

S. S. Hussain I.A.S. (Ex)

Chief Executive Officer

Ref. No. MCHI/CEO/16-17/006

May 21, 2016

Sub: Suggestions against hardship in Special Township Project (STP).**Ref: STP regulations of 2006,2014, 2015 and SDCPR -RP 2013**

Dear

As you are aware that the Government had brought the policy of STP as a result of housing demand stressed in Summit of 2005. Anticipation was to bring the massive affordable housing stock through private sector participation, since it was very difficult for Govt. to acquire land and create housing stock. In the processes the idea was to promote the private developers for the same. Since the big chunk of land is not available in SPA or Council/Corporation limit, then naturally STP will be in regional plan area. In reality, many concessions were getting during development permission in adjoining corporation or SPA, which are not applicable in the STP to be designed as per new SDCPR_RP 2013. The following table will show how the concessions areas were withdrawn in SDCPR_RP 2013 and indirectly housing become unaffordable.

Free of FSI area	CIDCO	NMDC	STP 2006	SDCPR RP 2013
Balcony	15%	15%	1/3 perimeter	15%
Enclosed Balcony	Allowed with premium	Allowed with premium	Only open. Encl. Not allowed	Allowed with premium
Double height Terrace	15%	1 EACH FLAT	NIL	20% Difficult to consume
CB width	0.6 X3.00	0.6 X3.00	No Mention	2.4*0.45 cantilevered 300 MM above floor level and upto beam bottom as per section
FB /Chajja Projection	One step below floor level 0.75 2 PER FLAT	One step below floor level 0.75 All Rms	No mention	Chajja as per section at beam bottom or 500 mm hence no use
LOBBY	17%	allowed	No mention	Not allowed

Staircase Regular & Fire escape	Regular & Fire escape, both are free as per actual area	Regular & Fire escape, both are free as per actual area	Regular & Fire escape, Regular free as per actual area but no mention of fire escape	only Fire escape is free as per actual area
Trees	Per 100 Sq.mt	Per 100 Sq.mt	Per 66 Sqmt	No ref.

Since, the above SDCPR _RP is more stringent, we request you to allow the element free of FSI like adjoining authorities, so that affordability can be achieved to certain extent.

Hence, we request your goodself to look into this matter and give a favourable decision by giving special concessions to STP to make more Affordable Housing and more clarity in Regulation in 15.4 required for STP regarding free of FSI elements in building.

Submitted for kind consideration and favourable response, please!

Yours



(S. S. Hussain)

To,
Dr. Nitin Kareer (I.A.S.)
 Principal Secretary - I,
 Urban Development Department,
 Government of Maharashtra,
 Mantralaya, Mumbai - 400 032

23-5-16
 Urban Development Department
 Mantralaya, Mumbai - 400 032