

C O N F I D E N T I A L

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY.

Minutes of the ninth meeting of the Advisory Council of the Delhi Development Authority held on Tuesday the 28th March 1961, at 9 A.M., in the Committee Room of the Old Secretariat, Delhi.

\*\*\*\*\*

PRESENT:

- |      |  |     |           |
|------|--|-----|-----------|
| (1)  | Shri Bhagwan Sahay,<br>Chief Commissioner, Delhi   | ... | President |
| (2)  | " Radha Raman, M.P.  | ... | Member    |
| (3)  | " R.P.N. Sinha, M.P.   | ... | "         |
| (4)  | " Brij Kishan Chandiwala.  | ... | "         |
| (5)  | " Bhagwan Datt Wadhwa  | ... | "         |
| (6)  | " R.L. Batra.  | ... | "         |
| (7)  | " Prahlad Sharan.  | ... | "         |
| (8)  | " R.K. Bhardwaj.   | ... | "         |
| (9)  | " Tilak Raj Chachra.   | ... | "         |
| (10) | " M.L. Mittal.   | ... | "         |
| (11) | Lt, Col, M.S. Boparai,<br>Health Officer,<br>Municipal Corporation of Delhi.   |     | "         |
| (12) | Shri C.P. Malik,<br>Director,<br>National Buildings Organization,<br>(Ministry of Works, Housing & Supply).                  |     | "         |
| (13) | Dr. K.L. Rao,<br>Member, Central Water & Power Commission,<br>(Ministry of Irrigation & Power).                              |     | "         |
| (14) | Shri K.K. Gamkhar,<br>for Director,<br>Military Lands & Cantonments,<br>(Ministry of Defence).                               |     | "         |
| (15) | " R.L. Bhagat,<br>for Shri H.P. Sinha,<br>Consulting Engineer (Road Development),<br>Ministry of Transport & Communications. |     | "         |

Members of the Board appointed by the Delhi Development Authority to hear and consider objections/suggestions to the Draft Master Plan - present by special invitation:

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| (1) | Shri C.K. Nair, M.P.   |
| (2) | " Sikandar Lal.  |
| (3) | " Balbir Singh Saigal,<br>Engineer-Member,<br>Delhi Development Authority. |

Also present:

- (1) Shri G. Mukharji,  
Vice-Chairman,  
Delhi Development Authority.
- (2) " Bishan Chand,  
Finance & Accounts Member,  
Delhi Development Authority.
- (3) " Kulwant Singh,  
Secretary,  
Delhi Development Authority.
- (4) " M.L. Gupta,  
Officer on Special Duty,  
Delhi Development Authority.
- (5) " R.R. Dhir,  
Executive Officer,  
Delhi Development Authority.
- (6) " S.N. Prasad,  
Architect-Town Planner,  
Town Planning Organisation.
- (7) " C.S. Gupte,  
Architect,  
Town Planning Organisation.

---

1. Minutes of the eighth meeting of the Advisory Council held on 22nd March 1961 were confirmed.

2. The consideration of the report and recommendations of the Board appointed by the Delhi Development Authority to hear and consider objections/suggestions to the Draft Master Plan for Delhi was then resumed.

Shri Brij Kishan Chandiwala stated that the implementation of the Plan would be difficult in view of the multiplicity of authorities. There were, he said, nine agencies, e.g. the Ministries of Home, Health, Works Housing & Supply, Land & Development Office, Delhi Administration, Delhi Development Authority, Municipal Corporation of Delhi, etc., beside three others and there was no co-ordination among them. The population of Delhi increases by about one lakh persons every year, out of which about 50,000 to 70,000 people come from outside. That means that during the last decade 6 lakhs to 7 lakhs persons had come to Delhi from other places. The population of Delhi city is expanding and the rural population is only 3 lakhs. It was necessary he said to devise ways and means as to how the internal population and that coming from outside should be housed. 4,000 tenements had been constructed for slum dwellers and 3,000 of them had been occupied by persons for whom these tenements were not intended, the slum dwellers

not having the capacity to pay the rent, and thus about Rs. 40,000/- per mensem was being wasted on subsidy. He suggested the giving of plots on no-profit-no-loss basis to people and then they would willingly move out and would surrender their houses in the city. Removal of slum dwellers to far off places, he said, would deprive them of their means of livelihood.

