MANAGING COMMITTEE

2019-2020

PRESIDENT

Nayan A. Shah

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT

Mayur Shah

PRESIDENT-ELECT Deepak Goradia

VICE PRESIDENTS

Boman Irani Harish Patel Nainesh Shah Domnic Romell

ADDL. VICE PRESIDENT

Sukhraj Nahar

HON. SECRETARY Bandish Ajmera

TREASURER

Mukesh Patel

SPECIAL PROJECTS

Parag Munot Sandeep Raheja Jayesh Shah Sanjay Chhabria Rasesh Kanakia

HON. JT. SECRETARIES

Navin Makhija Sandeep Runwal Shailesh G. Puranik Dhaval Ajmera Pratik Patel

JT. TREASURERS

Nayan Bheda Munish Doshi

CO-ORDINATORS

Tejas Vyas Shailesh Sanghvi Pritam Chivukula

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Jagdish Ahuja Jitendra Jain Deepak Gundecha

INVITEE MEMBERS

Praful Shah
Raajesh Prajapati
Sachin Mirani
Nikunj Sanghavi
Rajeev Jain
Shyamal Mody
Digant Parekh
Rushank Shah
Samyag Shah
Jayesh C. Shah
Sunny Bijlani
Sahil Parikh
Naman Shah
Suhail Khandwani
Ricardo Romell
Harshul Savla

PAST PRESIDENTS

Dharmesh Jain Vyomesh Shah Paras Gundecha Pravin Doshi Mohan Deshmukh Mofatraj Munot Rajnikant Ajmera Late G. L. Raheja Late Lalit Gandhi Late Babubhai Majethia

CREDAI-MCHI UNITS PRESIDENT, THANE UNIT

Ajay Ashar

PRESIDENT, KALYAN DOMBIVLI Deepak Mehta

PRESIDENT, MIRA VIRAR CITY Ashit Shah

> PRESIDENT, RAIGAD Kiran Bagad

PRESIDENT, NAVI MUMBAI UNIT Vijay Lakhani



Ref. No. MCHI/PRES/19-20/647

August 27, 2020

To,

Shri Iqbal Singh Chahal (I.A.S.)

Municipal Commissioner

Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai

Mumbai - 400 001

Sub: Suggestion for modification in Reg 33(7) DCPR 2034 for Municipal tenanted Plots and to promote cluster redevelopment under Reg 33(9 of

DCPR 2034

Respected Sir,

With reference to above, We would like to bring to your notice , certain suggestion to be made to modify existing Reg33(7) for Municipal tenanted plots and Lease hold plots of MCGM to make project viable and <u>bring more revenue to MCGM and to Promote cluster redevelopment under Reg 33(9)</u>, which has been a failure till date due to non-viable provision in DCPR 2034 and in earlier DCR 1991, which is the need of this city for promotion of sustainable development.

Following are our Suggestion for modification in said regulation with justification for your reference and perusal.

Sr.no	DCPR	Issues on	Recommendation	Justification
	2034		/Suggestion	
	Regn			
1	14-	In case of	Modification	33(7) being high
	Note ii	redevelopment	proposed: In case of	density projects
		under 33(7),	redevelopment	dealing with
		33(7)(A), 33(10)	under 33(7),	rehab of old
		amenity as per	33(7)(A), 33(10)	protected tenants
		this	amenity as per this	under rent
		Regulation shall	Regulation shall be	control act, to
		be reduced to	reduced to 35%.	consume FSI -
		35%.	And to be made	additional
			applicable for plots	amenity in 1991
			above 20000sq.mts	DCR was also
			only	insisted for plots
				beyond
				20000sq.mts to be
				restored.



Su no	DCPR	Icanoc on	Pagemendation (Suggestion	Justification
Sr.no	2034 Regn	Issues on	Recommendation/Suggestion	Justification
2	17(3)(B)(2)	Clarification of applicability of 17(3(3)(b) sub clause 2 - i.e.	Benefit under 33(7) for Free hold plots and Municipal tenanted plots and Non cess structures on cess plots availing benefit of FSi under 33(7) should be on par, being single regulation to prevent disadvantage MCGM for its own buildings and non cess structures being on same plot i.e. Reservation stands deleted equal to land component of BUA of structures including cess / non cess / or for municipal tenanted structures also on same plot . and Note: Notwithstanding anything in above , for Plot area is excess to the said land component shall hand over reservation as per 17(1) or AR policy for land and BUA , however for FSI in 33(7) shall be i.e FSI 3.00 on Gross plot including area under reservation	17(3)(b)(3) any ways stipulates to provide 25% municipal tenanted PAP housing even if plot have no reservation and for plots having Designation of MH and Non cess are deemed to be cess for purpose of FSI and same should be applicable for working our reservation component In case of vacant plot with no reservation, FSI is Gross 3.00, this way MBRRB will get more surplus and will improve project viability.
3	17(3)(b)(3)	BUA equal to 25% of Zonal FSI is to be provided PAP to MCGM, and for and the developer shall be entitled to BUA in lieu of cost of construction against handing over of built up amenity as per Note (d) of Regulation 17(1).	Benefit as per 17(1) to be allowed as TDR or in situ consumption of FSI as per same ratio	Similar option is given in all other schemes under AOS and 17(1)



