

दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण

निदिष्ट संख्या F. 1 (70) / 91-MP

Draft minutes of the Technical Committee meeting held on 3-12-91

सं. F-1333

दिनांक _____ विधि _____ जिसका बिजो हस्ताक्षर _____ सादरी वं _____ विधि _____ जिसका बिजो _____ 3/12/19
 जमाने की | जमाने की कर्जावश बानि की | जमाने की 4000/-
 30/-

4) $\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}$

1935
 4-12
 VC
 0-12

DCP
 19/12
 0-12 DC
 3/12

64179

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
(MASTER PLAN SECTION)

Draft Minutes of the Meeting of Tech. Committee held on 3.12.91 at 9.30 A.M. in the Conference Room of Vikas Minar 5th floor, Delhi Development Authority, I.P. Estate.

The following were present:-

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

1. Mr. C. Nerenha, Vice-Chairman, (In the chair)
2. Mr. H. D. Sharma, E.M.
3. Mr. J. C. Gamhbir, Commr. (plg.)
4. Mr. Santesh Auluck, C.A.
5. Mr. B. L. Khurana, C.E. (Elect)
6. Mr. S. C. Gupta, Dir. (DC&P)
7. Mr. R. G. Gupta, Dir. (TYA)
8. Mr. P. C. Jain, Dir. (AP&B)
9. Mr. W. S. Jolly, Dir. (LM)
10. Mr. V. N. Sharma, J.D. (D&J)
11. Mr. P. N. Dongre, JD (TYA)
12. Mr. Chander Ballabh, JD (AP)
13. Mr. N. K. Aggarwal, JD (WC&SA)
14. Mr. Prakash Naryan, JD (T)
15. Mr. A. K. Gupta, JD (B)
16. Mr. C. P. Rastogi, J.D. (CCG)
17. Mr. Vijay Risbud, J.D. (Narela)
18. Mr. Ashok Kumar, J.D. (Dwarka)
19. Mr. H. S. Sikka, JD (Dwarka) Ph. III
20. Mr. Surender Srivastava, DD (ZP)
21. Mr. S. P. Bansal, Dy. Dir. (NCR&UE)
22. Mr. Anil Barai, Dy. Dir. (MP) (Convener)

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ORGANISATION

23. Mr. B. K. Arora, A.D.

POLICE DEPARTMENT (TRAFFIC)

24. Mr. U. K. Chowdry, A.C.P.

L & D.O.

25. Mr. L. D. Ganatra, E.O.

M.C.D.

26. Mr. G. R. Ambwani, Engineer-In-Chief
27. Mr. R. C. Chaudhri, C.E. III
28. Mr. A. P. Sethi, A.T.P.
29. Mr. R. K. Bahargava, M.S.H.
30. Mr. C. M. Vij, S.E. - II
31. Mr. T. R. Gupta, C.E. (P) II

SPECIAL INVITIES:

32. ~~Mr. Ministry of Railway~~ *Delhi Administration*
32. Mr. Shanti Narain, Ex. Dir. Tech. Council *Dr. S. Raghunathan* *Sery. Transport*
Northern Railway For item No. 206/91
33. Mr. B. K. Makhija, Dy. C.E. -do-
34. Mr. M. N. Sehgal, Sr. Civil Engineer (C) -do-
- Container Corpn. of India
35. Mr. P. K. Malik, Director -do-
36. Mr. A. K. Kohli, G.G.M. (ech.) -do-
- CONCOR
37. Mr. A. K. Kohli, Grup G.M. -do-
- L.S.G. Deptt. Delhi (Admn.)
38. Mr. Deepak Sen Gupta, AD (Plg.) -do-
- N.C.R.P.B.
39. Mr. R. P. Rastogi, Regional Planner -do-
- Development Department
40. Dr. S. M. Bahija, Dy. Director For item No. 205/91

ITEM NO.196/91

Sub: Proposal for a 100 bedded hospital at Maidan Garhi for change of land use of an area measuring 20 acres from 'agriculture green belt' to 'public & semi-public facilities'.
(F.20(11)/85-MP).

✓ Deferred.

ITEM NO.202/91

Sub: Delineation of Bungalow Zone.
(F.1(7)/91-JD(CCG)).

✓ Deferred.

ITEM NO. 205/91

Sub: Identification of sites for Slaughter houses in Delhi.
(F.3(143)/82-MP).

The matter pertaining to identification of sites for slaughter houses within the Union Territory of Delhi and outside was discussed in detail. The officers of MCD were present in the meeting. The Technical Committee ^{observed} ~~was informed~~ that MPD-2001 provides that ~~ancillary~~ ^{to which are ancillary to} industries and the slaughter houses ^{activity} are permitted under the 'extensive industries' land use category, and ^{as such} ~~therefore~~, the slaughter house(s) ^{business would also} ~~are~~ located within this ^{self-same use} ~~use~~ zone. The Technical Committee was also informed that in writ petition No.2267/90, the Hon. Delhi High Court had directed the Union of India to inform the Court, on the next date of hearing, at least 5 different sites in or around Delhi where ^{could} ~~one or more~~ slaughter houses ^{in the light of} ~~can~~ be set up. The Technical Committee, therefore, ^{in the light of} ~~discussed~~ the details given in the preamble ^{to the agenda note, the Technical Committee} ~~and felt~~ that the following sites ^{could} ~~could~~ be suitable for the location of the slaughter house(s) - ^{decided}

- (i) One site in the vicinity of Burari Road or in Narela (in North Delhi), ^{location} ~~The specific site is~~ to be determined ^{subject to} ~~subject to~~ the clearance ^{from the} ~~from~~ the ^{site by} ~~Airport Authority~~ ^{Authority}.
- (ii) One site in the south of National High-way bypass No.24, in Chilla area in the vicinity of area ^{being} ~~developed~~ by Delhi Agriculture Marketing Board (DAMB).

