

BRIHANMUMBAI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

Subject : - Proposed self-redevelopment of Residential society bldg. Known as



Architect : -



Owner : -



Reference Plans for reference attached in console U/no.
P- 10498/2022/(264)/K/W WARD /AMBIVALI/337/1/NEW

Form: 4C Report on Various Concessions Sought

In this case, Architect has submitted plans for self-redevelopment of proposed low rise Residential building as per DCPR 2034 with Height 31.75 mts., for bldg. comprising of Stilt for parking + 1st floor (pt.) for residential & part Fitness Centre + 2nd to 8th floors + 9th floor part for society office & part floors for residential user in lieu of plot potential + FSI under regulation 33(7)(B) + 0.50 govt. F.S.I. by paying premium + adm. TDR + by claiming staircase, staircase lobby, lift, lift lobby area free of F.S.I. + fungible compensatory F.S.I. as per Reg. No. 31(3) of DCPR 2034.

Proposal Details:

➤ **D.P. Remarks**

As per D.P. Remarks u/no. Ch.E./DP34202104111319414 dated. 24/04/2021 (attached in additional documents) the plot under reference is situated in 'R' zone. The plot is not affected by any reservation and accessible from Existing road proposed to be widening. The plot boundaries are not matching with DP remarks being single plot is considered now, hence corrections in DP remarks will be insisted before grant of OC and condition to that effect will be insisted in IOD.

➤ **Survey Remarks**

As per Survey remarks (attached in document checklist) the plot under reference is situated "Residential Zone". The plot under reference is not affected by any reservation and is accessible from Existing Road proposed to be widening to 9.15 mts. as per DP 2034. The road status from ward office will be insisted before approval of plan. As per survey remarks the plot u/r. falls in 100 m periphery of heritage structure. Hence remarks from heritage point of view will be insisted before granted of plinth CC. As per the survey remarks it is stated that "*whether any land lock plot abuts to /adjacent to the plot under reference*" and as per the approved existing plan showing access to 4.57 mts. wide right of way up to public road through the plot u/r.

However, Architect has submitted letter attached in additional documents wherein he has stated that as per site condition there is no existing access given to any land lock plot through the proposed plot u/r. and no abutting plot depends on access through the plot u/r. As per proposed planning the access shown in earlier plan is not required.

➤ **Ownership :**

As per the P.R. Card attached in document checklist in console, owner of the plot is [REDACTED]. Title certificate attached in additional documents tab. Accordingly, Shri Krishna Aant Mulye Secretary of [REDACTED] has signed the notice u/s. 337 & 44/69 of MR & TP Act in the capacity of Owner and submitted proposal in this office.

➤ **Plot area :-**

1. As per P.R. Card = 1239.35 sq.mts.
2. Owner's Affidavit = 1239.35 sq.mts.
3. Architect plot area certificate = 1239.35 sq.mts.
4. Area as per site condition = 1239.35 sq.mts.
5. As per trigulation calculation = 1239.35 sq.mts.

Thus 1239.35 sq.mts. is considered on the basis of the said documents.

The plot u/r. is unauthorizedly sub divided as per CTS plan. Separate PRC are obtained by the applicant. However, penalty and layout scrutiny fee will be recovered before approval of plans.

➤ **Cognizance of Hon. Supreme Court orders for dumping ground case :-**

The orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dt.15.03.2018, SLP (D23708/2017) are applicable and the developer/owner requires to comply with the said order and submit approval of 'C' & 'D' waste disposal plan from SWM dept. of M.C.G.M. The bank guarantee & SWM NOC will be submitted before approval of plans.

➤ **Cognizance of Supreme court order dated 17.12.2013:**

The proposal is in conformity with the Supreme Court directives in Kohinoor case. The plot is abutting Existing Road proposed to be widened to 9.15 mts. Wide D.P. Road on East side. Since height of building is less than 32.00 mts., concurrence of Hon. Supreme Court directives in Kohinoor case of a minimum 6.00 mts. clear side open space is not applicable.

➤ **Applicability of Regulation 14 (A) & 15 as per DCPR 2034:**

In this case, the area of plot u/r. is 1239.35 sq.mts. which is less than 4000.00 sq. mt., Therefore, the provision of Reg. no. 14(A) and Reg. no. 15 of D.C.P.R. 2034 are not applicable to the plot u/r..

➤ **NOC from Chief Fire Officer:-**

Architect has proposed building with deficient open spaces and the N.O.C. from C.F.O. from fire safety point of view is obtained through online system. Copy of CFO NOC is attached in additional document tab. As per the submitted C.F.O. N.O.C., the building comprises of Stilt for parking + 1st floor (pt.) for residential & part fitness centre + 2nd to 8th floors + 9th floor part for society office & part floors for residential. Completion Certificate from C.F.O will be insisted before issuing Occupation Certificate to the building under reference. There are minor variations in AVS planning and bldg. ht. is less than 32.00 mts. hence CFO completion will be insisted as per proposed amendments at the time of OCC.

