Director (Bldg.), DDA

Co- opted expert members

- Sh. SudhirVohra, Architect

Special Invitee

- Director (Plg.) Rohini (Zone M & N), DDA

Others

- Director (Plg.) MPR & TC, DDA
- Addl. Chief Architect III, DDA
- Addl. Chief Architect II, DDA
- Sr. Architect, HUPW (SP&C), DDA
- Dy. Dir (Plg) MPR
- Arch. Asstt., NDMC

The Chairman welcomed Members and Special Invitees for the twelfth meeting of MAG on “**Common Platform for Building Approvals**”. Thereafter, Director (Plg.) MPR briefly outlined the issues to be discussed in this meeting.

i) Confirmation of the minutes of the Eleventh meeting of MAG on “Common Platform for Building Approvals” held on 17.06.2013

Following section from the Minutes of the Eleventh meeting of MAG on “Common Platform for Building Approvals” held on 17.06.2013 were discussed with reference to earlier discussions in Authority Meeting.

SI	Issues/ Suggestion	Observation/Recommendation of the Group
1	Suggestion regarding provision of rear setback in residential Plotted development where there is no back lane	
	(Forwarded by Suptdg. Engineer (Bldg.) HQ, MCD Vide Dy. No. D/06/SE(Bldg.) HQ/2012: DDA Dy. No. 951 dt.07.05.12; 1922dt.23.03.12; 1951dt.28.12.12 and also through MoUD: DDA Dy. No. 2042dt. 17.04.12; 2177dt. 27.04.12	MAG was informed that the suggestion was discussed in the Fourth Meeting of this MAG held on 05.07.2012. Regarding the norms in Para 4.4.3 Control for Building/Buildings within Residential Premises, Director (Building)-DDA informed the MAG that the compliance to the norm on ‘already existing as on 22.09.06’ is difficult to validate. MAG recommended that Notes (ii) and (iv) in Para 4.4.3 Control for Building/Buildings within Residential Premises may be deleted. Action: Director (Plg.) MPR& TC, DDA

The above minutes were discussed in view of a Public Notice issued vide S.O. 413 (E) dated 23.02.2011 for following modification in Para 4.4.3 - "Control for Building/ Buildings within Residential Premises. (Reference File No. F-3/28/2008/MP)

"**100% ground coverage and 300 FAR shall be eligible for regularization of construction already existing as on 22.09.2006 on payment of charges as per the modification in respect of plot size between 175-250 sqm."

The board of enquiry in its meeting dt. 26.04.2011 did not recommend the proposed modification. This was placed before the Authority vide item No. 44/2012 on 03.08.2012. The Authority decided that the following suggestions of non-official members of the Authority should be referred to Ministry of Urban Development, Govt. of India for consideration.

- i) *cut-off date should be extended to include all buildings constructed on such plots till date and restrictions should only pertain to maximum height permissibility of 15 m and structural and fire safety;*
- ii) *No demolition action can be taken against buildings which have already been constructed, the proposal should be consider regularization of such construction till date on all plot sizes.*

MoUD vide letter No. K-12011/10/2008-DD-I (Vol. II) dated 23rd November, 2012 has advised DDA to consider this issue as part of on-going revision of MPD-2021.

In view of the above background, the minutes of the meeting dated 17.06.2013 are revised as under:

Regarding the norms in Para 4.4.3 Control for Building/Buildings within Residential Premises, MAG observed that it is not desirable to withdraw the provisions already given in MPD-2021. MAG recommended that building sections of MCD & DDA to critically re-examine the implications of MPD – 2021 provisions in such cases based on ground realities and problems faced by the law abiding residents; Director (Bldg.), DDA to discuss this as part of the review of Building Bye Laws.

