

23

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
(2007-2008)**

FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTORATE OF ESTATES

TWENTY THIRD REPORT



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

TWENTY THIRD REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
(2007-2008)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTORATE OF ESTATES

Presented to Lok Sabha on 06.09.2007

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 06.09.2007



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

September, 2007/Bhadrapada, 1929 (Saka)

C.U.D. No. 23

Price : Rs. 55.00

© 2007 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Eleventh Edition) and Printed by Jainco Art India, New Delhi-110 005.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
REPORT	
CHAPTER I Background-Role and Function of the Directorate of Estates.....	1
CHAPTER II Availability of Residential Accommodation	12
CHAPTER III Availability of Office Accommodation	31
APPENDICES	
I. Status of 2036 dwelling units proposed to be constructed in Delhi.....	38
II. List of GPRAs to be vacated after lapse of time-period given under 'Discretionary Allotment'	41
III. Details of proposed Additional GPOA outside Delhi ..	44
IV. Minutes of the Seventh Sitting of the Standing Committee on Urban Development (2006-07) held on 29.12.2006.....	45
V. Minutes of the Second Sitting of the Standing Committee on Urban Development (2007-08) held on 30.08.2007	47

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN DEVELOPMENT (2007-2008)

Mohd. Salim — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Avtar Singh Bhadana
3. Smt. Botcha Jhansi Lakshmi
4. Shri Sharanjit Singh Dhillon
5. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
6. Shri Anant Gudhe
7. Shri Pushp Jain
8. Shri Kailash Joshi
9. Shri Sajjan Kumar
10. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra
11. Shri Babu Lal Marandi
12. Shri A.K. Moorthy
13. Shri Shripad Yesso Naik
14. Shri L. Rajagopal
15. Shri Rajesh Ranjan *alias* Pappu Yadav
16. Shri D. Vittal Rao
17. Shri Sudhangshu Seal
18. Kunwar Sarv Raj Singh
19. Shri Jagdish Tytler
20. Kunwar Devendra Singh Yadav
21. Shri Suresh Ganpatrao Wagmare

Rajya Sabha

22. Shri Nandi Yellaiah
23. Smt. Syeda Anwara Taimur
24. Shri B.K. Hariprasad
25. Shri Surendra Moti Lal Patel
26. Shri Krishan Lal Balmiki
27. Shri Brij Bhushan Tiwari
28. Shri Penumalli Madhu
29. Shri Mukul Roy
30. Shri Varinder Singh Bajwa
31. Shri Manohar Joshi

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.K. Sharma | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri S. Balshekar | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri R.K. Saxena | — | <i>Director</i> |
| 4. Smt. Anita B. Panda | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 5. Shri Harchain | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban Development (2007-08) having been authorized by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Twenty-Third Report on the subject "Directorate of Estates" of the Ministry of Urban Development.

2. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of the Urban Development on 29 December, 2006.

3. The Committee considered and adopted the Report at their sitting held on 30th August, 2007.

4. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officials of the Ministry of Urban Development for placing before them the requisite materials and their considered views in connection with the examination of the subject.

5. They would also like to place on record their deep sense of appreciation for the invaluable assistance rendered to them by the officials of the Lok Sabha Secretariat attached to the Committee.

NEW DELHI;
6 September, 2007

15 Bhadrapada, 1929 (Saka)

MOHD. SALIM,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Urban
Development.

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

(I) Role and Functions of the Directorate of Estates

1.1 The Directorate of Estates, an attached office of the Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India, is headed by the Director of Estates, who is further assisted by the Director of Estates-II. The Directorate is responsible for the administration and management of Government Estates known as General Pool, which includes office buildings for the various organizations of the Government of India as well as residential accommodation for the Government employees in 9 cities *viz.* The metropolitan cities of Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata, Chennai and five other cities namely, Shimla, Chandigarh, Ghaziabad, Faridabad and Nagpur. The General Pool Residential Accommodation (GPRA) is also available at 24 other stations *viz.* Agra, Port Blair, Hyderabad, Imphal, Kohima, Bhopal, Kanpur, Bangalore, Lucknow, Kochi, Shillong, Indore, Agartala, Allahabad, Jaipur, Rajkot, Dehradun, Mysore, Bikaner, Guwahati, Varanasi, Thiruvananthapuram, Gangtok and Srinagar. The Central Government Estates in the remaining cities and towns are managed by the Central Public Works Department (CPWD) offices located in these places.

Replying to a query from the Committee in this connection, the Ministry of Urban Development, in a written note, informed as under:

“...The Directorate of Estates is also providing bungalow type accommodation to Cabinet Ministers/MoS/Deputy Ministers/Supreme Court/High Court judges and Chairman and Members of various Statutory Commissions/Statutory bodies at Delhi, set up by the Government...”

In a related query, it was stated further as follows:—

“...The Directorate of Estates also provides accommodation to various Commissions, Statutory/Autonomous bodies, Tribunals, etc. which are declared eligible for General Pool accommodation by the CCA (Cabinet Committee on Accommodation).”

1.2 The Committee were also informed that apart from the administration of Government Estates (Residential Office

Accommodation) in 9 cities, the Directorate of Estates was also responsible for the following:—

- (a) Administration of Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952.
- (b) Administration of Public Premises Eviction (PPE) Act, 1971 against unauthorized occupants.
- (c) Administration of Markets/Shops in Government Colonies in Delhi, Faridabad, Ghaziabad, Mumbai and Nagpur.
- (d) Allotment of Accommodation in Vigyan Bhavan and Vigyan Bhavan Annexe.
- (e) Realization of License Fee from all allottees.
- (f) The control and administration of Holiday Homes at Shimla, Kanyakumari, Amarkantak, Mysore and Touring Officers Guest Houses at Kolkata, Mumbai, Bangalore, Chennai, Thiruvananthapuram, Lucknow and Delhi.

Construction of a new 'Holiday Home' at Goa

1.3 The Committee undertook an On-the-Spot Study Visit to Goa, Mumbai and Hyderabad from 2nd to 6th February, 2007 and held discussions *inter-alia* with the representatives of the State Governments concerned and the CPWD. During the course of discussions with the officials of CPWD in Goa, the Committee noticed that there was a need for building a 'Holiday Home' at Goa since the State though, was an important tourist destination, yet the Central Government employees did not have the facility of a 'Holiday Home'. Moreover, the Committee found that commercial tourist resorts and hotels, being too expensive, were largely out of reach for many Government employees, as they were not in a position to afford such an accommodation.

1.4 The Committee desired to know about the role of the Directorate of Estates in the construction of maintenance of the Residential as well as Office Accommodation. In their written note, the Ministry of Urban Development stated that the Directorate of Estates was responsible only for managing the "Assets" of the Government. It had no role to play in the actual construction activity, which was normally being done through the Central Public Works Department (CPWD).

1.5 The Committee then enquired as to whether the Directorate of Estates was satisfied with the administrative performance/duties of CPWD in handling administration of Residential/Office Accommodation. The Ministry, in their written note, informed that the Central Public Works Department under the Ministry of Urban Development was the nodal agency to undertake the work regarding maintenance of residential as well as office accommodation in Delhi and at regional stations. The CPWD was responsible for reporting vacation of houses as and when they fall vacant to the Directorate of Estates for further allotment to the eligible employees and thus it was the expectation of the Directorate of Estates from CPWD that they would intimate the condition of vacant houses/office accommodation while reporting the vacancies. Further, the Ministry stated that the CPWD had been reporting vacancies manually, causing delay in further allotment. However, the matter had been reviewed with the result that the reporting of vacancies became centralized and thus, was being received on the same day in the Directorate of Estates. The CPWD had also started reporting the condition of the houses *i.e.* whether they were fit for allotment or required minor/major repairs. On the basis of this reporting by CPWD, further action was being taken on whether to allot or defer the allotment. In addition, the Ministry stated that the list of vacant and occupied houses in the General Pool had been made available on the CPWD Sewa Kendra website, namely cpwdsewa.nic.in.

1.6 On the point raised by the Committee as to whether the Directorate had an Inspection Committee to carry out checks in residential colonies and office area to ensure proper up-keep and maintenance by the CPWD, the Ministry, in their written note, submitted as follows:—

“Overall responsibility of maintenance of residential accommodation lies with the CWPD. The Directorate of Estates does carry out inspection from time-to-time to check the proper unkeep and maintenance of the General Pool accommodation. The Directorate of Estates does not have any ‘Inspection Committee’ for the purpose. The Directorate of Estates is to inspect only for checking of subletting/misuse. Inspection for maintenance part is to be done by the C.P.W.D. officers. CPWD has a system of regular inspections by their field engineers.”