- (iii) One site in the area between Rohtak Road and the existing railway line to Rohtak forming part of the urban extension area.
- (iv) One site in the National Capital Region (NCR) outside UT of Delhi for which the exact location may be determined by the NCR Planning Board. This site should be ^{adequate} ~~sufficient~~ ~~enough~~ to accommodate the export component also.

2. In addition to the above site, as decided earlier by the Technical Committee in a meeting held on 16.7.90 the existing site at Idgah Road may be redeveloped for this purpose.

Accordingly, proposals for change of prescribed land use to extensive industrial land use be processed for being placed before the Authority. The Technical Committee also recommended that the decision of Delhi Admn./Authority that there should be no new industries of an industrial estate in the Union Territory of Delhi would need to be modified so as to accommodate additional slaughter houses vide (i) and (iii) in Delhi.

Item No.204/91

Sub : Construction of general pool accommodation at Andrews Ganj, Pinjrapole scheme Sadiq Nagar, New Delhi.
F.3(33)89-MP.

Deferred.

Item No.206/91

Sub : Inland Container Depot at Tughlakabad.
F.3(41)89-MP.

The representatives of the Ministry of Railways and CONCOR explained the main changes made in the scheme for the development of the Inland Container Depot (ICD), on the site belonging to the Railways (about 39 sq. hecets.) at Tughlakabad vide below :

- (a) There were three basic components of the scheme -
 - (i) Facilities to be constructed by way of siding and platforms;
 - (ii) Provision of ~~Cargo~~ ^{meat}-handling equipment; and
 - (iii) Built-up spaces for warehousing and administrative functions.

(b) Originally, the scheme prepared by the Container Corporation of India envisaged handling of containerised traffic of cargo to an extent of 3 lakhs TEUS. However, as discussed and decided in the meeting of the Committee of Secretaries, the size of ICD has to be restricted ~~only~~ ^{meat} to Delhi's requirements ^{only} and accordingly, the target ~~ed~~ ^{ed}.

~~and~~ capacity had now been scaled down to 1,15,000 TEUS by 2001.

(c) The reduction in capacity vide (b) above would entail no corresponding reduction in the length of siding as this was related to the maximum length of goods train to be berthed there. However, the land required to be developed for warehousing and parking of container carrying trailers/trucks would be less than before and the areas thus rendered surplus were proposed to be kept as ~~open~~ 'green' [as depicted in the revised plan which was tabled in the meeting].

It was also mentioned that at present the number of TEUS being handled at Pragati Maidan container depot had jumped from 15,000 to 40,000 TEUS. It was estimated that the balance traffic ~~emanating~~ from as well as to Delhi, which was being handled in break-bulk form by the railways as well as the road transport network, would switch over to the containerised form once the ICD at Tughlakabad was set up, levelling off ultimately at a figure of 1.15 lakh TEUs.

3. Commissioner(Transport), Delhi Admn. mentioned that while he had no objection to having the proposed container depot located in the Union Territory of Delhi, exclusively to meet Delhi's requirements, ~~by way of~~ ^{the resultant problems} traffic generation and resultant movement of trucks/trailers on city roads would have to be properly examined and taken care of as the road system was not ~~planned~~ planned and designed for that type and volume of traffic. Accordingly, various road realignment and widening schemes would have to be worked out to avoid resultant traffic congestion/bottlenecks.

4. The representatives of the NCR Planning Board stated that ~~the~~ matter had been examined by the NCR Planning Board and the opinion of the Board was that as far as possible, Delhi's economic activity should be curtailed and such activities which had multiplier effect, should be dispersed. NCR Board was therefore of the opinion that a better location for a container depot would be at 'Palwal' because it is located in the southern part of National Capital Region area and can very well handle the cargo coming through the roads or railways from ~~the parts~~ ^{the various parts of the} with the help of the proposed transportation linkages to be provided in the NCR Plan.

Shri Prakash Narain of DDA expressed certain reservations reg. (i) the estimates of Delhi's containerised traffic requirements being pegged at 1.15 lakhs TEUs as against 80,000 TEUs (which was the earlier estimate) and (ii) the adequacy of space provided within the complex for parking of 5000 trailers/trucks.

④ The various parts of the country

5. The Technical Committee decided that a sub-group may go into these various aspects in greater detail and submit its report for the consideration of the Technical Committee at its next meeting, viz.

