

ANNEXURE A

PROPOSALS DISCUSSED IN THE 38th MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE CONSTITUTED UNDER SUB RULE 4 OF RULE 3 OF THE GOA TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (PUBLIC PROJECTS/SCHEMES/DEVELOPMENT WORKS BY THE GOVERNMENT) RULES, 2008 HELD ON 29/09/2023 PLACED BEFORE 191st TCP BOARD MEETING TO BE HELD ON 25/10/2023.

Sr. No	Name of the Applicant / Proponent	Name of Proposal	Survey No.	Village & Taluka	Total area	Existing zone as per RP 2021	Change of zone/ rectification sought for	Decision of the Committee	Decision of the Board
1.	Goa Forest Development Corporation Ltd. (GFDC)	Change of zone of property for the purpose of development of Botanical Garden cum Eco-Recreational Park	Sy. No. 24/0(part)	Uguem Village, Sanguem Taluka	62,690 sq. mts.	Partly Settlement zone and partly Orchard zone	Settlement zone	The Committee deliberated on the proposal and considering that intended use of the property is for eco-tourism project for development of Yoga, Naturopathy and Wellness Centre with eco-friendly structures, recommended the change of zone of remaining area of the acquired land admeasuring 60,690 sq. mts. from Orchard to Settlement zone in RPG-2021.	Approved the decision as taken by the Committee
2.	Collector, North Goa District	change of zone of property for Construction of New Collectorate Building	Sy.No. 132/2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 & 23	Morombi-O-Pequeno village, Tiswadi Taluka	17824.00 sq.m.	Paddy Field	Institutional zone.	The Committee decided that change of zone of the property need to be considered from Paddy Field to Institutional zone. Further, it was decided that a condition shall be conveyed to the applicant that necessary permission under Section 17A shall have to be obtained prior to commencement of any development activity in the	Approved the decision as taken by the Committee

								<p>property under reference.</p> <p>Committee also decided that the applicant shall have a proper drainage network for the property under reference such that natural water drain shall not get affected by the proposed development.</p> <p>The proposal of Collector, North Goa District is accordingly recommended for change of zone for an area admeasuring 17824.00 sq. mts. from Paddy Field to Institutional zone.</p> <p>Dy. Collector (Revenue), was also directed to submit the copy of survey plan, land acquisition plan to the TCP Dept. prior to issue of any letter in this regard.</p>	
3.	Directorate of Panchayat	Change of zone of property for the purpose of construction of Community Hall and Panchayat Ghar.	Sy.No. 531/1-A(part), 531/2-A(part), 532-11-A(part), 532/12-A(part), 532/13-A(part) & 532/14-A(part)	Calapor village, Tiswadi Taluka	3094.00 m2.	Paddy Field	Settlement zone	<p>The Committee deliberated in the matter and the use proposed was discussed at length. Considering the activity proposed, it was observed that Panchayat building is institutional building and change of zone therefore could have been for Institutional zone instead of Settlement zone. The same was agreed upon by Director of Panchayat and accordingly, it was decided that</p>	Approved the decision as taken by the Committee

								<p>the request submitted by the Directorate of Panchayat would be revised requesting for change of zone from Paddy Field to Institutional zone.</p> <p>The same was taken note by the Committee and considering the reason cited by the Director of Panchayat, recommended the proposal for change of zone from Paddy Field to Institutional in respect of property bearing Sy.No. 531/1-A(part), 531/2-A(part), 532-11-A(part), 532/12-A(part), 532-/13-A(part) & 532/14-A(part) at Calapor village, Tiswadi Taluka, admeasuring an area of 3094.00 m2. Director of Panchayat was accordingly directed to submit the revised letter accordingly.</p>	
4.	Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd. (ONGC)	Change of zone of property	Sy.No. 68/1,2, 3; 69/1; 71/4 to 11; 73; 74; 75; 76/1; 72/2; 77/1, 2; 79; 42/1 to 41; 85/1, 2, 3; 86; 87/1 to 5; 88; 92	Quitol village, Quepem Taluka	10,24,000 sq.m.	Orchard, Paddy Field, Natural Cover, Orchard with No Development Slopes and Natural Cover with No Development Slope	Institutional Zone	<p>The proposal was deliberated in detail and the committee was of the opinion that at this stage, change of zone to institutional zone as sought by ONGC for an area of 10,24,000 shall be huge one and the same is not required considering the need and requirement of ONGC at this stage. Architect Shri Rajeev Sukhthankar who also attended the meeting on behalf of ONGC</p>	Approved the decision as taken by the Committee

