

**MINUTES OF 189th MEETING OF THE GOA TOWN & COUNTRY
PLANNING BOARD HELD ON 11/08/2023 AT 4.00 P.M. IN
CONFERENCE HALL, VAN BHAVAN, ALTINHO, PANAJI.**

The following attended the meeting:

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|------------------|
| 1. | Shri. Vishwajit P. Rane,
Hon. Minister for TCP | ... | Chairman |
| 2. | Shri Rajesh Faldessai,
Hon'ble MLA | ... | Member |
| 3. | Shri Praveen K. Raghav,
Chief Conservator of Forest. | ... | Member |
| 4. | Shri Sandeep Faldessai,
Dy. Director of Agriculture | ... | Member |
| 5. | Shri Raj Naik,
Dy. Director,
Directorate of Health Services | ... | Member |
| 6. | Maria Ferrao,
Surveyor of Works, PWD | ... | Member |
| 7. | Shri Ralph A. S. Barbosa,
Research Assistant, D.P.S.E., Porvorim-Goa. | ... | Member |
| 8. | Capt. Sanjeev Srivastav,
Senior Staff Officer
Works E&I, HQ,
Goa Naval Area, Vasco | ... | Member |
| 9. | Shri Paresh Gaitonde | | Member |
| 10. | Arch. Rajeev M. Sukhthanker | | Member |
| 11. | Shri Ralph De Souza,
President GCCI (Representative) | ... | Member |
| 12. | Shri. Rajesh J. Naik,
Chief Town Planner (Planning). | ... | Member Secretary |

Item No. 1: Confirmation of the Minutes of the 188th meeting of Town & Country Planning Board held on 15/04/2023.

Member Secretary informed that on approval by the Chairman, minutes of 188th meeting of TCP Board held on 15/04/2023 were circulated to the Members vide letter No. 36/1/TCP/484/2023/1730 dtd. 30/05/2023 and the decisions taken have been communicated in respective matters, as there were no comments/suggestions received for the same.

Members took note of the same and accordingly the Minutes of 188th meeting were treated as confirmed.

Item No. 2: Appeal under Section 45(1) of the TCP Act, 1974 filed by Mr. Tony Rodrigues against South Goa Planning and Development Authority. (File No. TP/B/APL/278/2022)

Member Secretary informed that the matter regarding appeal under Section 45(1) of the TCP Act, 1974 filed by Mr. Tony Rodrigues against South Goa Planning and Development Authority was earlier placed before the TCP Board in its 186th meeting held 25/11/2022 under item No. 05 and the Board had decided as under:

“The Member Secretary informed that the Appeal is preferred against Revocation Order issued vide ref.No. SGPDA/P/6403/673/22-23 dated 09/08/2022 regarding Development Permission granted vide ref. No. SGPDA/P/6403/1469/20-21 dated 15/03/2021.

It was further informed that Respondent PDA had granted permission for compound wall under Section 44 of the T.C.P Act, 1974 vide ref. No. SGPDA/P/6403/1469/22-23 dated 15.03.2021 for construction of a compound wall around property bearing Chalta No. 60 P.T. Sheet No. 14 Margao City.

The Appellant states that in order to construct the compound wall, he had submitted construction plan to the South Goa Planning & Development Authority - Margao and the Respondent after perusing the documents and after conducting the site inspection noticed that the said plot is a vacant plot and is affected by 6 meters wide road as per the ODP-2028 on the western side and one more road to eastern side. And whereas, the Appellant in his plan for compound wall had shown 6 meters tarred road on the eastern side, which physically connects the said plot surveyed under Chalta No. 60 of P.T. Sheet No. 14.

The Appellant states that in order to commence with the construction of compound wall, he went to clean the property wherein he was obstructed by the mundkars of the adjoining plot.

The Appellant states that the complaint was lodged by him against the said mundkars before the Fatorda Police Station and also obtained order of Temporary Injunction from Civil Court Margao in Regular Civil Suit No. 208/2021/H, restraining them from interfering and obstructing him.

The Appellant further states that in order to overcome the order of Temporary Injunction of the Civil Court, the said mundkars approached the Member Secretary of South Goa Planning & Development Authority with complaint against him.

The Appellant states that based on the complaint lodged by one Mrs. Caetana Barreto and others, another site inspection was conducted on 18-02-2022 and the Member Secretary of South Goa Planning & Development Authority thereafter issued show cause notice dated 20/05/2022 and Corrigendum dated 24/05/2022 to him and upon receiving the above notice, he replied to the same.

The Appellant states that even after conducting the site inspection and receiving a detailed explanatory reply, the Respondent issued the Revocation Order dated 09.08.2022 bearing ref. No. SGPDA/P/6403/673/22-23.

Appellant states that upon receiving the Revocation Order dated 09.08.2022, he immediately sought legal advice and has preferred the present appeal under Section 45(1) of the Goa, Daman and Diu Town and Country Planning Act, 1974 on the below mentioned grounds.

The appeal memo refers to the following grounds:

- 1) The impugned order issued by the SGPDA is arbitrary, perverse illegal and without any proper reasoning.*
- 2) The Respondent failed to appreciate the fact that there is an injunction order of the Civil Judge Junior Division in R.C.S.No.197/2021/H which is operating against the mundkars of the adjoining plot restraining them from interfering with the Appellant.*
- 3) The Respondent even after conducting the site inspection failed to appreciate the existence of 6 meters wide tarred road on eastern side of the property bearing Chalta No. 60 P.T. Sheet No. 14 Margao City.*
- 4) The Respondent failed to appreciate the fact that there is 6 meters wide proposed road as per the ODP-2028 on the western side of property bearing Chalta No. 60 P.T. Sheet No. 14 Margao City.*
- 5) The Respondent failed to appreciate the fact that the road connecting on the eastern side of property bearing Chalta No. 60 P.T. Sheet No. 14 Margao City is 6 meters tarred road and is a public road tarred with public funds and underneath there is sewerage pipeline.*

- 6) *The Respondent has failed to verify their own records in order to appreciate the fact that the Respondent themselves have carried out site inspection and approved the plans submitted by the Appellant therefore the impugned order issued against the Appellant is perverse to their own acts.*
- 7) *The Respondent has conducted site inspection and the existence of the road on the eastern side of the property bearing Chalta No. 60 P.T. Sheet No. 14 Margao City is admitted in their records therefore the Respondent has drastically committed an error in holding that on the eastern side of property bearing Chalta No. 60 P.T. Sheet No. 14 Margao City lies private property of the complainant.*

The Appellant states that cause of action arose on 10-08-2022 when he received the impugned Order bearing ref. No. SGPDA/P/6403/673/22-23 and hence the appeal is filed within the period of limitation.