(II) Procedure of Allotment of the General Pool Residential Accommodations (GPRAs) and Hostel Accommodations

1.7 According to the Ministry of Urban Development, a Rolling Allotment Year had been introduced *w.e.f.* 1.4.2002 under which open

Applications were being Invited for allotment of Government accommodation. The cut off date for determination of eligibility for various types of accommodation had been fixed as 1st January of each year which meant that the officers eligible as on 1st January of each calendar year, could submit their applications in the prescribed Performa for allotment of entitled type of accommodation as per their eligibility pay, which was prescribed as below:—

Type of Residence	Eligible Basic Pay Range
I	Less than Rs. 3050
II	Rs. 3050-5499
III	Rs. 5500-8499
IV	Rs. 8500-11,999
IV (Spl)	Rs. 10,000/-
VA (DII)	Rs. 12,000-15,099
VB (DI)	Rs. 15,100-18,399
VIA (CII)	Rs. 18,400-22,399
VIB (CI)	Rs. 22,400-24,499
VII	Rs. 24,500-25,999
VIII	Rs. 26,000 and above
HOSTEL	
Single Suite without kitchen	Rs. 6500
Single Suite with kitchen	Rs. 6500
Double Suite	Rs. 8500

1.8 The Committee were further informed that the Allotment Rules had been amended and a provision had been made for submission of applications on the first appointment/transfer to a station, by the last day of the month and the same would be included in the waiting list for the subsequent month. As regards allotment of accommodation in change, a provision had been made for vacation of the previous accommodation within 15 days instead of 8 days. Moreover, 10% of vacancies in Type-I and Type-II and 5% of vacancies in Type-III and IV had been reserved for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes employees. Also, the allotments were being made to SC and ST employees in the ratio of 2:1.

(III) Separate Tenure Pool

1.9 The Ministry informed the Committee that a Separate Tenure Pool had been created for allotment of accommodation to Non-All India Services Officers, on Central Deputation. In the pool, total number of units of various types were given as under:—

Type	No. of Units
Type VI A	24
Type VB (D-I)	63
Type VA (D-II)	138
Type IV (Special)	42
Type IV	100
Total	367

(IV) Discretionary Allotment

1.10 Responding to a query from the Committee regarding procedure for discretionary allotments of Government accommodation, the Ministry, in their written note, stated as under:—

“The existing guidelines of the Directorate of Estates dated 17.11.97 *inter-alia* provide ‘Discretionary Allotment’ of Government accommodation to serving Government officials on medical or on functional grounds. As per the guidelines, such discretionary allotments may be made in the next below type of the entitlement of the official under the 5% quota, discretionary allotments, which is restricted to 5% of vacancies in each type occurring in a calendar year. However, change of accommodation allowed on medical grounds on the recommendation of the Accommodation Committee is not treated against 5% vacancies fixed for discretionary allotments on the ground that there is no additional burden on the General Pool Residential Accommodation in case change of accommodation within the same type from area/floor to another is allowed on medical grounds.”

Allotments on functional grounds to personal Staff of various dignitaries are made as per aforesaid guidelines and amendments thereto issued from time-to-time. Allotments on medical grounds are considered by two ‘Accommodation Committees’ set up for the purpose.

The two Accommodation Committees are:

- (i) ACC Committee for allotment of General Pool Residential Accommodation of Type IV and below.
- (ii) ACC Committee for allotments of General Pool Residential Accommodation of Type IV (special) and above.

(V) Allotment of General Pool Office Accommodation

1.11 As regards the allotment of General Pool Office Accommodation, the Ministry stated in a written note that while making actual allotment of GPOA, the following criteria/order of priority was normally adopted:—

- (i) Priority to be accorded to those offices, which are located in dangerous buildings requiring immediate repairs.
- (ii) Next priority to be given to those offices which are required to be shifted in pursuance of some court directions or to whom allotment is to be made as per Court Orders.
- (iii) Third priority to be assigned to those offices, which are housed in leased buildings, for which Government of India is paying huge rent to the private owners.
- (iv) Rest of offices to be considered for allotment in the order in which their requests are received and registered in the Directorate of Estates. (The requests of Ministries for augmentation taking precedence over the requests of attached and subordinate offices).
- (v) For offices, whose location has only been approved in Delhi only, a “Non Availability Certificate” (NAC) is given to enable them to hire space from open market.

(VI) Redress of Public Grievances

1.12 The Committee were informed by the Ministry that the Directorate of Estates was having a Public Grievances Cell headed by the Additional Director (Establishment). All public grievance cases were reviewed on priority basis. Efforts were also being made to introduce Internet based Public Grievances Redress and Monitoring System (PGRAMS), for which procurement of hardware and software was stated to be under progress during the course of examination of the subject by the Committee.

(VII) Website of the Directorate of Estates

1.13 The Ministry informed that the website of the Directorate of Estates *i.e.* <http://estates.nic.in>. was a major step towards e-governance and transparency. The site was stated to have enabled the users to get the following current information in respect of allotment etc:—

- Information about the residential units available with Directorate of Estates.
- Circulars being published by the Ministry of Urban Development.
- Rules for allotment of residential units.
- Current occupant of a particular accommodation.
- Facility to download the various Forms connected with the allotment procedure.
- A communication channel to contact the officials of Directorate of Estates, and
- Answers to frequently asked queries of allottees.

1.14 It was further stated that the latest addition in the website namely 'House Allotments' was the main bank of information regarding the current status of allotment that had made it possible to retrieve the following additional information, including the information already being displayed/available to the users:—

- Personal data of individuals
- Housing Stock
- Trend of allotments
- Waiting list for an individual or a group
- Information for the Registered offices—including the list of Applicants from an office, Drawing and Disbursing Officer ID for an Office, Recovery of License Fee, List of allottees to whom AAN has been allotted.
- Information under Right to Information Act, 2005 consisting of Hand Book on GPRA, Hostel accommodation, Subletting cases and Information Booklet 2005.

(VIII) Right to Information Act, 2005

The Ministry informed the Committee that a separate cell had been opened under the Right to Information Act, 2005 in the Directorate of Estates *w.e.f.* October, 2005. In pursuance to the provisions of the Act, an Information Booklet had been published. In addition to this, the Directorate of Estates had also brought out a "Compendium of Allotment Rules" and "Handbook on Allotment Rules" to provide greater and far more effective access to information with complete transparency.

(IX) Budgetary support provided to the Directorate of Estates

1.15 The Budgetary Support for the Directorate of Estates during the last 5 years was submitted by the Ministry of Urban Development as follows:—

(Rs. in thousand)

Year	B.E.	R.E. as Projected	R.E. as Approved	Actual Expenditure
2002-03	473500	682290	474100	472045
2003-04	319500	389748	329700	300043
2004-05	365100	370500	365100	339061
2005-06	370100	398478	370100	352509
2006-07	<u>Plan</u> <u>Non-Plan</u> 2500293400	<u>Plan</u> <u>Non-Plan</u> 4125387494	Yet to be approved*	-

*On 8th August, 2007 the Directorate of Estates informed that an amount of Rs. 2500 thousand under Plan Head and Rs. 385900 thousand under Non-Plan Head were approved as RE for 2006-2007 on 25th January, 2007.

1.16 The Committee were informed that prior to 2006-07, Directorate of Estates had been administering only Non-Plan Heads *viz.* Salary, Overtime Allowances, Medical Treatment, Domestic Travel Expenses, Office Expenses, Rent, Rate & Taxes, Publications, Banking Cash Transactions Tax (BCTT), Grants-in-aid, suspense and other charges. With effect from 2006-07, however, apart from the Non-Plan Heads, a Plan Head *i.e.* IT, 04.99.50 had been allocated to the Directorate making available funds to the tune of Rs. 25 Lakh thereunder. In the Revised Estimates (RE) an amount of Rs. 41.25 Lakh was sought for the current year for the said Plan Head and Rs. 38.74 crore under Non-Plan Head, which was yet to be received by the Ministry. It was also informed

that Plan Heads providing budgetary support for expenditure involved in meeting the shortage of housing stock of the Directorate were administered by the Works Division of the Ministry.

(X) Constraints being faced by the Directorate of Estates in their functioning

1.17 When the Committee enquired about the constraints being faced by the Directorate of Estates in their working, the Ministry stated in a written note that the constraints being faced by the Directorate of Estates were as under:

- Shortage of staff
- Slow pace of computerization of various activities at Delhi and Regional stations
- Non-synchronization of computer operations between CPWD and Directorate of Estates
- Lack of co-ordination between CPWD and Directorate of Estates in the matter of construction of residential/office accommodation and its maintenance.

1.18 On being enquired about the staff position in the Directorate, the Ministry informed that the sanctioned strength of staff in the Directorate of Estates in the various categories of the post was 731, out of which 683 staff (including regional stations) were in position as on date.

Recommendation No. 1

Functioning of the Directorate of Estates—Scope of improvement

1.19 The Directorate of Estates, an attached office of Ministry of Urban Development has been entrusted, among other functions, with the overall responsibility for the administration and management of Government estates which includes General Pool Office Accommodation (GPOA) as well as the General Pool Residential Accommodation (GPRA). At present, the Directorate of Estates provides office buildings and residential accommodation in four metropolitan cities of Delhi, Kolkata, Mumbai & Chennai as well as 5 other cities in different parts of the country. The GPRA is also available in 24 other cities. In addition, the Directorate is responsible for administration of the Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952 and Public Premises Eviction Act, 1971.

The Committee note that the Directorate is responsible only for managing the estates of the Government and has no role to play in the actual construction activity, which is normally done through the Central Public Works Department (CPWD). As regards the unsatisfactory performance of CPWD in handling maintenance of residential as well as office accommodation in Delhi and at the regional stations, the Committee have been made to understand that since the CPWD is responsible for reporting vacation of houses to the Directorate for further allotment to the eligible employees, it is expected that the CPWD would intimate the condition of vacant houses/office accommodation also to them while reporting the vacancies, on which further action is taken by the Directorate as to whether to allot or defer the allotment.

