

## दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण

अनुनाम Master Han

विधि संख्या P. (63) / 91-mP

विषय

Minutes of the Technical Committee  
S. C. meeting held on 1-10-91.

४०      दिवस      दिवस । विना      हस्ताक्षर

जाने की | लपटे छो

સાચી રૂં      સિપિ      કિરણી મોડી      સાચી

कक्षाधिकारी का पद ली. | पद ली.



DRAFT MINUTES OF THE 90TH SCREENING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD  
ON 1-10-91 AT 9.30 AM IN THE CONFERENCE HALL, VIKAS MINAR.

The following members/invitees were present:

- |    |                                |              |
|----|--------------------------------|--------------|
| 1  | Vice-Chairman                  |              |
| 2  | Commissioner (Plg)             | In the chair |
| 3  | Commissioner (Slum)            |              |
| 4  | Chief Architect                |              |
| 5  | Addl Chief Architect-I         |              |
| 6  | Addl Chief Architect-II        |              |
| 7  | Chief Engineer (WZ)            |              |
| 8  | Director (Lands)               |              |
| 9  | Director (CL)                  |              |
| 10 | Director (LM)                  |              |
| 11 | Director (DC&P)                |              |
| 12 | Director (AP&B)                |              |
| 13 | Project Planner (Papankala)    |              |
| 14 | S/Sh P Behari, Sr Arch         |              |
| 15 | C L Aggarwal, Sr Arch          |              |
| 16 | S C Karanwal, Sr Arch          |              |
| 17 | N K Sharma, S E                |              |
| 18 | R K Jhingan, Sr Landscape Arch |              |
| 19 | C Ballabh, Jt Dir (Plg)        |              |
| 20 | V N Sharma, Jt Dir (J&D)       |              |
| 21 | A K Gupta, Jt Dir (Bldg)       |              |
| 22 | S P Kaura, Dy Dir (Instt)      |              |
| 23 | V P Nangia, Arch               |              |
| 24 | Baburam, Arch                  |              |
| 25 | Jarnail Singh, Arch            |              |
| 26 | H B D Malik, Arch              |              |
| 27 | Ratnakarnama, Conslt           |              |

ITEM NO.139/91

Proposed revised layout plan of isolated pocket No. 13, Palam (Manglapuri).

Revised proposal as placed on table by the Project Planner (Dwk) was discussed. After discussion it was decided that the 60m wide road alignment as proposed in the approved structure plan of Papankala be retained. The unacquired properties/land coming in the way <sup>of the said alignment</sup> be acquired. ~~The owners and tenants would be compensated as per existing rules.~~ It should, however, be kept in mind while working out <sup>the</sup> details that minimum existing structures are affected by the proposed road r/w.

ITEM NO.165/91

Layout plan for resettlement scheme for a pocket of land measuring 5.8 hect allotted by the DDA for resettlement of squatters near Matiala Village under the overall scheme of Dwarka Eject.

The layout plan was explained by Sh Jarnail Singh, Arch., Slum/JJ. The layout plan was approved with following observations:



④ + not a 6 mt wide road as stated in the agenda note x

④ the above observations +

④ essential provisions relating to such aspects as

The central road had been made 13 mt wide. <sup>However</sup> ~~to surrounding unauthorised colonies~~ <sup>would</sup> be by means of a 5 <sup>loop</sup> ~~mt wide road.~~ <sup>while a even they</sup> Few roads have been made 6 mt wide, <sup>but</sup> ~~the loop road is only 5 mt wide.~~ <sup>as</sup> the layout plan is <sup>in respect</sup> ~~deficient~~ <sup>essential</sup> of some of the facilities it was proposed that <sup>while provision for a</sup> ~~facility of~~ primary school be made in the adjoining areas, <sup>but other provisions like ESS sites - milk booth etc. should be made</sup> ~~within the proposed complex.~~ <sup>The rest of the</sup> Community spaces be kept open. <sup>largely a</sup> As this was <sup>case of</sup> ~~case of~~ <sup>clearance</sup> ~~being~~ <sup>approved by MCD.</sup>

ITEM NO. 169/91

Scrutiny of group housing schemes prepared by D. The <sup>details of the</sup> ~~proforma~~ <sup>were</sup> explained by Sh Pathak, Dy Dir (Moni). The <sup>proforma</sup> ~~scrutiny proforma~~ for group housing schemes was accepted <sup>subject to the</sup> ~~inclusion of items relating to~~ <sup>the observation</sup> that other aspects <sup>like</sup> ~~like~~ traffic/transportation, landscaping, fire-fighting ~~provisions~~, TV antenna and telephone cables, ~~fire fighting~~, underground tanks, milk booths, road widths, right line distance bus bays, dhalaos, post boxes <sup>and</sup> police beat boxes ~~landscaping etc.~~ <sup>be also added in proforma</sup> The Committee also desired that the ~~proforma~~ <sup>report and final proforma booklet</sup> be circulated ~~thus modified~~ <sup>expanded</sup> be printed & circulated to all Architect/Planners so that future proposals are submitted to Screening Committee <sup>along with the proposed proforma.</sup> ~~in DDA in the form of a booklet as a bundle~~ <sup>them to frame and put up their detailed</sup> ~~proposals in the said proforma to the Screening Committee in future.~~ <sup>Cutting of tree in Plot No. 171, Tarun Enclave, Pitampura.</sup>

ITEM NO. 173/91

The <sup>the</sup> ~~position of~~ <sup>tree</sup> ~~and proposed building on plot~~ <sup>was explained by Sh Jhingan, Sr Arch (Landscape)</sup> ~~After discussions,~~ <sup>a detailed</sup> it was decided that existing tree should be retained for the present.