➤ **Parking:-**

As per regulation 44(1) Table No. 21 of DCPR 2034, the required car parking spaces are 39 nos. and architect has proposed 39 nos. of car parking spaces. Parking is proposed in stilt inform of stack & 3level pit stack parking. The certification remarks under EODB format, for parking layout for proposal under reference are attached in additional documents tab.

➤ **Applicability of regulation 33(7)(B):-**

In this case, Architect has claimed incentive additional BUA of 10.00 sq.mts. per tenement of existing buildings as per Reg. 33(7)(B) of DCPR 2034.

The guidelines for processing the proposals under Reg. 33(7)(B) are issued vide Sr. No. 5 of Transitional Policy Circular-T4 as under :

(a)- As regards the utilization of incentive additional built up area as per Regulation 33(7)(B), the General Body Resolution of society shall be necessary specifying the beneficiary of such incentive additional BUA (i.e. for members of society/ developer or combination thereof).

In this case, the proposal is for self-redevelopment and the proposal is submitted by the society. Architect has submitted the copy of GBR from society attached in additional document tab, wherein it is stated that incentive F.S.I. as per 33(7)(B) will be used for sale component to reduce burden of TDR to be purchase.

(c) - *For arriving at number of existing tenement for the purpose of incentive additional BUA, following guidelines shall be adopted:*

- (i) If the Copied of approved plans are available, then the proof of number of tenements shall be taken from the approved plans. However if the user shown in the approved plan is residential user which is subsequently changed unauthorisedly, then the benefit of incentive additional BUA shall not be permissible to the said tenement.*
- (ii) For the purpose of calculating incentive additional BUA tenement wise, only existing residential tenements shall be considered. Further, as regards considering 15% incentive additional BUA, existing BUA shall include residential and non-residential area, if any.*

In this case, Architect has submitted copy of O.C.C. Certificate and Plans along with amended plans of existing building. It can be seen that in O.C.C./amended plans was granted on 20/09/1982 under file number CE/6099/BSII/AK. There are total 20 Nos. of flats on plan matches with the site condition as shown on plans. Accordingly, Architect has claimed 10.00 sq.mts. per tenements (i.e. 20 x 10.00 Sq. Mts. = 200.00 Sq. Mts.) as more than 30 years is passed after 20.09.1982.

(d)- *The Regulation 33(7)(B) will be applicable only when existing members of the society are proposed to be re-accommodated in the same project on plot/layout.*

In the case, the notice u/s. 337 & form u/s. 44/69 is signed and submitted by the society for self-redevelopment of existing society bldg. and all the society members are re-accommodated in the same project on the plot u/r.

As per Reg. 33(7)(B) (4) – *This regulation will be applicable for re-development of existing authorized buildings which are of thirty years of age or more.*

Architect has submitted copy of O.C.C. Certificate granted u/n. CE/6099/BSII/AK dated 20/09/1982 to the exiting society bldg. attached to console. Hence, it can be seen that the bldg. is more than 30 years old.

➤ **Planning Details :-**

1. Architect has submitted proposal for self-redevelopment of Residential building (ht. 31.75 mts.) comprising of Stilt for stack & pit puzzle parking with ht. (4.60 + 2.30 = 6.90 mts.) + 1st floor (pt.) for residential & part fitness centre + 2nd to 8th floors + 9th (pt) upper floors for residential user and society office in lieu of plot potential + FSI under regulation 33(7)(B) + 0.50 govt. F.S.I. by paying premium + adm. TDR + by

claiming staircase, staircase lobby, lift, lift lobby area free of F.S.I.+ fungible compensatory F.S.I. as per Reg. No. 31(3) of DCPR 2034.