On the issue of the inspection done by the Directorate to carry out checks to ensure proper up-keeping and maintenance by the CPWD, the Committee note that the Directorate inspects only for checking up sub-letting or misuse of premises and that the maintenance part is to be done by the CPWD, which has a system of regular inspection by their field engineers. In this scenario, the Committee are of the opinion that since the Directorate has been given the overall responsibility of providing accommodation to various Government organisations, dignitaries as well as the Central Government employees, the maintenance of the same can not be construed as an altogether separate activity, with which the Directorate has nothing to do. They feel that there is a need to expand the scope of its activities further in order to ensure better maintenance and up-keep of the buildings/office premises. Although the Ministry has sought to convince the Committee that the CPWD is the only agency responsible for construction and maintenance of the Government assets, the Committee consider it to be yet another instance of shirking of responsibility. They are of the view in the wake of rather sub-standard maintenance of the official and residential buildings by concerned agency, it is time that the present scheme of things is reviewed and the Directorate develops a mechanism to ensure that the agency responsible for maintenance of the Government assets is performing its duties satisfactorily. Besides, the Committee feel that there exists a serious lack of co-ordination at present between the CPWD and Directorate in the matter of construction of residential/office accommodation and its maintenance, a fact which even the Directorate has acknowledged, that requires urgent attention. Therefore, they desire that the CPWD Wing dealing with the repair and maintenance of the Government, residential complexes/offices buildings, should be made directly accountable to

the Directorate of Estates. This will not only prevent the duplicity of agencies to look after the upkeep of the Government buildings but will also enable CPWD to devote more time towards its other activities. In case such an arrangement is not considered feasible, the Committee urge the Ministry to urgently devise a mechanism which ensures better coordination between CPWD and the Directorate. They are of the opinion that with advanced computer technology ensuring a synchronization of operations between the Directorate and the CPWD is definitely possible. The Committee therefore recommend that the Government should initiate appropriate steps in the matter urgently so as to fill the existing communication gap between the two Departments.

Recommendation No. 2

Need to build a 'Holiday Home' at Goa

1.20 The Committee note that as a welfare measures, Holiday Homes are being run at Shimla, Kanyakumari, Amarkantak and Mysore by the Directorate of Estates. However they find that such a 'Holiday Home' is not available in Goa, a tourist destination inviting a large number of tourists from India and abroad. The Committee feel that in view of the high costs involved in stay in hotels and resorts in Goa, there is a need to build a 'Holiday Home' for the convenience of Central Government employees. They, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Urban Development should assess the feasibility of providing a new Government Holiday Home at Goa for the facility of Government employees and take appropriate steps to construct the same early.

CHAPTER II

AVAILABILITY OF RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION

(I) Shortage in General Pool Residential Accommodation (GPRAs)

2.1 While explaining the position of availability of "Housing Stock" with the Directorate of Estates, the Ministry of Urban Development informed in their written note that the total housing stock in Delhi was 63216 and 34534 in 32 other Regional Stations. However, they also stated that this stock was grossly inadequate and many Senior Officers/Employees of the Central Government were waiting for allotment of entitled type of accommodation in Delhi and at regional stations.

(a) Position of Housing Stock in Delhi

2.2 As regards the position of availability of 'Housing Stock' in Delhi, the Ministry has informed that the overall satisfaction level in Delhi was 67%, based on the fact that the applications had been invited under the Rolling Allotment year.

The Ministry then submitted the demand and availability position of 'Housing Stock' in Delhi as on 31.12.2005, which is reproduced below:—

Type	Housing Stock	Applicants waiting for allotment	% of Satisfaction Level
1	2	3	4
I	16555	661	96
II	23709	11839	67
III	11854	3912	75
IV	5372	3233	63
IV Spl.	799	2811	22
5-Less Popular	152	833	16
D-II	1345	3358	29

1	2	3	4
D-I	879	1071	30
C-II	433	1520	24
C-I & Bungalow	163	374	35
VII	90	136	43
VIII	102	136	44
Hostel Units	1763	304	85
Total	63216	31188	67

2.3 As regards the Hostel Units, the Ministry stated that Hostel accommodation was termed as "Transit accommodation". Hostel accommodation was allotted to those employees, who had not been provided their entitled and regular type of accommodation. The Ministry informed that there were hostels meant for touring officers in Mumbai, Chennai, Bangalore, Lucknow, Thiruvananthapuram and Delhi. In Delhi the position regarding transit accommodation available for Touring Officers at F-Block, Curzon Road Hostel Kasturba Gandhi Marg was given as under:—

(i) Fully furnished Air-conditioned Double Suites	—	10
(ii) Furnished Double Bed Suites	—	12
(iii) Furnished Single Bed Suites	—	08

2.4 The Ministry has stated that the touring officer hostel at Curzon Road was meant for touring officers on duty, on leave and also to accommodate guests of regular allottees of Curzon Road Hostel. So far as adequacy was concerned, the accommodation was just enough to cater to the demand. The Ministry added that they experienced shortage during the festival season *i.e.* from September to December. Additionally, it was informed that there was the Central Government Guest House at Kidwai Nagar (West) which started functioning in September 2006.

The accommodation available in this Guest House was given as follows:—

(i) Furnished Air-conditioned Double Suites	04
(ii) Furnished Air-conditioned Double Bed Suites	16

The Ministry also informed that catering facilities was not available in the above hostels.

In addition to above the following accommodation was available for allotment to regular serving officers in Delhi, which came under General Pool:

(i) Double Suites	1465
(ii) Single Suites with Kitchen	297
(iii) Single Suites without Kitchen was given as under	85

2.5 When the Committee pointed at the differences in satisfaction levels in different Types of Flats, the Secretary (UD) agreed during evidence held before the Committee on 29th December, 2006 as follows:—

“As far as satisfaction level is concerned, in Delhi, I may take up some types, if not all the types. In Type I, which is the lowest type, it is almost 100 per cent. In Type II, it is 67 per cent. In Type III, it is 77 per cent. When we move up to Type V, it is 26 per cent. There is a gap at all these higher levels as far as satisfaction is concerned.”

Further, he candidly admitted as under:—

“Satisfaction would be at a level where we think that it is all right and we are managing. I do not think that we ourselves can be happy and satisfied that we are doing the best. We may say that we are doing the best possible job, but the point is whether it meets the requirement or not. Suppose we may have a little bit of problem in accepting that it is not satisfactory because whatever we are asked to do within those limitations, it is a satisfactory way of doing things. Ideally, given the total resources, one would definitely try to reach the ultimate possible and be at the higher into the scale.”

2.6 While responding to a subsequent query from the Committee, the Ministry, *vide* their written note, submitted the following:—

“The Prioritization Committee of Government of India has decided in 1984 that while for construction of additional residential accommodation, satisfaction level of 70% at Delhi and 50% at other cities may be achieved. Following satisfaction level has been achieved as on 31.12.2006:

Type I	99%
Type II	67%
Type III	77%
Type IV	62%

2.7 As regards the shortage of housing units, the Ministry in their written note informed that there was a shortage of 32,000 (approx.) residential units in various types in Delhi in the General Pool. The Ministry then added that some Government employees might not have even applied for GPRA for one reason or the other, for instance, perhaps were having their own private accommodation or were living in hired accommodation. The shortage could increase if such employees applied for allotment of GPRA. It was stated that generally, eligible persons were being allotted accommodation below their entitlement because of the shortage of housing stock.

2.8 The Committee then enquired about the steps taken by the Ministry to fulfil the shortage of GPRAs in Delhi. In response, the Ministry stated in written reply that to fulfil the shortage of GPRAs in Delhi, it was proposed to construct additional 319 units of 'Transit Accommodation' at HUDCO Place, New Delhi. Further, it is proposed to construct 2036 dwelling units*, which had already been sanctioned after obtaining the approval from the local bodies. Further, there was a provision of 1588 dwelling units in GPRA schemes of Aliganj, Dev Nagar, Rouse Avenue in Delhi, which were yet to be sanctioned. It was also proposed to take up the construction of these by modification of numbers and types of accommodation as per requirement of prevalent satisfaction levels. The details of the GPRAs sanctioned works to be started in Delhi had been submitted by the Ministry as follows:—

Sl.No.	Name of Work	Location	No. of units	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Construction of (C/o) 140 Type V & 104 Type VI Flats in Packet-6, DDU Marg, New Delhi	DDU Marg	244	
2.	C/o 340 Type IV Quarters in Pocket-I, DDU Marg, New Delhi	DDU Marg	340	Work taken up under Public Private Partnership (PPP) Mode as per advice of Ministry of Finance
3.	C/o 108 Type V & 24 Type VI Quarters at Vasant Vihar, New Delhi	Vasant Vihar	132	

*Status of construction of 2036 Dwelling units placed at Appendix-I.