① + not a 6 mt wide road as stated in the agenda note x

The central road had been made 13 mt wide, <sup>Howe</sup> ~~to surrounding unauthorised colonies~~ <sup>would be b</sup> ~~means of a 5 loop~~ ~~7 mt wide road.~~ ~~few roads have been made 6 mt wide, but the loop road is only 5 mt wide.~~ <sup>Further</sup> ~~the layout plan is deficient of some of the facilities~~ <sup>in respect</sup> ~~it was proposed that facility for a primary school be made in the adjoining areas, but other provisions like ESS, sites - milk booth etc. be made~~ <sup>while provision for a</sup> ~~within the proposed complex.~~ <sup>the rest of the</sup> ~~Community spaces be kept open.~~ <sup>largely a</sup> ~~As this was case of fait accompli~~ <sup>clearance</sup> ~~the scheme was approved subject to being approved by MCD.~~

④ the above observations +

ITEM NO. 169/91

④ essential provisions relating to such aspects as

Scrutiny of group housing schemes prepared by DDA. <sup>details of the</sup> ~~The proforma was explained by Sh Pathak, Dy Dir (Moni).~~ <sup>were</sup> ~~The scrutiny proforma for group housing schemes was accepted with the observation that other aspects like traffic, transportation, landscaping, fire-fighting provisions, TV antenna and telephone cables, fire fighting, underground tanks, milk booths, road widths, right line distance, bus bays, dhalaos, post boxes, and police beat boxes, landscaping etc. be also added in proforma.~~ <sup>The Committee also desired that the proforma of report and final proforma booklet be circulated to all Architect/planners so that future proposals are submitted to screening Committee along with the proposed proforma.</sup> ~~in DDA in the form of a booklet so as to enable them to frame and put up their detailed proposals in the said proforma to the Screening Committee in future.~~ ~~Cutting of tree in Plot No. 171, Tarun Enclave, Pitampura.~~

ITEM NO. 173/91

The position of <sup>the</sup> ~~tree~~ <sup>vis-à-vis the</sup> ~~and proposed building on plot~~ was explained by Sh Jhingan, Sr Arch (Landscape). After <sup>a detailed</sup> ~~discussions~~, it was decided that existing tree should be retained for the present.



ITEM NO.174/91

Allotment of alternative nursery school site to Tender Feet Education Society in New Friends Colony in lieu of the site already allotted to them in Sector-C, Pocket-B, Vasant Kunj.

The proposal was explained by Sh C Ballabh, Jt Dir (Plg). After <sup>a detailed</sup> discussion, it was <sup>observed</sup> decided that the shifting of <sup>the</sup> nursery school from Vasant Kunj to Friends Colony, <sup>as proposed</sup> ~~as proposed~~ may not be allowed. <sup>of a lot lot or provided for in the approved</sup> (4)

Allotment of land for community hall in Gujrawala Town, Phase-III.

The position was explained by Sr Arch (NZ) and after <sup>some</sup> discussion it was decided that <sup>a</sup> community hall site be carved out of <sup>the vacant</sup> nursery school <sup>plot</sup> ~~site~~ <sup>located</sup> near CSC Gujrawalan Town Phase-III. <sup>If the said</sup> ~~plot had already been committed for other purposes~~ <sup>at first</sup> ~~preference, otherwise second nursery school site~~ <sup>proposed</sup> ~~community hall may be provided for~~ <sup>as earmarked in layout plan be considered, as</sup> ~~above site is already committed.~~ <sup>the a portion of</sup> ~~the second~~ <sup>nursery school plot shown in the</sup> ~~layout plan~~

L S C, Kohat Enclave, Pitampura, Delhi. <sup>approved</sup>

The scheme was explained initially by the Senior Architect (NZ) and then in detail by the Consultant (Sh Ratnakarnama). After <sup>a</sup> detailed discussion the scheme was approved subject to the following modifications:

(i) The Width of 9m wide road be increased to make it a 3 lane carriage way in the stretch of LSC area fronting the plots and proposed buildings be suitably shifted.

(ii) Only scooter entry/parking be provided <sup>for the</sup> ~~on~~ service lane side.

(iii) One plot each for <sup>a</sup> nursing home <sup>and</sup> <sup>respectively</sup> guest house, be <sup>identified</sup> ~~proposed~~ in the layout plan. <sup>(iv)</sup> ~~The~~ <sup>offices</sup> 2nd and 3rd <sup>constructed</sup> floors of main shopping block shall be <sup>for</sup> ~~on~~ the

.....P/4

(4) Layout plan, into a nursery school plot. A fresh allotment of nursery school plots to nursery school ~~even~~ <sup>where</sup> ~~plots~~ <sup>still</sup> ~~existed~~ <sup>had been</sup> ~~been~~ <sup>as per a recent policy</sup> ~~decision~~ <sup>taken by the</sup> ~~Chairman DDA, the~~ <sup>Committee</sup> ~~decided to~~ <sup>reject the</sup> ~~proposal~~

ITEM NO.180/91

ITEM NO.184/91



allotted for the use of self-employed professionals, govt/semi-govt departments, MCD and its various subordinate agencies, DESU, public distribution systems etc.

The following general issues were also discussed, while discussing the location of ESS, CE (Elect)

1) Location of ESS suggested that ESS may be located in the load-centre. He was requested to give a note on the most desirable

location of ESS in various type of schemes, from the technical point of view so that some decisions are taken and followed everywhere.

2) Guidelines could be adopted for the purpose, in preparing the designs.

3) Dir (CI) was also asked to put up a note on area requirements for various sizes/categories of Banks so that it is kept in mind by the architects while designing a particular project.

4) Some features so that the some could be provided for while drawing up the Night Shelter (Near Guru Angad Nagar).