1. Shri R. Reghunathan, Secretary (Transport), Delhi Admn.
2. Shri Prakash Narain, Jt. Director (Transport), DDA.
3. Sh. G. R. Ambwani, Engineer-in-Chief, MCD or his representative.
4. Shri R. P. Rastogi, representative of NCR Plg. Board.
5. Concerned officers of Northern Railways/RITES/CONCOR.

6. The Technical Committee also noted that for the dispersal of rail passenger traffic, the MPD-2001 had provided for setting up of 4 metropolitan passenger terminals, each in a different direction. For South Delhi, the site provided in the Master Plan was the land now being developed for the proposed ICD. It was, therefore, felt that in case this entire site was to be utilised for ICD and its related activities, an alternative site for metropolitan passengers terminal in South Delhi would have to be identified immediately. It was decided that Commr. (Plg.) would call a meeting at his level to identify a suitable alternative site, in consultation with Ministry of Railways, and report back to the Technical Committee in this regard, at the next meeting.

- (iii) One site in the area between Rehtak Road and ^{the existing} Railway line to Rehtak (~~as part of the~~ ^{forming part} of the Urban Extension area).
- (iv) One site in the National Capital Region (NCR), ^{outside U.T. of} Delhi for which the exact location may be determined by the NCR ^{Planning} Board. This site ^{should} be sufficient enough to accommodate the export component also.

2. In addition to the above sites, as decided earlier, ^{the existing} site at ^{Sadgah} Mundeesalana Road ^{may} also be properly developed for this purpose. ^{According to proposals for change of prescribed land} The Technical Committee recommended that wherever required, necessary amendment in the Master Plan ^{to change the} of land use to extensive industrial land use, be processed ^{for being placed} before the ^{recommended} The Technical Committee also felt that the decision of ^{the} Delhi Administration/Authority that there should be ^{or industrial estate} no new industries in the Union Territory of Delhi, ^{that} would need to be modified to the extent ^{that} this would not ^{be} apply to locate the industries to meet the essentially requirements for Delhi. ^{as to accommodate the} additional slaughter houses vide (i) to (iii)

Item No. 204/91 ^{in Delhi}

Sub: Construction of general pool accommodation at Andrews Ganj, Pinjrapele scheme Sadiq Nagar, New Delhi. (F.3(33)/89-MP).

Deferred.

ITEM NO. 206/91

Sub: Inland Container Depot at Tughlakabad. (F.3(41)/89-MP)

^{representatives of the Railway & CONCOR} The ^{main changes made in the scheme} Railway's representatives were present in the meeting. They explained the ^{for the development of the} scheme formulated for an Inland Container Depot (ICD) at Tughlakabad ^{on} within the land ^{site belongs to the Railways} already under their possession ^{at Tughlakabad as follows vide below} (about 39 hec.). They explained that ^{the scheme} there are ^{to be constructed by way of} three basic components of an ICD namely (a) ^{facilities} space Facilities for siding and platforms; (b) ^{built-up spaces for} space for cargo handling equipments; and (c) ^{for} space for warehousing and administrative functions.

^{by} (2) ^{originally} the scheme prepared the Container Corporation of India, ^{encouraged handling of} at this location can ultimately handle the Container traffic of cargo to an extent of 3 lakh TEUS. However, as discussed and decided in the meeting

of the Committee of Secretaries, the size of ICD ~~was to be restricted only to Delhi requirements, and no other Railway~~ ^{proposed} will be restricted to 1,15,000 TEUS by 2001.

Initially, the proposal is to develop the ~~infrastructure~~ facilities for 90,000 TEUS. They ~~also~~ ^{stated} explained that the area planned for this purpose is mostly custom bound and no outsider or any other activity is allowed. ~~All the ancillary functions related to cargo handling, custom clearance and others will be performed within this complex. The Technical Committee, while examining the proposal, observed that the length of the platform as provided in the scheme is the longest required to handle the maximum size of the Goods train. It was also noted that to scale-down the total operation within the stipulated limit of about 700 acres of land, is earmarked as 'green' also likely to be used for future expansion. It was also noted that parking space for about 500 trailers/trucks will be required, which is to be properly planned within this complex. It was noted that at present, the maximum capacity which is being handled, is 40,000 TEUS from Pragati Maidan and after the proposed development of ICD at Tughlakabad, the Pragati Maidan site will be used only to handle the cargo pertaining to Exhibition only.~~

3. Commissioner (Transport), Delhi Admn. mentioned that while they have no objection for having a Container Depot in the Union Territory of Delhi, basically to meet Delhi's requirements, while clearing the project, overall requirements of traffic movement, movement of trucks/trailers, of City Road, needs to be properly examined because Delhi's roads are not planned and designed for that type of traffic. Also, the movement of this type of traffic needs to be identified in terms of different corridors/highways/roads within the Union Territory of Delhi so that proper improvement schemes could be worked out to avoid traffic congestion/bottlenecks. He also mentioned that proper parking ~~lets~~ ^{is} required, outside the

① accordingly the target capacity ~~had~~ ^{has} now been scaled down
(c) The ~~apex~~ ^{said}

