

523

NINETY-EIGHTH MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

B.M.R.D.A.

DATE : 5th July, 1985 (Friday).

TIME : 11.30 A.M.

PLACE : The Committee Room,  
Mantralaya (5th Floor).

MEMBERS PRESENT :

- Shri B.G. Deshmukh, - Chairman  
Chief Secretary to the  
Government of Maharashtra.
- Shri S.R. Kakodkar, - Member  
Metropolitan Commissioner.
- Shri D.K. Jain, - Member  
Secretary to the Government of  
Maharashtra, Urban Development  
Department.
- Shri L.N. Doshi, - Member  
Secretary to the Government of  
Maharashtra, Housing and Special  
Assistance Department.
- Shri J.G. Kanga, - Member  
Municipal Commissioner,  
Bombay Municipal Corporation.
- Shri L.C. Gupta, - Member  
Managing Director, CIDCO.
- Shri Shirish B. Patel. - Member

INVITEES :

- The Financial Adviser, B.M.R.D.A.
- The Chief, T&CP Division, B.M.R.D.A.
- The Chief, T&C Division, B.M.R.D.A.
- The Chief, Planning Division, B.M.R.D.A.
- The Chief Engineer, Engineering Division, B.M.R.D.A.
- The Director (Engineering Services & Projects),  
Municipal Corporation of Greater Bombay.
- The Senior Planner, T&CP Division, B.M.R.D.A.
- The Legal Adviser, B.M.R.D.A.

Shri S.V. Asgaonkar, Secretary, Executive Committee, BMRDA.

At the outset, the Committee placed on record the valuable services rendered as a Member of the Committee by Shri N.R. Ranganathan, Secretary, Urban Development Department and welcomed Shri D.K. Jain who was attending

the.....



the meeting of the Executive Committee for the first time after his appointment as Secretary, Urban Development Department.

Item No.1 : Confirmation of the minutes of 96th and 97th Meetings of the Executive Committee.

The minutes of the 96th meeting held on 23.4.1985 and of the 97th meeting, held on 28.5.1985 were confirmed.

Item No.2 : Action taken on the minutes of the last (97th) Meeting together with progressive action on the past decisions.(Part 'a' only).

During the course of discussion on this item, the following points/suggestions emerged, after which the action taken report was noted by the Committee :-

- (1) Report of the Telecommunication Adviser appointed by BMRDA be circulated to the members of the Executive Committee for their consideration and comments well in advance.
- (2) The Managing Director, CIDCO observed that eventhough BMRDA was trying to get proposed legislation expedited, Truck Terminal Project itself was not progressing well. He feared that if the Truck Terminal was not ready in all respects even after the necessary legislation was enacted, the concerned transport companies, etc. would resort to agitation as happened at the time of shifting of Onion and Potato Market in the past.

The Chief, Transport and Communications Division, BMRDA pointed out that in response to Demand Registration in the proposed Truck Terminal announced by BMRDA, out of about 1,000 companies only 120 had so far registered their demand. Other companies did not register their demand because according to them estimated rate of built-up area (inclusive of common facilities) was on a higher side. Their expectation is that they should not be charged

land.....



land and infrastructure costs but should only be charged cost of construction. They have made representation to the Minister of State for Urban Development, who had recently held a meeting with Bombay Goods Transport Association's (BGTA) representatives and BMRDA officials. As a result, BGTA representatives had offered to make specific proposals to the Metropolitan Commissioner and these were awaited.

BMRDA has estimated the rate of built-up area covering probable cost together with 15% supervision charges and there was no other profit element included therein.

The Municipal Commissioner pointed out that at the last Meeting of the Executive Committee, all issues concerning Truck Terminal were discussed at length and it was agreed that there should be legally competent ways and means for ensuring relocation of transport companies in the proposed Truck Terminal. The Secretary, Law and Judiciary Department has been asked to consider how best this could be done. The Committee had come to the conclusion that unless the transport companies were legally forced to shift from their existing locations in South Bombay to the Truck Terminal the scheme would not be successful in its operation.

The Chief, Transport and Communications Division pointed out that the proposed legislation itself provides that the same will come into effect only after State Government issues a Notification to that effect and that too after giving public notice and inviting objections and suggestions within a period of not less than 30 days. There was, therefore, no possibility of legislation becoming effective without Truck Terminal Project being completed as apprehended by the Managing Director, CIDCO. He further

pointed.....



pointed out that in all cases where relocation of existing activities was intended, e.g. agricultural produce market, textile or iron and steel, competent legislation was enacted well in advance.