1	2	3	4	5
4.	C/o 440 Type II Quarters at Dev Nagar, New Delhi	Dev Nagar	440	
5.	C/o Type III, 400 Quarters at Dev Nagar, New Delhi	Dev Nagar	400	
6.	C/o Type IV, 180 Quarters at Dev Nagar, New Delhi	Dev Nagar	180	
7.	Re-Development of Aliganj Area, Aliganj-Sh. 300 Type II Quarters	Aliganj	300	
Total			2036	

2.9 The Ministry also furnished to the Committee, the details of the proposed GPRAs, which had not yet been sanctioned in Delhi as follows:—

Sl.No.	Name of Work	Total Number of GPRAs Units
1.	Aliganj, New Delhi	608, Type IV Quarters
2.	Dev Nagar	400, Type III
3.	Rouse Avenue	340, Type IV and 240, Type V
Total		1588 Units

2.10 When the Committee enquired during the course of oral evidence about the steps taken of filling the gap in demand and supply of the GPRAs in Delhi, the Secretary (UD) stated as follows:—

“There is a need to add more houses. Construction of new houses for the General Pool is undertaken by CPWD after assessing the requirement of the types of houses and availability of funds. I notice that availability of funds has been a somewhat of constraint in adding accommodation as per requirement. During the last two decades something like 2,400 houses have been added to the pool. Coming to the augmentation of the housing stocks, let me say that since we are not able to provide houses to all people at all levels in all categories, there is a need to augment the stock. Something like 2,100 houses are planned to be added in Delhi. Our rough estimate at the time is that this may take about two to three years and another 1,600 (approximate) houses are also planned to be added. This is as far as addition of houses in Delhi is concerned.”

While answering a query on the maintenance of houses, the Secretary, (UD) admitted during the oral evidence that there was a need for improvement in this particular aspect.

2.11 When the Committee enquired about the position of availability of land, funds and commencement of construction works of the new GPRA units during evidence, the Secretary stated as follows:—

“I tried to pin-down myself to starting of work. But I have two constraints. One is after doing all these, what is the allocation, which will be available to us in the coming year 2007-08?

Secondly, for how many number of houses or whatever the accommodation is? So, it would depend on these two factors. That would substantially depend on the 11th Plan allocations, which we get, about which discussions are on now. So, it would be dependent on this. Once a certain assurance of certain amount is there, I suppose we will have to confine ourselves to that availability of funds and try to fit it within the works, which can get started and hopefully which can get completed. But I am still hopeful that in about three years' time-frame, we should be able to work out, achieving these figures.”

2.12 In a post-evidence query in April, 2007 from the Committee, the Ministry of Urban Development was asked to furnish an up-to-date status on the Budgetary provision made during the year 2007-08, physical targets fixed etc., on the proposed 2036 dwelling units in Delhi. The Ministry, in their reply dated 30th April, 2007, stated that a sum of Rs. 685.53 lakh had been received by them as Budgetary allocation for the same. It was also informed that pre-construction activities were under progress in Dev Nagar and Aliganj area. Their statement containing other relevant details is placed at Appendix-I.

Discretionary Allotments of the GPRAs

2.13 The Ministry had informed that two Committees had been constituted by them to consider discretionary allotments and make recommendations in each case. In addition some fixed period allotments were also being made to Freedom Fighters, Artistes, Social Workers, Private Persons and Organizations etc. with the approval of Cabinet Committee on Accommodation (CCA). The category and type-wise break up of allotments made against 5% discretionary quota for the

year 2005 as submitted by the Ministry of Urban Development to the Committee, is reproduced as follows:—

IN DELHI

Type	Functional	Medical	Others	Total	Total No. of vacancies occurred during the year	Percentage of discretionary allotment made during the year
A	04	02	—	06	2838	0.21
B	49	23	01	73	2961	2.46
C	02	02	—	04	2142	0.18
D	04	—	—	04	856	0.46
Type IV (Spl)	01	03	—	04	182	2.19
DII	01	03	—	04	291	1.37
DI	01	02	02	05	142	3.52
CII	—	04	02	06	141	4.25
CI	—	—	01	01	36	2.77
Total					107 Units	

OUTSIDE DELHI

Type	Functional	Medical	Others	Total
B	—	02	—	02
Total	62	41	06	109 Units

2.14 When the Committee enquired about the number of instances noticed where the persons/organizations have not vacated the allotted accommodation within stipulated time, the Ministry informed that there were 11 such cases in Delhi. These are appended as Appendix-II to the Report.

2.15 On the question of checks carried out to obviate excessive number of 'Discretionary Allotments' made by the Directorate of Estates, Secretary (UD) stated during the course of oral evidence as follows:—

“Due to excessive out of turn allotment of Government accommodation in the early nineties, the Supreme Court was seized with the matter. The Court had directed that discretionary or out of turn allotments should be regulated and transparency maintained by framing appropriate rules. In this context, regulations have been framed which were notified on 17.11.1997. All such allotments are made under an overall ceiling of five per cent of vacancies, which occur in a particular type in a particular calendar year. An yearly statement of out of turn allotments made during the year is also placed on the Table of both the Houses of Parliament on an annual basis for each calendar year.”

2.16 In a post evidence query, the Committee desired to be furnished with the latest statement of the discretionary allotments made, which was placed on the Table of the House. The Ministry informed that the Annual Statement is laid on a calendar year basis. Accordingly, they furnished a statement for the calendar year 2005 on 20th March, 2007, which is placed at Appendix-III.

(II) Subletting of GPRAs allotted to individuals

2.17 The Ministry has informed in their written reply that during the period 1.4.2005 to 31.12.2005, 997 houses were inspected from subletting angle. Subletting was suspected in 378 cases and cancellations were made in 150 cases by the competent authority.

2.18 During the course of oral evidence, the Committee asked about the latest position of subletting cases, which came to the notice of the Directorate of Estates. To this, the representative of the Ministry stated as follows:—

“Usually, subletting is reported to us either by way of a complaint or as a feature that is taking place because sometimes what happens is that an allottee, a Government servant allottee, would have rented out or sublet this place to a person who might be carrying on a business which is not quite legitimate or would not be conducive to guarantee a peaceful and good residential quality of life. So, the neighbours would sometimes like to make the complaint. Sometimes there are rivals who are making the complaints. Sometimes even the Departments will make the complaints. When these complaints are made, a team is sent out for examination, and then there is a process of giving them a hearing before a decision is taken. Then, finally an order would be passed in order to establish the fact that there has been or it has not been able to prove the subletting situation.”

Another representative added that:—

“Till November, we have done about 1,241 inspections during the current year. Out of that, we found that 461 were sublet, which is about 37 per cent. It is basically in different categories, and it does not relate to any particular type. Once these are identified as sublet, then there is a hearing; they appear before the deciding authority, who goes into what is the inspection report, what is the document that he presents, what is his or her presentation, and then, it is decided whether the house is sublet or not. Once the deciding authority takes a decision that the house is sublet, then the house is cancelled and he is debarred. He is given a notice and there is also a chance that within 30 days he can appeal before the appellate authority who is the Directorate of Estates. If the decision is upheld again, then if the house is immediately cancelled, he has to vacate. If he does not vacate, then the eviction proceedings begin.”

2.19 Regarding the penalty imposed for subletting of GPRAs, the Ministry also informed the Committee in a written note that the provisions under Allotment Rules had been made more stringent to deal with the menace of subletting with the effect that in proven cases of subletting, the allottee was debarred for allotment for the remaining period of his service. Besides the allottee was charged market rent as damages. Disciplinary proceedings for major penalty were also initiated against the allottee under the relevant Rules by the concerned Department/Ministry.

(III) Administration of the Public Premises Eviction Act, 1971

2.20 The Committee were informed that during the year 2005 (from 1.1.2005 to 31.12.2005), 1562 eviction cases were filed by the Directorate of Estates against unauthorized occupants before the Estate Officers under the provision of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Act, 1971. 1040 cases were disposed of by way of eviction/vacation of premises. 195 cases of recovery of outstanding arrears/damages were also filed.

2.21 The Ministry also submitted that the total number of eviction cases relating to different categories of accommodation (excluding cases adjourned *sine-die*) pending as on 21.12.2006, was 696. The Ministry further submitted the Type wise break-up of the same as follows:

Type	No. of pending cases (excluding <i>sine-die</i> cases)
1	2
A	160
B	127

1	2
C	87
D	43
E & Special	84
Hostel	5
Market	137
Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha Pool (Cases of Members of Parliament)	53
Total	696

2.22 During evidence, the representative of the Ministry informed the Committee that the process of eviction generally took between two to two-and-a half months during which the Estate Officer gave two hearings. When asked whether the outstanding arrears could be recovered from the dues of such Government employees/officers, the representative answered in the affirmative.

Residential accommodation for Members of Parliament and Ex-presiding Officers of the House

2.23 Answering a specific query from the Committee during the oral evidence regarding accommodation for MPs, the Secretary, (UD) stated as under:—

“We start of with the basic proposition that there is Rajya Sabha Pool, and there is Lok Sabha Pool for MPs accommodation. It is from there we start. If there is a problem in accommodating Members of Parliament within that allotted Pool due to various reasons, either it has not fallen vacant or some extra accommodation has been allotted, it is then that a resort to General Pool accommodation is made where the Ministry has to make available houses from out of the General Pool. Of course, allocation of houses to Ministers is something which is done by the Ministry or the Directorate of Estates. Other than that, we are guided by the House Committee rules of respective Houses of Parliament.”

2.24 Regarding the rules guiding these allotments, he further informed:

“So far as allotment of houses form Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha Pools is concerned, the House Committee Rules would guide us,

and have no say on that. But when it is a question of General Pool accommodation, then the General Pool provisions would apply there.”

2.25 He also stated as under:—

“Since the Pool is not sufficient, there is dependence on the General Pool. The word “General” means it is meant for a whole lot of people including officers, Chairmen of Commissions, Committees and the like, and there is a terrible pressure on the availability of housing stock, as far as that particular reference to Type VII or VIII is concerned”.