3. The Chief Commissioner explained that in Delhi there were two main agencies (1) the New Delhi Municipal Committee, exercising control over a limited area which was owned by Government, and (2) the Municipal Corporation of Delhi, which exercises jurisdiction in urban and rural areas. The Corporation was faced with a stupendous task of providing electricity, transport and water facilities to lakhs of people, and the Corporation had already been provided with Rs. 35 crores or Rs. 40 crores by Government for the internal services, i.e. electricity, water, etc., during the next five years, and now the question was of the effective functioning of the Corporation within the frame-work of legislation to solve these problems. The most important question, the Chief Commissioner said, was that of land development and allotment of land. The development had been entrusted to various agencies, the Corporation had been asked to develop land for slum clearance, jhuggies and jhonprres scheme and for flatted factories. Some land, after acquisition, would also be given to the Delhi Development Authority for development to be made available to the public in the form of plots. The Chief Commissioner had been vested with all the powers of the various Ministries of the Government of India in the matter of acquisition and development of land. The Chief Commissioner said that basically, he had felt no difficulty with any agency, for every agency had been given sufficient work to keep it busy to the utmost.

4. Shri R.P.N. Sinha, M.P., suggested that with a view to avoiding any obstruction in the implementation of the Plan from any quarter, e.g. from the Corporation, etc., the Delhi Development Authority, on whom was laid the duty of securing development of Delhi according to the Plan, should have over-riding powers. The Chief Commissioner was of the view, however, that over-riding power was not necessary and that co-ordination and co-operation followed from areas ability to make one's ideas acceptable to others and that democracy essentially meant functioning by compromise.

5. Shri Chandiwala suggested the imposition of some sort of restrictions on the migration and settlement of people from outside in Delhi. This, however, it was explained to him, was not possible in view of the Constitution of India. As regards arrangements for their housing, the Chief Commissioner was of the view that these arrangements might be made at some places on the outskirts of the city by providing say 20 or more acres of land in 10 different places, where the basic facilities in the way of roads, latrines, etc. could be provided and people could build their huts. Shri Prahlad Sharan observed that if these people lived 6 to 8 miles away there would be the question of their livelihood and also the transport problem. It was

explained that the city was expanding so that people would be able to find employment near their place of habitation and besides flatted factories were proposed near residential areas. It was considered that the important question was to prepare correct layouts and have reservations of roads, schools, dispensaries, etc., and development on a sub-standard basis which could be improved when the resources of people increased and that in the meanwhile people might live in jhugies of their own in these sites. It was suggested that these sites should be marked on the Plan.

6. Lt. Col. Boparai stated that certain dumping sites had been proposed in the Draft Master Plan for sanitary land fill in urbanised areas. He observed that the use of domestic refuse and city refuse for filling sites in urban areas would be objectionable and that these sites should be used exclusively for dumping malba only and that in rural areas filling by domestic refuse and city refuse could be resorted to and that for this purpose dumping sites a little outside the urban area, i.e. in rural areas should be selected. The Chief Commissioner observed that Municipal refuse should go to the rural area for composting and that it would be a waste to use the city refuse for city land filling.

7. Shri Tilak Raj Chachra observed that certain proposals made by the Municipal Corporation of Delhi in their objection (NO: 418) had been rejected by the Board and that as these proposals were weightly they should be reconsidered and accepted. He referred to items Nos.10 and 11 on page 10, item No.20 at page 12, item No.28 at page 13 and item No.48 on page 15 of the recommendations, which were all explained to him. He also referred to objection No.233 at page 8 of the recommendations relating to the Saraswati Garden, and said that 75 to 80 per cent portion of this colony had been built up and the rest of the area fell within the green belt. He suggested the making of minor adjustments in the green belt to save the built up area. This was agreed to.

8. Shri Bhagwan Datt Wadhwa stated that the three house building co-operative societies, namely the Gujranwala, Dera Ismail Khan and the State Bank of India Employees House Building Co-operative Societies, had during the last 12 years paid about Rs.25 lakhs to Government on the purchase of land from the Ministry of Rehabilitation, etc., and that if their lands were acquired and plots were given to them on lease-hold basis they would be put to a heavy loss. The Chief Commissioner explained to him that Government, as the main provider of funds for the development of land, was entitled to raise resources from unearned increment in the value of land on transfer. Shri Wadhwa suggested exclusion of a part of the land of the Dera Ismail Khan House Building Co-operative Society from the green belt to avoid settlement of some families at some other place. The Chief Commissioner said that the question of the exclusion of the said area from the green belt was merely a question of adjustment and might be considered.