							<p>explained about the future need of the institution however the committee was of the opinion that the ONGC is free to approach the Government as and when the need arises to expand the facilities at the institution.</p> <p>Arch. Shri Rajeev Sunkthankar was accordingly asked to rework the actual area required for change of zone to Institutional zone.</p> <p>On further detail deliberation on the issue, Arch. then suggested that existing area admeasuring 132700 m2 under Settlement zone be considered for change to institutional zone and whereas additional area of 2,49,578 m2 be released for change of zone to Institutional Zone. Thus, the additional area to be changed to institutional zone was brought down from 8,91,300 m2 to 2,49,578 m2, thereby maintaining an area of 6,41,722 m2 still under undevelopable zone.</p> <p>Considering the revised statement as worked out by the Architect, Committee recommended the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Change of zone for an area of 132700 m2 from	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

								Settlement to Institutional zone. 2. Change of zone for an area of 249578 m2 from other undevelopable area to Institutional zone.	
5.	Registrar of Cooperative Societies & Ex-officio Joint Secretary (Cooperation) Govt.	Change of zone of property	Sy.No. 79/1-A	village Ponda of Ponda Taluka.	3096.00 sq.mts.	Settlement zone	Institutional Zone with FAR of 100	The Committee recommended the proposal of the Registrar of Cooperative Societies for change of zone of property from Settlement Zone to Institutional zone with FAR of 100 for an area admeasuring 3096.00 sq.mts.	Approved the decision as taken by the Committee
6.	Director General of Police, Panaji Goa	Change of zone of property	Sy.No. 116/1(A)	Saligao village, Bardez Taluka	3500.00 sq. mts.	Playground	Institutional zone	The Committee deliberated at length on the proposal and was of the opinion that since the land has been already transferred to DGP, the same is required to be put to Institutional use such as Police Station, Conference Rooms, Ancillary Residential uses/barracks, etc. and for which purpose, change of zone of the property from Playground to Institutional zone is necessary. The Committee also took note of the letter of the Chief Architect, PWD, under ref.No. 11/93(AN)/CA-PWD/2022-23/707 dtd. 10/3/2023, which states that the property under Sy.No. 115 & Sy.No. 116 at Saligao, which is earmarked as	Approved the decision as taken by the Committee

								<p>Playground, need to be changed to Institutional zone as plots under same survey numbers are allotted to various Government Departments such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Directorate of Fire & Emergency Services (Sy.No. 115/1) 2. Goa State Bio-Diversity Board – Seed Bank (Sy.No. 116/1) 3. Director General of Police (Sy.No. 116/1) 4. RDA Food Park (Sy.No. 116/1) <p>Considering the land has already been allotted to various Government Departments, the Committee recommended the change of zone of the property admeasuring 3500 m2 from Playground to Institutional zone.</p>	
7.	Goa Housing Board	Change of zone of property	Sy. No. 24/1-A, Part - B	Village Curca, Tiswadi Taluka	35955.00 sq.mts.	Institutional (Housing) with FAR 150	Institutional (Commercial) with FAR of 200	<p>The Committee deliberated on the proposal vis-à-vis the provisions under GLDBCR-2010 and was of the opinion that it cannot consider any further enhancement of FAR from 150 to 200, as the provisions under GLDBCR-2010 restricts the maximum permissible FAR to</p>	Agreed with the decision of the Committee, accordingly the proposal is not recommended for approval

								any Institutional zone to 150. The Committee therefore did not recommend the request of Goa Housing Board for consideration of change of zone from Institutional (Housing) with FAR of 150 to Institutional (Commercial) zone with FAR of 200.	
8.	Goa Housing Board	Change of zone of property	Sy. No. 34/1, Plot-E	Village Penhna-de-Franca, Bradez Taluka.	6138.00 sq.mts.	Institutional (Housing/Office Buildings) with FAR of 150	Institutional (Housing/Office Buildings) with FAR of 250	The Committee deliberated on the proposal vis-à-vis the provisions under GLDBCR-2010 and was of the opinion that it cannot consider any further enhancement of FAR from 150 to 250, as the provisions under GLDBCR-2010 restricts the maximum permissible FAR to any Institutional zone to 150. The Committee therefore did not recommend the request of Goa Housing Board for consideration of change of zone from Institutional (Housing/Office Buildings) having FAR of 150 to Institutional (Housing/Office Buildings) zone with FAR of 250.	Agreed with the decision of the Committee, accordingly the proposal is not recommended for approval
9.	Goa Housing Board	Change of zone of property	Sy. No. 449/1-A, Sector-A	Village Tivim, Bradez Taluka	13795 sq. mts.	Institutional (Housing) with FAR 150	Institutional (Commercial) with FAR of 150	The Committee deliberated on the proposal and recommended the same, as it was observed that the change of zone is sought from Institutional (Housing) to Institutional (Commercial) by	Not agreed with the decision of the Committee, accordingly the proposal stands rejected.