2.26 Further, the Committee desired to know the entitlement of Ex-Presiding Officer of the House. It was pointed out that as per Rajya Sabha rules, he was entitled for a Type VII/VIII Bungalow, but not entitled to such types as per General Pool rules. The Committee further pointed out certain ambiguities in this regard. A judgment of Supreme Court on allotment of Type VIII Bungalows was also referred in this context. To this, the Secretary, (UD) responded as under:—

“I think a request made by the House Committee was acceded to and houses are made available. It will depend upon the number of houses available at any point of time and there would be a constraint and one has to wait for a house to fall vacant. There are other considerations like somebody who is equally important or somebody who is higher up in the rank is also waiting for a house. As per the Supreme Court intervention, it is a closed chapter now. There was an intervention and that had been appropriately placed before the Court and now that issue is over. After that houses have been allotted and there is no issue as far as court intervention is concerned.”

(b) Position of Housing Stock outside Delhi

2.27 As regards the position of availability of ‘Housing Stock’ outside Delhi, the Ministry submitted to the Committee the demand and availability position of ‘Housing Stock’ in various Regional Stations, as on 31.12.2005, which is reproduced as follows:—

Stations	Demand	Availability
1	2	3
Mumbai	9067	8565
Kolkata	6734	6497

1	2	3
Chennai	2785	2654
Shimla	2384	1160
Chandigarh	2957	2419
Faridabad	1405	1850
Ghaziabad	632	820
Nagpur	1781	1895
Indore	366	423
Lucknow	1215	1137
Hyderabad	850	924
Cochin	231	244
Bangalore	4634	1462
Shillong	314	90
Agartala	314	164
Imphal	120	64
Kohima	100	64
Kanpur	679	793
Ahmedabad (Rajkot)	115	140
Allahabad	902	846
Bhopal	170	166
Thiruvananthapuram	321	230
Dehradun	136	22
Mysore	157	136
Gangtok	276	100
Bikaner	34	21
Jaipur	395	547
Varanasi	110	198
Guwahati	547	226
Agra	81	114
Port Blair	257	219
Srinagar	306	244

2.28 In their written note, the Ministry, submitted that there were 32639 units under GPRA outside Delhi as on 31.12.2005. Further, 1030 units were proposed to be added up to 31.03.2007. Further, it has been proposed to construct about 2300 additional GPRA at various locations outside Delhi in the 11th Plan to improve the satisfaction level at these locations. The details have been submitted as follows:—

Sl.No. Stations	Houses to be Constructed during 11th Plan			Remarks
	Land available	Yet to be acquired	Total	
1. Shimla				
2. Bangalore	410	0	410	
3. Gangtok	10	0	10	
4. Patna	215	0	215	
5. Vadodra	58	0	58	
6. Kasauli				
7. Amritsar		240	240	
8. Jalandhar		178	178	
9. Bareilly	107	0	107	
10. Bhubneshwar	38	0	38	
11. Raipur		200	200	The numbers are approximate. Exact/current demand to be assessed.
12. Calicut	58	0	58	
13. Jammu	200	0	200	The numbers are approximate. Exact/current demand to be assessed.
14. Silchar	51	0	51	
15. Vizag	0	524	524	
Total	1147	1142	2289	

2.29 When the Committee desired to know about the position of construction of 1030 dwelling units outside Delhi, the Ministry submitted the following details:—

Sl.No.	Stations	No.	Remarks
1.	Mumbai	112	Work in progress.
2.	Kolkata	96	Completed.
3.	Chennai	16	Completed.
4.	Shimla	110	32 Nos. Completed.
5.	Indore	10	Work in progress.
6.	Cochin	39	Completed.
7.	Bangalore	60	Completed.
8.	Agra	25	11 Nos. Completed.
9.	Jodhpur	328	Completed.
10.	Pune	210	165 Nos. Completed.
11.	Gangtok	6	Work in progress.
12.	Nainital	14	Work in progress.
13.	Siliguri	4	Work in progress.
Total		1030	

The Ministry added that out of 1030 units; 747 units had since been completed and 217 Units were targeted to be completed upto 31st March 2007. Out of remaining 66 units at Shimla, 42 units would be completed by September 2007 and balance 24 units were not feasible due to these quarters being declared as located in a sinking zone.

2.30 During the course of oral evidence held on 29th December, 2006, the Committee pointed out to the representatives of the Ministry of Urban Development that many officers do not show interest to go to far-flung areas like Gangtok, Guwahati, Shillong, Agartala and Imphal due to lack of accommodation facilities at such stations. There the demand for dwelling units could be less but there was a shortfall. Similarly, in stations like Mumbai and Bangalore, land was available and the demand was high but there was acute shortfall in government accommodation in metropolitan areas. The Committee then desired to know about the steps take to remove the imbalances between demand and supply of dwelling units for Government employees in far-flung

areas as well as metro-cities. To this, the Secretary, (UD) stated as follows:—

“We will once again review the requirements station wise and what is the plan to be made available. It is right to think in terms of those stations where the demand is more and supply is less currently and it needs to be augmented.”

He added that:—

“There is a combination of factors here. Though there is a shortfall in numbers, it is also possible that compared to Delhi, in places like Bangalore or Mumbai, the rent is also comparatively less. The officers staying in Government accommodation are paying comparatively less. This also has to be taken into consideration while looking at the shortage of space *per se*. These factors also need to be accounted for while taking a decision for any particular situation.”

2.31 With regard to Mumbai city, the Committee pointed out to the representatives of the Ministry that vacant lands in Mumbai are mostly vulnerable to encroachments by slum dwellers and desired to know the safeguards taken by the Ministry in this respect. To this, the Secretary, (UD) stated as follows:—

“This is an absolutely important act in the sense that increasingly it is becoming difficult to hold on to vacant land. We had another discussion only today as to how to hold on to vacant land and probably fencing and things like that. So, this is one of the ways of doing things. But there are cities where housing itself is a major issue. Unauthorized construction, slums, encroachment etc. are becoming a normal position. So, one will have to look at where land is available and where land is available and funds are available, one should give priority. Of course, when we look at it, the project as a whole, what we prioritize is whether land is immediately available and it is a vacant land or not and whether the construction can take place or not. If a project involves acquisition of land and then building, naturally it will take more time and it will require more funds also. So, it is a little tight-rope walking and a difficult balancing one has to do.”

Recommendation No. 3

Provision of residential accommodation by the Directorate—problems of shortage

2.32 The shortage of residential accommodation for Government employees has engaged the attention of the Committee for quite

some time. The Committee note that at present there is a shortage of 32,000 (approximately) residential units in various types in Delhi alone in the General Pool. The availability of housing stock with the Directorate is 63216 units in Delhi and 34534 units in 32 other regional stations, which is insufficient keeping in view the huge demand. The Ministry have also admitted during the examination of the subject that in view of the gross inadequacy of the available units several Govt. officers/employees are waiting for allotment of entitled type of accommodation in Delhi and at regional stations and that there definitely exists a need to add more houses. In addition, the examination by the Committee has further revealed that in Delhi, the overall satisfaction level is 67 per cent with 31188 applicants waiting for allotment from Type I to Type VIII including that for hostel accommodation. From this, the Committee are inclined to conclude that the situation in regional stations could be no better. During the evidence, the Secretary of the Ministry sought to assure the Committee that given the total resources, the Directorate would definitely try to achieve Hundred per cent satisfaction level. As part of the Ministry's efforts to fulfill the shortage of GPRAs in Delhi, the Committee have been made to understand that it is proposed to construct 2036 dwelling units, which has already been sanctioned; and 1588 more units, which is awaiting sanction in Delhi, which according to rough estimates may take about 2 to 3 years. The Committee have also been apprised of the Ministry's proposal to add 1030 dwelling units upto 31.3.2007 and also to construct 2289 houses, during 11th Plan, at other regional stations. The Committee further note that with effect from the year 2006-07, a Plan Head has been allocated to the Directorate thus making available funds to meet shortage of housing stock. Besides, during the current Financial Year, a sum of Rs. 685.53 lakh has been received by the Directorate as Budgetary allocation for the construction of the requisite dwelling units. In addition, the regulations for discretionary allotments have been notified in November, 2007 which has fixed an overall ceiling of 5 per cent of vacancies occurring in a particular type in a particular calendar year. The Committee feel that although the proposal of the Directorate to construct more units in Delhi as well as regulate the discretionary allotments in the right direction, they are not sure as to whether the Ministry have carried out a similar exercise to fulfill the financial requirements of the proposed houses to be constructed in the 11th Plan, in the regional stations too and whether appropriate budgetary support is available for constructing the same.

The Committee are also of the view that due to lack of Government accommodation in certain North-Eastern cities like

Gangtok, Guwahati, Shillong, Agartala etc., may Government employees feel constrained to join their duty in these stations. Therefore, the Committee desire that the Ministry should speed up their efforts to work out the exact requirement in terms of the General Pool Residential Accommodation in other regional stations, including the North-East and initiate efforts to fulfill the requirement suitably. In this context, the Committee feel that the Ministry may think in terms of devising a separate component plan for creating GPRAs in the selected North-East cities so that adequate Budgetary allocations could be ensured for the same. They desire to be apprised about the same in due course.