2. The entrance lobby with 4.08 mts. height is proposed at Stilt level and area of same is claimed free of FSI as per clause 31(1)(xxi) of DCPR 2034.
3. The Society office is proposed on 9th floor adm. 7.90 sq.mts. against permissible 20.00 sq.mts. and area of same is claimed free of FSI as per regulation 31(1)(vii) read with 37(9).
4. The fitness center is proposed at 1st floor level adm. 36.56 sq.mts. against permissible 53.79 sq.mts. The area of fitness center is claimed free of FSI as per regulation 31(1)(xvii) read with 37(28).
5. As per regulation 28(A) electric substation is provided in stilt for plot area above 1000 sq.mts. upto 2000 sq.mts. and area of the same is claimed free of FSI as per regulation 31(1)(xxx).
6. 1 no. open type 1.50 mts. wide staircase and 2 no's of lifts are proposed in building as per regulation 37(15) & 37 (17) of DCPR 2034.
7. French windows are proposed for better light and ventilation to rooms with a sill ht. of 0.15 mts. from respective floor level. Chajjas are proposed having width of maximum 1.20 mts. wide beyond building line and 0.70 mts beyond cantilever portion of building line. The area of same is claimed free of FSI as per regulations 31(1)(xii) and 31(1)(xiii) read with regulation 42(ii)(e)(i) and 42(ii)(f)(i).
8. Vertical fins projecting on the periphery of toilet ducts and at the face of bldg. line with depth upto 1.20 mts. as shown in the plans and area of same is claimed free of FSI as per Reg. 31(1)(xii).
9. U.G. tank, Fire Tank is proposed at the north side of the plot are claimed free of F.S.I as per Reg. No. 31(1)(xiv) of DCPR 2034.
10. Electric meter penal is proposed in stilt level as per Reg. 37(11) and area of same is claimed free of F.S.I. as per 31(xxxii).
11. Architect has proposed to claim area of elevated water tank free of FSI at terrace floor as per DCR 2034 regulation 31(1)(xxxiv) the said area is excluded from FSI consumption.
12. 1.00 mts. ht. safety grills are provided within bldg. line on French window of the rooms.
13. Architect has proposed 39.00 nos. of parking spaces against required 39.00 Nos.

14. 1.50 mts. parapet walls are proposed on terrace floor required as per regulation 37(23) of DCPR 2034.
15. Space for servant toilet is proposed in mid-landing area and area of same is claimed free of F.S.I. as per regulation 31(1)(xxvi).
16. Part terrace is created on 9th floor due to full consumption of FSI.

➤ **Auto Scrutiny:-**

Plans are auto scrutinized with Auto-DCR system and minor deviations are observed which are justifiable and will be got corrected before approval of plans. Table with respect to Auto DCR Scrutiny and Deviation observed with justification is given by architect in his report. The cognizance of the deviations is taken in to account by correcting the plans and submitted the proposal for approval of authority.

To approve the plans of redevelopment of existing building, consideration and approval of Ch.Eng.(D.P.) /Hon'ble M.C. is required for the following points :-

Sr. No.	Concession Required	Provisions of DCPR	Approval required from
1.	<p>To condone deficiency in open space as per discretionary powers vested under regulation 6(b) of DCPR 2034.</p> <p>a) To the tune of max. 21.48% for L/V & max. 24.67% for F.O.S. in F.S.I. 1.00 from cantilever building line by charging 100% premium.</p> <p>b) To the tune of max. 58.56% for L/V & max. 24.67% for F.O.S. from cantilever outermost building line for full consumption of F.S.I. by charging telescopic premium.</p> <p>c) To condone joint open deficiency to the tune of max. 41.53% without charging premium due to hardship, planning constraint and as per regulation 6(b) of DCPR 2034.</p>	Reg.6(b) of DCPR 2034	Ch.Eng.(D.P.) /Hon.M.C.
Justification by Architect			
Architect as per form 3 list of indicative concessions has stated as under:			
A) Hardship:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plot under reference is situated in Andheri area where there is restriction of height from civil aviation department. 2. Also, Architect has proposed 31.75 mts. height of building. If more then 32.00 mts. height of building is proposed Architect has to provide 6.00 mts. clear open space which is not possible due to planning constraints. Hence, he has proposed more horizontal building. 			

3. To make project financially viable, it is necessary to utilize TDR and permissible fungible compensatory F.S.I. as per Reg. No. 31(3) of DCPR 2034 on plot u/r.
4. The plan submitted does satisfy majority of requirement as per the new policy, however, Architect has obtained the NOC from CFO as attached in console for the said building with the proposed open space.

On account of the above genuine hardship, deficiency in open space is created, which may be condoned.

B) Health safety:-

Owner will appoint licensed plumber to supervise and carryout the drainage work. The drainage work will be carried out as per the provision of drainage and sanitary code. The condition to this effect will be in corporate in I.O.D. Further, the completion certificate of drainage arrangement will be insisted before granting occupation permission to the bldg. under reference by verifying that conveyance of foul / waste is achieved speedily and effectively without risk of nuisance to the health of the occupants of the bldg. and neighborhood.

More so, effective disposal of rain water will be achieved as per the remarks by E.E.[S.W.D.] by providing paving around the bldg. with slope towards S.W.D., so that there will not be any water logging S.W.D. completion certificate will be insisted before Occupation certificate.

In view of providing above arrangement, it is felt that due care will be taken towards the health of the occupants & neighborhood.

C) Fire safety:-

As per Appendix-VIII of DCR 1991, the multi storied bldg. or premises shall confirm to the requirement of chief fire officer from fire safety & firefighting point of view. The Ht. of bldg. is 31.75 mts. and deficiency in open spaces is created and hence the compliance of the requirements & final NOC from CFO will be submitted before occupation. The CFO NOC for proposed bldg. will be attached in console.