								maintaining the same FAR as recommended earlier i.e. FAR of 150.	
10.	Goa Housing Board	Change of zone of property	Sy. No. 92, 93 & 94	Village Curti, Ponda Taluka.	2400.00 sq.m	Institutional (Housing) with FAR of 150	Institutional (Commercial) with FAR of 200	The Committee deliberated on the proposal vis-à-vis the provisions under GLDBCR-2010 and was of the opinion that it cannot consider any further enhancement of FAR from 150 to 200, as the provisions under GLDBCR-2010 restricts the maximum permissible FAR to any institutional zone to 150. The Committee therefore did not recommend the request of Goa Housing Board for consideration of change of zone from Institutional (Housing) with FAR of 150 to Institutional (Commercial) zone with FAR of 200.	Agreed with the decision of the Committee, accordingly the proposal is not recommended for approval.
11.	Goa Housing Board	Change of zone of property	Sy. No. 93/1(part), 93/2, 3, 4; 94/1 & 2; 95/1(part); 12/1, 2(part); 11; 13/1; 10/3, 2, 1 for Sector-Z	Village Rumdamol, Davorlim, Salcete Taluka.	6250.00 sq.mts.	Institutional (Housing) with FAR of 150	Institutional with FAR of 150	The Committee deliberated on the proposal and recommended the same, as it was observed that the change of zone is sought from Institutional (Housing) to Institutional by maintaining the same FAR as recommended earlier i.e. FAR of 150.	Not agreed with the decision of the Committee, accordingly the proposal stands rejected.

12.	Goa Housing Board	Change of zone of property	Sy. No. 35/1, 36/1 & 2, 37/1, 38/1, 39/1 & 40/1	Village Dhargalim, Pernem Taluka	1,68,002.00 sq. mts.	Institutional (Housing) with FAR of 150	Commercial with FAR of 150	During the discussion on the proposal, it was however brought to the notice of the Committee that the property under reference is already declared as “Planning Area” by the Government and is brought under the jurisdiction of Mopa Airport Development Authority (MADA) and therefore the provision of the Section under which the change of zone is being considered, is not applicable to the property under reference. Goa Housing Board was accordingly directed to further verify about the inclusion of the property under MADA. The proposal therefore was not considered for the request as made by Goa Housing Board.	Agreed with the decision of the Committee, accordingly the proposal is not recommended for approval.
13.	Goa Housing Board	Change of zone of property	Sy. No. 34/1	Porvorim, Penha-de-Franca Village, Bardez Taluka.	3772.00 sq. mts.	Settlement	Institutional (Commercial) with FAR of 200	The Committee deliberated on the proposal vis-à-vis the provisions under GLDBCR-2010 and was of the opinion that it cannot consider any further enhancement of FAR from 150 to 200, as the provisions under GLDBCR-2010 restricts the maximum permissible FAR to any Institutional zone to 150. The Committee therefore did not recommend the request of Goa Housing Board for consideration of change of zone from	Agreed with the decision of the Committee, accordingly the proposal is not recommended for approval.

								Settlement to Institutional (Commercial) zone with FAR of 200.	
14.	Change of zone for Goa Housing Board	Change of zone of property	Sy. No. 92/0, 93/0, 94/0	Curti Village, Ponda Taluka.	945.00 m2	Settlement	Institutional zone	The Committee deliberated in the matter and decided to recommend the proposal for change of zone of Block – H from Group Housing (Residential Settlement) to Institutional, for an area admeasuring 945.00 m2.	Not agreed with the decision of the Committee, accordingly the proposal stands rejected.
15.	Goa Housing Board	Change of zone of property change of zone/Re-designation of plot earmarked for School	Sy.No. 123/1 to 8	Xeldem village Quepem Taluka.	1630.00m2	School	Institutional zone	The Committee deliberated at length on the proposal and was of the opinion that there could still be takers for the plot earmarked for School under the approved layout and therefore did not recommend the change of zone of the plot to Institutional. Shri Ramesh Raikar was however asked by the Committee to obtain necessary NOC from Education Department for change of use of plot, if at all they still desired to change the use of Block F from School to Institutional zone. It was therefore decided to reconsider the proposal of the Goa Housing Board, if at all such NOC for change of zone is obtained by Goa Housing Board from Education Department.	Agreed with the decision of the committee of not recommending for change of zone of the plot. Accordingly the proposal stands rejected.