**Action: Chief Town Planner, North DMC
Director (Bldg.), DDA**

The minutes of the Eleventh meeting held on 17.06.2013 were confirmed with above modifications.

ii) **Action Taken note of the Eleventh meeting of MAG on "Common Platform for Building Approvals" held on 17.06.2013**

Action Taken Report on the Minutes for Eleventh Meeting of the MAG held on 17.06.2013 was noted.

a) **Draft Redevelopment Guidelines for Commercial Areas:**

The draft guidelines were presented by Addl. Chief Architect, HUPW, DDA. After discussion following suggestions were given:

- i. It was informed that modifications in MPD – 2021 for chapter on Commercial Centre have been notified on 13.05.2013. These provides guidelines for shops cum residence complexes developed prior to 1962. Thus guidelines should also cover such commercial centres. All the modifications notified should be incorporated in guidelines.
- ii. This involves the observations from Land Disposal Wing of DDA also. HUPW to organise presentation under the chairmanship of VC, DDA where officers from LD, Finance, Legal etc can also be invited.

Action: Addl. Chief Architect III, HUPW

- iii. It was informed that after enhancement of FAR it will be difficult to plan commercial centres where maximum prescribed height is 15m. MAG suggested following modification in **Table 5.4: Development Controls - Commercial Centres**

Use / use premises	Maximum Coverage (%)	FAR	Height (mts)	Proposed Height (mts)
a) Commercial Centres				
i. Convenience Shopping Center/ Local Shopping Centre/ Local Level Commercial areas	40	100	15	NR
ii. Service Market	40	100	15	NR
iii. Organised Informal Bazaar	40	40	8	NR

Action: Director (Plg.) MPR

iii) Discussion of Suggestions received towards Review of MPD-2021

Sl.	Diary No.	Name/ Address	Suggestion made	Observation made by MAG
1	2221, 2248, 2387, 2636, 2767, 3149, 3586, 3800, 3810, 3826, 3986, 4003, L-185, L-62, L-83, L-87	Mr. R.C. Kinger, Executive Direction, Indian Buildings Congress Rani Lakshmi Bai SatyaPrakash Wg. Cdr., President, FONARWA (Federation of NarainaVihar Residents Welfare Associations)B- 77, NarainaVihar, New Delhi 110028 SatyaPrakash Wg. Cdr., President, FONARWA, B-77, NarainaVihar, New Delhi	Disaster management Planning to go hand in hand with Plan preparation. Deputing disaster management officers at sites where public works are being carried out. Helipads may be planned in the zone for communication and disaster management, firefighting and easy movement in case of emergency. For the purpose of Disaster mitigation, structural condition and quality of the houses should be checked regularly. It should be made mandatory to construct structurally strong houses to minimize the impact of natural & manmade disaster. Selling of Liquor innieighbourhood level commercial centres (CSC and LSC) shall be prohibited, as it creates nuisance in residential areas.	MPD – 2021 has proposed One (1) Disaster Management Centre for each administrative zone with area of 1 Ha. Helipads are special requirements and one such helipad is proposed in Rohini Phase- IV to cater to the requirement of Urban Extensions. MAG observed that the hazardous, repair, nuisance creating activities like liquor shop etc. should not be permitted in CSCs which are located within a Residential locality. MAG suggested following modification in Table 5.1, Note (vi) (vi) The activities which are not allowed under mixed use as per para 15.6.2 shall also be not allowed in Convenience Shopping Centres. Action: Director (Plg.) MPR