Recommendation No. 4

Unauthorized Sub-letting of Government Residential Accommodation

2.33 The Committee observe that one rampant malpractice, which has aggravated the already acute shortage of Government accommodation, has been the unauthorized sub-letting of quarters, resorted to by certain unscrupulous allottees. They note that during the period of April to December, 2005, sub-letting was suspected in 378 cases by the Directorate of Estates. Between January to November, 2006, around 461 similar cases were suspected. Regarding identification of cases of sub-letting, the Committee have been made to understand that sub-letting is reported mainly by way of a complaint and not as a result of the inspections conducted by the Directorate on their own to detect the unauthorized sub-letting. The Committee are of the definite opinion that if inspections are carried out regularly, it would be a continuous threat to those who resort to unauthorized sub-letting of the Government accommodation. Though the Committee appreciate the steps already taken by the Government to detect such cases and levy penalty on the persons responsible for it, they would further advise the Ministry to carry out effective inspections regularly and extensively to detect the maximum possible number of cases of unauthorized sub-letting. Besides, strong action needs to be initiated against such unscrupulous employees, both serving and retired who misuse the Government facilities for monetary gains, as a deterrent measure, which would not only discourage such aberrations but also mitigate the hardships faced by the genuinely needy employees, by making available to them the Government accommodation without unnecessary delay.

Recommendation No. 5

Residential Accommodation for Members of Parliament and Ex Presiding Officers of the House

2.34 The Committee note that the accommodation requirements for the Members of Parliament is met from the Rajya Sabha and

Lok Sabha Pools, which come under the rules made by the House Committee of the Parliament, and in case of shortage, the Ministry makes an effort to make available houses from out of the General Pool Accommodation. The Committee also acknowledge the hardship faced by the Ministry in this field in view of a number of VIPs waiting in line for allotment of appropriate accommodation. Nonetheless the Committee feel that there is a need to augment the availability of houses in the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha Pools so that the existing pressure on the General Pool could be eased. With regard to the entitlement of Ex-Presiding officers of the House, the Committee have been given to understand that as per Rajya Sabha Rules, the Ex-Presiding officer is entitled for a Type-VII/Type-VIII Bungalow but not entitled to such types as per General Pool Rules. The Committee feel that this anomaly in rules is highly uncalled for. They are of the opinion that in many cases of allotments, clarity and transparency is perhaps compromised due to lack of uniform rules. Therefore, the Committee desire the Ministry to take up this matter with the House Committee so that prevailing anomalies in the rules of allotments in the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha Pools are done away with urgently. The Committee feel that as peoples' representatives, the housing requirement of Members of Parliament is a functional necessity and thus requires more attention from the Ministry. Therefore, they desire that the Ministry may explore the possibility of enhancing the availability of entitled type of accommodation for Members of Parliament. The Committee also desire that the availability of appropriate accommodation for Ex-Presiding officers of the House as well as the present order of priority accorded to such dignitaries in the matter of allotment may be reviewed and taken up suitably with the House Committee, if needed, so that the difficulties, if any, faced by the dignitaries falling in this category, may be suitably addressed.

Recommendation No. 6

Problem of Encroachment of Government—acquired land in Mumbai

2.35 The Committee express serious concern over the fact that in Mumbai city, vacant Government land is extremely vulnerable to encroachments by the different sections of society. During the course of the oral evidence, the Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development has also admitted that it is becoming increasingly difficult for them to hold on to the vacant land and that unauthorized construction and encroachment on it is becoming commonplace. The Committee feel that unless construction activities are taken up well in time, the

acquired land lying vacant will always be a temptation giving scope for encroachment and unauthorized construction. Besides, once the land is encroached, it is an uphill task for the Government to get it vacated and in the process, the Government may have to approach the courts and incur avoidable expenditure too. Therefore, the Committee strongly recommend that the Government must adopt such an approach so that as far as possible, the acquired land do not remain idle for unnecessary long period. Besides, in cases where delay is considered unavoidable, adequate safeguards like fencing, prohibitory hoardings and other required measures to protect such lands should be taken by the Government immediately, particularly in cities like Mumbai, where land mafia is reportedly, very active owing to the fact that the availability of land for construction is shrinking day-by-day.

CHAPTER III

AVAILABILITY OF OFFICE ACCOMMODATION

(i) Shortage in Office Accommodation available with the Directorate of Estates

3.1 The Committee have been informed by the Ministry of Urban Development in their written note that the position of office accommodation is also not very satisfactory. There is a net shortage of 25.90 Lakh sq. feet of Office accommodation in Delhi alone and 20.12 Lakh sq. feet in other Regional Stations. The details of availability and shortage of General Pool Office accommodation at Delhi and various Regional Stations in India as on 31.12.2005 as furnished by the Ministry, was as follows:—

Stations	Demand (Sq.ft)	Availability	Shortage (Sq.ft.)
Delhi	1,07,43,000	77,85,000	29,58,000
Kolkata	20,74,653	13,79,402	6,95,251
Mumbai	11,33,246	9,63,211	1,70,035
Chennai	8,91,551	6,77,185	2,14,366
Shimla	1,82,556	1,79,358	3,198
Chandigarh	1,68,176	1,10,032	58,134
Nagpur	3,97,126	3,40,699	56,427
Faridabad	1,82,126	1,82,126	Nil
Ghaziabad	1,20,330	1,20,330	Nil
Bangalore	5,31,802	1,71,697	3,60,105
Thiruvananthapuram	1,93,411	85,811	1,07,600
Hyderabad	2,81,395	1,83,806	97,589
Agra	28,764	36,921	(-)8,157
Lucknow	2,17,367	1,30,474	86,893
Bhopal	1,86,240	43,040	1,43,200
Indore	2,16,408	1,88,171	28,237
Cochin	1,02,945	1,03,616	671(-)

3.2 The Committee desired to know about the steps taken by the Ministry to fulfil the demands of Government Office Accommodation. The Ministry stated that to tide over this problem the, Directorate of Estates gives “Non Availability Certificate” to facilitate hiring of office accommodation from the open market by different Departments/ Ministries. An amount of Rs. 15.5 crore was stated to be allocated during the current Financial Year to make payments toward rent etc. of the requisitioned/leased buildings by Directorate of Estates. However, the Ministry informed that no new buildings had been acquired/hired during the current Financial Year by the Directorate of Estates, as the existing policy of the Ministry was to encourage direct tenancy.

3.3 On a query regarding allocation of funds in the Budget for the purpose of payment of rent amounting of Rs. 15.5 crore by the Directorate of Estates for Office Accommodation, the representative of the Ministry confirmed during the oral evidence held on 29th December, 2006, as follows:—

“Yes, Sir. So, we have also leased accommodation in various buildings. For that also we are paying the rent.”

Secretary (Urban Development) added:—

“Basically, I think, it is a historic situation. Earlier we used to rent out accommodation to accommodate the requirements of other Departments or the Ministries. Of late, the tendency is to make the certificate available so that they are on their own and they go and find accommodation for themselves.”

(a) Shortage of General Pool Office Accommodation in regional areas

3.4 When the Committee enquired about construction of new General Pool Office Accommodation (GPOA) in the various regional areas, the Ministry informed in their written reply that additional GPOA had been proposed and sanctioned in Calicut, Bareilly, and Nasik. Also, additional GPOA have been proposed for Chennai, Bangalore, Thiruvanthapuram, Vadodara, Port Blair, Mysore, Jaladnhar, Kanpur, Varanasi, Gangtok, Amritsar, Allahabad, Bhubaneswar, Patna, Vizag, Gurchuk, Guwahati, Silchar, Srinagar, Jodhpur, Hubli, Belgaum, Kottayam, Mangalore and Trichur. (Please see Appendix-III)

(b) Scenario of Government Office Accommodation in Delhi

3.5 The Committee enquired about the details of Government Office Accommodation available with the Directorate of Estates in Delhi. The

Ministry in their written reply informed that the scenario of office accommodation in Delhi was not fully satisfactory and there was a net shortage of 25.90 lakh sq. fit. as on date. In addition to this, there was leased office space of 5.96 lakh sq. fit, which needed to be released by Directorate of Estates to minimize the rental liability. They further informed the Committee that due to the scarcity of office space the needy Departments/Ministries had been issued a 'Non-Availability Certificate' to meet the requirements from the open market.

3.6 When the Committee enquired about the steps taken to overcome the shortage in Government Pool Office Accommodation (GPOA) and avoiding of hiring of office space from the open market in Delhi, the Ministry stated that to avoid hiring of office accommodation from the open market, the following new GPOA projects were in the pipeline:—

Sl.No.	Location	Quantum of Space	Remarks
(i)	INA Complex	15370 sq. mtrs. (Plinth area)	Project under planning/ construction stage and may be available within 3 years. Only 60% of plinth area can be utilized.
(ii)	Pushp Vihar, Phase-II M.B. Road	87,460 sq. mtrs. (Plinth area)	-do-
(iii)	Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Marg (Rouse Avenue)	30,000 sq. mtrs. (Plinth area)	—
(iv)	Shahdara, Delhi	11,000 sq. mtrs. (Plinth area)	—
	Total	1,43,830 sq. mtrs. (Plinth area) or 86,298 sq. mtrs. (Carpet area) or 9,28,566 sq. fit. (Carpet area)	

3.7 The Ministry, however, also stated that even after completion of the above said GPOA Projects, the shortage of office space in Delhi would still remain.