ITEM NO.186/91

The proposal was explained by Arch (Slum) and Sr Arch (EZ). After some discussion, it was decided

(i) The ground floor space be kept as a hall with toilets so that it can be used as office space for banks, post office etc.

(ii) 1st and 2nd floors be kept as proposed night shelter with toilet facilities as per requirements.

(iii) The windows may be shielded with jali. It was also agreed that the entire wall be undertaken by the Slum Wing for DDA. Suitable adjustment be made for land, cost of construction etc.

DDA's share of the building costs.

In the meeting of the Screening Committee held on 1-10-91, two items were discussed which were included in the agenda for Technical Committee (from the agenda item of the meeting of 27-9-91).

ITEM NO.177/91  
Tech Committee

Proposal for carving out additional plots in Gujrawalan Co-operative House Building Society, Ph I, II & III.

F23(9)/69-Bldg. pt.

.....F/5



The points raised by Commr (Plg) in the agenda item were discussed in detail and the Screening Committee made the following observations:

(i)

The eligibility of the <sup>wait-listed members</sup> membership should be ascertained from the Registrar, Co-operative Societies <sup>with reference to</sup> ~~as on~~ the cut-off date on the basis of which the land was allotted or the layout plan was approved. ~~This should be ascertained by~~

~~Dir (CL) also keeping in view the order of passed in 1967~~ <sup>allotment of additional land and/or</sup> the L.G. with regard to the ~~membership~~ <sup>sanction of revised layout plans in</sup> ~~decided in 1967.~~ <sup>respect of plotted corp. housing Societies.</sup>

(ii)

There should be a uniform policy in dealing such matters where approved layout plans are proposed to be modified <sup>in order</sup> to carve out more plots to accommodate <sup>left-out</sup> additional members, <sup>keeping in</sup> view such instances as the following: ~~(It was noticed that) earlier~~ <sup>(a)</sup> In cases of Dera Gazikhan Co-operative House Building Society and ~~also in case of~~ Central Govt Co-operative House Building Society (Vasant Vihar), one plot had been allotted to more than one member.

(iv)

<sup>(b)</sup> In certain other plotted corp. societies ~~Also where there were additional members~~ <sup>where additional plots could not be carved out</sup> available in the Society to whom they could ~~sanction had been given for developing~~ <sup>schemes</sup> not allot plots, were given flats by developing part of the land for flatted/group housing <sup>in order to accommodate</sup> ~~accommodating more than one member in each plot.~~

The Committee generally felt that such approaches were preferable to that of ~~sub-dividing~~ plots, as was proposed in the instant case.

Keeping in view the above observations, the Screening Committee observed that when the alternatives mentioned above are available to the society, they should adopt the same rather than proposing the modification in approved layout plan. The committee also observed that in no case community facility area, forming part of the



approved layout plan, will be allowed to be utilised for plotted development. For additional population, if permissible, extra land for facilities will have to be provided.

ITEM NO.178/91  
Tech Committee

Regarding relaxation in the side set back in the corner plots falling in the Rehabilitation on Ministry Employees Co-op House Building Society at Malviya Nagar. F23 (171)/74-Bldg.

After considering various aspects of the question, presented, the Screening Committee recommended that the side

set-back in case of corner plots with 60' to

72' depth in order to achieve permissible ground

coverage be relaxed to 1/2 the plot depth in

the rear.



DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY  
(MASTER PLAN SECTION)

Supplementary Agenda for the Meeting of the Technical Committee to be held on 27.9.91 at 9.30 A.M. in the Conference Room of Vikas Minar at 5th floor, Delhi Development Authority I.P.Estate, New Delhi.

<u>Sl.No.</u>	<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
<del>16.</del>	<del>176/91</del>	Proposed development around T.V. tower Pitampura and change of land use for various activities. PS/CA(85)87-88/7918	42-45
		To be presented by C.A.	
17	177/91	Proposal for Carving out additional plots in Gujrawala Co-operative House Building Society, Ph-I, II and III. F.23(9)/69-Bldg.pt.	46-49
		To be presented by Dir.(AP&B)	
18.	178/91	Regarding relaxation in the side set back in the corner plots falling in the Rehabilitation on Ministry Employees Co.Op. House Building Society at Malviya Nagar. F.23(17)/74-Bldg.	50-51
		To be presented by Dir.(AP&B)	
<del>19.</del>	<del>116/91</del>	Request for additional coverage FAR and land by Bhalis House of worship, Kalkaji. F.13(50)/78-Bldg.	52-55
		To be presented by JD(AP)	
<del>20.</del>	<del>73/91</del>	Redevelopment Scheme at Janpath land. F.16(89)/81-MP	56-60
		To be presented by JD(ZP)	



Item NO-176/91

Sub:- Proposed developments around TV tower, Pitampura and change of land use for various activities.

PS/CA/85/87-88/79/8

There has been two meetings with Vice-Chairman on the subject. Minutes of the latest meeting is placed opposite. It was decided to inform the Lt. Governor of the latest position regarding the proposal and the design.

An attractive Television Tower with a height of 235 mtrs. has been constructed in Pitampura on Ring Road. This has become a landmark in Delhi. The Television Tower is visible from a distance of 20 kms. This Tower is located in about 4 hectrs. site which is a part of Master Plan green.

Such a tower becomes an important feature in the landscape of any major metropolitan city. Some famous examples are Post office tower at London, T.V. Tower at Moscow and Eiffel Tower at Paris. At the time of consideration of plans of T.V. Tower by DUAC, it was felt that a landmark like this Tower should not be a mere structure but should become the focal point of an educational and cultural complex inspiring the youth of the country and of interest to tourists. Considering these aspects, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting set up a national group of the renowned Architects, Engineers, Town Planners, Scientists and Sculptors with Sh. A.P. Kanvinde as the Convenor to evolve a suitable design of the Tower and its surroundings.