The question of mobilising funds for the Truck Terminal construction was also discussed. It was informed that BMRDA had held a dialogue with Industrial Development Bank of India (IDBI) and two commercial banks to explore the possibility of making available finance at a concessional rate <sup>of interest</sup> to the prospective buyers of accommodation in the Truck Terminal. This had met with partial success in that the banks had indicated that for those transport companies owning a truck or trucks, term loans could be made available @ 14% interest, with refinance from I.D.B.I.

In response to a point made by Managing Director, CIDCO about possible financial assistance from HUDCO, it was informed that BMRDA's specific request in that regard had been turned down by HUDCO.

Other suggestions made during discussion about Truck Terminal were as under :

- (i) Those who would voluntarily shift in the beginning should be encouraged to do so and those who would shift later on should be charged more for built-up accommodation.
- (ii) Considering that the Truck Terminal would relieve tremendous wear and tear of City's roads, Government should agree to reduce the cost of land.
- (iii) Separate charge for parking of trucks in the Truck Terminal should be levied.
- (iv) A comprehensive scheme of incentives for shifting of transport companies, etc. to the Truck Terminal may be prepared on the lines of scheme of incentives for shifting of industries.
- (v) The Committee desired that progress report of the Truck Terminal Project (other than legislation) be reported to every Meeting of the Executive Committee.

The.....



The Chief Secretary and Chairman directed that a meeting of the members of the Bombay Goods Transport Association (BGTA) with the Chief Secretary; the Secretary, Urban Development Department; the Commissioner of Police for Greater Bombay; the Transport Commissioner; the Municipal Commissioner; and the Metropolitan Commissioner be arranged after about one month so as to make it clear to the members of the BGTA that Government was bent upon shifting of transport companies, etc. to the proposed Truck Terminal when it will be ready.

- (vi) A time schedule for the construction of Truck Terminal be made available for information of the Executive Committee at its next meeting.

At the end of the discussions it was confirmed that the proposed legislation was necessary and that progress on construction of the Terminal atleast to the extent of the demand already registered be continued while vigorously pursuing the legislation side-by-side.

- (3) It was desired that Notification for shifting of Steel Market to New Bombay be issued at an early date.

- (4) The Secretary, Housing and Special Assistance Department was requested to ensure that the Stay granted against shifting of Hanuman Nagar be got vacated and the occupants be shifted to the proposed alternative sites as early as possible.

- (5) Note regarding continuance or otherwise of Notification under Section 13 of the BMRDA Act, 1974, be placed before the Executive Committee at an early date.

Item No.3 : Applications for permission under Section 13 of the BMRDA Act, 1974.

The applications bearing the following registration numbers were placed on the Table :

- (1) 478/20/5/85
- (2) 479/23/5/85
- (3) 480/24/5/85

- (1) Application .....



(1) Application No.478/20/5/85 (Bombay Port Trust) :

The Committee considered the application and noted that the proposal was for reconstruction of Shed No.6 in Indira Dock of Bombay Port Trust, in 'A' Municipal Ward, thereby reducing its existing area of 14,180.00 square metres to 8,715.05 square metres. It was recapitulated that the Executive Committee had at its 78th meeting, held on 13.4.1983 permitted reconstruction of this shed with floor area of 18,000 square metres. The present application was, however, made when the said permission granted lapsed on 12.4.1985. The present proposal of the applicant was in accordance with the directive of the Ministry of Shipping and Transport which in turn was based on recommendations of the Report of the Consultants for Port Planning. In view of the foregoing the permission applied for by this application was granted by the Committee, subject to the stipulation that reduction in floor area of the proposed shed shall not be accepted, ipso-facto, as a ground for construction of additional storage sheds elsewhere in future and any such proposal would be considered on merits and in the light of BMRDA's policy.

(2) Application No.479/23/5/85 [Regional Transport Officer (Bombay City)]:

The Committee considered the application and noted that the proposal was for reconstruction of building at C.T.S. Nos. 3389, 3400, 3401 out of S.No.3/383 of Tardeo Division at Old Bodyguard Lines Road, in 'D' Municipal Ward thereby increasing its floor area from 4,426 square metres to 28,118 square metres and F.S.I, 1.32, for being used as office complex of the Regional Transport Office (City). Permission for proposed additional area was sought for to meet applicant's requirement upto 1991 on account of increase in vehicle population and resultant increase in jobs in the office of the applicant. The Committee, however, felt that anticipated increase of 12 to 15 lakhs vehicles in the Island City by 1991 and also addition of 600 jobs thereby was on a higher side. Enough justification for expansion of applicant's activity in the Island City, particularly, when the

Department.....



Department was in possession of about 18 acres of land in Western Suburbs, as also for the anticipated increase in cars and office jobs in the Island City was not given by the applicant. The Committee, therefore, decided to reject the application for want of sufficient justification.