② Length of goods train to be handled there ~~however~~ ^{the land required}

but this is lower than

to be developed for warehousing and parking of container ~~trucks~~ ^{trailer} trucks would be less ~~than before~~ ^{than before} ~~the area~~ ^{the area} ~~rendered~~ ^{rendered} ~~open or green~~ ^{open or green} ~~as depicted in the revised plan which was tabled in the meeting~~

depot had increased from 45,000 to

to containerised form once the ICD at Tughlakabad is set up,

levelling of ultimate at a time 7

195

195

~~Container depot needs to be identified, and properly developed and maintained by the concerned Agency. Also, the ancillary units and activities along the layout engaged from their location point of view, needs to be properly examined.~~

4. The representatives of the NCR ^{Plg Board} present in the meeting, ~~informed the Technical Committee~~ ^{that} this matter had ~~also~~ been examined by the NCR Planning Board and the opinion of the Board ^{is} that, as far as ^{possible} Delhi's economic activity should be curtailed and such activities which had multiplier effect, should be dispersed. ^{NCR} Planning Board ^{is of} the opinion that ^a the better location for a Container Depot ^{is at} Palwal, because it is located in the southern part of National capital ^{Region} area and can very well handle the cargo coming through the roads or railways with the proposed transportation linkages in the ~~regional~~ ^{NCR} plan,

5. The Technical Committee, ~~after going through the observations mentioned above~~, decided that a sub-group may go into ~~details of various aspects~~ ^{these various} ^{in greater detail} and submit its report for the consideration of the Technical Committee ~~at its next meeting~~ ^{viz.}

1. Shri R. Raghunathan, ^{Secretary} Commissioner (Transport), Delhi Admn.
2. Shri Prakash Narain, Jt. Director (Transport), ODA.
3. Shri G. R. Ambwani, Engineer-in-Chief, MCD or his representative.
4. Shri R. P. Rastogi, representative of NCR Plg. Board.
5. Concerned officers of Northern Railways/RITES/CONCOR.

6. The Technical Committee also noted that in ~~PPD-2001~~ ^{that} for the dispersal of passengers, ^{there is} ^{had provided for setting up of} a proposal of ⁴ Metropolitan passengers terminals, ^{in different directions}. For South Delhi, ^{the area} under reference is one such site suggested in ~~PPD-2001~~ ^{developed in the proposed ICDEX}. It was ^{therefore felt that} ^{entire} to be utilised for ICD and its related activities, an alternative ^{site} for ^{Metropolitan} Passengers Terminal in South Delhi ^{needs to be identified} ^{and therefore}, it was decided that Commr. (Plg.) may call a meeting ^{at his} ^{a suitable} of the concerned organisations and identify ~~the sites~~ ^{for Metropolitan Passenger Terminals.}

^{alternative site and, in} consultation with ^{Ministry} Railways, ~~and~~ ^{and} report back to the TC ^{in this regard}, at the next meeting.

(H) Throughout the Delhi Metropolitan area had been that on the NCR.
 P. Dr. Prakash Narain of ODA expressed certain reservations re (i) the stipulated Delhi traffic requirements being pegged at 1.15 lakh TEUs as against 80,000 TEUs (which was the earlier estimate) and (ii) the adequacy of space provided ^{for the} ^{complex} ^{for 500} ^{trucks} ^{parking of 500} ^{trucks/trucks}

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
(MASTER PLAN SECTION)

...

Agenda for the meeting of Technical Committee to be held on 3.12.91 at 12 (Noon) 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>
1.	196/91	Proposal for a 100 bedded hospital at Maidan Garhi, Change of land use of an area measuring 20 acres from 'agri. green belt' to 'public & semi-public facilities' F. 20(11)/85-MP	1 - 2 To be presented by Dy. Dir. (NCR&UE)
2.	202/91	Delicitation of Bunglow zone-Reg. F. 1(7)/91-JD(CCG)	3 - 6 To be presented by J.D. (C.C.G.)
3.	203/91	Identification of sites for Slaughter houses in Delhi. F. 3(143)/82-MP	7 - 8 To be presented by Dy. Dir. (NCR&UE)
<u>Laid on Table.</u>			
4.	204/91	Construction of general pool accommodation at Andrwes Ganj, Pinjrapole Scheme Sadiq Nagar, New Delhi. F. 3(33)/89-MP	To be presented by Director(DC&P).
5.	206/91	Inland Container Depot	To be presented by Dy. Dir. (NCR&UE)

Item No 196/91

Sub: Proposal for a 100 bedded hospital at Maidan Garhi New Delhi. Change of land use of an area measuring about 20 acres from 'Agricultural Green Belt' to 'Public & Semi Public facilities'. F20(11)85-MP

Additional Director (Health Services) had requested for commissioning of 100 bedded hospital at Village Maidan Garhi, New Delhi. The land measuring 20 acres was sanctioned for the purpose by LG Delhi vide his letter F.7(11)74-75 dt. 4.1.77. On 12.2.87 Addl. Dir. (Health Services) informed that the proposed hospital is being constructed with tube well and pump house. To avoid encroachment over the land, Delhi Admn. had already spend on the construction an amount of 12.3 Lakhs approximately.

2. The matter was examined and it was observed that Maidan Garhi is located in Ridge area and it is shown for recreational use in perspective plan for Delhi-2001.