1. S/Sh. A.P. Kanvinde
2. Charles M. Correa
3. Mahendra Raj
4. Satish Gujral
5. Shanko Chowdhary
6. J.R. Bhalla
7. Shirish Patel
8. Dr. T.N. Subba Rao



The group recommended a comprehensive design of the total environment over an area of 31 acres of land around the Tower. This was proposed to include social and cultural centre and science museum etc. to generate interest amongst the people in acquiring scientific information and cultural heritage. The group recommended development of "Court of Heritage", "Court of Science" and museums. Regarding the provisions of Master Plan, Delhi Development Authority informed them that the development on additional land of 27 acres has to be done keeping in view the over all land use i.e. District Parks, playgrounds and open spaces without raising substantial structures. The group recommended in their report of 19th June, 1987 that DDA should act as the nodal agency to ensure implementation of the project.

A high level meeting held on 20.7.87 under the chairmanship of the then Cabinet Secretary, while considering the above mentioned report decided that Delhi Administration may be asked by Ministry of Home Affairs to give a scheme and a group be set up to consider the plan. The group may associate department of Culture, Science & Technology, Information & Broadcasting, Telecommunications etc. Department of Telecommunication were prepared to pay on pro-rata cost for getting some area in the Court of Science for a telecommunication museum. Accordingly, Secretary(Tourism), Directorate of Tourism vide his letter dated 8.9.87 requested DDA for allotment of 27 acres of land on a cost and also to process change of land use. They have also suggested that this area may be developed as a centre on similar basis as La cite' near Paris.



Delhi Development Authority on the basis of the recommendations of the Delhi Urban Arts Commission initiated to hold a competition for this area, but ultimately it was decided not to call the competition and Lt. Governor approved on 16.11.89 that the work should be given to M/s. Stein Doshi and Bhalla. It was further decided that Mr. Kanvinde may also be willing to join in the preparation of the conceptual plans. It was also suggested that if DDA thinks essential the Group can consult Mr. Raje also. They would be paid as per DDA's norms.

Regarding implementation of this project, DDA has agreed to spend money on design of the scheme and the development of the adjacent land and green spaces, which is now enlarged to approx. 50 Hectr. The other institutional uses falling in this area will be either re-located or adjusted within the site.

There were 4 college sites and one hospital site in the area which was proposed to be used for this scheme. Out of this allotment was made for one college (Guru Gobind Singh College of Commerce) and a polytechnic (Women Polytechnic). Though we are not sure but 2 of the remaining college sites were to be given to Delhi University in lieu of their land acquired by DDA in Mukherjee Nagar area. To make the proper scheme it was felt necessary that these sites may be shifted from here and relocated elsewhere. In this we found the



management of Guru Gobind Singh College of Commerce very adamant and refuse to shift from the present site even after the intervention of the Lt. Governor.

The project was discussed in the Technical Committee on 1.4.91 wherein the following was decided:-

- a) two sites, one for college and one for polytechnic as proposed in the vicinity of the District Centre, be approved.
- b) the land use of the area indicated as 'Facility Centre' be changed to 'Recreational and cultural use' and recreational area to public and semi public facilities' because of (a) above.

Accordingly we relocated 2 of the sites in the green area west of Wazirpur Distt. Centre which is approximately 500 mtrs. away and also carved out a site for the Guru Gobind Singh College in the nearby area which is only few 100 mtrs. away.

Before a final decision is taken it was decided that we may call the representatives of DTDC and Delhi Admn. and discuss with them the proposed scheme.

The matter is placed before the Technical Committee for its consideration.



Item No. 177/91

Subject: Proposal for carving out additional plots in Gujranwala Co-operative House Building Society Phase I, Phase II and Phase III.

File No. F.23(9)/69/Bldg./Pt.

This case pertains to carving out of additional plots within the existing unallotted plots in Gujranwala C.H.B.S.

The details are as follows:-

1) The Layout Plan for Part I was approved vide DDA Resolution No. 323 dated 12.7.1966 and subsequently revised for 409 plots. The approval was conveyed by this office letter dated 4.10.1969.

Part II of this Scheme was approved on 28.8.1970.

Part I and II both these areas have been denotified from development area of DDA vide Notification No. F.12/22/87/L&B/Planning dated 31.5.1989.

The layout plan for Phase III was approved for 91 plots on 23.7.76 and six plots in Phase II in place of S.P. Unit area. A copy of the approved set back cum-demarcation plan submitted by the Architect of the Society is laid on the table.

2) The society has requested for revision of layout for carrying out additional four plots in Phase I within green area and additional 46 plots within unallotted plots in Phase II and Phase III. The list of total members of the Society duly approved by R(CS) indicates that there were total 768 members. Further it has been informed by the Society that one member had resigned. Therefore, the total strength of the Society is 767 members. The Society was allotted land in three phases as below:-

Phase	Area of land allotted.	Total plots approved
I	46.37 Acs. (46.54)	409
II	19.4 Acs.	211
III	10.36 Acs.	91 + 6 (In Phase II)
TOTAL :		<u>717 Nos.</u>



-47-

It appears that total members were not accommodated by the Society at the time of obtaining approval of the Layout plan. Out of total 767 members allotment of plots has been made to 654 members. Thus, giving unallotted 63 plots with the Society against 113 approved members to whom the plots could not be allotted so far as reported by the Society. Society had requested DDA for allotment of more land in order to accommodate above said members. This request was not acceded to by the DDA. General Body and the Managing Committee of the Society resolved to revise the layout plan by carving out 50 additional plots on the same residential unallotted 63 vacant plots by decreasing the present size of the plots.