The Appellant has therefore prayed for the following:

- (a) *The appeal be allowed.*
- (b) *The impugned Order under ref.No. SGPDA/P/6403/673/22-23 dated 09-08-2022 be quashed and set aside;*
- (c) *Necessary and appropriate compensation be granted to the Appellant or be directed to be paid to the Appellant by the Respondent for causing unnecessary harassments and mental torture to the Appellant; and*

During the hearing, Adv. Jagannath Sambari represented the Appellant, whereas Member Secretary Shri Shaikh Ali Ahmed was present on behalf of South Goa PDA.

The Appellant argued that although he had validly obtained the development permission for the construction of the compound wall, the same was revoked by the PDA by citing the reason that there is no 6.00 mts. road shown on eastern side of the property as per ODP-2028 and by further stating that 6.00 mts. wide road shown on the eastern side of the property by providing road widening area, is not as per provision of the ODP and that part of property of Chalta No. 61 of P.T. Sheet No. 14 is also shown as road by him.

The Appellant further stated that he had submitted the plans by showing the accessibility to his plot as existing on site, as per which, the width of road on eastern side is 6.00 mts. The Appellant also clarified that the same road although not reflected on ODP is existing on site and hence is reflected on site plan.

While arguing on behalf of the Authority, Member Secretary Shri Shaikh Ali Ahmed stated that while replying to the Revocation Order dtd. 9/8/2022, the Appellant has not clarified regarding 6.00 mts. road shown towards eastern side of his property. He further stated that no clear details are provided by the Appellant pertaining to availability of 6.00 mts. road shown towards

eastern side of his property and that the same is also not reflected in ODP – 2021.

After considering the arguments placed before it by both the parties, the Board felt that the Appellant has already reflected the roads as existing on site, which is not denied by the Respondent thus, the Board was of the view that the approval earlier granted by the Authority is valid as it reflects the site condition.

The appeal therefore is allowed by the Board and revocation order issued by the Authority is set aside”.

The Board was further informed that the Government had accorded approval to the recommendation of the Board vide Note No. TP/B/APL/278/2022/85 dated 09/01/2023 and accordingly an Order communicating the decision of the Board was issued by the Chief Town Planner (Planning) & Member Secretary, TCP Board vide ref. No. TP/B/APL/278/2022/260 dated 20/01/2023.

The Board was further informed that an Order dated 25th July 2023 of Hon’ble High Court of Bombay at Goa is now received in the matter of Writ Petition No. 1084 of 2023 (F) filed by Fredy Barreto and anr. v/s State of Goa, through Chief Secretary and 4 others and it is mentioned in the Order that the Respondent Petitioner and contesting parties have agreed by consent that the appeals against the Order of the TCP Board having ref.No. TP/B/APL/278 and TP/B/APL/279, filed by the Respondent No. 4 need to be heard afresh and consequently the Hon’ble High Court has set aside the Orders as passed by the Board in the appeal matters and have therefore remitted the appeals back to the Board with the directions to hear the Respondent No. 4 original Appellant as well as the Petitioners, who are the original complainants.

The Board took note of the order passed by the Hon’ble High Court and accordingly directed the Member Secretary to issue notices to all the concerned parties including the complainant, on whose complaint, order of revocation was passed by the South Goa Planning and Development Authority, to remain present for hearing in the matter on receipt of notices.

Item No. 3: Appeal under Section 45(1) of the TCP Act, 1974 filed by Mr. Tony Rodrigues against South Goa Planning and Development Authority. (File No. TP/B/APL/279/2022)

Member Secretary informed that the matter regarding appeal under Section 45(1) of the TCP Act, 1974 filed by Mr. Tony Rodrigues against South Goa Planning and Development Authority was earlier placed before the TCP Board in its 186th meeting held 25/11/2022 under item No. 06 and the Board had decided as under:

The deliberations in the matter and the decision of the Board is as under:-

“The Member Secretary informed that the Appeal is preferred against the Revocation Order vide ref. No. SGPDA/P/6403/673/22-23 dated 09/08/2022 regarding Development Permission No. SGPDA/P/6403/1469/20-21 dtd. 15/03/2021.

It was further informed that Respondent PDA had granted permission for compound wall under Section 44 of the T.C.P Act, 1974 vide ref. No. SGPDA/P/6403/1469/20-21 dated 15.03.2021 for construction of a compound wall around property bearing Chalta No. 61, P.T. Sheet No. 14 Margao City.

The Appellant states that in order to construct the compound wall he had submitted the construction plan to the South Goa Planning & Development Authority the Margao and the Respondent after perusing the documents and after conducting the site inspection noticed that the said plot is a vacant plot and is affected by 6 meters wide road as per the ODP-2028 on the western side and one more road to eastern side. And whereas, the Appellant in his plan for compound wall had shown 6 meters wide tarred road on the eastern side, which physically connects the said plot surveyed under Chalta No. 61 of P.T. Sheet No. 14.

The Appellant states that in order to commence with the construction of compound wall, he went to clean the above property wherein he was obstructed by the mundkars of the adjoining plot.

The Appellant states that the complaint was lodged by him against the said mundkars before the Fatorda Police Station and also obtained order of Temporary Injunction from Civil Court Margao.

The Appellant further states that in order to overcome the order of Temporary Injunction of the Civil Court, the said mundkars approached the Member Secretary of South Goa Planning & Development Authority with complaint against him.

The Appellant states that based on the complaint lodged by one Mrs. Caetana Barreto and others another site inspection was conducted on 18-02-2022 and the Member Secretary of South Goa Planning & Development Authority thereafter issued show cause notice dated 20/05/2022 and Corrigendum dated 24/05/2022 to him and upon receiving the above notice, he replied to the same.

The Appellant states that even after conducting the site inspection and receiving such detailed explanatory reply, the Respondent issued Revocation Order dated 09.08.2022 bearing ref. No. SGPDA/P/6403/673/22-23.

Appellant states that he has given all the clarifications required by the Respondent wherein he informed the Respondent about the approved plan and the construction license, which were issued after perusing the documents and conducting site inspection. The Appellant further states that he informed the Respondent that the complainant, who have complained are trying to harass him without any basis however the Respondent has failed to lend its ears to the contentions put forth by him and proceeded to issue Revocation Order.