3. The case was discussed in various TC meetings held on 12.2.88, 17.6.88 & 2.3.89. The background of the case was explained to the Technical committee in its meeting dt. 2.3.89, but it was observed that Delhi Admn. is stressing on development of a plot which is not earmarked for hospital, while there are other plots identified for hospital and prone to encroachments if not utilised immediately. Technical committee cited that one such plot is available in Janakpuri, which should be taken up for construction by Delhi Admn. in the first instance and thereafter the case of Maidan Garhi should be taken up. The said decision was conveyed to Health Deptt., Delhi Admn.

4. A meeting was held at Raj Nivas on 27.8.91 in which Secy. (Medical) pointed out that recently DDA had taken a view that the plot was located on the ridge and, therefore it may not be possible to establish a hospital there. She further pointed out that the Indira Gandhi Open University and a Veterinary Hospital have already been established in the vicinity and besides, all the surrounding area has already been carved out into small plots and it is unlikely that the land even if it is reverted to Gaon Sabha or is maintained as green, will be free from encroachment. Besides, there is no hospital in South catering to the requirements of the rural areas. VC, DDA was therefore, requested to look into the matter and to consider giving the approval for change in land use.

5. OBSERVATIONS:

Following provisions of MID-2001 need consideration in this case:

- i. There exist a geographical imbalance in the availability of hospital beds per 1000 population, among different planning divisions in Delhi. The areas in East (E), North west(H) and west Delhi (G) are relatively deficient in comparison to other areas; and hence need attention on priority for provision of health facilities.
- ii. As part of the proposed urban extension-2001 approved by the Authority & submitted to the Ministry of Urban Development there is a proposal to develop about 5121 ha of land in South Delhi, New hospital sites as per Master Plan norms shall be provided as soon as the areas is acquired and taken up for development.
- iii. Location of major health facilities in rural areas are proposed in specific growth centre villages, identified based on the criteria of road linkages, growth rate etc. Village Chawla is one of the nearest growth centre villages proposed, there is located in South West Delhi.

Item No. 202/91

-3-

Sub : Delineation of Bungalow Zone - reg.

F.No.: F.1(7)91/JD(CCG)

BACKGROUND

A number of request from Private plot owners and govt. departments in New Delhi have been received directly or through NDMC for giving land use/building construction permission. Desired permissions could not be issued due to one reason or the other. One of the most important impediment in not issuing the building permission is delineation of Lutyen's bungalow zone. Therefore, a need is arisen to demarcate the bungalow zone boundary as per MPD-2001 and to specify the development/redevelopment control norms.

Ministry of Urban Development vide D.O.No.K-13011/17/86-DDIIA dt.8.2.88 issued the guideline for delineation of Bungalow Zone- (Lutyens Delhi-Annexure-I).

2. OBSERVATIONS

MPD-2001 came into operation on 1.8.90 and it recommended:

" Lutyen's New Delhi comprises of large size plots and has a very pleasant environment. In fact, the area is unique in its continuing existing at low density in the heart of the city. While formulating the redevelopment plans, of this area due care should be taken to ensure that its basic character is maintained."

3. MPD-2001 has not indicated the exact boundary of the bungalow zone/area and the same needs to be spelled out clearly. Therefore, the issue is divided into the following categories

- A. Delineation of Bungalow area
- B. Development control norms
 - i) South of Rajpath
 - ii) North of Rajpath
 - iii) Central Vista and others.

...2/-

4. Delineation of Bungalow Zone

The matter was considered by the Technical Committee meeting held on 9.3.91 based upon the D.O. Letter no. K-13011/17/86-DDIIA dt. 8.2.88 of the Ministry as well as the notification issued by DDA in December, 1988 for inviting public objections and large number of objections were received and considered. Decision of the Technical Committee is given as Annexure-II.

"It was decided, therefore, that the said boundaries should be adopted and notified for purposes of formulating the proposed redevelopment scheme as per MPD-2001."

5. PROPOSAL

In the meantime, MOU called a meeting on 29.4.91 under the chairmanship of Secretary, UD and once again opened the issue of delineation of bungalow zone ab-initio. Main issues considered were delineation of bungalow zone, retaining the tree-studded character with low profile construction, development norms to be followed in North and South of Rajpath and recoveries towards facility area/conversion charges etc. Steering Committee under the chairmanship of Secretary, UD had its meetings on 14.5.91, 5.6.91, 26.6.91, 12.7.91, 22.7.91 and 18.9.91.

6. Suggestions considered for adding and deleting certain areas are given as under :

i) Hanuman Road plots : This pocket was not included in the boundary of February'88. It is observed that this area is predominantly a plotted development area of small size plots and practically built up and having hardly any bungalow character. Therefore, this pocket could remain outside bungalow zone.

ii) Jantar Mantar Road pocket :

This pocket was also not included in the February'88 boundary of bungalow zone. There are about 9 bungalow plots in this area and in case of, two high rise buildings have come up and one plot for group housing has been sanctioned and

building has come upto 3rd floor besides 3 plots are earmarked for socio-cultural use in MPD-2001. On the remaining plots still the old bungalows are in existence and the area is dominated with trees. Therefore, it was suggested that this pocket be part of bungalow zone.