#### THE PROPOSAL

1. Out of these proposed 50 additional plots four plots are proposed in Phase I by converting the green area into residential plots.

There is already 45' wide road passing through the green area. Details are given below:-

<u>As approved</u>		<u>As proposed</u>		
Total Area	Existing land use	Total Area	Min. Size of Plot	Proposed No. of plots.
20.312 Acres	PARK	20.545 Acres	261.38 Sq. Yards	4 Nos.

\* Total increase in Area is 1125.00 Sq. Yds. or 0.23 acres.

The Phase I of this Scheme stands transferred to MCD.

2. The comprehensive proposal for Phase III (including six plots in Phase II) has been examined as per MPD-62 norms since the scheme stands approved prior to MPD-2001. The following table gives comparison between the approved plan and proposed plan Plans for Phase I and Phase III for carving out additional plots as proposed by Society is laid on the table.



As approved

48

As proposed

	Total Area	Min. size of plot	Existing No. No. of plots for change	Total Area	Min. size of the Plot	Proposed No. of Plots
Block A	2738.63	138.05	18	3434.63	75.42	44
	Sq. Yds.	Sq. Yds.		Sq. Yds.	Sq. Yds.	
Block B	2522.95	125.00	17	3028.95	75.00	37
	Sq. Yds.	Sq. Yds.		Sq. Yds.	Sq. Yds.	
Block C	1733.33	125.00	13	1733.33	100.00	16
	Sq. Yds.	Sq. Yds.		Sq. Yds.	Sq. Yds.	
	(6 Plots in Phase II)			(8 Plots in Phase II)		
	6994.91	1.445 Acs.	48	8196.91	1.69 Acs.	94
	Sq. Yds.			Sq. Yds.		

Total increase - 1202 Sq. Yds. or 0.245 Acres.

It may be seen from the Table that increase in residential area is about 0.25 acres. This area of 0.25 acres is reduced from circulation area. The proposed minimum size of the plot is less than 125 sq. yds. as required by MPD-62.

PROVISION OF COMMON FACILITIES :

Total area of the land allotted to the Society is 76.3 acres. Area under facilities required as per MPD-62 is 30.3 per cent + 2 per cent of service personnel area, i.e., 32.3 per cent of total area which works out to be 24.644 acres. Total area provided under common facilities in all three phases in this scheme is 25.9 Acres.

GROSS DENSITY :

Gross density for all three phases works out to be as follows:-

	Population	Area
Phase I	4788.00	46.54 Acres
Phase II	2056.50	19.40 Acres
Phase III	1351.35	10.36 acres
	8195.85	76.30 Acres

i) Gross Density =  $\frac{\text{Total Population}}{\text{Total land}} = \frac{8195.85}{76.30} = 107 \text{ PPA (Approx.)}$

ii) Permissible density as per Zonal Plan = (100+15% Variation) PPA.

The details of plots and details of proposed population are given in the Annexures 'A' and 'B'

/...



The matter was referred to Commissioner (Lands) for making observations and recommendations. The Lands Department of DDA has no objection to this proposal.

The matter was also referred to Registrar, Co-operative Group Housing Societies. The Registrar (CS) has verified that in all 768 members are enrolled in the Society and out of these members 654 plots have been already allotted, and still 113 members stand enrolled with the Society awaiting allotment against 63 vacant plots. The Society has also submitted an undertaking that it would surrender surplus plots to DDA, if any, arising out of this revision.

Proposed Layout Plans for Phase I, Phase II and Phase III for carving out additional plans as proposed by the Society are placed before the Technical Committee for consideration.



SANCTIONED				PROPOSED			
Plot No.	No. of Plots	Area of Plot	Total area in Sq. Yds.	Plot No.	No. of Plot	Area of Plot	Total area in Sq. Yds.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<u>POCKET 'A'</u>							
227	1	217.78	217.78	223	1	106.67	106.67
228 to 234	7	155.58	1011.15	223 A	1	78.75	78.75
				223 B	1	78.75	
235	1	243.84	243.84	224	1	77.92	77.92
				224B	1	77.83	77.83
236 to 243A	9	140.00	1260.00	224B	1	76.25	76.25
				224C	1	75.42	75.42
				225	1	75.82	75.82
				225A	1	76.21	76.21
				225B	1	76.56	76.56
				225C	1	76.88	76.88
				226	1	76.00	76.00
				226A	1	76.28	76.28
				226B	1	76.54	76.54
				226C	1	77.92	77.92
				227	1	225.00	225.00
				227 A to 234	12	75.00	900.00
				235	1	225.00	225.00
				236 to 243	12	75.00	900.00
	18		2732.77		48		3434.63
<u>POCKET 'B'</u>							
211	1	198.33	198.33	211	1	135.00	135.00
211A-217	1	125.00	875.00	211A-214A	10	75.00	750.00
218	1	190.50	190.50	215	1	137.25	137.25
219	1	168.00	168.00	215A	1	75.42	75.42
				215B	1	75.82	75.82
220	1	159.72	159.72	215C	1	76.21	76.21
221	1	151.40	151.40	216	1	76.56	76.56
222	1	180.00	180.00	216A	1	76.88	76.88
				216B	1	76.00	76.00
				216C	1	79.81	79.81
				217-218B	8	75.00	600.00
				219C to 220	2	135.00	270.00
				221 to 222C	8	75.00	600.00
	17		2522.45		37		3028.95



SANCTIONED				PROPOSED			
<u>POCKET 'C'</u>							
278A- to 13	125.00	1500.00	Sq.Yds.	278A to 16	100.00	1500.00	Sq.Yds.
288A				288			
(6 Plots in Phase II)				(8 Plots in Phase II)			
13		1500.00	Sq.Yds.	16		1500.00	Sq.Yds.