Appellant states that upon receiving the Revocation Order dated 09.08.2022, he immediately sought legal advice and has preferred the present appeal under Section 45(1) of the Goa, Daman and Diu Town and Country Planning Act, 1974 on the below mentioned grounds:

The appeal memo refers to the following grounds:

- 1) The impugned order issued by the SGPDA is arbitrary, perverse illegal and without any proper reasoning.*
- 2) The Respondent failed to appreciate the fact that there is an injunction order of the Civil Court passed in R.C.S.No.197/2021/H which is operating against the said mundkars retraining them from interfering with the Appellant.*
- 3) The Respondent failed to appreciate the fact that after discussion with the member secretary the eastern side road as shown on the plan was proposed road in case of any future development and not an existing 6 meters wide road. Therefore the Appellant was directed to maintain 3 meters setback from the centre point of the said road.*
- 4) The Respondent failed to appreciate the fact that the road existing on the eastern side of property bearing Chalta No. 61 P.T. Sheet No. 14 Margao City is a public road tarred with public funds and underneath there is sewerage pipeline.*
- 5) The Respondent has failed to verify their own records in order to appreciate the fact that the Respondent themselves have carried out site inspection and approved the plans submitted by the Appellant therefore the impugned order issued against the Appellant is perverse to their own acts.*

6) That the plans that were approved by the Respondent were after perusing the documents, conducting site inspection and after discussion with the member secretary therefore in case of any objections the Respondent should have directed the Appellant to revise the approved plans. Therefore straight away passing the impugned order of revocation is arbitrary and bad in law.

The Appellant submits that the said Impugned Order is arbitrary, illegal, over sighted, violating the principles of natural justice and hence is liable to be quashed and declared as null and void.

The Appellant states that cause of action arose on 10-08-2022 when he received the impugned Order bearing ref. No. SGPDA/P/6403/673/22-23. and hence the appeal is filed within the period of limitation.

The Appellant therefore has prayed for the following:

- (a) The appeal be allowed.
- (b) The impugned Order 09-08-2022 be quashed and set aside;

During the hearing, Adv. Jagannath Sambari represented the Appellant, whereas Member Secretary Shri Shaikh Ali Ahmed was present on behalf of South Goa PDA.

The Appellant argued that although he had validly obtained the Development Permission for the construction of the compound wall, the same was revoked by the PDA by citing the reason that there is no 6.00 mts. road shown on eastern side of the property as per ODP-2028 and by further stating that 6.00 mts. wide road shown on the eastern side of the property by providing road widening area, is not as per provision of the ODP and that part of property of Chalta No. 61 of P.T. Sheet No. 14 is also shown as road by him.

The Appellant further stated that he had submitted the plans by showing the accessibility to his plot as existing on site and has proposed the road widening area for providing better accessibility and keeping in view the future widening of the same road. The Appellant further stated that the Authority while granting the approval earlier, had appreciated this and accordingly had considered the proposal for approval wherein, road widening area was clearly shown thereby making this road on the eastern side as 6.00 mts., which actually is in the larger interest of the planning.

While arguing on behalf of the Authority, Member Secretary Shri Shaikh Ali Ahmed stated that while replying to the Revocation Order dtd. 9/8/2022, the Appellant has not clarified regarding 6.00 mts. road shown towards eastern side of his property. He further stated that no clear details are provided by the Appellant pertaining to availability of 6.00 mts. road shown towards eastern side of his property and that the same is also not reflected in ODP – 2021.

After considering the arguments placed before it by both the parties, the Board was of the opinion that the plans approved earlier by the Authority was by keeping in view the planning point wherein the scope for widening of the public road is available.

The Board was also of the opinion that the Authority cannot adopt two different views at two different times. The Board therefore was of the opinion that the approval granted earlier was correctly issued and therefore allowed the appeal.

The appeal therefore was dismissed by giving the directions to the Appellant to submit the revised plans before the Respondent PDA by giving necessary clarification about existence of the road vis-à-vis provisions under ODP.

The South Goa PDA was accordingly directed to consider the application for revised plan on receipt of the same”.

The Board was further informed that the Government had accorded approval to the recommendation of the Board vide Note No. TP/B/APL/278/2022/84 dated 09/01/2023 and accordingly an Order communicating the decision of the Board was issued by the Chief Town Planner (Planning) & Member Secretary, TCP Board vide ref. No. TP/B/APL/278/2022/260 dated 20/01/2023.

The Board was further informed that an Order dated 25th July 2023 of Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa is now received in the matter of Writ Petition No. 1084 of 2023 (F) filed by Fredy Barreto and anr. v/s State of Goa, through Chief Secretary and 4 others and it is mentioned in the Order that the Respondent Petitioner and contesting parties have agreed by consent that the appeals against the Order of the TCP Board having ref.No. TP/B/APL/278 and TP/B/APL/279, filed by the Respondent No. 4 need to be heard afresh and consequently the Hon'ble High Court has set aside the Orders as passed by the Board in the appeal matters and have therefore remitted the appeals back to the Board with the directions to hear the Respondent No. 4 original Appellant as well as the Petitioners, who are the original complainants.

The Board took note of the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court and accordingly directed the Member Secretary to issue notices to all the concerned parties including the complainant, on whose complaint, order of revocation was passed by the South Goa Planning and Development Authority, to remain present for hearing in the matter on receipt of notices.

Item No. 4: Regarding proposal received from Mr. Raul Francisco Fernandes for proposed construction of residential building in the property bearing Survey No. 236/1 of village Taleigao, Tiswadi Taluka.

Member Secretary informed that the proposal regarding construction of residential building Block 'A-1' (revised), Block 'A-2', 'A-3' and 'D' in property bearing Survey No. 236/1 of village Taleigao of Tiswadi Taluka of Mr. Raul Francisco Fernandes is forwarded by the North Goa Planning and Development Authority to the Government for decision in the matter.

It was then informed that as per the details issued by the North Goa PDA, the property under reference admeasures an area of 11072 m² and as per ODP 2028 of Taleigao Planning Area, the same is earmarked as "S-2" Settlement zone (80 FAR).

As per the details submitted by the GPPDA, it had earlier granted Development Permission vide Order No. GPPDA/175/TAL/1943/2019 dated 14-03-2019 for repair, alteration and renovation of existing bungalow block 'A' having total built up area of 1208.31 m², whereas the proposal submitted now is for further revision of the same plans i.e. to the revision of building Block 'A' which now comprises of lower ground + two upper floors consisting of living room, dining room, kitchen and 24 bedrooms with attached toilets.

