

From: Harpal Singh, CN 209, Rangpuri Pahari, Malikpur Kohi, N.D. 110037

944

18.11.2011

OFFICE OF THE DIR (Pg.)
M.P.R./T.C. D.D.A. N. DELHI-2
Dy. No. 1.M.M.S.
Dated 18/11/11
The Director (Planning) MPR
Delhi Development Authority
Sixth Floor, Vikas Minar, I.P. Estate, New Delhi - 110002

Subject: Advertisement for 'Inviting Public Suggestions for Mid-Term Review for MPD 2021', dated 04/10/2011
Ref. Letter from Ms Gita Dewan Verma on the subject 'MPD-2021 review' dated 11/11/11

1. This is in continuation of the letter under reference. My detailed objections/suggestions mentioned in para 5b(i) of the said letter were on Chapter 4 'Shelter. My response was one of the (7000-611 = 6389) responses for which hearing was not duly arranged. It is pertinent that main contention of my objections was that the proposals are misconceived, being based on the incorrect premise that "The rapid and almost uncontrolled growth of population has put these facilities under severe pressure, and there are significant deficiencies." I had pointed out that:

"If statistics and estimates of DMP 2001 are added to the draft MPD 2021 Table (page 162 in Hindi /374 in English), it becomes obvious that the problem is on account not of any runaway population growth but of non-implementation of explicit Plan targets inasmuch as that the requirement projected in DMP 2001 is consistent with the requirement in 2001 as set out in DMP 2021. Now it is notable that for water and sewerage the requirement projected for 2021 in DMP 2021 is more or less the same as that projected for 2001 in DMP 2001 even as the population estimate is hugely different..."

DMP 2001 page 29		DMP 2021 page 162 Hindi/374 English				
Available	Required	Projected	Achieved	Available	Required	Projected
1981	1981	2001	1981-2001	2001	2001	2021
Water (mgd)	253	496	1127	397	650	1150
Sewerage (mgd)	118	397	902	396	512	920
Power (mw)	650	4000	4000	2352	3265	8800
Solid waste (ton/day)	2058	2568	6735	3485	5543	15750
						10207

I had suggested deletion of remark blaming "uncontrolled growth" and appropriate corrections acknowledging implementation failures in premise. I had also made specific suggestions for water supply and drainage proposals acknowledging carrying capacity and topographic constraints of environmentally sensitive (CGWA, notified ridge etc.)

Handwritten notes and signatures in blue ink at the top right of the page, including the name 'D. D. Mohr' and dates like '23/11/11'.

areas, electricity proposals acknowledging the development finance policy implication of supply privatization etc.

2. MPD 2001 had also envisaged MPD monitoring and review, However, the required monitoring was not carried out and the MPD 2001 was prepared also without proper surveys of ground reality. Further, although the MPD 2001 had not precluded public inputs in monitoring, submissions like mine that highlighted the inconsistencies in the plan document were not considered. For example the information provided in a group of matters including mine before CIC (assisted by Er. Sarbajit Roy and Dr. Poonam Prakash) disclosed that for the objections/suggestions received on the draft MPD 2001 only the 'summaries', prepared and classified chapter wise by the MPPR office, were put up to the Board. In particular, in my case, no hearing notice was received.

3. MPD 2021 has clear provisions for how the monitoring based review is to be carried out in which there appears to be no role for public monitoring. Since 2007, the required mechanism for monitoring, as per the stipulated provisions in the MPD 2021 for management action groups, monitoring unit and high level committee for monitoring and review, have already been implemented and the relevant monitoring and review data is expected to be available with them. As my objections/suggestions for draft MPD 2021 were not duly considered, I would like to recast and resubmit the same for the ongoing review process for which the following information be provided to me:

- i) data related to review and monitoring so far available for Chapter 14 "Physical infrastructure";
- ii) All relevant records (documents/information/minutes/decisions) of high level committee, all management groups especially the management action group on Infrastructure Development Group, Enforcement and Plan Monitoring Group, Local Level Participatory Planning Group, Spatial data Infrastructure Group.

Harpal Singh

Encl: Letter by Ms Gita Dewan Verma dated 11/11/2011

Cc: Mrs Gita Dewan Verma and others as in the endorsement of the letter dt. 11/11/11

11/11/11

249

From: Gita Dewan Verma
1356, D-1 Vasant Kunj, ND 110070; Ph 26895840, 26132921

To: Director (Pig) MPR, DDA, 6th Floor, Vikas Minar, IP Estate, ND 110002

Sub: MPD-2021 review

Ref: i. DDA advertisement dt.04/10/11 [copy enclosed]

ii. Indian Express news item dt.12/10/11 [copy enclosed]

ii. HT news item dt.11/11/11 [copy enclosed]

Sir,

The "advertisement" u/r requests [members of the] public "to send their valuable suggestions / views in writing on specific aspects of the plan for consideration during the Mid-Term Review exercise to Director (Pig) MPR". The news dt.12/10/11 u/r quotes, "Committees will be formed to look into feasibility of these suggestions before they are included or rejected". The news dt.11/11/11 u/r conveys post-review MPD modifications will be effected next year. The "advertisement" -- saying MPD-2021 "emphasizes on public participation and Periodic / Mid-Term Review" -- gives the impression that MPD-2021 envisages it. However, in my view such solicitation runs **contrary to MPD-2021 & DDA Act** [para 2 & 3 herein], and suggestions are **neither feasible nor amenable to action by Dir.(Pig)** [para 4 & 5 herein].