D) Structural safe :-

1. The Owner/developer will appoint a registered Structural Engineer for the proposed bldg. who will design the building as per the provisions of latest I.S. Code considering the earthquake resistance factor.
2. The work will be supervised by licensed site supervisor to whom license has been issued by MCGM.
3. The structural design and calculations will be submitted by the licensed.
4. Structural engineer and its Structural stability will be insisted before considering occupation permission for the building.
5. The completion certificate from Structural Engineer and Site Supervisor will be

	<p>obtained before granting occupation permission to the bldg. under reference. Thus the structural safety of the building will be ensured.</p> <p><u>E) Public safety & neighborhood safety:-</u></p> <p>As the health and Structural safety of the inhabitants will be ensured as explained above, the aspect of public safety will also be taken care of while redevelopment of the property. The necessary under taking from Owner will be submitted as per the format mentioned in ease of doing business manual version 1.1, stating that no nuisance to the public and inhabitants of the neighborhood shall be caused due to the proposed construction of building under reference. The necessary Janata Insurance Policy will be submitted so as to ensure the public safety / labor safety.</p>
	<p>Comments by A.E.B.P. K/W</p> <p>As per justification mentioned in 4B and Form 3B of List of Indicative Concessions. The deficiency in open space as reflected in table of list of indicative concession is in order with reference to plans for consideration. The hardship and neighborhood safety, structural safety, health safety as stated above in respect of building under reference are justifiable. Neighborhood safety structural safety & health safety is taken care of by appointing Structural Engineer, Site Supervisor and License plumber as stated above.</p> <p>The provision of regulation 6(b) of DCPR 2034 stipulates as, <i>“In specific cases where a clearly demonstrable hardship is caused, the Commissioner may for reasons to be recorded in writing, by special permission permit any of the dimensions prescribed by these Regulations to be modified, except those relating to floor space indices unless other wise permitted under these Regulations, provided that the relaxation will not affect the health, safety, fire safety, structural safety and public safety of the inhabitants of the building and the neighborhood.”</i></p> <p>In view of above, Ch.Eng.(D.P.)/Hon. M.C.’s approval is requested, to condone deficiency in open space as per discretionary powers vested under regulation 6(b) of DCPR 2034.</p> <p>(a) to the tune of max. 21.48% for L/V & max. 24.67% for F.O.S. in F.S.I. 1.00 from cantilever building line by charging 100% premium.</p> <p>(b) to the tune of max. 58.56% for L/V & max. 24.67% for F.O.S. from cantilever outermost building line for full consumption of F.S.I. by charging telescopic</p>

	<p>premium.</p> <p>(c) to condone joint open deficiency to the tune of max. 41.53% without charging premium due to hardship, planning constraint and as per regulation 6(b) of DCPR 2034.</p>		
	Comments by E.E.B.P. K/Ward		
	<p>In view of above justification by Architect and comments by A.E.(B.P.) to condone deficiency in open space as per discretionary powers vested under regulation 6(b) by charging premium and hence submitted for approval by Ch.E.(D.P.)/Hon. M.C.</p> <p>a) to the tune of max. 21.48% for L/V & max. 24.67% for F.O.S. in F.S.I. 1.00 from cantilever building line by charging 100% premium.</p> <p>b) to the tune of max. 58.56% for L/V & max. 24.67% for F.O.S. from cantilever outermost building line for full consumption of F.S.I. by charging telescopic premium.</p> <p>c) to condone joint open deficiency to the tune of max. 41.53% without charging premium due to hardship, planning constraint and as per regulation 6(b) of DCPR 2034.</p>		
2.	<p>To allow area covered under staircase, lift and lift lobby as shown hatched in plan free of FSI by charging premium as per DCPR 31(1)(iv) and to allow area covered under reg. no. 31(1)(iii) of DCPR 2034 free of FSI without charging premium.</p>	<p>Reg. 31(1)(iv) & 31(1)(iii) of DCPR 2034</p>	<p>Ch.Eng.(D.P.) /Hon.M.C</p>
	Justification by Architect		
	<p>Architect has claimed the areas of staircase, lift, and lift lobby of habitable floors of proposed building on residential habitable floors i.e. 1st to 9th floors as per reg. no. 31(1)(iv) of DCPR 2034 by charging premium and without charging premium for non-habitable floors as per regulation 31(1)(iii) including area of lift and lift lobby proposed on terrace level.</p>		
	Comments by A.E.B.P. K/W		
	<p>Architect has proposed residential building comprising of residential habitable floors (i.e. 1st to 9th) floors as per reg. no. 31(1)(iv) of DCPR 2034 by charging premium, excluding those specified under DCPR 31(1)(iii) are permitted free of FSI without charging premium with special written permission from the Commissioner.</p>		