9. Shri Tilak Raj Chachra referred to item No.42 in the Corporation's objection at page 14 of the recommendations and said that the proposal had been rejected by the Board, vide recommendation against objection No.373 at page 33,

one of the main grounds given being that the width of the land between the Delhi-Mathura Road and the railway track was very narrow. He said that near Moti Nagar there were small scale industries on a very narrow track of land and suggested allowing use of this area too for industrial purposes, especially in view of the industrial development on the Punjab border.

10. Dr. R.K. Bhardwaj suggested that the Delhi Cloth Mills area had been shown in the Plan as earmarked for flatted factories but that there was a Mohalla called 'Beri Wala' there, and that similarly in Pul Bangash area which, also, had been shown for flatted factories there was a 'Naya Mohalla'. He suggested that both these Mohallas be retained as residential.

/would be  
allowed for  
development  
and three  
years

11. Shri R.P.N. Sinha, M.P., referred to objection No.551 at page 28 of the recommendations and asked what objection there was if any individual wanted to develop his land under acquisition proceedings according to Plan. It was explained to him by the Chief Commissioner that the owner should have developed his land long ago and that Government was acquiring only the land that had not yet been developed. The Chief Commissioner further explained that Government was acquiring the whole land from the owners for the purpose of giving, on the basis of sanctioned layouts, to Co-operative societies and any land remaining would be developed by Government. The land would be allotted on a lease-hold basis, and two years/ for house building, and permission of Government would be necessary to transfer the land. The key-note of the new land policy was that there would be no unrestricted freedom to own land and that the ownership would pass to Government, but every individual whose land was being acquired would be given a plot of land. The funds raised by unearned increment would be utilised for re-investment in the city of Delhi. This was the effective check to land speculation.

12. Shri Radha Raman expressed the fear that the co-operative societies, who own land (on a free-hold basis) which was being acquired, might join hands and start litigating. It was, however, explained that there were High Court rulings that the acquisition of land in Delhi for construction of houses was a public purpose and that the question of the payment of compensation for lands to be acquired would be speeded up. Shri Radha Raman suggested in this connection that compensation might be kept by Government and adjusted against the price of the plot to be allotted to the individual. It was explained to him that it was open to the individual voluntarily to make an application. As regards the rate at which raw land will be given to co-operative societies whose land was under acquisition it was explained to him that this would be on the basis of premium for lease-hold - cost of acquisition plus a certain amount and annual ground rent. Shri Tilak Raj Chachra stated that despite the land acquisition notification even now transfers of proprietary rights in lands were taking place, and that at some places structures were also coming up. It was also stated in the meeting that in broad areas notified for acquisition, little strips of land here and there belonging to Custodian of Evacuee Property had been disposed of to private individuals,

and that those pockets would also have to be acquired for making a proper layout plan for the whole area. Shri Radha Raman suggested the issue of a Press Note stating that the policy of Government for the future had been defined that no land would be allotted except on lease and that any person who purchased land which had been notified for acquisition under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, would suffer.

13. Shri R.L. Batra referred to item No.21 in the Corporation's objection at page 12 and objection No.245 on page 35 relating to the Motia Khan - Jhandewala area, and stated that 3 or 4 years ago the Corporation had purchased 3.5 acres of land from the Delhi Improvement Trust for the construction of sweepers quarters but that this land had been shown as green area in the proposed Plan which would cause complications.

The area bounded by the Desh Bandhu Gupta Road, Mondhewala Road and the Idgah Road has been proposed in the Plan for flatted industries, residential purposes and on the ground floor there would be showrooms. Shri Batra stated that about 700 people were engaged in heavy and small scale industries in this area whom it was proposed to shift. He wanted, however, these dealers to be accommodated on the spot.

14. Shri R.L. Bhagat (Ministry of Transport) referred to item No.33 in the objection from the Ministry of Transport at page 68 and said that the proposed right-of-way for the outer ring road, viz. 210 ft. would be inadequate and that this width should be 250 ft. as proposed by the Ministry. It was explained to him that this would involve the dismantling of some houses and that on the ring road in Lajpat Nagar the size of the bungalow plots had already been reduced when 60 ft. of land had been taken away for the widening of the road, and that, therefore, further widening of the road was not feasible. As regards the new alignment of the road from Pusa Gate to Naraina village near the firing range it was stated on behalf of the Town Planning Organization that this had already been taken into account. Shri Bhagat also objected to the extension of the road from the Wazirabad barrage to Sahibabad being called a national highway as the Alipore Road was being developed as a National Highway.