Sr.no	DCPR 2034	Issues on	Recommendation/Suggestion	Justification
	Regn			
4	22(7)(4) for	Puildings of	Cumplus area for	Under Dec. 20. Correspond
4	33(7)(4) for Municipal	Buildings of Corporation	Surplus area for lease hold lands of MCGM, to	Under Reg 30, Government FSI is at a cost of 35% of land
	tenanted	existing prior	be on par with Appendix III of	ASR and Municipal tenanted
	properties	to 30.09.1969 as	MHADA act to being free hold	property if kept at 100% on
	- ie	per this	and	Land ASR will lead to severe
	buildings	Regulation,		disadvantage of such plots
	belonging	the BUA	And Municipal tenanted	which otherwise generate
	to	beyond area	property on Par with Table C of	additional PAP in EVERY
	corporation	required for re-	33(5) Provision of Surplus table	SCHEME for use in Govt
		accommodatio		infrastructure projects
		n of existing	Further for Surplus area in	
		occupants and	municipal tenanted plots ,	
		incentive	where sharing is not availed by	
		thereon of such	applicant then recovery of	
		rehab area if	Capitalised value to be done as	
		any shall have to be shared	per Table C of 33(5) to maintain parity among development of	
		between	MCGM and MHADA lands	
		MCGM and		
		Society of	The Capitalised value of	
		occupants in	Surplus area to be max 25% of	
		the ratio of	land ASR on par with 33(5)	
		1(MCGM):	policy for premium for Surplus	
		0.5(Society of		
		occupants) or	notification dated 20.08.2019	
		compensation	vide TPB/4319/18/CR -	
		for MCGM	123/2019/UD 11	
		share shall be		
		paid to		
		MCGM, as per policy of		
		policy of Municipal		
		corporation.		
		corporation.		



Sr.no	DCPR 2034 Regn	Issues on		Recommendation /Suggestion			J	ustific	ation	ı
5	33(7)5(b) Municipal tenanted properties - ie buildings belonging to	Provided, further that if the number of plots jointly undertaken for development of six or more with cessed buildings existing prior to	Incentive to be on par with 33(10)- table B				t r k	Benefit for Slum and legal tenement to be on par and not discriminatory- DCPR to be standardised for benefits with similar constraint.		
	corporation and	30/9/1969, or in case	Basic Ratio		In	ocentive as pe	r area of sch	eme		
	incentive for Proposal	of redevelopment of municipal properties under this regulation	(LR/RC)*	up to 0.40 ha	More than 0.4 ha up to 1 ha	More than 1 ha up to 5 ha	Mose than 5 ha up to 10 ha	For more than 10 ha upto 20 ha	For more than 20 ha	
	under 33(9)	having eligible	Above 6.00	0.8	0.85	0.90	0.95	1.0	1.05	
	to benefit with same	tenements density more than 650/ ha,	Above 4.00 and	0.90	0.95	1.0	1.05	1.1	1.15	
	incentive as 33(10)	FSI will be 3.00 or FSI required of	Above 2.00 and upto 4.00	10	1.05	1.1	1.15	12	1.25	
		rehabilitation for occupiers plus 70%	Upto 2.00	1.10	1.15	1.2	1.25	1.3	1.35	
					there are incent plot ar sity, or 33(10) f incer 33(9) to be be ment.	tive to rea rati n simi ntive	be her ilar for			
6	33(7)(19)	To allow composite development of slum and cessed structures together in case of corporation schemes	Clarification required - MCGM has already forwarded report for same - To allow composite development of 33(7) and slum structures adjoining or within scheme as per 33(10) to allow larger land parcels to amalgamate and claim benefit under respective schemes and planning is together for better quality of light and					however SRA g authority for ow in case of blots of MCGM is planning o Benefit or to be same		
7	33(7) (8)	Relaxation in building for 33(7)	ventilation					structures prior se condition is		