3.8 During the course of oral evidence, the Committee pointed out to the representatives of the Ministry that the Government Offices

having their Headquarters outside Delhi should not be given Government Office Accommodation in Delhi as such Departments could open their offices in regional areas. To this, the Secretary (UD) stated as follows:—

“As far as office space is concerned, there is a constraint, and I think that this is one of the points that I would definitely like to highlight here. I am taking into account the overall situation in Delhi. We provide certificate for other types of offices, so that they can go to the market and rent out space. But it s a question of what offices should be located in the core area of Delhi and what offices can go outside Delhi. This is where each Ministry normally put up a case or builds up a case as to why that office or authority should be located in Delhi itself thereby adding a new dimension to the shortage of office space. Further, quite often it would require allocation of accommodation at the higher levels.”

He added as follows:—

“I would just like to refer to two points. The first is about allotment of land for office space in Delhi. Quite often it starts as a new authority or a new office is to be established. So, the matter is taken up to the Cabinet that this office is important and quite often the stand taken is that it has to be located in Delhi close to the Ministry or holding important consultations. That is the starting point. It does not always start by getting land allotted. First, it is location of the office in Delhi itself. Then, they will try with us to find out whether there is some official accommodation available. If that is available, and if they succeed in highlighting that, that office is so important that it has to be accommodated in one of the existing buildings, then they succeed in getting the accommodation also. Otherwise, they take a certificate from us that accommodation is not available, and then they rent out a building in the core part of Delhi itself. That is as far as the location of new offices in Delhi is concerned. Then, coming to the question of existing offices trying for land, I must say that it is increasingly becoming difficult to make available that type of land in the core part, unless they also decide to shift to the far off areas.

The second point is about the assessment of requirement of space, which is something, which we have initiated as an action. There has been a big slow response from each Ministry because I suppose the Ministries normally do not want to part with the required

information or sufficient information. So, we have highlighted it as a point of action for us. We will provide opportunities to the Ministries to take stock of the accommodation available, the space available with them, whether it is sufficient, whether it is more, whether it is less, based on certain basic information to be given. So, we will continue to indulge in that exercise so that we get a clear picture as to whether some people are holding accommodation more than what is required.”

Recommendation No. 7

Availability of Office Accommodation—Problems of shortage of shifting of Offices from Delhi

3.9 The Committee note that in so far as the available space for office accommodation is concerned, there is a net shortage of 25.90 lakh sq. feet in Delhi alone and 20.12 lakh sq. feet in other regional stations as on 31st December 2005. They also note that at present, there is leased office space of 59.96 lakh sq. feet which needs to be released by the Directorate of Estates of minimize the rental liability of the Government. The Committee also note that in most of the major cities, the actual availability of Office Accommodation with the Directorate of Estates is almost 50% of the overall demand of Office Accommodation for Government Departments/Ministries etc. To cite two instances, in Kolkata, the demand for Office Accommodation is 20,74,653 sq. fit. but the availability is only 13,79,402 sq. ft. Similarly, at Bangalore the demand for Office Accommodation is 5,31,802 sq. fit. but the availability is 1,71,697 sq. ft. Apart from these cities, there is also shortage of Office Accommodation at Mumbai, Chennai, Shimla, Chandigarh, Nagpur, Thiruvananthapuram, Hyderabad, Lucknow, Bhopal and Indore. As per the Ministry, the allocation of funds in the Budget for the purpose of payment of rent is around Rs. 15.5 crore during the current Financial Year. Although the Committee have been made to understand that no new buildings have been acquired or hired during the current Financial Year in order to encourage direct tenancy, the Committee feel that the problem of shortage of office space is as serious as that of Residential Accommodation. With regard to steps taken by the Government to overcome this shortage, the Committee note that there are four new GPOA Projects currently under planning/ construction stage totalling approximately 9.28 lakh sq. fit. which may be available within three years from now on in Delhi. However, the Ministry have already admitted that even after completion of the same, the shortage of office space in Delhi will continue to exist

to some extent. As regards the construction of new GPOA in various regional areas, the Committee note that additional GPOA has been proposed and sanctioned in three cities and in 25 other cities, further GPOA has been proposed to be constructed. While the Committee feel that the Ministry is making efforts to meet the demands for Office Accommodation in Delhi and other areas, at the same time they are also of the view that the location of new offices in Delhi requires a policy shift, in the sense that Government offices having their Headquarters outside Delhi should not be given office space in Delhi. The Committee agree with the Ministry that it indeed is an uphill task to convince a Department about not having their offices in Delhi. Nonetheless, they feel that the Ministry must think twice before agreeing to provide office space to such departments in future. Besides, the Committee are also aware that although some offices were identified for shifting out of Delhi, yet those have not shifted so far. Moreover, the Committee note that although the Ministries have also been asked by the Government to assess their requirements of space, the response in some cases is either too slow or not forthcoming at all. The Committee recommend that all such cases must be followed up vigorously so as to bring them to a logical end without further delay. Further, the Committee are of the opinion that in order to ease the pressure on Delhi for office space, the Government should make prudent use of the already available land by demolishing old and dilapidated structures and construct vertical structures. In addition, the Government may also explore the possibility of establishing a 'Satellite Office City' in the NCR region which may either be integrated with the existing metro transport link of the Central Secretariat Office Complex in Delhi or may have separate corridors for rapid transport system to ensure a safe, smooth and efficient travel for the potential office-goers coming from Delhi.

Recommendation No. 8

Need to avoid the hiring of Office Accommodation from the open market

3.10 The Committee note that in order to partially meet the problem of shortage of GPOA, the Directorate of Estates have resorted to giving 'Non-availability Certificate' or 'No Objection Certificate' to different Departments/Ministries so as to facilitate the hiring of Office Accommodation from the open market. During the current Financial Year, a huge amount has been allocated to make payment towards rent of the requisitioned/leased buildings by the Directorate. The Committee strongly feel that this arrangement can work only on a short time basis and thus cannot be a permanent

solution to the problem of shortage of office space. The Committee have already recommended that the Government should think of providing office space outside Delhi in the NCR Region which, if considered seriously, can provide a solution to problem of renting or leasing of office space in Delhi at enorbitant rates. The Committee would like to be apprised about the action taken in the matter in due course. The Committee further desire that the new construction projects for providing GPOA at the INA Complex, Pushp Vihar, Deen Dayal Upadhyay Marg and Shahdara in Delhi, which currently are in the pipeline, may be completed well in time without any undue delay.

Recommendation No. 9

Need to provide GPOA in Regional Areas

3.11 All the information made available to the Committee, they note that additional GPOA has been proposed and sanctioned in three cities namely Calicut (new Kozhikode), Bareilly and Nasik. Also there are proposals for additional GPOA in 25 other cities including Chennai, Bangalore, Allahabad, Bhubaneswar, Port Blair, Varanasi and Guwahati etc. The Committee hope that the already sanctioned construction projects have already commenced and that the Government is taking requisite action to ensure the completion of these projects within a specific time-frame. As regards the proposals in 25 other cities, the Committee would urge the Government to give priority to the construction proposals in those cities where huge amount is currently being spent on rent or lease of hired buildings. The Committee would like to be apprised about the progress regarding their sanction, time-frame for completion etc. within three months of the presentation of this report.

NEW DELHI;
6 September, 2007

15 Bhadrapada, 1929 (Saka)

MOHD. SALIM,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Urban
Development.

APPENDIX I

STATUS OF 2036 DWELLING UNITS PROPOSED TO BE CONSTRUCTED

Sl.No.	Name of work and Location	Number of Units	Budget allocation received during 2007-08 (Rs. in lakhs)	Whether physical targets fixed	Time-frame fixed for completion of assign.	Agency selected for construction of unit	Whether construction started or not	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	C/o. 140 Type-5 & 104 Type-6 flats in Pocket-VI, DDU Marg, New Delhi	244	372.73	2 years from date of start	24 months	Tender with Central Works Board	No	The issue of permit density relaxation is under consideration of the Ministry of Urban Development. The work shall be awarded on approval of drawings by DDA.
2.	C/o. 340 Type-4 quarters in DDU Marg, New Delhi	340	33.00	Not yet fixed	Not yet fixed	The Model Concession Agreement (MCA) to	No	Work taken up under Public - Private Partnership (PPP) mode. The Consultant has

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
						be finalized before call of tenders		prepared two alternatives of Lay out Plan (LOP) which are to be discussed with Planning Commission for preparation of model concession agreement.
3.	Co/ 108 Type-5 & 24 Nos. Type-6 quarters, at Vasant Vihar,	132	162.35	Revised Scheme under approval.	Revised Scheme under approval	Revised Scheme under approval	No	The area is presently under Zonal green as per Master Plan. A revised Lay out Plan (LOP) has been prepared making suitable provision for the Zonal green on an integrated plan of Vasant Vihar Complex.
4.	C/o. 440 Type-2 quarters at Dev Nagar, New Delhi	440	25.35	Yes, 2 years from date of start	24 months	Tenders yet to be called	No	Pre-construction Activities under progress

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5.	C/o. 400 Nos. Type-3 quarters at Dev Nagar, New Delhi	400	61.40	Yes, 2 years from date of start	24 months	Tenders yet to be called	No	Pre-construction Activities under progress
6.	C/o. 180 Nos. Type-4 quarters at Dev Nagar, New Delhi	180		Yes, 2 years from date of start	24 months	Tenders yet to be called	No	Pre-construction Activities under progress
7.	Redevelopment of Aliganj Area, New Delhi. SH: C/o. 300 Nos. Type-2 quarters	300	30.70	Yes, 2 years from date of start	24 months	Tenders yet to be called	No	Pre-construction Activities under progress
Total		2036	685.53					