15. Shri Radha Raman referred to objection Nos.244 and 469 at page 1 and said that the Board had recommended one furlong belt to the north of the G.T. Road to the Loni Road upto the new proposed road near the Delhi U.P. Border to be declared industrial area. In view of the fact that industry was developing on the U.P. border he suggested the giving of two furlong depth instead of one furlong on the Loni Road. He also referred to objection No.266 from the Corporation at page 8 relating to the land use of the area lying between the Mathura Road and the railway line from the Okhla Railway Station to the Delhi-Punjab border and suggested that this should be allowed for industrial use. He said that the Board had rejected the representation from the co-operative society on the ground of this being a narrow strip but that this principle had been departed from at other places.

The co-operative society had sunk money on the purchase of this land and he suggested that the members of the society should either be promised better accommodation elsewhere or allowed to use this very piece of land for industrial purposes on such conditions as might be considered necessary, e.g. service road etc. Referring to objection No.223 at page 7 relating to Anand Parbat area, Shri Radha Raman suggested that some industries which would suffer by shifting from this place might be retained there. It was explained that although this was a very congested place and there was heavy traffic on the road and therefore no place for industries, yet to accommodate as many industries as possible in this area, the Board had recommended redevelopment of the area.

16. On the question of non-conformity areas Shri Radha Raman wanted the policy to be made clearer. He said that as further expansion would not be allowed, the entire working of these factories would be affected. The Chief Commissioner explained that no facility would be extended to make the non-conforming use increase and that in 5 to 10 years they would have to shift to the place provided for them where there would be room for them for legitimate expansion. Regarding co-operatives and individual ownership Shri Radha Raman suggested the announcement of the policy to the adversely affected persons by a Press Note, and the giving of correct directions and advice for the future to the bonafide societies. It was explained to him that the criterion and terms of allotment of land would be such that the societies whose aim was exploitation would not be able to succeed in their purpose.

17. Regarding the requirement of an affidavit that the applicant for a plot does not own either in his own name or in the name of any of his dependents, a house or a plot in Delhi or in New Delhi, the Chief Commissioner explained that the idea was not to debar such persons for ever and that it was only on account of the limited number of plots available at present that the restriction was being imposed. A question was raised whether the owners of houses in slum areas will be shown any preference over owners in developed area. This point was noted for consideration.

18. Shri Radha Raman stated that in rural areas where an individual owns say 2 or 4 acres of land, the Corporation bye-laws did not allow him to build a house. It was explained to him that the fear was that in the name of a farm-house the place might be turned into a colony and that what was required was that the rules should be such that the character of the farm should not be disturbed and the owner should be able to live on the farm.

19. Shri R.L. Wadhwa referred to objection No.329 from the Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Shanker Road, New Delhi, at page 30 and stated that this land had been allotted to the Sabha by the Ministry of Rehabilitation and a temple was already in existence and that the proposed widening of the Shankar Road would involve the dismantling of existing buildings thereby causing a loss of several lakhs of rupees. It was decided that the site might be visited again.

20. Dr. R.K. Bhardwaj wanted to know by what time and by what agency would 8,000 acres of land being acquired immediately would be developed. He was informed by the Chief Commissioner that the whole matter would be explained in a Press Conference.

21. Shri Brij Kishan Chandiwalla observed that comparisons with the border states were inappropriate in as much as their areas were much bigger, while the whole territory of Delhi was not equal to one of their Tehsils and that proposals for industrialisation etc. should be made according to the size of the territory. He also observed that whereas the cause of the co-operatives and factories had been pleaded there is no mention of the common man and the slum dwellers of whom there were 2.5 lakhs in the city and 7 lakhs in jhuggies also needed to be taken care of. The Chief Commissioner explained that for the next five years money had been given to the Corporation for solving this problem and now it was for the Corporation to execute the necessary schemes. Shri Chandiwalla suggested that in the interest of the livelihood of the poor man he should not be removed from the place where he was living at present. The Chief Commissioner was of the view that spaces for the poor should be near the city and they should be housed in 3 or 4 storey buildings. The public demand was about land use for residential purposes near the place of work, but there were practical difficulties, e.g. the question arose whether on the Minto Road, which is an expansive land, there should be offices or houses for slum dwellers.

\*\*\*\*\*

*Bhuvan Singh*

President,  
Advisory Council  
of the Delhi Development Authority

*Bw*

20/8/62