Sr.no	DCPR	Issues on	Recommendation	Justification
8	Min Road width requireme nt is 18m to do Cluster developm ent as per DCPR Reg. 33(9) 1.1	To be reduced to 9.0 m for height upto 120m - 12m for additional height	Roads in city of 18.0m above are less than 35% of total roads which means 65% of City cannot do Cluster redevelopment which is the need of the hour for planned development. Also Under DCPR 33(7)/33(10) 9.00 m width of road is sufficient for the redevelopment proposal.	
9	Land pooling - Exchange of such land with a suitable land of at least equivalent value as per ASR land rates. Reg. 33(9)(3)	Exchange of such land with a suitable land of at least equivalent value as per 25% ASR land rates. Also Once money is deposited with MCGM, It shall deemed approval for plots belonging to State Government/MCGM lease hold plots and for private plots Acquisition process to be simplified to be completed by Collector within 6 months . Detail Guidelines to be prepared for same.	Supreme Court has Given in its judgement in lease hold plots also that encumbered lands cannot be valued more than 25% of Land ASR, as such there cant be value of land but value to FSI.	
10.	Sub clause 4(a) insist to provide consents to be registered. Reg. 33(9) 4(a)		Registration is additional tax burden which needs to be relaxed.	



11	Rehab area Addition al area to rehab is Granted only if Scheme is above 1HA unlike in 33(7) where based on no of plots addition al area to rehab is granted as result tenant don't want to amalga mate for	Proposed Rehab area - upto 1HA - Based on no of plots rehab to be granted 5% (Single plot)/8%- (2-5 plots) /15% more than 5 plots same as per clause 33(7)- (5)(A/B/C/) and thereafter for more than 1HA as per table below	same are	a as	s proposed per other will be a					
	larger develop ment under 33(9). Reg.									
12	33(9)(5									
12	Reg. 33(9)(6)		33(9) and par amalgama as other scheme w with Clu are less	to to ation of will ne ster and	er 33(7) , 1) to be on allow of schemes ise Slum over merge as benefit also for o be made					
		Table B on par with 33(10)	Basic Ratio		In	centive as per	entive as per area of scheme			
		(-)	(LR/RC)*	up to 0.40 ha	More than 0.4 ha up to 1 ha	More than 1 ha up to 5 ha	More than 5 ha up to 10 hs.	For more than 10 ha upto 20 ha	For more than 20 ha	
			Above 6.00	0.8	0.85	0.90	0.95	1.0	1.05	
			Above 4.00 and upto 6.00	0.90	0.95	1.0	1.05	1.1	1.15	
			Above 2.00 and upto 4.00	1.0	1.05	1.1	1.15	1.2	1.25	
			Upto 2.00	110	1.15	1.2	1.25	1.3	1.35	



Sr. no	DCPR 2034 Regn	Issues on	Recommendation/Suggestion						
13	33(9)	Basic FSI as proposed in Existing	The basic FSI for proposal under cluster redevelopment needs to be increased based on road width and plot size						
	DCPR is FSI 4.00	Sr.no	Cluster size	Road width	FSI				
			a	upto 1HA					
					9.0m	4.00			
					12.0m	4.50			
					18.0m				
					and more	5.00			
			b	1HA to 2 HA	1				
					9.0m	4.50			
					12.0m	5.25			
					18.0m				
					and more	5.50			
			b	2HA and ab	ove				
					9.0m	5.00			
					12.0m	5.50			
					18.0m				
					and more	6.00			
			All proj Enegery recycling for pro	g provision of jects under 33 y effeciency 2 he with tertian ject within s	DCPR 2034 (9) to Follow 2) water rec by treatment site or inve	v Green buil ycling with 4) alternati ntment off	Iding norms applicable i.e 1) tertiary treatment 3) waste we power like solar or wind site to offset enviornment MOEF guidelines.		



Sr.	DCPR	Issues on	Recommendation/Suggestion
no	2034		Justification
	Regn		
14	10(7) of	Instalment	Proposal – 10% of total premium at time of NOC to CC and 90% before
	DCPR	and	NOC to OC, and in lines with policy with SRA to keep flat lien for
	2034	recovery of	euqitable cost in name of MCGM
		premium	
			Justification: Reg 10(7) o DCPR 2034 mentions "Development permission/ Commencement certificate shall be granted only on payment of the requisite fees, development charges, premiums, Development cess/off-site infrastructure charges, as applicable for the proposal. The development shall be considered unauthorized if carried out without requisite payments to the Government/MCGM/Planning Authority.
			NOTE: The Commissioner with special permission may decide the modalities of procedure for Development Permission, including online approval process, from the point of view of Ease of Doing Business.
			Based on above considering, the hardship we request to consider above proposal for recovery of premium

Sir, we request you to consider above suggestion for revive the industry and to promote development under cluster which is the need of the hour for a city like Mumbai.

Thanking You,

For CREDAI-MCHI

Nayan A. Shah

President Hon. Secretary

Bandish Ajmera