	In view of above justification by Architect, Ch.Eng.(D.P.)/Hon'ble M.C.'s approval is requested to allow area covered under staircase, lift and Lift lobby as shown hatched in plan free of FSI by charging premium as per DCPR 31(1)(iv), excluding area covered under reg. no. 31(1) (iii) of DCPR 2034 free of FSI without charging premium.		
	Comments by E.E.B.P. K/Ward		
	In view of justification by Architect and comments by A.E.(B.P.), submitted for approval of Ch.Eng.(DP)/Hon'ble M.C. to allow area covered under staircase, lift and lift lobby as shown hatched in plan free of FSI by charging premium as per DCPR 31(1)(iv) and to allow area covered under reg. no. 31(1) (iii) of DCPR 2034 free of FSI without charging premium as explained above.		
3.	To allow to utilize the fungible component BUA permissible on plot u/r. without charging premium for area 346.57 sq.mts. for residential rehab component & by charging premium of area 351.47 sq.mts. for residential sale component at 50% of S.D.R.R. rates for residential development as per policy.	Reg. 6(b) and Reg. no. 31(3) of DCPR 2034.	Ch.Eng.(D.P.) /Hon.M.C
	Justification by Architect		
	Architect has proposed to claim fungible compensatory FSI as per D.C.R. 31(3) for residential development up to 35%. The fungible FSI is proposed to be utilized for enlarging the room sizes and to propose additional floors.		
	Area of plot	1239.35 sq.mts.	
	Net plot area	997.45 sq.mts.	
	Total BUA Permissible	1994.89 sq.mts.	
	Total BUA Proposed	1994.40 sq.mts.	
	Proposed fungible FSI Residential component (1994.47 x 35%)	698.04 sq.mts.	
	Permissible fungible area without premium Rehab component (990.21 x 35%)	346.57 sq.mts.	
	Proposed fungible area by charging premium Sale component	351.47 sq.mts.	
	Architect has proposed to claim fungible compensatory FSI as per D.C.R. 31(3) for residential development up to 35% for sale component. The fungible FSI is proposed to be utilized for enlarging the room sizes and to propose additional floors. The existing building was constructed for Ground + 4 upper floor under file number		

CE/6099/BSII/AK. Architect has submitted O.C. Certificate along with plans of existing building in the console.

Architect has attached in console copy of following documents.

- a. As per approved plan u/n. CE/6099/BSII/A/K dated 26/04/1979 wherein the proposed BUA of the existing bldg. is shown 1170.19 sq.mts.
- b. As per OC canvas mounted plans u/n. CE/6099/BSII/A/K dated 27/06/1981 wherein the proposed BUA of the existing bldg. is shown 1179.11 sq.mts.
- c. Architect has also submitted fungible area statement of existing members. It can be seen from the statement that the total existing BUA of members is 990.21 sq.mts..

From the above listed documents it can be seen that the BUA consumed in the existing bldg. ranges from 1179.11 sq.mts. to 990.21 sq.mts.. Hence least area may be considered for claiming of rehab fungible area i.e. 990.21 sq.mts.

Architect has claimed fungible area on existing B.U.A. adm. 990.21 sq.mts. of which residential fungible F.S.I. for rehab is claimed without charging premium for area 346.57 sq.mts. and residential fungible for sale is claimed by charging premium for area 351.47 sq.mts. at 50% of S.D.R.R. rates for residential development as per policy.

Comments by A.E.B.P. K/W

Architect has proposed to claim fungible compensatory FSI as per D.C.R. 31(3) for residential development up to 35%.

As the available records of existing bldg. on the plot u/r. submitted by architect attached in console following documents.

- a. As per approved plan u/n. CE/6099/BSII/A/K dated 26/04/1979 wherein the proposed BUA of the existing bldg. is shown 1170.19 sq.mts.
- b. As per OC canvas mounted plans u/n. CE/6099/BSII/A/K dated 27/06/1981 wherein the proposed BUA of the existing bldg. is shown 1179.11 sq.mts.
- c. Architect has also submitted fungible area statement of existing members. It can be seen from the statement that the total existing BUA of members is 990.21 sq.mts..

As per the above listed documents submitted by Architect, BUA consumed in the existing bldg. ranges from 1179.11 sq.mts. to 990.21 sq.mts.. Hence least area may be considered for claiming of rehab fungible area i.e. 990.21 sq.mts.

Architect has claimed fungible area on existing B.U.A. adm. 990.21 sq.mts. of which residential fungible F.S.I. for rehab is claimed without charging premium for area 346.57 sq.mts. and residential fungible for sale is claimed by charging premium for area 351.47 sq.mts. at 50% of S.D.R.R. rates for residential development as per policy.

In view of above, Ch.E.(DP)/Hon'ble M.C.'s approval is requested to allow to utilize the fungible component BUA permissible on plot u/r. without charging premium for area 346.57 sq.mts. for residential rehab component & by charging premium of area 351.47 sq.mts. for residential sale component at 50% of S.D.R.R. rates for residential development as per policy.