It is noticed that as per the drawings submitted, besides revision of Bungalow, the applicant has also proposed additional block 'A-2' consisting of basement and ground + 3 floors having residential apartment having total built-up area 1926.95 m² and additional bloc 'A-3' having basement, stilt and 3 upper floors having total built-up of 2429.11 m². Beside this, a block 'D' admeasuring area of 1200 m² is also proposed exclusively for parking of 32 cars.

The detail area statement as per the note of North Goa PDA is as under:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	Total area of Plot	11072.00 m2
2	Coverage consumed	27.95%
3	Total Built up area on all floor	8349.78 m2
4	FAR consumed	56%

North Goa PDA has stated that as per their records, earlier Development Permission was granted vide Order No. GPPDA/175/TAL/1943/2019 dated 14-03-2019 for residential bungalow in favor of Mr. Raul Francisco Fernandes and that the present proposal dated 29-09-2022 is also submitted in the name of Mr. Raul Francisco Fernandes. North Goa DPA has however stated that as regards to ownership documents, the applicant had earlier submitted Form I & XIV which contained the following names:

1. Comunidade of Taleigao
2. Infotech Corporation of Goa Ltd., for IT SEZ
3. Goa College of Architecture
4. Janet Gonsalves alias Joanita alias Jeanette Gonsalves

Member Secretary then informed that the NGPDA has stated that the applicant has submitted an affidavit dated 10-12-2018, which states that he is in possession of land admeasuring 11000 m2, bearing Sy. No. 236/1, falling within the limit of Village Panchayat of Taleigao and that as per the records, the name of Comunidade of Taleigao reflects on documentation, including Form I & XIV concerning the said plot. The contents further mentions that in order to amicably resolve the rectification of record and rights, a proposal was put forth before the Comunidade of Taleigao, which was placed before the General Body Meeting of Comunidade held on 28-06-2009 and it was resolved to allot land admeasuring 11,000 m2 in his favor and the said proposal was accepted by the Managing Committee in its meeting held on 12-07-2009.

The Note of the Authority further states that in the meantime, it had received a complaint dated 29-05-2023 from Mr. Xavier De Almeida, stating that Mr. Raul Fernandes has encroached on Comunidade land and has

requested not to grant any permission or renewal license to Mr. Raul Fernandes. It is however stated by the North Goa PDA that the said compliant has been subsequently withdrawn by the complainant vide his letter 07-06-2023.

Member Secretary then informed that the Chairperson of North Goa PDA has referred to the details of the proposal and has taken note of the earlier permission granted by the then Authority in 2019 and has therefore referred the matter to the Government for decision.

The Board was then informed that the Chief Secretary has drawn the attention towards the ownership aspect.

While deliberating on the proposal and on inquiry, Member Secretary informed that the North Goa PDA has not raised any technical observations from planning point of view as regards to FAR, coverage, setback, uses proposed, etc. and as regards to the ownership aspect, it has categorically stated that while granting Development Permissions, the Authority imposes conditions stating that *“the ownership of the property shall be verified by the licencing body before the issuing of the licence”*.

Considering therefore that the initial permission was earlier granted by the then Authority in 2019 and that the ownership aspects are not dealt by the Authority, it was decided that the North Goa PDA shall consider the proposal for grant of Development Permission subject to necessary conditions as imposed by the Authority.

Member Secretary was accordingly directed to communicate the decision of the Board to the North Goa PDA.

Item No. 5: Notification of GIS-Based Zoning Plan for Pernem Taluka under Section 13 of the Goa Town and Country Planning Act 1974.

Member Secretary informed that the Town and Country Planning Department vide Notification published in the Official Gazette Extraordinary Series II, No 24 dated 16th September has notified Sections 17D and 17E under TCP Act, which are pertaining to the Preparation of Zoning Plans and further informed that as per Section 17D of the Town and Country Planning Act,

Government has the power to direct the Chief Town Planner (Planning) to prepare Zoning Plans.

The Board was further informed that Section 17D and 17E of the TCP Act came into force on the 22nd of September 2022 published in the Official Gazette Extraordinary Series 1 No 25 dated 22/09/2022 vide Notification vide ref. No. 21/1/TCP/GTCTPACT/2022/1494.

The Board was then briefed that in its 183rd meeting held on 11/08/2022, it was decided to prepare the Zoning Plans for Kadamba Plateau and Pernem Taluka and the Government had accorded approval for the same on 24/08/2022 and accordingly, a tender for the Preparation of GIS-Based Zoning Plan for Pernem Taluka was floated on 08/02/2023 to the empanelled consultants on the Goa e-tendering website vide ref. No. 40/7/General/TCP/2021/427 dated 08/02/2023 and after the evaluation of the Technical and Financial Bids, Sky Group being the highest-ranked bidder, was awarded the tendered work. The said proposal was approved by the Finance Department.

It was then informed that the Letter of Award for the work of Preparation of GIS-Based Zoning Plan for Pernem Taluka was issued to Sky Group vide ref. No. 40/7/General/TCP/2022 dated 20/04/2023 and the same was acknowledged by the company vide letter dated 24/04/2023 and accordingly a Contract Document for the tendered work was signed with Sky Group on 16/05/2023.

The Board was briefed about the contract document, RFP and following deliverables, timelines, and payment schedule:

Sl	Deliverable	Timeline	Payment Schedule
1	Inception Report	15 days from the commissioning of the project	10%
2	Base map	90 days from approval of the Inception Report	10%
3	Existing Land use Map	90 days from approval of Base map	10%
4	Data Analysis Report	60 days from approval of the Existing Land use Map	15%
5	Draft Master Plan	60 days from approval of the Data Analysis Report	25%

6	Final Master Plan	60 days from receipt of the Committee report on Objections and Suggestions on the Draft Master Plan	30%
---	-------------------	---	-----

Member Secretary then informed that the Consultant had submitted the first deliverable i.e. Inception Report for the referred work on 26/05/2023 vide letter No. SG/UPT/PERNEM/06 dated 26/05/2023 and subsequently, the Consultancy Evaluation & Review Committee (CERC) meeting was convened on 30/05/2023 to discuss the Inception Report and approve the same and that based on the suggestion made by the CERC, the consultants had submitted the revised Inception Report on 08/06/2023.

