MANAGING COMMITTEE 2022-2023

PRESIDENT Boman Irani

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT Deepak Goradia

> PRESIDENT-ELECT Ajay Ashar

VICE PRESIDENTS

Domnic Romell Shrikant Joshi Jayesh Shah Shailesh Puranik Parag Shah Sukhraj Nahar

HON. SECRETARY **Dhaval Ajmera**

TREASURER Pritam Chivukula

SPECIAL PROJECTS Shahid Balwa Parag Munot Rajendra Chaturvedi Raajesh Prajapati Harshul Savla Parth Mehta

HON, JT. SECRETARIES **Pratik Patel** Tejas Vyas

> JT. TREASURERS Mukesh Patel

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Harish Patel Nainesh Shah **Bandish Ajmera** Sandeep Raheja Subodh Runwal Rasesh Kanakia Gautam Ahuja Deepak Gundecha

SPECIAL ADVISORS Abhishek Lodha Gautam Chatterjee Ar. Hafeez Contractor Anuj Puri Ankur Gupta Adv. Parimal Shroff

INVITEE MEMBERS
Mohit Malhotra Jackbastian Nazareth Venkat K. Narayan Abhishek Kapoor Amit Thacker Gurminder Singh Seera Munish Doshi Nishant Agarwal Cherag Ramakrishnan Azim F. Tapia Jayesh C. Shah Shailesh Sanghvi Sunny Bijlani Binitha Dalal Sahil Parikh Nikunj Sanghavi Rushank Shah Ricardo Romell Samyag Shah Rushi Mehta

Rajeev Jain YOUTHWING CONVENOR Naman Shah

PROCUREMENT CONVENOR Nimish Ajmera

WOMEN'S WING CHAIRPERSON Mona Ajmera

CREDAI-MCHI UNITS

THANE KALYAN-DOMBIVLI MIRA VIRAR RAIGAD NAVI MUMBAI PALGHAR BOISAR BHIWANDI SHAHAPUR-MURBAD URAN-DRONAGIRI ALIBAG KARIAT-KHALAPUR-KHOPOLI



Ref. No. MCHI/PRES/22-23/205 Date: 30/5/2022

To Dr. Jitendra Awhad Hon'ble Minister for Housing, Government of Maharashtra. Mantralya, Mumbai.

अल्पसंख्याक विकास व

Sub: CREDAI-MCHI suggestion formedevelopment of MHADA layout मंत्रालय, मंगई ४०० ०३२

Respected Sir.

At the onset, CREDAI-MCHI would like to thank you for scheduling the meeting to discuss CREDAI-MCHI suggestion for giving boost to MHADA redevelopment. We are fortunate to have a leader like you, who have always supported the real estate industry.

We bring to your kind attention few suggestions for MHADA redevelopment for your guidance:

Modification to Reg. 33(5) of DCPR 234

a) Under DCPR 2034, Regulation 33(5), MHADA has prescribed the minimum area for rehabilitation and the said area is based on the existing rehabilitation area or minimum area, MHADA has further provided for incentive incremental area i.e. as the layout gets larger, possible incremental area also increases, as stated in clause 2.1 (A) (a) and (b) therein.

Now, while the above clause provides for the rehabilitation entitlement as prescribed by MHADA, the same standard is not ascribed to while computing the premium to be charged for FSI for the rehabilitation component. For computing premium for the rehabilitation component, only the existing builtup area is being deducted, and theresidual area up to the entitlement as given above is chargeable. This is not in the spirit of the regulation to charge for area that is mandated by MHADA as entitlement to the rehabilitation component.

We, therefore, propose the following addition of clause 2.1 (A)(iii) as follows –

Existing clause	Proposed addition
*	2.1 (A) (iii) Provided further that for
	thepurpose of calculating premiums
	under this regulation, the area as
	given above in (i) and (ii) shall be
	deducted from the proposed area
	(for the rehabilitation component as
	per entitlement) and the balance
	area available for sale to be
	charged.

Maharashtra Chamber of Housing Industry

Maker Bhavan II, 4th Floor, 18, V. Thackersey Marg, New Marine Lines, Mumbai - 400 020. Tel: 42121421, Fax: 4212 1411/407 Email: secretariat@mchi.net Website: www.mchi.net



b) Under DCPR 2034, Regulation 31, clause 3, the fungible compensatory area on rehabentitlement shall be granted without charging premium for redevelopment schemes of EWS/LIG category under Regulation 33(5).

However, SPA MHADA is granting such free fungible FSI for Regulation 33(5) schemes only on the existing BuA (as per lease deed or area certified by REE, MHADA) and not the entitlement area as prescribed in Regulation 31(3) stated above.

Furthermore, the redevelopment of MIG/HIG has now been permitted for the tenements having area up to 80 sq mt. However, the Fungible Compensatory Area without charging premium has been restricted to Redevelopment of Scheme of EWSand LIG category only and to the extent of the rehabilitation component not exceeding 35 sq mt. This restriction under Reg. 31(3) is unreasonable as theentitlement area has been determined by the Government and is stated up to 80 sqmt.

The definition of free fungible FSI for such schemes may, thus, be explicitly clarified and stated as below with the following modification to Reg. 31(3) as follows –

Existing clause	
-----------------	--

In case of redevelopment under regulation 33(5), 33(6) & 33(7)(B) of the Regulation the fungible compensatory FSI area admissible on existing BUA shall be granted without charging premium.

Provided further that in case of redevelopment schemes of EWS/ LIG category under Regulation 33(5) where rehab entitlement not exceeding 35 sq.mt, then fungible compensatory area on such rehab entitlement shall be granted without charging premium.