Comments by E.E.B.P. K/Ward

In view of justification by Architect and comments by A.E.(B.P.), submitted for approval of Ch.Eng.(DP)/Hon'ble M.C. to allow to utilize the fungible component BUA permissible on plot u/r. without charging premium for area 346.57 sq.mts. for residential rehab component & by charging premium of area 351.47 sq.mts. for residential sale component at 50% of S.D.R.R. rates for residential development as per policy as explained above.

4.	To allow (a) To allow 4.60 mts. height of Stilt for stack parking & (4.60 + 2.30) i.e. 6.90 mts. for 3 level pit puzzle parking with pit. (b) To allow stack & 3 level pit puzzle parking spaces partly within building line and partly projecting beyond building line in side & in F.O.S. at minimum 3.17 mts. from road.	Reg. 6(b) of DCPR 2034	Ch.Eng. (D.P.) /Hon.M.C
----	---	---------------------------	-------------------------------

Justification by Architect

As per Reg. No. 44, Table No. 21 of DCPR 2034, the parking requirement for proposed 41.00 nos. of residential flats along with 10% visitors parking is 39.00 nos. and Architect has provided 39.00 nos. of parking spaces. Architect has provided the required parking's by proposing 08.00 nos. of 2 level stack parking in Stilt floor, 30.00 nos. of pit puzzle parking in stilt, and 1.00 No. of surface parking in rear open space as shown on plans.

Architect has proposed 4.60 mts. height of stilt to accommodated stack parking & 6.90 mts. for 3 level pit puzzle parking with pit. Higher height of stilt may be permissible as per regulation 37(30) for accommodation of mechanical parking systems. The plot under reference is situated in Andheri West where there

is a restriction on height by the Civil Aviation Department hence Stilt Height cannot be further increased. Moreover, the plot is small and odd in shape causing hardships and planning constraints to accommodate require number of parking spaces.

Architect has proposed stack & 3 level pit puzzle parking spaces partly within building line and partly projecting beyond building line on rear side & in F.O.S. at minimum 3.17 mts. from road due to hardship and planning constraints.

Comments by A.E.B.P. K/W

Architect has provided 39.00 nos. of parking spaces against required 39.00 nos. of parking spaces. Architect has provided the required parking's by proposing 08.00 nos. of 2 level stack parking in Stilt floor, 30.00 nos. of pit puzzle parking in stilt, and 1.00 No. of surface parking in rear open space as shown on plans.

All the existing members of the society are to be accommodated with specific carpet area and specific floors due to hardship and planning constraints. Architect has proposed 4.60 mts. height of stilt to accommodate stack parking & 6.90 mts. for 3 level pit puzzle parking with pit. Higher height of stilt may be permissible as per regulation 37(30) for accommodation of mechanical parking systems.

Architect has proposed stack parking & 3 level in pit puzzle parking partly in stilt and partly projecting beyond stilt in side & F.O.S. at minimum 3.17 mts. from road, due to hardship and planning constraints.

In view of above justification of Architect, Ch.E.(DP)/Hon'ble M.C.'s approval is requested to allow

- (a) to allow 4.60 mts. height of Stilt for stack parking & (4.60 + 2.30) i.e. 6.90 mts. for 3 level pit puzzle parking with pit.
- (b) To allow stack & 3 level pit puzzle parking spaces partly within building line and partly projecting beyond building line in side & in F.O.S. at minimum 3.17 mts. from road.

Comments by E.E.B.P. K/Ward

In view of justification by Architect and comments by A.E.(B.P.), submitted for approval of Ch.Eng.(DP)/Hon'ble M.C. to allow

- (a) to allow 4.60 mts. height of Stilt for stack parking & (4.60 + 2.30) i.e. 6.90 mts. for 3 level pit puzzle parking with pit.
- (b) To allow stack & 3 level pit puzzle parking spaces partly within building line and partly projecting beyond building line in side & in F.O.S. at minimum 3.17

