

Update from Stakeholder Meeting (only related to any CGHS) [2025Dec11]

- This is note written in personal capacity & does not represent MC's opinion

DDA has a policy called “*Redevelopment Policy*” and it is published¹ in Master Plan 2021(MPD2021), this was published in 2007. Under this MPD, a policy “*Redevelopment of Existing Urban Area*” has been made. But till date, neither has anyone applied nor gotten an approval, but on the other hand several Govt/PSU projects have been redeveloped.

Considering this situation, DDA had published a Public Notice inviting stakeholders for consultation and present their problems so that they could be addressed in the upcoming MPD.

The intent of this note is to enable and report to the esteemed members, so that they stay informed and at appropriate time an informed decision can be taken.

It may be noted that there was a lot of representation from every part of the city (*Rohini, Mayur Vihar, Dwarka etc*) and everyone is facing the same set of problems that we are facing in Green Heavens. They were hoping to find solution to their problems using the redevelopment policy.

This note reports what happened there and documents the questions asked.

A. Understanding the Policy

1. The policy was made because the city acknowledged that many area require redevelopment due to underutilization of land potential to contribute to economy, increasing population and deterioration in existing buildings. To enable this objective, an incentive of up to 50% will be allowed over and above the current permissible FAR.
2. Under this policy, Redevelopment of CGHS will allow additional FAR (*society area >4 Ha*)² and that would mean:
 - a. To consume additional FAR, Option 1= make existing flats bigger, Option 2= make additional flats to generate funds to finance redevelopment.
 - b. Use some 10% FAR to make Commercial (*shop or office*) and generate revenue;
 - c. The current policy requires using 10% of the Total FAR (New + Old) and make houses for Economically Weaker Section (EWS) and hand it over to the Government for allotment.

B. Representations made by Stakeholders

1. It was said that the CGHS members are not in Favor of changing the “**character of any society**”, so the Govt must amend the provision that requires accommodating the EWS housing.
2. It was stated that, MC need a framework to decide in AGM the conflict between consenting & unwilling members on the question of redevelopment. This is also needed since some members have done “Freehold” and they are entitled to rights outside the domain of RCS³ and they cannot be forced to participate in redevelopment. This should be addressed in Policy. A question was raised that in older/earlier societies, a significant number of members have purchased flats on POA basis and they currently do not have voting rights, so will their consent/unwillingness be considered?
3. In continuation with above, one representative mentioned that the sole decision of Redevelopment should be based on “Structural Audit” reports and the structural safety should be prioritized.
4. There was a suggestion that the Policy should clearly define the role of MCD, DDA & RCS and clarity must be provided on whom should be approached for redevelopment. Hierarchy of approval was requested.

¹ MPD provide planning norms for next 20 years, the next MPD (MPD2041) is in draft stage.

² SAIL CGHS Plot Size= 12,087 sqm (*approx. 1.2 Ha*)& we have consumed 1.44 FAR | FAR permissible in 2025=200

³ RCS= Registrar of Cooperative Societies

5. One representative mentioned that in the new allotment, the preference must be given to existing members.
6. DDA was asked to publish a list of empanelled contractors who could be approached by the Societies for construction, DDA disagreed with that suggestion.
7. Another representative suggested that the DDA must allow phased redevelopment should be considered in the policy and entire city must not be allowed to redevelop so that the members can easily find rental houses while their societies are getting reconstructed.
8. The issue of visitor parking was raised, and newer norms was sought to resolve road encroachment.
9. The topic of having a framework for collecting funds was requested.

Anti-Development Points Raised in the Stakeholder Consultation

10. Some members raised the issue of seismic concerns and said that vertical high rises should not be considered in CGHS.
11. Dwarka Federation representative mentioned that only President of societies should be called for such consultation and expressed his views on why Redevelopment should not be done (*infrastructure is already crumbling*). He said FAR Expansion will aggravate current problems.

C. Questions for our Society

- Q1. Do we want bigger flats or more flats and use the revenue to lower our redevelopment expenses?
- Q2. Do we want to reconstruct or redevelop our society?
- Q3. How do we generate funds?
- Q4. Its only 25 years since our construction was done using best available material and supervision, yet our society required repairs with just 5years of occupation, so how do we avoid the mistakes we made?