(The Committee, however, desired that the Transport Commissioner should hold a dialogue with the Metropolitan Commissioner and submit a fresh application for the area which according to him is absolutely essential to be in the Island City of Bombay. The Committee also desired that at the time of presentation of revised application of R.T.O.(City) to the Committee. The Transport Commissioner should be asked to remain present and explain the proposal to the Committee.)

(3) Application No.480/24/5/85 (M/s.Neeru Silk Mills) :

The Committee considered the application and noted that the proposal was for construction of a 3 storeyed structure by demolishing part of the existing ground floor structure on land bearing S.No.242 of Lower Parel Division in 'G-South' Municipal Ward, for being used as Office-cum-Showrooms and warehouse. In this process, the existing floor area of 39,301.86 square metres was proposed to be increased by 3,482.10 square metres. The land under reference is in I<sub>1</sub> Zone as per the sanctioned Development Plan and as per the Revised Draft Development Plan it is in I<sub>2</sub> Zone. The information about the proposed addition of jobs was not given by the applicant. As per provisions of Development Control Rules in force, users of office and store are incidental to the industrial activity only and the proposed user of office of group of companies is not permissible. Besides in I<sub>1</sub> Zone, Textile manufacture is not permissible under D.C. Rule, No.13(lxxxii). The proposed development is also not permissible under the Industrial Location Policy. The F.S.I. already consumed is more than F.S.I. of 0.5 permissible as per Revised Draft Development Plan. The proposed activity was also likely to adversely effect the traffic on the external roads by loading/unloading activities, parking, etc. As per explanation

added.....



added by BMRDA Notification, No.MC/RDM-1082/2118(A), dated 7th October, 1980 to the Original Notification, dated 10th June, 1977, the Committee has no powers to grant any permission which may be in excess of or contrary to any provisions of the Development Control Rules in Greater Bombay for the time being in force. The application was, therefore, rejected being ultra vires of the Committee's powers and, therefore, not maintainable.

Accordingly, the Committee passed the following Resolution :

RESOLUTION NO.308 :

"Resolved that in exercise of the powers conferred on it by clause (iv) of the sub-section (3) of Section 7 of the Bombay Metropolitan Region Development Authority Act, 1974, (as amended upto date) read with sub-section (1) of Section 13 of the said Act and all other powers enabling it in this behalf, the Committee hereby grants permission to the Bombay Port Trust (Application bearing Registration No.478/20/5/85) for reconstruction of shed No.6 with floor area of 8,715.05 square metres in Indira Docks of B.P.T. in 'A' Municipal Ward, for the reasons recorded in the minutes.

"Resolved further that the application from the Managing Partner, M/s. Neeru Silk Mills (bearing Registration No.480/24/5/85), received in terms of Section 13(2) of the BMRDA Act, 1974, being ultra vires of the powers of the Committee and, therefore, not maintainable, is hereby rejected.

"Resolved further that the application from the Regional Transport Officer (C), Government of Maharashtra (bearing Registration No.479/23/5/85), also received in terms of Section 13(2) of the BMRDA Act, 1974, is hereby rejected for want of enough justification."

Item No.4 : Mankhurd.....



Item No.4 : Mankhurd Belapur Rail Line - Status Report.

The Committee noted the Status Report. The Committee also noted that this issue had been represented by the Chief Minister and Chairman of the Authority to Government of India. It was decided that the outcome thereof may be awaited. The Committee also desired that the issue connected with taking the alignment of Mankhurd-Belapur Rail Line through Navy land at Mankhurd be sorted out in the meantime.

Item No.5 : Incentives for office growth in new centres and disincentives for offices in South Bombay.

Consideration of this item was deferred. However, it was observed that even in the case of banking, telephone, and transport facilities, New Bombay is treated as separate from Greater Bombay. For the sake of growth of New Bombay, it was necessary that there should be complete integration of facilities available in Greater Bombay and New Bombay. There was also discontent about erratic electric supply in New Bombay. It was desired that these issues be also highlighted in the item note and it should be discussed in the next meeting of the Executive Committee.

Item No.6 : Broad parameters to allow office area in the Island City of Bombay under Section 13 of the BMRDA Act.

Consideration of this item was deferred pending note on the question of continuation of Notification under Section 13 of the BMRDA Act, 1974.

Item No.7 : International Workshop on Environmental Management for Local and Regional Development, and UNEP DAY International Symposium on Role of Science and Technology in promoting sound development. Permission to Shri V.K. Phatak to attend these Symposia during June 9 to June 15, 1985 on invitation of UN Centre for Regional Development, Nagoya, Japan.

The Committee considered the Item Note and passed

the.....