The Board was also informed that the Consultants have submitted the base maps of the Pernem Taluka vide letter No. SG/UPT/PERNEM/10 dated 07/06/2023, vide inward No. 2195 dated 08/06/2023 and accordingly, CERC meeting was held on 12/06/2023 to discuss on the said deliverables and based on the suggestions made by CERC, revised base maps have been submitted by the Consultants vide their letter dated 19/07/2023.

As required, the Consultants have submitted the Existing Land Use Maps and the Data Analysis Report for the tendered work vide letter No. SG/UPT/PERNEM/13 dated 24/07/2023 and letter No. SG/UPT/PERNEM/14 dated 25/07/2023 respectively and the same was discussed in the CERC meeting held on 1st August 2023.

The Board was then informed that the Consultants have now submitted the Draft Zoning Plan to the Department, which is already deliberated by CERC in its meeting.

Sky Group Consultancy thereafter gave a detailed presentation on the procedure adopted for preparation of draft Zoning Plan. Data analysis carried out based on the information collected from various sources, was also explained by the consultants.

The consultants stated that the Zoning Plan is built up on the recent investment and policies at the State and Centre such as Mumbai Kanyakumari Economic Corridor, Mopa Airport, Goa Logistics and Warehousing Policy – 2023 and Goa Industrial Policy – 2022.

While explaining on the details on the proposals, the consultants informed that population projection – 2051 and also the economic projection – 2051 have been considered while formulating the policies. Also, it was informed that the analysis of land market prices, land suitability were done, which has formed the basis for zoning plan proposals.

While further elaborating on the proposal, the consultant explained on planning principles such as transit oriented development, small city concept and airport corridor based growth, etc.

Other parameters considered by the consultants was about the mobility which highlighted the regional connectivity and modal split of vehicles on NH-66.

The consultants explained that details slope analysis has been carried out using remote sensing digital elevation models images obtained from NRSC which has been used to re-identify areas falling under development and non-development slopes.

The consultants showed the Board members a land suitability map in which different layers such as hazard areas, CRZ areas, NDZ, etc. have been mapped and superimposed to highlight areas that are suitable for development and area which are not suitable for development.

The Board considered the draft Zoning Plan prepared by the Sky Group Consultancy and took note of the procedure undertaken by the Consultants in preparation of Zoning Plan and observed that sufficient care has been taken by the consultants to collect and compile the data collected from different Authorities/Departments and have carried out necessary scientific analysis of the same.

Accordingly, the Board considered the draft Zoning Plan prepared, for notification of the same u/s 12 of the TCP Act, as is required under provisions of the Act.

Member Secretary was accordingly directed to undertake further procedure in this regard.

Item No. 6: Applicability of Section 17(2) of the Town & Country Planning Act, 1974 for the Planning Areas withdrawn from the jurisdiction of Planning & Development Authorities.

Member Secretary informed that under the provisions of Section 18 of the TCP Act, 1974, Planning Areas and their amalgamation/sub-division etc. are declared and on such declaration, the provisions of the TCP Act are applied to such areas and then informed that Section 19 of the TCP Act further provides for withdrawal of the Planning Areas. The extract of the Section 19 of the TCP Act were informed as under:

(2) When a notification is issued under sub-section (1) in respect of any planning area or part thereof — (i) this Act and all rules, regulations, bye-laws, notifications, orders, directions and powers made, issued or conferred under this Act, shall cease to apply to the said area or part and the Planning and Development Authority, if any constituted, under this Act shall cease to have jurisdiction in respect of the said area or part, as the case may be; but where any Planning and Development Authority has been constituted exclusively for such area or part, such Authority shall, on the date of the notification stand dissolved;

The Board was further informed that citing this provision, there are instances wherein the PDAs have withdrawn some of Planning Areas coming under their jurisdiction.

Relevant provisions of the TCP Act as regards to declaration, withdrawal of Planning Areas and constitution of PDAs were then brought to the notice of the Board. It was accordingly informed that once the Planning Areas are declared, the Planning & Development Authorities for such Planning Areas are constituted under Section 20 of the TCP Act, 1974, Accordingly the Government has constituted the following PDAs:

1. North Goa PDA having its jurisdiction over Mapusa Planning Area,

Panaji Planning Area, Taleigao Planning Area and Bambolim Planning Area

2. South Goa PDA having its jurisdiction over Margao Planning Area and Ponda Planning Area
3. Mormugao PDA having its jurisdiction over Sancoale Planning Area, Dabolim Planning Area, Chicolna - Bogmalo Planning Area, Vasco-da-Gama Planning Area and Chicalim Planning Area

The Board was also informed that landuse map and landuse register for such Planning Areas are thereafter prepared by Planning & Development Authorities under Section 26 & 27 of the TCP Act. Outline Development Plans are then prepared under Section 29 of the TCP Act, which states as under:

29. Preparation of Outline Development Plan.— Every Planning and Development Authority shall, as soon as may be, and not later than one year from the date of its constitution or appointment, as the case may be, prepare, after consultation with the concerned local authority or authorities, if any, an Outline Development Plan for the planning area within its jurisdiction and submit it to the Government, through the Board, for provisional approval: Provided that on an application made by the Planning and Development Authority, the Government may, by order extend the aforesaid period by such further period or periods as it thinks fit.

ODPs are accordingly prepared by the PDAs by following the provisions under Section 34 & 35 of the TCP Act and thereafter the said ODPs are approved by the Government under Section 36 of the TCP Act. It was brought to the notice of the Board that once the ODPs are prepared, concerned PDAs have been following only these ODPs to regulate the development and not the Regional Plan for these areas.

Board was then briefed that after obtaining approval of the Goa Town and Country Planning Board and the Government, the North Goa Planning & Development Authority vide Notification No. NGPDA/ODP/CCANP/2404/2022 dated 13/12/2022, published in Official Gazette, Series II, No. 37 dated 15/12/2022 had earlier notified Outline Development Plan for Calangute-Candolim Planning Area - 2025 and Outline Development Plan for Arpora-Nagoa-Parra Planning Area -2030 and whereas, the Government vide

Notification No. 36/1/TCP/443/2022/3406 dated 16/12/2022, published in Official Gazette, Extraordinary No. 4, Series II, No. 37 dated 20/12/2022 had subsequently withdrawn the Planning Areas of Calangute-Candolim and Arpora-Nagoa-Parra.