(iii) Adequacy of Common Facility :

Total area of land allotted = 76.30 Acres

Facilities required, i.e., as per old Bye-laws

30.30% + 2% for S.P. Area = 32.3%

=  $\frac{76.30 \times 32.30}{100}$

= 24.644 Acres.

Facility provided = 25.90 Acres.

(iv)	<u>Residential Area sanctions</u>	<u>Now Proposed</u>	<u>Excess Area</u>
Pocket 'A'	2732.77 Sq. Yds.	3434.63 Sq.Yds.	701.86 Sq.Yds.
Pocket 'B'	2522.45 Sq. Yds.	3028.95 Sq.Yds.	506.50 Sq.Yds.



DENSITYPhase IProposedExisting:

Total plots sanctioned	= 409.00 No. of Plots	= 413.00
Total no. of D.U.s	2X413	= 826.00
2X409	= 818.00	
Total Population @ 4.5		
DUs 818 X 4.5	= 3681.00 826X4.5	= 3717.00
S.P. 5% of 818	= 40.90 5% of 3717	
	<u>3721.90</u>	<u>4788.00</u>
	Persons	Persons

Excess Population 3758.3-3721.9 = 36.4 persons  
Say = 36 Persons.

PHASE III

Total plots sanctioned	= 97	Proposed	= 14.30
No. of DUs 2 x 97	= 194	2X143	= 286.00
Total population @ 4.5			
DUs. 194 X 4.5	= 873	286x4.5	= 1287
S.P. 5% of 194	= 9.7	S.P. 5% of 1287	= 64.35
	<u>882.70</u>		<u>1351.35</u>
	Persons		Persons

Excess Population 1301.30-882.70 = 418.6 Persons  
Say 419 Persons.

Total proposed population 3758+1301 = 5059 Persons  
Phase II Population 2056.5 = 7115.5 Persons



Subject:- Regarding relaxation in the side set back in the corner plots falling in the Rehabilitation Ministry Employees Coop. House Building Society at Malviya Nagar.  
File No.F.23(17)/74/Bldg.

The President of the Rehabilitation Employees Coop. House Building Society Ltd. has requested that the permissible ground coverage of 60 percent in the corner plots is not available due to the 4 Ft. side set back. He has requested to relax the side set back in the corner plots upto 50% in 60 ft. plot depth and 60% in 72 ft. plot depth so that the permissible ground coverage of 60 per cent is available in these plots.

Background of the case:

- i) The building activity of Shivalik Enclave has been released vide letter No.F.23(17)/74/Bldg. dt.22.3.91.
- ii) Later on the President of the society pointed out that in case of corner plots, it was not possible to achieve permissible ground coverage after leaving front, rear and side set back as per set back-cum-demarcation plan. List of such plots was submitted. In order to achieve permissible coverage, the society suggested that such plots should be allowed to cover side set backs upto 50 per cent of the depth of the plot. In some cases even after allowing 50 per cent of the coverage of the side set back, it is not possible to achieve permissible ground coverage. In such cases it may be necessary to cover side set backs upto 60 per cent of the depth of the plot.

With these background, the Architect has submitted the following two proposals:-

1. PROPOSAL No.1

The Architect has proposed that rear set back of 5 feet against the required set back of average 10 feet. Ground coverage is achieved in this case but following deficiencies have been pointed out.

- i) Building line w will not be maintained.
- ii) In case of back to back plot privacy is hampered.
- iii) In case back to back plots there could be problems related to laying of services and light and ventilation plans.

In view of the above, this proposal is found not workable.

contd....



PROPOSAL NO. 2.

The Architect has proposed the followings:

For the plots having depth of 60 feet and area upto 250 sq. mtr., the side set back of minimum 4 feet shall be covered upto 50 per cent of plot depth.

The plot having 72 feet depth and total area upto 250 sq. yds., the side set back of minimum 4 feet shall be covered upto 60 per cent of the plot depth. The details of proposed relaxation in side set back is indicated on the plan (laid on the table).

After examining the above proposals it is observed that with the relaxation in the side set back - cum - upto 50 per cent of the plot depth from the rear, the permissible ground coverage of 60 per cent can be achieved in both category of plots.

As a general practice adopted in the Building Section, relaxation in the side set back upto 50 per cent of the plot depth from rear in the corner plots where ever the permissible ground coverage is not achieved is already followed.

The proposal to relax 50 per cent of the plot depth from the rear in the side set back in corner plots, to achieve permissible ground coverage is placed before the Technical Committee for consideration.

.....



Item No. 116/91

Sub:- Request for additional coverage FAR and land by Bahai House of Worship, Kalkaji.

File No.F.13(50)/78/Bldg.

Dr.Gopi Nath, Director(G),Bahai House of Worship vide his letter dated 16th April,1991 addressed to the VC,DDA has requested for allowing them additional construction in their premises and also for leasing of additional land for parking purposes. In his letter Dr.Gopi Nath has pointed out that temple has become a land mark for Delhi and on an average 7 lakh people/devoter visiting the temple every month.

2. Originally they have owned a land measuring 10.67 HA (26.4 acres), out of which change of land use was notified for 'institutional use' only for 3.24 HA(8 acres) in the year 1978. Subsequently, the building plans were sanctioned in February, 1979 with ground coverage of about 7610 sq.mt or 25% of 3.24 HA. (total floor area is 8400 sq.mt.) The remaining 743 HA land was to be reserved for land scaping as a part of Master Plan green/district park and open spaces. Dr.Gopi Nath in his above referred letter has now made the following requests:

- (i) An additional floor space with 3000 sq.mt. ground coverage for the construction of Audio-Visual Auditorium and Exhibition Hall and residences for volunteer staff in two storey building.
- (ii) Allotment of additional land in the East of the existing land, measuring about 1.22 HA which is proposed to be utilised partly for the construction of additional building explained above and partly for parking.
- (iii) To lease out additional land along the Southern boundary to the East of one acre land temporarily leased by DDA for parking.