iii) Hailey Road area

This pocket was also excluded from the bungalow zone as per February '88 guidelines of the Ministry except the plots fronting on Ferozshah Road. There are about 43 bungalows and in about 11 plots new construction in the form of Group Housing has come up and there might be few more cases (about 7 nos.) where sanction by NDMC has been issued. Considering the tree studded character still available in the remaining area, it was recommended that this entire pocket be included in bungalow zone.

iv) Mandi House and institutional area and Supreme Court area

As per Govt.'s letter of Feb. '88 Mandi House and Supreme Court was not included. However, keeping in view that these pockets are in mid of the bungalow zone and still dominated with trees, it was recommended that these pockets be also form part of bungalow zone.

v) Yashwant Place Pocket

In Feb. '88 letter Yashwant Place pocket was included in the bungalow zone. It was observed that Yashwant Place is more or less fully built up and the land between Yashwant Place and railway line has been recently developed by the MOU and a number of plots has been allotted to various State Govts. and they have gone ahead with building plans etc. Therefore, it was considered that this pocket be excluded i.e. the pocket consisting of Yashwant Place and the area in South upto railway line (Yellow colour).

vi) Ridge

In Feb. '88 Govt.'s letter part of the Ridge upto Upper Ridge road linking Dhaule Kuan round-about and Panchkuan road round-about was included but part of the Ridge was left over. While considering this matter in detail

it was recommended that total ridge area as identified in the MPD-2001 should form part of the bungalow zone and this area should be "No construction/NO Development Zone". It was also considered if the area of the ridge at this location notified in the Forest Act is more than the area identified in MPD-2001 as the Ridge area, then the whole of the notified forest area should be taken as part of the bungalow zone. (Declared forest area is smaller than Ridge area as per MPD-2001).

7. As per minutes of the meeting held on 22.7.91 (Annexure III) and corrigendum issued vide minutes dt. 18.9.91 (Annexure IV) by the Ministry, the following would be bungalow zone boundary based on the Feb.'88 guidelines (Red colour):

- i) The whole ridge area between Link Road and Dhaulta Kuan may form part of the Bungalow zone and that it should remain a "No construction/No Development zone". This will be ensured through Zonal Development plan of the Ridge area. If the forest area in this part is notified has a greater area than the ridge portion, then the notified forest ^{area} will be included (Blue colour).
- ii) The area on Hailey Road scheme which was not included in the 1988 guidelines, will now form part of the Bungalow zone (Blue colour).
- iii) The Supreme Court and Mandi House area will be added to the Bungalow zone (Blue colour).
- iv) Area between Akbar Bhawan (Akbar Hotel) and Railway line be excluded, since land has already been allotted to various State Govts. for putting up State Bhawan and in some cases the State Govts. have gone ahead with the passing of building plans etc. (Yellow colour).

8. Thus, the boundary line decided above is to be processed. Accordingly, boundary line as now approved by the Ministry of "Bungalow Zone" is demarcated on the map (Red colour).
Decision required:

- 9.i) Whether the boundary line now decided by the Ministry (Red colour) is to be approved (laid on table) for formulation of redev. scheme as per MPD-2001.

or

- ii) Boundary line as earlier approved by the Technical Committee as per guideline given by the Ministry in Feb.'88) in its meeting held on 9.3.91 (laid on table ; blue colour).

10. Matter is placed before the Technical Committee for its consideration.

Extracts from Ministry of urban Development B.O. letter no. X-13011/17/86-DDIIA dt. 8.2.88 with regard to revised guidelines. Salient points are as follows:

- (a) The space to be constructed should be guided only by per floor coverage and floor area ratio (FAR), norms. These would, in general, influence the height of building leaving at the same time independence to the builders with regard to height. There is, therefore, no need to impose any specific height restrictions. The maximum per floor coverage should be 25% of the net plot for all zones. This will include the area required for all services except passage to the building. The remaining 75% must include the passage to the building and the green area around.
- (b) Lutyen's Bungalow area: In order to maintain the present character of Lutyen's Delhi, which is still dominated by green areas and bungalows, there should be a separate set of norms for this Zone area. This area has been clearly demarcated. It will consist of the entire Lutyen's Delhi Excluding (i) the area lying between Baba Khareg Singh Marg on the South, Punchjain Road on the north and the ridge on the west (ii) the area between Baba Khareg Singh Marg, Ashok Road, Ferozshah Road, Barakhamba Road and the Connaught Place, (iii) Mendi House and (iv) the institutional area where the Supreme Court is situated. It will, however, include the areas presently out of Lutyen's Delhi which consist of (i) Nehru Park (ii) Yashwant Palace (iii) the area between Yashwant Place and the railway line on the South, and (iv) the area lying between Nehru Park-Yashwant Palace on the west and the boundary of Lutyen's Delhi on the western edge of Safdarjung Aerodrome and the Race Course. There were the following norms for construction in the Lutyen's Bungalow zone:
- i) The new construction of dwellings on a plot must have the same plinth area as the existing bungalow and must have a height not exceeding the height of the bungalow in place, or if the plot is vacant, the height of the bungalow which is the lowest of those on the adjoining plots.