It was then informed that the directions vide Circular No. 36/1/TCP/443/2022/3462 dtd. 22/12/2022 were then issued to North Goa District Office to strictly follow approved Outline Development Plan of Calangute-Candolim and Arpora-Nagoa-Parra, as mentioned above for scrutinizing/issuing the application for construction, revision, re-construction, sub-division of land, zoning, conversion, etc.

The Board took note that the North Goa PDA has now no jurisdiction over such Planning Areas withdrawn and therefore the functions of issuing Technical Clearances for construction/sub-division for these areas are performed by the North Goa District Office, Town & Country Planning Department, Mapusa as and when the cases pertaining to these areas are referred to or received by the Town & Country Planning Department.

Attention of the Board was drawn to Section 19 of the TCP Act, as per which, once the Planning Area are withdrawn, the Act and all rules, regulations, bye-laws, notifications, orders, directions and powers made, issued or conferred under the Act, shall cease to apply to the said Planning Area withdrawn. Extract of Section 19 was informed as under:

“19. Power to withdraw planning area from operation of the Act.— (1) The Government may, if it is of opinion that it is necessary so to do in the public interest by notification, withdraw from the operation of this Act the whole or part of any planning area.

(2) When a notification is issued under sub-section (1) in respect of any planning area or part thereof—

(i) this Act and all rules, regulations, bye-laws, notifications, orders, directions and powers made, issued or conferred under this Act, shall cease to apply to the said area or part and the Planning and Development Authority, if any constituted, under this Act shall cease to have jurisdiction in respect of the said area or part, as the case may be; but where any Planning and Development Authority has been constituted exclusively for such area or part, such Authority shall, on the date of the notification stand dissolved;”

Member Secretary then informed that as per the instructions issued vide Circular No. 36/1/TCP/443/2022/3462 dtd. 22/12/2022, North Goa District Office of TCP Dept. has been following approved Outline Development Plans for Calangute - Candolim, Arpora-Nagoa-Parra villages for scrutinizing/issuing the permissions for construction, revision, re-construction, sub-division of land, zoning, conversion, etc.

The Member Secretary then brought to the notice of the Board the provisions of Section 17(2) of the TCP Act, which provides for following:

“(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), if the Government is of the opinion that alteration/modification is necessary to be carried out to the regional plan for the purpose of rectifying any inadvertent error that has occurred in the regional plan, and for correction of inconsistent/ incoherent zoning proposals in the regional plan, it may direct the Chief Town Planner (Planning) to carry out such alteration/modification to the regional plan and the Chief Town Planner (Planning) shall by notification in the Official Gazette carry out such alteration/modification to the regional plan in such manner and only to such extent as prescribed.”.

Member Secretary then informed that a Note bearing No. Misc/TCP/2023/858 dtd. 11/7/2023 is received from the office of Hon’ble Minister for TCP, highlighting therein the issues pertaining to applicability of Section 17(2) of TCP Act, to the Planning Areas, which are now withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the PDA through de-notification.

While deliberating on the subject, the Chairman stated that the commitments made through the zoning provisions under the ODPs, such as that for grant of Development Permissions/NOCs, Zoning Certificates, etc., when such withdrawn Planning Areas were under the jurisdiction of PDAs, need to be honoured, as the process of law has been followed for the procedure. However he opined that there are instances wherein corrections/rectifications/modifications to the notified ODPs are also required and for which there has to be a procedure. He further opined that the issue need to be addressed on priority as there are several persons affected by the zoning provisions of ODP as well as that of Regional Plan as was being followed earlier for the Planning Areas withdrawn.

It was therefore decided that while retaining and honouring the zoning provisions under the notified ODPs prepared for the relevant areas/villages, necessary revision to RPG-2021 also needs to be undertaken for these villages, which have now been withdrawn from the Planning Areas.

Member Secretary was accordingly directed to initiate further necessary procedure in this regard.

Item No. 7: Proposal for relaxation of maximum permissible height for remainder of construction of School building at property bearing Sy. No.34/1-B(Part) of Goalim Moula village, Tiswadi Taluka by Sharda Mandir Trust in the plot having an area of 15,500.00m².

Member Secretary informed that a proposal is received from Sharda Mandir Trust through Administrator-Cum-Manager of Sharada Mandir School, Mr. Oscar Gonsalves for construction of School building and compound wall at the property bearing Sy. No.34/1-B(Part) of Goalim Moula village, Tiswadi Taluka in the plot having an area of 15,500.00m².

It was informed that as per the Outline Development Plan for Kadamba Plateau, the plot under reference is earmarked as Public/Semi-Public Institutional (P) with permissible FAR of 100. As per Surface Utilization Plan of Tiswadi Taluka, notified under Regional Plan for Goa - 2021, the said property is earmarked as Settlement zone. The Village Goalim-Moula is classified as VP-1 category with permissible FAR of 80 and with maximum permissible height of 11.50 mts. above stilt floor.

The Board was further informed that as per the records submitted by the applicant, following approvals were earlier issued by Tiswadi Taluka Office of TCP Dept.:

1. Technical Clearance/NOC issued vide No. TIS/9329/GMOULA/TCP/2021/481(A) dtd. 5/3/2021 for proposed construction of School building (part) (Revised plan).
2. Completion Order for School buildings issued based on the approval granted vide No. TIS/9329/GMOULA/TCP/2021/481 dtd. 5/3/2021.
3. Occupancy Certificate issued by Village Panchayat Curca, Bambolim and Talaulim vide ref. No. VP/CBT/2021-22/Occu/434 dtd. 28/6/2021.

4. Conversion Sanad No. RB/CNV/TIS/4/2007 dtd. 3/1/2008 issued by Additional Collector-II, North Goa.

It was further informed that Phase-1 of the building is completed after receipt of all statutory approvals for the construction in portion of land admeasuring an area of 11500 m² with height of 14.00 mts. Whereas, as per the proposal now submitted, additional construction of School building i.e. of Phase-II, is to be taken up in remaining portion of the land having an area of 4000 m², which is zoned as Settlement (S2) zone, wherein maximum permissible height is 11.50 mts.

It is therefore observed that the same property under Sy.No. 34/1-B-1 is having two different zones i.e. Institutional (P) with maximum permissible height of 15.00 mts. and Settlement (S2) with maximum permissible height of 11.50 mts.

A relaxation is therefore sought by the applicant in height from 11.50 mts. to 14.00 mts. for the portion of the building falling under Settlement (S2) zone, to maintain height of the School building as 14.00 mts. as is approved in Phase-I such that a uniform height of 14.00 mts. is attained in Phase-I and Phase-II. The reasoning given by the applicant is to utilize part of the property as Playground and remaining part to be maintained as open spaces. Further, the applicant has stated that they are providing multi-purpose hall for the School in Phase-II development, which necessitates additional height.