2	2388, 3903	Sh. Nandlal, 1162, MultaniMohalla, Gandhi Nagar, Delhi 31, Delhi 110031	There is a shortage of 12 lacs houses instead of 1 lakh. This should be changed in the MPD 2021 clause 4.1	As per MPD – 2021, Para 4.1 Housing Need: As per the Census 2001, Delhi has 24.5 lakh Census houses under the category of residence and residence-cum-other uses, in which 25.5 lakh households are residing. This reflects a net housing shortage of about 1.0 lakh houses / dwelling units. The figure of 1 Lakh is a difference of Households as per census figures. No modification suggested by the MAG.
3	2731	Mr. Rajan Richards Chaudhary, C-5/36Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi	Suggestion regarding Footnote (5) under the F.A.R. table in Para 4.4.3 (A) of MPD-2021 which states- “Permissible FAR and Dwelling Units shall not be less than MPD-2001 norms” stands injuncted/ stayed. In Terms and Conditions: (ii) The total coverage and FAR permissible in any plot in a category, shall not be less than that permissible and available to the largest plot in the next lower category. (x) (a) In case the permissible coverage is not achieved with the above-mentioned setbacks in a plot, the setbacks of the preceding category may be allowed. In both the above cases the words “the next” and “the preceding” should be amended by “ any ”.	MAG did not agree to the suggestion made. No modification/ amendment suggested.
4	1579	Sh. Neeraj Gupta, 17/2868, Beadonpura, Karol Bagh, New Delhi 110005	Regarding Para 15.3.3 sub para (iii), declaration of Pedestrian Shopping Street (PSS) for streets with width 7.5m ROW	MAG observed that as per the Orders of the Hon’ble Supreme Court no further mixed-use/ commercial streets are to be declared. Hence, no modification/ amendment suggested.
5	2822, 3074	RanjuMinhas, 21-D, DDA flats, Masjid Moth Phase 1	Multi-storeyed flats have to be planned on the land where old DDA flats were built. Thus accommodating more dwelling units in same area with better facilities. Exploration of the option of high rise multi-storeyed flats	MPD – 2021 has proposed redevelopment of Plotted/ Group Housing in Para 4.2.2.1-Planned Areas: No modification/ amendment suggested.
6	2714	SayarBenganiA bhinandan#9, Lower Rawdon Street, Kolkata 110020	Withdraw the Green Belt forming part of 2 nd revenue village Samalka along the road Rajokri-Bijwasan-Najafgarh Road, include the same as part of Urban Extension and allow residential activity.	The issue was discussed in the 12 th meeting of the MAG on ‘Enforcement & Plan Monitoring’ held on 29-07-2013. No modification/amendment was suggested.
7	3969	Rajiv Kumar Bhagat, Shop No.31	Banks running from school should not be allowed. If allowed, space provided should be inside school	As per MPD-2021, Table 13.21: Educational Facilities, only Bank Extension Counter is permitted in

		CSCQD Block, Pitampura	building with parking facilities provided and no direct entry to main road allowed.	Senior Secondary School. No regular bank branch is allowed in School Premises. No modification was suggested.
8	G-695	Ghalib Memorial Co-operative Group Housing Society Ltd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Redevelopment/Reconstruction of building construction by Old Group Housing Co-operative societies (flatted accommodation) in Delhi which are in a dilapidated condition and the relevant provision in MPD-2021. - Reconstruction of old cooperative group housing, which are more than 15 years old, with 200 FAR should be allowed increased 400 FAR. Ground coverage of 33.3% increased to 40%. - Effluent treatment plant, installation of solar panel, rain water harvesting should be made mandatory for new constructions. 	<p>The suggestions were discussed w.r.t. to the provisions in MPD – 2021 and following is suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Availing additional FAR due to increase from MPD – 2001 <p>Building section has issued a public notice on 13.09.12 for availing additional FAR in case of Group Housing. Availing additional FAR in “additional tower/ block” is not feasible as increase in the DU is not permitted. The increase in FAR will be feasible only in case of addition/ extension of a block attached to the main building. In such cases the additional FAR will be utilized as continuation/ extension of the individual flats. These will be subject to certification by the Architect/ Structural Engineer about the structural stability. MAG recommended modification in public notice by the building section with the approval of Hon’ble L.G.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MAG further observed that in such cases the Ground Coverage permitted may be increased to 40%.
	G-577	Forwarded by OSD to L.G	<p>Effects of extra FAR on existing CGHS:</p> <p>Suggestion that Cooperation should stick to the clear directions of Hon’ble LG on the matter that no additional structure be allowed on existing CGHS structures to avail extra FAR, which can only be availed in the form of new buildings, if open space available with the society as per BBLs. Ongoing Housing Complexes may re-submit plan attaining with adequate Structural safety measures duly incorporated by certified Structural Engineer empanelled with MCD.</p>	<p>a) In view of the above following amendment is suggested in Para 4.4.3 Control for Building within Residential Premises, B. Residential Plot – Group Housing:</p> <p><i>vi) Ground Coverage up to 40 % may be allowed to achieve low-rise high-density housing without lifts.</i></p> <p>In continuation following sentence to be added: <i>In case of addition/ alterations for availing balance FAR, ground coverage up to 40% may be allowed.</i></p>
9	-	Forwarded by Director (Plg.) Rohini	<p>Public Notice issued by Director (Bldg.) DDA dated 13-09-2012 stated that additional FAR in Group Housing Societies shall be approved only on additional tower/block, and not on existing structures, owing to probable structural failure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recommendation to withdraw the Public Notice to avail additional FAR only on additional tower/ Block. Instead allow utilization of additional FAR as permissible according to MPD-2021 for existing structures. - Recommendation to amend the Registrar Cooperative Societies Act to allow increase in number 	<p>b) Availing incentive FAR in case of redevelopment.</p>