Proposed modification

In case of redevelopment under regulation 33(5), 33(6) & 33(7)(B) of the Regulation the fungible compensatory FSI area admissible on existing BUA shall be granted without charging premium.

Provided further that in case of redevelopment schemes of EWS/ LIG / MIG category under Regulation 33(5) where rehab entitlement not exceeding 35 sq.mt has been determined by the Government under these Regulations, then fungible compensatory area on such total rehab entitlement shall be granted without charging premium, and not restricted to the existing BuA as defined by the planning authority or special planning authority, as may be applicable.

2. Suggestion for modification under Reg 17(3)(b) of DCPR 2034

Under DCPR 2034, Regulation 17(3)(B), clause 2, in case of redevelopment of plot(s) having cessed structure(s), the land component of the said cessed structure(s) as per zonal (basic) FSI shall deemed to have been automatically deleted from the reservation.

Regulation 33(7) which pertains to the redevelopment of plot(s) having cessed structure(s), treats non-cess structures and non-tallying structures at par with cessed structures as mentioned in clauses 13 and 19 therein. Regulation 17(3)(B) draws reference to the provisions of Reg. 33(7), and as an extension should allow for the deletion of land component under non-cessed and non-tallying structures as per zonal (basic) FSI from the reservation, in keeping with the spirit of parity created by Regulation 33(7) and all associated regulations in the DCPR.



We, therefore, propose the following modification to Reg. 17(3)(B) clause 2 as follows –

Existing clause	Proposed modification	
(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in these	(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in these	
regulations, in case of redevelopment of plot/(s)	regulations, in case of redevelopment of plot/(s)	
having cessed structures/s and having	having cessed, non-cessed and/or non-tallying	
reservation in the DP, the land component of the	structures/s and having reservation in the DP,	
said cessed structure as per Zonal (basic) FSI	the land component of the said cessed, non-	
shall be deemed to have been automatically	cessed and non-tallying structure as per Zona	
deleted from reservation.	(basic) FSI shall be deemed to have been	
	automatically deleted from reservation.	

3. Suggestion for modification under Reg. 33(24) of DCPR 2034

Vide the notice dated 28.02.2022, TPB-4321/543/C.R.186/2021/UD-11, Reg. 33(24) has been defined for reconstruction or redevelopment of tenanted buildings belonging to MHADA or tenanted buildings belonging to MCGM in the Island City. These buildings which were originally developed under Reg. 33(7) of DCR 1991, now due to reconstruction no longer have the "cessed" status and are considered noncessed. Thus, the provisions of Reg. 33(7) are not directly applicable for redevelopment of such buildings which might be in dilapidated condition. To facilitate redevelopment of these, Reg. 33(24) has been introduced.

Now, the incentive FSI being permitted as part of this regulation has been defined as per the LR/RC ratio and number of plots. While the principle draws from the basis used for Reg. 33(7), the actual quantum of incentive FSI is substantially lesser than Reg. 33(7). This would not be incentive enoughfor private developers to take on redevelopment of these dilapidated buildings, which are at least 454 by UDD's own count in the said notification cited above. Keeping in line with the provisions of Reg.33(7) which was the original regulation for redevelopment of these properties, it is, therefore, requested that the incentive FSI table as quoted in Reg. 33(7) clause 5(a) be replicated in Reg. 33(24) clause 7(A).

The said clause 5(a) from Reg. 33(7) is reproduced below -

The FSI for rehabilitation of existing tenants/occupiers in a reconstructed building and incentive FSI that will be available shall be as under:

(a) In the case of redevelopment of cessed building existing prior to 30/9/1969 undertaken by landlordor Co-operative societies of landlord and Co-operative Housing Societies of landlord / occupiers, the total FSI shall be 3.00 of the gross plot area or the FSI required for rehabilitation of existing occupiers plus50% incentive FSI whichever is more and the occupier shall be eligible for 5% additional rehab Carpet area as per serial No. 2 subject to maximum limit. The incentive FSI admissible against the FSI required for rehabilitation shall be based on the ratio (hereinafter referred to as the Basic Ratio) of Land Rate (LR), in Rs/sqm, of the lands as per the ASR and Rate of Construction (RC) in Rs/sqm, applicable to the area as per the ASR and shall be given as per the table below:

Table

LR/RC	% Incentive FSI permissible			
	Single plot	Two to five plots	Six or more plots	
Above 6	75	85	90	
Above 4 and up to 6	78	88	95	
Up to 4	80	90	100	



We, therefore, request the following modification to Reg. 33(24) clause 7(A) as follows –

Existing clause

A. For redevelopment undertaken by Private developer as per clause 2(a) above:
 FSI required for rehabilitation of existing occupants plus incentive thereon mentioned below, subject to minimum 3 FSI

LR/RC	% Incentive FSI permissible			
	Single plot	Plots more than 1 up to 3	Plots more than 3 up to 6	Plots more than 6
Above 6	30	35	40	45
Above 4 and up to 6	35	40	45	50
Above 2 and up to 4	40	45	50	55
Up to 2	45	50	55	60

Proposed modification

A. For redevelopment undertaken by Private developer as per clause 2(a) above:
 FSI required for rehabilitation of existing occupants plus incentive thereon mentioned below, subject to minimum 3 FSI

LR/RC	% Incentive FSI permissible			
	Single plot	Two to five plots	Six or more plots	
Above 6	75	85	90	
Above 4 and up to 6	78	88	95	
Up to 4	80	90	100	

We hope that the above mentioned suggestions will be considered positively and necessary actions will be carried under your guidance.

Thanking you for your continuous support.

Yours faithfully,

For CREDAI-MCHI

Boman rani President

Dhaval Ajmera

Hon. Secretary