3. In his letter Dr.Gopi Nath has made all the calculations with reference to the total land i.e. 10.67 HA, whereas the change of land use has been notified only for 3.24 HA. Therefore, calculations of the percent with the covered area and FAR with respect of the total land has in fact no meaning. The land use of the remaining area being Master Plan Green.

4. The case has been examined and the joint site inspection with Sh.R.K!Jhigan,Sr.Land Scape Architect has been made. The following points are submitted for consideration:

- (i) The additional land requested for is a part of notified Forest Area.
- (ii) In the first instance, the land which they have used for parking on temporary lease should be considered for



additional allotment rather than extending it towards East which falls right in the middle of the green area.

- (iii) About 500 mtr. from the boundary of existing temple there area number of old structures and it would be worth while deciding whether to allow additional construction if found necessary existing construction area rather than in the centre of the green area, that too after processing it for change of land use.
- (iv) There is a H.T. power line passing through the land under reference which is to be super imposed in the plan.
- (v) A report from Land Branch and views of Dir.(Hort) will also be added before finalising the issue.

5. It is therefore, desirable to prepare a comprehensive landscape plan for the entire stretch covering Nehru Place, Kalkaji Mandir, temple under reference and the adjoining green area. While preparing this scheme, care should be taken for providing proper parking space, circulation system, the requirements projected by the temple and some of the basic additional requirements to be provided by the DDA.

The matter is submitted for the consideration of the T.C.

6. The proposal has been considered by the T.C. in its meeting held on 9.7.91 and it has noted that: Dr.Gopi Nath of Baha'i House of worship and his Archt. were both present in the meeting. They explained their proper for additional construction to the extent of 3000sq. mtrs. an audio-visual auditorium/exhibition hall and also for the dormitories to be provided for the temple users. After a detailed discussion the TC desired that a landscape plan be prepared for the entire green area surrounding the Bahai temple by the Sr.Landscape Architect of the DDA, taking into consideration the overall parking requirements for the visitors and other pending proposals of the Bahai temple authorities. This should be completed within a period of one month. Meanwhile Dr.Gopi Nath was asked to examine and indicate whether they would like to implement this comprehensive landscape Scheme and maintain the green area accordingly under licence from DDA. It was decided that in any case, the location of the proposed audio-visual auditorium/exhibition hall, dormitories and required car parking area would be finalised along with the consequent changes in the prescribed land use, if any, in the light of comprehensive landscape plan.

7. The proposal again discussed in the Technical Committee in its meeting held on 27.8.91 and the Technical Committee noted that in MPD-2001 the site proposed for construction had been earmarked as 'public & Semipublic use' although in the original scheme sanctioned for the Bahai temple, this was shown as a landscape area. Keeping in view the fact that the proposed structure being in the vicinity of the temple should be merged as far as possible with the land scaping, the



Technical Committee decided that the scheme be prepared in such a manner that the proposed construction would not pose any obstruction to the vista of the Bahai temple and that if necessary an adjustment in the land title between the DDA and Bahai may be made to accommodate the proposed scheme and the site be demarcated accordingly.

T.C. also noted that the overall site had been declared as a forest area and, therefore desired that this decision should be brought to the notice of the Secretary(UD)/Secretary (Environment).

8. The site was inspected by Dir.(DC&P), Dir.(Bldg.), Chief-Architect, Sr.Landscape Architect and the representative of Lands Section. After inspecting the site, the representatives of Bhai's were advised to prepare a model indicating the buildings proposed to be constructed for watch and ward in the form of dormitory and the auditorium. They were also advised to prepare a landscape plan keeping in view that the proposed structures merged with the total landscape. For this purpose, they were also advised that they may consider green area earmarked in the plan for Master Plan/Zonal Plan in the vicinity of Bhai's Temple, so that the Technical Committee may have a look on the total/overall plan for development. They were advised that the proposed structure should confine within their own area and should be limited to the minimum extent and are essentially required. It is, therefore, suggested keeping in view that when the land was to denotified, the condition was imposed that they will confined their construction within a limit of 2 acres of built up area.

Regarding the parking, it was advised that the area presently used for parking and how it is proposed to enlarge by taking an area from the surroundings, may also be shown in the overall scheme.

9. Representative of the Bhai's House worship Dr.Gopi Nath, Director General came to discuss this case along with the Architect with Vice-Chairman, DDA on 24.9.91. In pursuant to the site inspection and the advice rendered to them by the inspecting team the submitted the concept proposal. According to this concept proposal the proposal of construction of auditorium and dormatry is within the land owned by them and the additional parking space is proposed on the land owned by the DDA.

As per Master Plan(MPD-2001), this area is indicated for institutional use. However, under the forest act, this area was reserved Forest. This reservation was made after the approval of the proposal of Bahai House on this premises. The two actions are required.

41. For construction of Auditorium and Dormatery: c d

This additional construction premission may be considered by the T.C. as the section profile taken care of the Landscape



environment and can not be objected from the land use point of view. However, reference has to be made for permitting this construction in the reserved forest to the Ministry of Environment through Ministry of Urban Development.

2. For construction of additional parking place on the DDA land:

The allotment of this land has to be considered first and permission to use for parking may also be considered.

- 10.1 The proposal is placed before the Technical Committee for its consideration.