			<p>of dwelling units in Group Housing Societies to facilitate redevelopment and utilization of additional FAR.</p>	<p>MAG was informed that MPD – 2021 provides <i>“to incentivise the redevelopment maximum overall FAR of 50% over and above the existing permissible FAR on individual plots”</i> in Para 3.3. However, the provisions are silent about proportionate increase in Dwelling Units. The members observed that in case permissible Dwelling Units are not increased, the average Dwelling Unit size will be higher than the existing and outside the affordability of a large number of persons. This will defeat the objective of Master Plan to increase the <i>“population holding capacity of the area within existing urban limits through redevelopment”</i> as per the strategy given in Chapter 3.0.</p> <p>In view of the above following amendment is suggested in para 3.3 Redevelopment of existing urban area, 3.3.2 Guidelines for Redevelopment Schemes:</p> <p><i>v) To incentivise redevelopment, a maximum overall FAR of 50% over and above the existing permissible FAR on individual plots subject to a maximum of 400 shall be permissible. Higher FAR shall however not be permissible in redevelopment of Lutyens Bunglow Zone, Civil Lines Bungalows Area and monument regulated Zone.</i></p> <p>In continuation, following sentence to be added: <i>In case of residential premises, wherever dwelling units are proposed, the number of dwelling units will increase in same proportion as FAR.</i></p> <p>Action: Director (Plg.) MPR</p>
10	L-454 G-694	PHD Chamber	<p>Para 8(6) in Chapter 17. Development Code in MPD-2021.</p> <p>i. Contradiction in Delhi Building Bye-Laws, 1983 and Development Code: Chapter 17 of MPD-2021 Clause 8(5) Basement.</p> <p>MPD-2021: Chapter 17: Development Code, Clause 8(5), sub clause (b)</p>	<p>The issue of permitting podiums in High-Rise Buildings has been discussed in the tenth meeting of this MAG held on 05-06-2013; and the recommendation of the MAG was placed before the tenth meeting of the Advisory Group held on 03-07-2013.</p> <p>No modification/amendment was</p>

			<p>The basement(s) beyond building line shall be kept flushed with the ground and shall be ventilated with mechanical means of ventilation.</p> <p>Delhi Building Bye-Laws 1983: Clause 14.12.2 (iii) The minimum height of ceiling of any basement shall be 0.9m and maximum of 1.2m above the average surrounding ground level.</p> <p>Suggestion : In case of high rise buildings (more than 15m in height) in all use premises, podium floor(s) above ground level will be allowed up to the setback lines for parking, services and landscaping only and will not be included in FAR and ground coverage.</p>	suggested by the MAG.
11		<p>Pending Action of: Sixth Meeting of the Advisory Group on Review of MPD-2021 held on 27.04.2012</p>	<p>Hon'ble L.G. informed about the large number of unsafe buildings in Delhi, and need for retrofitting work for these buildings. He suggested that DDA may have a separate division (retrofitting Division) for these building with members from SPA & IBC.</p> <p>Sr. Consultant, UTTIPEC stated that some NGO- Architecture firms working on this should also be made part of the group.</p> <p>Hon'ble L.G. asked to fix a meeting with SPA, DDA, IBC& Pvt. Consultants.</p>	MAG observed that retrofitting of unsafe buildings is beyond the scope of Master Plan exercise. Hence, no modification suggested.

The meeting ended with thanks to the Chair.

Sd/-
Director (Plg.) MPR & TC, DDA

Copy to:

- All members
- Co-opted Members
- Special Invitees
- Concerned officers for necessary action as mentioned in the minutes.