The proposal was deliberated at length and it was observed that the applicant, by the present proposal, has proposed extension in the form of two wings, to the existing School building.

The Board took note of the amended regulation under the Goa Land Development and Building Construction Regulations, 2010 notified in Official Gazette (Extraordinary) Series I, No. 18 dtd. 9/8/2023, which states as under:

“(2) The Government on recommendation of the Town and Country Planning Board shall grant additional height and FAR to the proposals on case to case basis in consideration of the locational aspect, nature of development, use proposed, information available and on any such other criteria, if required.

Such relaxation shall however not be relaxed for more than 20% permitted in the prevailing Regulations”.

The Board, in view of the reasoning given by the applicant, and the use of the premises and the development proposed, observed that the present proposal has got the merit to consider of the above provision under 6.1.1(2) and accordingly decided to recommend the proposal for consideration of relaxation of height to 14.00 mts., as proposed by the applicant vide his application dtd. 10/8/2023.

Member secretary was accordingly directed to forward the proposed to the Government for necessary consideration for relaxation of height, as recommended by the Board.

Item No. 8: Regarding guidelines under Section 17A for cutting of hilly land and filling up of low lying land.

Chief Town Planner (Landuse) informed the Board that the Town and Country Planning Department, under 17A of the Town and Country Planning Act, issues NOCs for hill cutting and filling up of low lying areas based on the guidelines that were previously approved by the Board.

The Board was accordingly informed about the guidelines followed till date while considering the proposal u/s 17A and further informed that the said guidelines need to be further modified by considering the practical issues coming up while considering such proposals. The Board was also briefed that there are instances wherein the benefit of doubts and ambiguity in the guidelines is being explored by the culprits engaged in unlawful activities as regards to hill cutting and filling up of low lying land.

CTP (Landuse) placed before the Board the revised guidelines that have been framed by considering the earlier guidelines issued and the issues as referred above.

The board deliberated on the aspects and the problems faced by the department while considering such proposals under Section 17A and the issues faced by the officials of the Department in defending its FIR in the court of law.

After having detail discussion on the same, the following guidelines were finalized for the purpose of considering applications under Section 17A for hill cutting as well as filling up of low lying land.

REVISED/ ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES FOR GRANTING PERMISSION UNDER OF SECTION 17-A OF THE GOA TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT, 1974

GUIDELINES FOR CUTTING OF SLOPING LAND

No development shall be permitted on land having slope of more than 25% (1:4 gradient). No permission for cutting of land under Section 17-A of the Goa Town and Country Planning Act shall be necessary for land having slope of less than 1:10. (Less than 10% slope).

Note: For measurement of slope, protrusions/folding, of limited width may not be taken in isolation.

Requirement for the applicant to submit for such permission when asked permission for construction/sub-division or independent development.

1. Contour plan (interval 1 mts)
2. Survey Plan.
3. Ownership document
4. Longitudiness, and cross-section to explain the proposals of road, retaining wall etc., including building if any. 1:500 plan 1:200
5. Photographs of the sites (with dates) certified.
6. The applicant shall submit the drains showing the existing natural/artificial drains pattern with details. The applicant shall show the alternate drainage pattern with special reference to the linkage to the existing drainage system. The length and breath with volumes of water plan shall also be indicated.
7. Structural Liability Certificate must be obtained to ascertain the structural stability of the proposed retaining walls and foundations of the constructions on slopes having slope between 10%-25%.

1) Guidelines for considering applications of cutting of sloping land having slope between 10% to 20%.

- i) Permission for cutting of sloping land is to be considered in order to render the land feasible for building construction/land development and allied facilities.
- ii) The application under Section 17-A of the Act shall be processed simultaneously with application for Technical Clearance/Development Permission as far as possible.

- iii) While considering the application, it shall be ensured that buildings are designed in stepped/terraced formation in order to minimize the extent of cutting.
- iv) Such terraces shall be cut as per the table mentioned below, except for the construction of special buildings like industrial buildings, institutional buildings and for other buildings and development which require level areas of larger width.
- v) The following shall be general guidelines for cutting in order to render the land suitable for the construction of buildings:

Type of building/development	Extent of slope	Maximum extent of cutting in mts.	Maximum extent of leveling/grading in terraces (width in meters)
Residential/Commercial	10 to 15%	4.0 mts.	26
	15 to 20%	3.0 mts.	15

For development like playground/petrol pumps/ industrial buildings etc. which require level surface of larger width, cutting may be considered as per requirement with protection measures. Structural Liability Certificate may be obtained separately to ascertain the stability of slope and protection measures to be undertaken. Such applications will be sent to the Government for final approval.

Necessary angle of repose/inclination shall be maintained as per the soil characteristics and retaining wall and other protection measures shall ensure for stabilization of slopes with suitable drainage, wherever required.

Note: In case of development of road the maximum permissible gradient of 1:10, which is to be strictly observed and longitudinal and vertical sections of the road are to be seen for grant of permission. In order to derive access to property from public road and other existing roads, box cutting of limited length could be permitted, if alternate roads are not available by maintaining protection measures.

- 2) Land having slope between 20% to 25%.

Cutting/excavation shall as far as be limited to digging for foundation/footings and for providing services like drains, water lines, sewage line, septic tank, soak pits, sump, well and access/circulation space.

In special circumstances, where terracing is required to be undertaken for accommodating, it may be permitted to a maximum extent of 10 mts. width with a vertical cutting limited to 2 mts. In such case, certification from a Structural engineer on the stability of slope and protection measures to be undertaken are to be separately obtained.

GUIDELINES FOR CONSIDERING FILLING UP OF LOW LYING LAND

Documents/details to be submitted.

1. Contour plan (interval 1 mts)/Block levels.
2. Survey Plan
3. Copy of the Technical Clearance/Development Permission, if any.
4. Ownership document
5. Site plan showing location of boundary, internal road, drainage pattern.
6. Longitudinal and cross sections to explain the profile of level before and after undertaking cutting with buildings foundations, proposals of road, retaining wall, etc.
7. Latest photographs of the site.
8. Drainage pattern showing the existing natural/artificial drains with details. Alternate drainage pattern with special reference to the linkage to the adjacent existing drainage system shall be proposed in necessary. The length and breadth its capacity shall also be indicated.
9. Conversion Sanad.