2. GOI notification No.S.O.141(E) dt.07/02/07 of MPD-2021 refers to public / community participation only at the 'local area planning' level proposed in it. On the other hand, MPD monitoring & review is envisaged as a technical task "through indicators of physical and socio-economic changes" [Para 18.2] to be done by a "high-level committee" [Para-18.3] with help of [Para-18.5] a "dedicated Monitoring Unit" [Para-18.3] and 10 "Management Action Groups" [Para-18.4] -- and not of public suggestions / views.

3. DD Act has no provision for MPD 'monitoring' or 'review' *per se*, but 'monitoring' is implicit / pre-requisite to powers vested in GOI under S.42 [Returns and inspection] to "call for reports, returns, and other information ... in regard to the implementation of the master plan" etc. The MPD review mechanism proposed in MPD-2021 is within ambit of DD Act, subject to the provisions of S.5A [Constitution of Committees] for constituting the 'High-Level Committee' of S.4 [Staff of the Authority] for setting up the 'Monitoring

' In 'INTRODUCTION' itself, distinctions are made between public-private and community participation [vision" stated in Para-3], between "a co-ordinated and integrated approach..." and "a participatory planning process at local levels" [Para-2], and between "Performance oriented planning" and "Decentralised local area planning by participatory approach" [Para-20 (b)]. Chapters on various uses mention public / community participation only for specified 'local area' aspects -- e.g: redevelopment of slum & JJ clusters, resettlement colonies and unauthorized colonies "by ensuring participation of the inhabitants" [Para-3.3.1.3A], redevelopment of unplanned industrial areas "with the participation of the owners / entrepreneur in a systematic manner" [Para-7.6.2], "more community participation and decentralised management" for performance improvements in physical infrastructure [Para-14.0], etc -- and final chapter "18.PLAN REVIEW AND MONITORING" enumerates "Major Issues" [Para-18.2] in 3 sets -- planning, implementation and monitoring & review -- mentioning participation in relation to 'local area' level implementation only..

940

i. Public notice dt.08/04/05 (draft MPD-2021): MPD-2021 notification says that "about 7000" responses were received and for "about 611" hearing was arranged. I was invited for hearing although I had not sent any objections / suggestions. Others (including S/Sh Ajit Singh, Badri Prasad, Hoti Lal, Harpal Singh, Sant Lal, Samay Singh & Rajinder Singh) who had consulted me and sent detailed / specific responses were denied hearing and later came to know (in RTI process) that their responses had either gone missing or were otherwise not duly considered. Er.Sarbajit Roy, who was invited for hearing, was denied the information including access to record of all the responses that he had requested in advance.

ii. Public notice dt.31/08/05 (CLU at Tehkhand): My response was mixed up with MPD-2021 responses and misplaced in MPR office and I was later given special hearing by court order.

iii. Public notice dt.28/07/06 (CLU at Vasant Kunj): My response was misplaced, perhaps in same way.

iv. Public notices dt.20/04/08 & 16/05/08 (mixed use provisions): My responses marked "STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL - TO BE OPENED ONLY IF I GIVE CONSENT IN WRITING AFTER RECEIVING INFORMATION RELATING TO PROCEDURE ..." were opened by MPR office without my consent.

v. Public notice dt.09/06/08 (controls for hotels): My response was misplaced and I was otherwise issued on 17/07/08 (when I visited MPR office and the copies enclosed with para-4 herein were provided to me) invitation for the hearing on 18/07/08.

vi. Public notice dt.11/01/09 (EWS reservation in housing): S/Sh Indrajit Singh, Navin & Rajinder Singh who had sent detailed responses after consulting me did not receive intimation for hearing. Sh Indrajit Singh later came to know in RTI process that their responses were on file along with those of several others' all of whom had sent copy of same response.

vii. Public notices of July-September 2011: At the hearings held on 02/11/11 for one recent and two earlier public notices (whereat I was present for the earlier notices) the Board, after Dr.Poonam Prakash brought to notice of the Board that since July the public notices u/S.11A were not even being uploaded in Public Notice section of DDA website, cancelled the hearing in the recent matter and directed re-publishing the notice and enquiry into the lapse in dissemination.

c. On DDA website is found -- besides the Link "Review of MPD2021" on which responses may be posted -- a link "Login for View Suggestion", i.e., suggestions received from public are being viewed by persons having privileged access to the website, identities of whom are not disclosed to public. This is exceptional, especially considering that in the matter of Er.Sarbajit Roy cited in sub-para (i) above, access to others' responses was denied for reason of risks from touts / vested interests.

Copy to: Er.Sarbajit Roy, S/Sh Ajit Singh, Badri Prasad, Hoti Lal, Harpal Singh, Indrajit Singh, Navin s/o Sant Ram, Samay Singh & Rajinder Singh and Dr Poonam Prakash -- for information of the references to their matters under para-5(b) above

Enclosed:
1. Copies cited in reference on p. 1 [3 pages]
2. Copies provided by MPR office cited in para 4 on p.2 [6 pages]