- ii) In the commercial areas, such as Khan Market, Yashwant Place etc. and in institutional areas within the Lutyen's Bungalow Zone, the norms will be the same as those for these respective areas outside the zone,
- iii) The existing regulations for the Central Vista will continue to be applicable.
- iv) The demarcation line of the Lutyen's Bungalow zone should not run along prominent roads, because, if it does so, there will be bungalows on the side of the road and the high rise buildings on the other side. It has, therefore, been decided that the demarcation of the Lutyen's bungalow zone should run along the first inner/outer road of Jane from the prominent road through which the demarcation line is shown. However, the demarcation can run though the prominent road where there is park, ridge or green area on the other side of the road.

ANNEXURE-II

Extracts from Minutes of Technical Committee meeting held on 9.3.91:

Technical Committee noted that in MPD-2001, a provision has been made for the formulation of a redevelopment scheme for the bungalow zone of Lutyen's Delhi. It was also seen that the boundaries of Lutyen's Bungalow zone had already been published in December 1988 based on Govt.'s letter of 8.2.88 and 23.7.88. It was decided, therefore, that the said boundaries should be adopted and notified for purposes of formulating the proposed redevelopment scheme as per MPD-2001. As far as the areas/pockets which fell within Lutyen's Delhi but were outside the bungalow zone, the committee decided that the proposals for re-development/sanction of building plans should be sanctioned as per the relevant provisions of MPD-2001 read with the existing Zonal Development Plan, NDRAC recommendations and the re-development schemes earlier published by the DDA. Technical Committee also indicated that as desired by Govt. general set of guidelines may be formulated for the re-development of the bungalow zone on a 'priority basis' within a period of 2 months.

ANNEXURE-III

Extracts from Record of discussions of the meeting held on 22.7.91 under the chairmanship of Secretary to discuss Lutyen's Bungalow zone.

Delineation of the boundary of Bungalow Zone

The participants considered the delineation of the Lutyen's Bungalow zone, keeping in view the discussions held so far. It was agreed with reference to the area earmarked under Feb, 88 guidelines, the following modifications may be considered:

- i) The whole ridge area between Shanker Road and Dhruva Kurn may form the part of the Bungalow Zone and that it should remain a "No Construction No Development" zone. This will be ensured through zonal development plan of the Ridge area. If the forest area in this part is notified has a greater area than the ridge portion then the notified forest area will be included.
- ii) The area on Hailey Road and Ferozshah Road, which was not included in the 1988 guidelines, will now form part of the Bungalow zone;
- iii) The Supreme Court and Manok House area will be added to the Bungalow zone.
- iv) Chanakyaपुरी area will be included other than the area between Akbar Bhawan (Akbar Hotel) and Railway line, since land has already been allotted to various State Govts. for putting up State Bhawan and in some cases the State Govts. have gone ahead with the passing of building plans etc.

ANNEXURE IV

Extract from Minutes of the meeting held on 18.9.91 under the chairmanship of Secretary(UD) to discuss the building controls of Lutyen(s Bungalow Zone).

Shri S.C.Gupta, Director(DC&P), DDA pointed out certain inaccuracies in the minutes of the meeting held on 22.7.91 in regard to the delineation of the boundary of Lutyen's Bungalow Zone. It was decided to carry out the following corrigendum to para 2 of the minutes of the meeting held on 22.7.91.

- i) The whole ridge area between Shankar Road and Daula Kuan appearing in first two lines may be substituted by the words ' the whole ridge area between Link Road and Daula Kuan'.
- ii) The words 'Area on Hailey Road and Feroz Shah Road' may be substituted by the words 'the area on Hailey Road scheme'.
- iii) The words 'Chanakyaपुरी area will be included other than be omitted. The words between Akbar Bhawan(Akbar Hotel) and Railway line' be followed by the words 'be excluded'.

ITEM NO. 205/91

Sub.: Identification of sites for Slaughter house in Delhi.
F.3(143)/82-MP
....

As per Master Plan for Delhi Perspective 2001 slaughter house could be allotted in Industrial area. There are number of sites identified in the Master Plan for extensive industries; the suitable site for location of slaughter house would be as follows :

1. Chilla in Trans Yamuna Area.
2. Two sites for extensive industry proposed in the Master Plan for Delhi in urban extension. Probably, sites have now been identified and could be discussed in the next Technical Committee. However, in both these cases land has to be acquired.

The issue of slaughter house has been discussed in the Technical Committee where at the instance of MUD it has also been decided to utilise the present site of slaughter house by modernising the same. As such the case is being taken up for extensive industry.

The export component of the slaughter house is proposed to be shifted to the adjoining estate in the NCR; for this a letter has been sent to Member Secretary, NCR Planning Board.

Under the subject implication of the recent decision of Delhi Admn. to stop development of any new Industrial Estate in Delhi; DDA has resolved that in principle Industrial Estate need not be developed as a means of Transport and has encouraged small scale industries.

Considering the need of slaughter house in Delhi, it is suggested that following may be discussed in Technical Committee for conveying the same in the High Court.

Four(4) locations of slaughter house in the Union Territory of Delhi proposed for 8 acres to 10 acres.