APPENDIX II

LIST OF GPRA_s TO BE VACATED AFTER LAPSE OF TIME- PERIOD GIVEN UNDER 'DISCRETIONARY ALLOTMENT'

1. **24, Canning Lane:**—AITUC (All India Trade Union Congress) was allotted 24, Canning Lane for a period of 2 years *w.e.f.* 02.05.2000 on payment of special licence fee with the approval of CCA. Subsequently, the period was extended for a further period of three years *w.e.f.* 01.05.2002 to 01.05.2005 with the approval of CCA. The allotment was further extended upto 31.12.2006.
2. **Flat No. CI/11, Humayun Road:**—Kumari Mayawati was allotted CI/11, Humayun Road *w.e.f.* 14.06.2002 in her capacity as Vice-President of the BSP, in relaxation of the existing guidelines governing allotment of Government accommodation from General Pool to the Political Parties with the approval of CCA on payment of normal licence fee.
3. **AB-19, Mathura Road:**—Foreign Correspondents Club of South Asia was allotted bunglaow No. AB-19, Mathura Road *w.e.f.* 01.09.1992 on the recommendations made by the Ministry of External Affairs initially for a period of one year on payment of Market Rent. The period of allotment has been extended periodically with the approval of CCA and the last extension is for five years *w.e.f.* 06.01.2005.
4. **05, Windsor Place:**—This bungalow was allotted to Indian Women's Press Corps for a period of two years subject to approval of competent authority, which was occupied by them on 23.05.1994. Allotment was periodically extended by the CCA and the last extension was upto 05.01.2006. Eviction proceedings had been initiated to get the house vacated and Eviction orders passed on 24.7.2006. However, on the basis of a letter received from Shri P.R. Dasmunsi, Minister for I & B and Parliamentary Affairs, eviction has not been carried out. Ministry of I & B is approaching the CCA for further retention of the bungalow.
5. **34, Lodi Estates:**—This was allotted to Shri Ashwini Kumar, Resident Editor, Punjab Kesri in June, 1998 on security grounds with the approval of CCA on payment on special licence fee. The retention allowed by the CCA was upto 05.08.2006. Formal

cancellation of the house is yet to be made for want of approval, file stands submitted to UDM.

6. **91, Lodi Estates:**—This bungalow was allotted to Rajmata Gayatri Devi of Jaipur in June 1977. The period of allotment extended from time to time with the approval of CCA and the CCA in its meeting held on 20.6.88 approved the allotment for her life time on payment of Special licence fee. The matter was reviewed following Delhi High Court order dated 27.10.99 and the CCA allowed further retention of the premises by her upto 06.12.2001. This allotment was further extended with the approval of CCA up to 31.12.2002. From 01.01.2003, she is in unauthorized occupation of the premises. She has gone to the High Court against the Eviction order passed by the Estate Officer. The matter is pending in the Court.
7. **11, Talkatora Road:**—This house was allotted to Shri K.P.S. Gill on security grounds and periodical extensions were taken from the CCA. The last extension was upto 30.4.2006 and the allotment has accordingly been cancelled *w.e.f.* 1.5.2006. MHA has since requested to allow him to retain accommodation for a further period of one year on security grounds. Since MHA is the nodal authority to decide and assess the security threat, they have been requested to prepare the CCA note in the matter *vide* letter dated 7.11.2006.
8. **14, Talkatora Road:**—This bungalow was allotted to Shri M.S. Bitta in June 1996 on security grounds and periodical extensions were obtained from the CCA. The last extension was upto 30.4.2006 and the allotment has been cancelled in his name. Home Ministry has requested to allow him further retention for one year on security grounds. MHA being the nodal authority to decide and assess the security threat, they have been requested to prepare the CCA note in the matter *vide* letter dated 7.11.2006.
9. **6-A, Telegraph Lane:**—Shri P.V. Prabhakar Rao S/o Late Shri P.V. Narsimha Rao has been allotted Type V accommodation No. 6-A, Telegraph Lane for the period from 07.03.2006 to 21.02.2007 on payment of normal licence fee to enable him to vacate bungalow No. 9, Moti Lal Nehru Marg.
10. **DI/112, Rabindra Nagar:**—The allotment of this house was regularized in the name of Smt. Pratibha Pande in her capacity as Eminent Artiste for a period of three years *w.e.f.* 01.01.1990. The period of allotment subsequently extended upto 31.12.1997

with the approval of CCA. From 01.01.1998, she is in unauthorized occupation of the premises. Ministry of Culture is approaching the CCA for retention of accommodation in her capacity as eminent Artiste. File in the matter stands submitted to UDM.

11. **DI/193, Bharti Nagar:**—The allotment of flat No. DI/193, Bharti Nagar was made to Ms. Sarla Mehta, in her capacity as an eminent Social Worker on leave and licence fee basis for a period of 1 year with the approval of CCA. The allotment was subsequently extended upto 08.02.2000 and then up to 08.02.2003 with the approval of CCA. The allotment was cancelled and eviction proceedings initiated, Estate officer has passed eviction order also. However, Ms. Mehta filed a suit against the eviction order in the Court of ADJ.

APPENDIX III

DETAILS OF PROPOSED ADDITIONAL GPOA OUTSIDE DELHI

Sl. No.	Stations
Sanctioned schemes	
1.	Calicut
2.	Bareilly
3.	Nasik
New Schemes under considerations	
1.	Chennai
2.	Bangalore
3.	Thiruvananthapuram
4.	Vadodra
5.	Port Blair
6.	Mysore
7.	Jalandhar
8.	Kanpur
9.	Varanasi
10.	Gangtok
11.	Amritsar
12.	Allahabad
13.	Bhubneshwar
14.	Patna
15.	Vizag
16.	Gurchuk, Guwahati
17.	Silchar
18.	Srinagar
19.	Jodhpur
20.	Hubli
21.	Belgaum
22.	Kottayam
23.	Mangalore
24.	Trichur

APPENDIX IV

COMMITTEE ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT (2006-2007)

MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE
HELD ON FRIDAY, THE 29TH DECEMBER, 2006

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1645 hrs. in Committee Room,
'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Mohd. Salim—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
3. Shri Anant Gudhe
4. Shri Pusp Jain
5. Shri Sajjan Kumar
6. Shri Sudhangshu Seal
7. Kunwar Sarv Raj Singh
8. Shri Jagdish Tytler
9. Kunwar Devendra Singh Yadav

Rajya Sabha

10. Shri Nandi Yellaiah
11. Shri B.K. Hariprasad
12. Shri Surendra Moti Lal Patel
13. Shri Penumalli Madhu
14. Shri Mukul Roy
15. Shri Manohar Joshi

SECRETARIAT

Smt. Neera Singh — *Under Secretary*

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY

1. Shri M. Ramachandran — Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development
2. Shri S.M. Acharya — Additional Secretary, Ministry of UD
3. Shri A. Chakrabarti — Director General (Works) CPWD
4. Shri V.K. Sharma — Director (S&D), CPWD
5. Ms. Sujaya Krishnan — Director of Estates II, Directorate of Estates

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee. The Committee then decided to reschedule their study visit to Hyderabad, Mumbai and Goa due to Municipal Elections in Mumbai, the Committee will now undertake an on-the-spot study visit to Goa, Mumbai and Hyderabad from 2nd to 6th February 2007 instead of 31st January to 3rd February, 2007.

3. The Chairman, thereafter welcomed the representatives of the Ministry of Urban Development to the sitting of the Committee. The Chairman, then asked the representatives of the Ministry to brief the Committee about their views on the subject 'Directorate of Estates'. He also drew the attention of the representatives of the Ministry to the provisions of direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker.

4. The Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development briefed the Committee on the details of the work being done by the Directorate of Estates. The Committee then discussed in detail various issues related to the subject. The representatives of the Ministry clarified the queries raised by the members.

5. A verbatim record of the proceedings has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX V

STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT (2007-2008)

MINUTES OF THE SECOND SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE
HELD ON THURSDAY, THE 30TH AUGUST, 2007

The Committee sat from 1600 hrs. to 1700 hrs. in the Chairman's Chamber Room No. 119, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Mohd. Salim—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Smt. Botcha Jhansi Lakshmi
3. Shri Kailash Joshi
4. Shri Shripad Yesso Naik
5. Shri Suresh Ganpatrao Wagmare

Rajya Sabha

6. Shri B.K. Hariprasad
7. Shri Surendra Moti Lal Patel
8. Shri Krishan Lal Balmiki
9. Shri Brij Bhushan Tiwari
10. Shri Manohar Joshi

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri R.K. Saxena — *Director*
2. Smt. Anita B. Panda — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri Harchain — *Under Secretary*

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee. The Committee first took up for consideration the draft report on Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Seventeenth Report of the

Committee on the subject Central Public Works Department (CPWD). After some deliberation, the Committee adopted the draft report without any modification.

3. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration the draft report on the subject "Directorate of Estates". Members suggested certain minor changes/modifications to the draft report. The Committee then adopted the draft report with those modifications.

4. The Committee then authorized the Chairman to finalise both the Reports on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Ministries and present the same to the Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.