	mts. from road.		
5.	To allow odd shaped 15% R.G. partly paved at the distance of min. 1.50 mts. from building line & partly physical on mother earth in FOS touching front boundary on south-east corner by charging premium, due to hardship and planning constraints and subject to provision of perforated paver blocks in paved R.G.	Reg. 27 & Reg. 6 (b) of DCPR 2034	Ch.Eng.(D.P.) /Hon.M.C.
Justification by Architect			
<p>In this case area of plot is 1239.35 sq.mts. Hence, as per regulation 27 of DCPR 2034, 15% shall be provided for plot area adm. 1001 sq.mts. to 2500 sq.mts. Further, it states that <i>"The minimum dimension of such LOS shall not be less than 7.5m, and if the average width of such LOS is less than 16.6 m, the length there of shall not exceed 21/2 times the average width."</i></p> <p>Architect has proposed 15% odd shaped R.G. in south side open space having width less then 7.5 mts.. The said 15% R.G. is proposed partly paved at the distance of min. 1.50 mts. from building line with perforated paver blocks for penetration of water in soil & part portion of physical R.G. on mother earth in FOS touching front boundary on south-east corner of the plot as the plot being small & odd shaped and due to planning constraints.</p> <p>It is to mention here that the present proposal is for self-redevelopment of existing building known as [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] There is restriction of height from airport authority of India & as the plot being small & odd shaped due to planning constraints the bldg. is proposed more horizontal than vertical. Also, required numbers of tree will be planted and rain water harvesting system will be installed in the building.</p>			
Comments by A.E.B.P. K/W			
<p>In this case, Architect has proposed 15% odd shaped R.G. in south side open space having width less then 7.5 mts.. The said 15% R.G. is proposed partly paved at the distance of min. 1.50 mts. from building line with perforated paver blocks for penetration of water in soil & part portion of physical R.G. on mother earth in FOS touching front boundary on south-east corner of the plot as the plot being small & odd shaped and due to planning constraints.</p> <p>It is to mention here that the present proposal is for self-redevelopment of existing building known as [REDACTED]</p>			

	<p>There is restriction of height from airport authority of India & as the plot being small & odd shaped due to planning constraints the bldg. is proposed more horizontal than vertical. Also, required numbers of tree will be planted and rain water harvesting system will be installed in the building.</p> <p>In view of above justification of Architect, Ch.E.(DP)/Hon'ble M.C.'s approval is requested to allow To allow odd shaped 15% R.G. partly paved at the distance of min. 1.50 mts. from building line & partly physical on mother earth in FOS touching front boundary on south-east corner by charging premium, due to hardship and planning constraints and subject to provision of perforated paver blocks in paved R.G.</p>		
	<p>Comments by E.E.B.P. K/Ward</p> <p>In view of above justification by Architect and comments of A.E.(B.P.), submitted for approval of Ch.Eng.(D.P.)/Hon'ble M.C. to allow To allow odd shaped 15% R.G. partly paved at the distance of min. 1.50 mts. from building line & partly physical on mother earth in FOS touching front boundary on south-east corner by charging premium, due to hardship and planning constraints and subject to provision of perforated paver blocks in paved R.G.</p>		
6.	To allow dry type sub-station in stilt with substandard dimension & size, due to hardship, planning constraint and as per reg. 6(b).	Reg. 28, Reg. 31 (xxx) & Reg. 6 (b) of DCPR 2034	Ch.Eng.(D.P.) /Hon.M.C.
	<p>Justification by Architect</p> <p><i>As per Reg. 28 of DCPR 2034, In case of development / redevelopment of any land, building or premises, provision for electric substation may be permitted for plot above 1000 sq.mts. & upto 2000 sq.mts. with 40.00sq.mts. (single transformer of 8.0 x 5.0).</i></p> <p>In this case, substation is proposed in stilt on North side of the building. with area 7.29 sq.mts. [i.e. (2.43 mts. x 3.00 mts.) instead of required area 40.00 sq.mts. (8.00 mts. x 5.00 mts.). Architect has proposed dry type sub-station on North side in stilt. Due to planning constraints and hardship, there is no space available for providing substation in open space as R.G. is proposed on south side in open space as such, he is left with no space for providing sub-station in open space. Hence, he has proposed sub-station in stilt and the area of the same is claimed free of FSI as per Reg. 31 (xxx) of DCPR 2034.</p> <p>The NOC from Energy Supplying Company will be incorporated in IOD</p>		

	conditions to be submitted before requesting for FCC.		
	Comments by A.E.B.P. K/W Ward		
	<p>Architect has proposed substation in stilt with inadequate size & dimension i.e. area 7.29 sq.mts. (2.43 mts. x 3.00 mts.) instead of required area 40.00 sq.mts. (8.00 mts. x 5.00 mts.). Architect has proposed dry type sub-station on North side in stilt. Due to planning constraints and hardship, there is no space available for providing substation in open space as R.G. is proposed on south side. Hence, he has proposed sub-station in stilt and the area of the same is claimed free of FSI as per Reg. 31 (xxx) of DCPR 2034. The condition for submit NOC from Electricity supply company will be incorporated in IOD condition.</p> <p>In view of above justification of Architect, Ch.E.(DP)/Hon'ble M.C.'s approval is requested to allow dry type sub-station in stilt with substandard dimension & size, due to hardship, planning constraint and as per Reg. 6(b).</p>		
	Comments by E.E.B.P. K/Ward		
	<p>In view of justification by Architect and comments by A.E.(B.P.), submitted for approval of Ch.Eng.(D.P.)/Hon'ble M.C. under regulation 6(b) of DCPR 2034 to allow dry type sub-station in stilt with substandard dimension & size, due to hardship, planning constraint and as per reg. 6(b) as explained above</p>		
7.	<p>To allow</p> <p>(a) 2 nos. of AVS for ventilation to toilets of Cross-section area 7.57 mts. instead of required 9.00 mts. & having Width of (1.25 mts. x 2.85mts.) + (2.45 mts. x 1.64 mts.) instead of required minimum dimension of one side of shaft of 3.00 mts. free of F.S.I. by charging premium as per policy.</p> <p>(b) to allow 1 nos. of AVS counted in FSI for ventilation to 1 no. of toilet with Cross-section area adm. 0.60 sq.mts. instead of required 9.00 sq.mts. & Width of (0.40 mts. x 1.50 mts.) instead of required minimum dimension of one side of shaft of 3.00 mts. by charging premium due to planning constraints as per Reg. 6(b) of DCPR 2034.</p>	Reg. 6 (b) of DCPR 2034	Ch.Eng.(D.P.)/Hon.M.C
	Justification by Architect		
	<p>As per Reg. No. 40(2) of DCPR 2034, for building having height more than 30 mts., cross section area of A.V.S. required is 9.00 sq.mts. with minimum dimension of one side of shaft 3.00 mts.</p>		