Item No. 73/91

Sub.: Re-development scheme of Janpath Lane, New Delhi.  
F.16(89)/81-MP

Technical Committee, in its meeting, held on 15.4.91 while discussing the Redevelopment Scheme of Janpath Lane, decided as below:

"The proposed redevelopment scheme at Janpath Lane was discussed in detail. It was noted that there were several small plots in one chunk which would need to be developed within one combined envelope while the other plots could be developed with an independent envelope. The representative of Traffic Police opined that the Redevelopment of this area would generate a lot of traffic which needed to be studied in detail, as was decided in the earlier meetings. The Technical Committee, after going through the documents, details and observations made by the representative of the Traffic Police, desired that Dir.(DC&P) may convene a meeting with the representative of the Traffic Police and the Consultant Mr.Sanyal that the points relating to parking needs and circulation based on traffic requirements could be looked into in depth. If the proposal was found satisfactory from these points of view the same be processed further, if otherwise, it should be brought before the Technical Committee against for final decision".

Subsequently, the matter was examined in consultation with D.C.P.(Traffic) and Sh.Sanyal, Traffic Consultant and Jt.Dir.(T). Their observations and the comments are as below:

Comments from D.C.P.(Traffic):

- i. They have observed that there is an intense traffic activity in Connaught Place and its surrounding areas and any further intensification of activities is certainly going to have an adverse impact on traffic circulation within the Connaught Place Area.
- ii. Entries in the proposed Complex are from Janpath through a 65 ft. carriageway and through Tolstoy Marg through a 45 ft. carriageway. The traffic covering on both these

contd..



have to merge and discharge only through a 30 ft. narrow lane between the Jantar Mantar and the proposed scheme site. This is the bottle neck.

iii. There is already heavy parking on the eastern side of Janpath and without sub-ways and facilities for cross-over, the area is bound to become extremely accident prone.

iv. The parking requirements needs to be assessed properly as the earlier parking provisions with the norms have gone <sup>outdated</sup>. D.C.P. (Traffic) in fact is against permitting any multi-storey development in Connaught Place Area where traffic congestion already exists.

Comments of Mr. Sanyal, Consultant, Traffic Police:

- i. Parking - He has suggested parking norm of 3.00 E.C.S. per 100 sq.mtr. in place of 2.00 E.C.S. per 100 sq.mtr. provided in MPD-2001 and in the scheme.
- ii. Circulation - The evening peak dispersal might give rise to additional level of congestion in the segment of Janpath between Tolstoy Marg and ~~Water~~ circle. and pedestrian movement across such inlet and outlet points will require special consideration.
- iii. The proposed bus interchange will result in heightened pedestrian movement including informal shopping activity in the vicinity and underneath.
- iv. The position on Parliament Street at the point of entry is also critical specially when the buses are entering in the form of queue.

contd.....



v.. The intersection of Tolstoy Marg with Janpath Lane and Janpath will be the two major distributor locations. Tolstoy Marg must be widened to 36 m right of way between Parliament Street and Janpath. In the first instance as the remaining portion may be 30 m right of way and subsequently could be widened to 36 m.

vi. Internal Circulation System : In the central block single entry exit location for major parking activity may create some problem. In view of the entry facility provided towards Janpath side and entry/exit facility provided towards Tolstoy Marg side; therefore, proper signal will become necessary.

Comments of Jt.Dir.(T) :

i. The scheme has also been examined by the Jt.Dir.(T). The scheme as prepared is feasible to implement with the traffic management. The internal circulation as proposed based on the existing road pattern can work in form of three different rotary concepts for various flow of traffic.

ii. The proposed interchange at the level of 6 ft. may not be feasible as adequate length ~~with~~ the ramp may not be available. This will also block entry and exit to LIC Building (existing).

iii. The bus terminal at this location as per the recommendation given by NDRAAC in its studies having entry from Janth and exit from Parliament Street. The basic objective was to avoid buses from outer circle of Connaught Place. In the proposed scheme, the buses will enter from Parliament Street and will have an exit on the Janpath to the Outer Circle and within the Parliament Street.

contd..



iv. Circulation within the complex needs more detailed exercise after identifying all entry and exit to the existing and proposed parking lots/buildings.

Comments:

DCP (Traffic) in his remarks have taken into consideration the total Connaught Place and its surrounding areas. In this regard, it is submitted that MPPD-2001 has proposed this area for redevelopment scheme 150 FAR, earlier in Master Plan-1962, it was to develop to 250 FAR. Therefore, the intensity on use is reduced to the extent the road network can take the load. While formulating the scheme the road pattern has been envisaged on that basis. In fact, no constructive suggestion has been given as far as the circulation pattern envisaged in the scheme. The observation that the traffic from 65 ft. and 45 ft. carriageway merged together and passes through 33 ft. wide lane is not so as is very clear from the drawing. It is also important to indicate that this site is not a vacant site and their various activities already functioning within the existing building. That the redeveloped proposal with 150 FAR, quantum of construction and activity which is likely to be reorganised. In fact with the planned system of these buildings and reorganisation of the traffic system will improve the total circulation and parking system of the area.

MPPD-2001 has indicated norms for parking and same has been revised and, therefore, the suggestion that it should be increased is not feasible, at this stage. Regarding other points, these may be taken care while preparing implementation scheme by the concerned authorities.

Regarding the location of the bus terminal, it was based on the recommendation given by NDRAC. However, it is feasible whether it should be on the surface or elevated while working the implementation scheme by the implementing scheme, this can be seen.



In this regard, it is mentioned that a reference has been received by the [redacted] in regard to Plot No.3-A, Block No.124 known as 14, Janpath Lane, New Delhi. The party has submitted their building plans on the basis of the development controls giving the scheme which was considered by the Technical Committee. The scheme was sent by NMC to E.M. [redacted] for comments. However, the comments have not been sent so far, as the scheme is yet to be approved by the Authority.

VC has desired that the matter should be brought before the Technical Committee. Accordingly, the matter is placed before the Technical Committee.