- i. Existing slaughter house site: land use to be changed to extensive industry.
- ii. Urban extension: Narela site identified on the plan, land use to be established as per urban extension.
- iii. Urban extension Rohtak Road: land use to be established/processed as part of Urban Extension.
- iv. Chilla in Trans Yamuna Area : land use already established in the Master Plan for Delhi.
- v. Site in NCR for export component of slaughter house.

The Authority resolution that no more industry should be developed in the Union Territory of Delhi would require amendment that in the urban extension 2 sites should be developed as a slaughter house. After discussing the item in the Technical Committee, the views of the Technical Committee could be conveyed to the High Court.

The matter is placed before the Technical Committee for its consideration

Item No. 206/91

Laid on Table

SUBJECT : I.C.D., Tughlakabad.

1. BACKGROUND

The case of ICD was earlier discussed in the T/C of DDA first on 31.7.89 and later on 11.9.89. The decision of Technical Committee was as follows :-

"Earlier also, this item was discussed in the meeting of technical committee held on 31.7.89. The report prepared by RITES was also examined by the Ministry of Urban Development and they have desired the comments of the DDA. In the Ministry, it was decided that the ICD should confine its size to serve Delhi. Technical Committee observed that the proposal received is not only to serve Delhi but also the Outer areas. Therefore, it was desired that it should be modified/revised so as its size is confined only to meet the requirements of Delhi".

The issue since has been discussed in various other meetings in the Ministry of Urban Development and the Committee of Secy's, Govt. of India, Rlys have once again revised the proposal and referred the layout plan etc. to DDA/MCD for consideration.

2. LAND & LANDUSE :

i) Area presently available for development with Railways at Tughlakabad - 39.2 ha (opp).

ii) Landuse as per MID-2001 :- TRANSPORTATION (Rail/Terminal/Integrated Metropolitan Passenger Terminal).

3. PROPOSAL UNDER CONSIDERATION : Development of ICD Tughlakabad.

- a. Transfer of 2.8 ha/1.61 ha of land by DDA to N. Rlys. for approach road.
- b. Relocation of 350 jhuggis from the approach road.
- c. Permission to cut the trees, plantation already done by N. Rlys.
- d. Widening of M-B road particularly in the vicinity of ICD

4. CAPACITY : EXISTING/PROPOSED

- i) Existing contained traffic capacity handled in Delhi.

Pragati Maidan - (design capacity-6000 TENS) ^{40,000}
now handling - 18,000 TENS & more.

- ii) Project container traffic in Delhi & hinterland 2000 AD

Earlier projections : 2,60,000 TEN's expandable to 3,00,000 TENS with

following breakup of traffic :

(30% Delhi; 30% UP, 20% Punjab, 10% Haryana, 5% R J & remainder 5% from Himachal Pradesh)

---- Ch.4 RITES Report
Page 33.

@ 30% size of Delhi will be (86,666 TEN'S expandable to 1,00,000 TENS)

- iii) Revised projections after two meetings of committee of Secy. :

- a. Revised projection DMA - 1,37,880 TENS
- b. Hinter land Traffic - 23,160 TENS
- c. Revised traffic projection for DMA/D. M. - 1,15,000 TENS

1) We still now at no time the complete report on

the project has been submitted by N. Railways to DDA. The Technical Committee has discussed the project only in the context of Metropolitan Passenger terminals, proposed in MPR-2001. Now also only the plans of the project have been supplied, without following vital information:-

- A. Project report with all details.
- B. Exact area under consideration & land requirements.
- C. Overall movement patterns of the containers inter & intra city destined to the ICD in Delhi Union Territory & their parking, road/rail improvements required etc.
- D. Details of all envisaged ancillary facilities & uses eg. Informal/Formal shopping bookings agents etc.
- E. Environmental Impact Assessment Study.
- F. Additional load on trunk services & infrastructure in the vicinity.
- G. Effect of ICD on the overall demand of goods traffic in Delhi & the plans for proposed goods terminals.

11) The revised capacity of the proposed ICD is not

clearly indicated in the proposal. It is indicated in the note circulated by the Ministry

of Urban Development on 10.7.91, the capacity is indicated to be 80,000 TEUS. Whereas the

proposal seems to be for 1,37,800 TEUS.

In fact our strong view is that the capacity has no real meaning at this stage, because once a

lower capacity is agreed, there would be no clear possible at later stage to confine the size of

operation. Hence the suggestion is to prepare

an integrated plan of the entire area bounded by

marshalling yard in the East, M.B. Road in South,

Tughlakabad Road in the West & Okhla Industrial

area in the North. The area for a small ICD

could be precisely indicated in the plan. The

The integrated planning is otherwise required in view of demands raised by other competing use activities.

(iii) Due to the proposal of ICD, the most practical/feasible alternative site for passenger traffic in South be identified to arrive at a final view on the subject.

(iv) While working on the integrated transportation plan it is recommended that dedicated two lanes be reserved on all radial rail routes for MRTS. This

may have to be ensured by Railways in case of South bound lines passing through the area also.

(v) There are seven constraints on expansion of road right of ways in case of Mathura Road & M.F. Road.

Moreover the canalized traffic may require augmentation/improvements in case of number of

junctions, road over bridges/under passes in the city. This needs to be specified clearly on the

basis of a detailed study.

6. In view of the observations above the case is put-

up for consideration of Technical Committee.