Architect has proposed 2 nos. of artificial ventilation shaft for ventilation to toilets with Cross-section area adm. 7.75 sq.mts. instead of required 9.00 sq.mts. & Width of (1.25 mts. x 2.85mts.) + (2.45 mts. x 1.64 mts.) instead of required minimum dimension of one side of shaft of 3.00 mts. free of FSI and 1 nos. of AVS counted in FSI for ventilation to 1 no. of toilet with Cross-section area adm. 0.60 sq.mts. instead of required 9.00 sq.mts. & Width of (0.40 mts. x 1.50 mts.) instead of required minimum dimension of one side of shaft of 3.00 mts., mainly due to planning constraints in re-accommodation of existing society members having flats with specific size and area and same may be allowed by charging premium.

Comments by A.E.B.P. K/W Ward

As per Reg. No. 40(2) of DCPR 2034, for building having height more than 30 mts., cross section area of A.V.S. required is 9.00 sq.mts. with minimum dimension of one side of shaft 3.00 mts.

Architect has proposed 2 nos. of artificial ventilation shaft for ventilation to toilets with Cross-section area adm. 7.75 sq.mts. instead of required 9.00 sq.mts. & Width of (1.25 mts. x 2.85mts.) + (2.45 mts. x 1.64 mts.) instead of required minimum dimension of one side of shaft of 3.00 mts. free of FSI and 1 nos. of AVS counted in FSI for ventilation to 1 no. of toilet with Cross-section area adm. 0.60 sq.mts. instead of required 9.00 sq.mts. & Width of (0.40 mts. x 1.50 mts.) instead of required minimum dimension of one side of shaft of 3.00 mts., mainly due to planning constraints in re-accommodation of existing society members having flats with specific size, hence requested to allow the same may be allowed by charging premium.

In view of above justification of Architect, Ch.E.(DP)/Hon'ble M.C.'s approval is requested

- (a) to allow 2 nos. of AVS for ventilation to toilets of Cross-section area 7.57 mts. instead of required 9.00 mts. & having Width of (1.25 mts. x 2.85mts.) + (2.45 mts. x 1.64 mts.) instead of required minimum dimension of one side of shaft of 3.00 mts. free of F.S.I. by charging premium as per policy.
- (b) to allow 1 nos. of AVS counted in FSI for ventilation to 1 no. of toilet with Cross-section area adm. 0.60 sq.mts. instead of required 9.00 sq.mts. & Width of (0.40 mts. x 1.50 mts.) instead of required minimum dimension of one side of shaft of 3.00 mts. by charging premium, due to planning constraints as per Reg. 6(b) of DCPR 2034.

	<p>Comments by E.E.B.P. K/Ward</p> <p>In view of justification by Architect and comments by A.E.(B.P.), submitted for approval of Ch.Eng.(DP)/Hon'ble M.C.</p> <p>(a) to allow 2 nos. of AVS for ventilation to toilets of Cross-section area 7.57 mts. instead of required 9.00 mts. & having Width of (1.25 mts. x 2.85mts.) + (2.45 mts. x 1.64 mts.) instead of required minimum dimension of one side of shaft of 3.00 mts. free of F.S.I. by charging premium as per policy.</p> <p>(b) to allow 1 nos. of AVS counted in FSI for ventilation to 1 no. of toilet with Cross-section area adm. 0.60 sq.mts. instead of required 9.00 sq.mts. & Width of (0.40 mts. x 1.50 mts.) instead of required minimum dimension of one side of shaft of 3.00 mts. by charging premium, due to planning constraints as per Reg. 6(b) of DCPR 2034.</p>
--	---

Submitted Please.

A.E.(B.P.) K/W

E.E.(B.P.) 'K' Ward

Dy. Ch. E. (B.P.)W.S.-I

Ch. Eng. (D.P.)

Hon'ble M.C.

Sir,