Permission for filling of low lying land (only in respect of land which are at lower level by 50 cms. or more from the adjoining original ground level) to be considered as under.

- i) Permission for filling of low lying shall be considered only in respect of confirming provisions in the statutory notified Plans and to enable approved projects.
- ii) Due care for the maintenance of the overall drainage pattern of the area shall be ensured.
- iii) Filling of land shall not amount to blocking of any drainage channel. In case the filling affects the natural flow of water, proper diversion of water flow linking to the nearby drainage channel/basis shall be ensured. If the filling up involves a drainage channel, spring, water body, watercourse, etc. NOC from Irrigation Department will be essential.
- iv) NOC from Water Resources Department may be obtained, for filling of larger areas which are likely to cause hindrance to natural drainage pattern.
- v) If the filling up involves damaging mangroves then it will not be allowed.

- vi) In general Khazan lands will not be allowed to be filled up.
- vii) Garden lands of specialized crops as bettlenut, medicinal/herbal plants is not be allowed to be filled up..
- viii) Irrigated crop lands will not be allowed, without the approval of the Town Planning Board.
- ix) Filling of land shall not be permitted in the buffer zones and influence zones of water bodies notified under Wetland Management Rules.

Chief Town Planner (Land use) was accordingly directed to implement the guidelines as above and to inform about the same to the branch offices for the purpose of scrutiny of any proposals received under Section 17A of the TCP Act, 1974.

Item No. 9: Amendment to the Goa Land Development & Building Construction Regulations, 2010.

Member Secretary informed that as per the Goa Land Development & Building Construction Regulations, 2010 under regulation No. 6.1.1, Table V, there was a provision for reduction in FAR in plots having an area of more than 4,000 sq.mts. in both VP1 and VP2 category villages, which however is amended and notified vide Gazette Notification dtd. 09/08/2023.

The extract of the regulation 6.1.1, as was existing is as under:

6.1.1. The following Regulations shall be applicable in the respective zones: (a) Regional Plan for Goa: The Settlement zone areas means the areas which could be brought under development for various uses and the compatibility of the said uses/zones within the settlement level plans. FAR applicable shall be as per TABLE-V given below.

TABLE-V

VP Status	Area of Plot	FAR permitted	Height
VP1	Area below 4000m ²	80	As per S2/R2
VP1	Area 4000m ² & above	60	As per S2/R2
VP2	Area below 4000m ²	60	9.00 mts. including stilt
VP2	Area 4000m ² & above	50	9.00 mts. including stilt

Member Secretary then informed that the amendment carried out to the said regulation is as under:

3. Amendment of regulation 6.1.1.— In regulation 6.1.1 of the principal Regulations, in clause (a),—

(i) in the TABLE-V, the following entries shall be omitted, namely:—

<i>“VP1</i>	<i>Area 4000m² & above</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>As per S2/R2</i>
<i>VP2</i>	<i>Area 4000m² & above</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>9.00 mts. including stilt”;</i>

Member Secretary further informed that amendment to regulation 12.8 has also been carried out and is notified vide Official Gazette (Extraordinary) dtd. 9/8/2023.

The extract of the regulation 12.8, as was existing is as under:

12.8 Amalgamation of sub-divided plots. — In case where sub-divided plots are amalgamated, except for those in Industrial zone/Goa Industrial Development Corporation’s plots, the FAR permissible shall be reduced by 20% of the permissible FAR in respective zone.

The Board was informed as per the amendment carried out to the said regulation, no reduction of 20% FAR shall now be carried out for the amalgamated plots which are the parts of sub-division.

The amendment carried out reads as under:

5. Amendment of regulation 12.8.— The regulation 12.8 of the principal Regulations shall be omitted.

The Board took note of the same and it was opined that since above two regulations were part of the Regional Plan policy – Release One, the same shall also be treated as amended by virtue of these amendments.

It was accordingly decided to obtain the Government approval for the same.

Item No. 10: Regarding incentives to be given for construction/ Development of Cancer Hospital & other related requirements.

Member Secretary informed that physical and social infrastructure in the State of Goa is improving at a rapid pace, wherein the Government is encouraging various organizations etc. to set up their institutions in the State of Goa to provide better facilities to the local population and to improve their standard of living.

The Board was briefed that recently, the Government has announced setting up of Cancer Research Facility/Hospital in the State of Goa to provide better health care facilities to Goan population such that they can avail benefit of advanced technology/facility in this field.

While discussing on the subject, Chairman expressed that the State need to encourage such institutions by extending necessary assistance in setting up of such facilities and one such facility, he said, that could be extended by the Department is by means of grant of additional FAR for the buildings, if proposed.

After deliberation, it was decided that if approached with a proper proposal, the Department shall consider grant of additional FAR for the project proponent to set up cancer related treatment facilities.

Item No. 11: Deputation of Town Planning Officers in other corporations/Authorities etc., shall be discontinued and wherever placed they shall be called back.

Member Secretary informed that various committees are constituted by the Government under GIDC, RERA, I.T. Department, Smart City Mission, MADA, etc. wherein the functions of Town & Country Planning Dept. and that of Chief Town Planner are dealt directly by the said Authorities. It was informed that whenever there is any proposal for construction/sub-division etc. in the areas under the jurisdiction of these Department/Authorities, such proposals are now directly dealt by the said Authorities/Departments by placing them before their respective committees and hence are not referred to the TCP Department.

It was brought to the notice of the Board that the committees constituted in this regard by the respective Authority/Department, consist of a Town Planning Officer, who is not below the rank of Dy. Town Planner and such Dy. Town Planners are sent on deputation by the TCP Department to these Authorities.

The Board was then informed that by virtue of this arrangement, the functions of the Department are adversely affected, as the Department is already having shortage of the officers and due to this shortage of Officers, dual charge is given to the Officers to look after the functions of two different offices, thereby affecting the efficiency of the Department and causing little delay in imparting the services.

The matter was deliberated and the Chairman was of the opinion that the Department can no longer spare its officers by affecting its own functioning and hence therefore there shall not be any further deputation of Town Planner officers to the other Departments.

Considering the need of the Department to implement Ease of Doing Business policy of the Government, it was decided that the Department shall call back its officers, who are on deputation in other Departments, such that various functions and services offered by the TCP Dept. are dealt efficiently.

Member Secretary was accordingly directed to undertake further necessary correspondence in this regard.

Item No. 12: Any other item with permission of the chair.

No other issues were discussed under this item.