

**TWENTY NINTH REPORT**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2002)**

**(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

**MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY  
ALLEVIATION  
(DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2001-2002)**

*[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the  
Twenty third Report of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural  
Development (Thirteenth Lok Sabha)]*

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 13.3.2002*

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on 14.3.2002*

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*March, 2002/Phalguna, 1923 (Saka)*

## CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

INTRODUCTION

**CHAPTER I**            Report

**Analysis of Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 23<sup>rd</sup> Report of the Committee (13<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha).....**

**COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2002)**

***Shri Anant Gangaram Geete - Chairman***

**MEMBERS**

***LOK SABHA***

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Ranen Barman
4. Shri Padmanava Behera
5. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
6. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
7. Shri Shriram Chauhan
8. Shri Shamsheer Singh Dullo
9. Shrimati Hema Gamang
10. Shri G. Putta Swamy Gowda
11. Shri Basavanagoud Kolor
12. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
13. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
14. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
15. Dr. Laxminarayanan Pandey
16. Shri Sukhdeo Paswan
17. Shri Chandresh Patel
18. Shri Laxmanrao Patil
19. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
20. Shri Rajesh Ranjan
21. Shri Gutha Sukender Reddy
22. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
23. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
24. Shri Maheshwar Singh
25. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
26. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
27. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
28. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma
29. Shri D. Venugopal
30. Shri Dinesh Chandra Yadav

***RAJYA SABHA***

31. Shri S. Agniraj
32. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
33. Shri N.R. Dasari
34. Ven'ble Dhammaviriyo
35. Shri H.K. Javare Gowda
36. Shri Maurice Kujur
37. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana

38. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
39. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan
40. Shri Nabam Rebia
41. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
42. Shri Man Mohan Samal
43. Shri Devi Prasad Singh
44. Shri Prakanta Warisa
45. Vacant

#### **SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi - Joint Secretary
2. Shri K. Chakraborty - Deputy Secretary
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra - Under Secretary

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (2002) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Twenty ninth Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twenty third Report of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2001-2002) of the Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation (Department of Urban Development).

2. The Twenty third Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 20<sup>th</sup> April, 2001. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 1<sup>st</sup> January, 2002.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 27<sup>th</sup> February, 2002.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twenty third Report of the Committee (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) is given in *Appendix XII*.

***NEW DELHI;***  
***11 March, 2002***  

---

***20 Phalguna, 1923 (Saka)***

***ANANT GANGARAM GEETE,***  
***Chairman,***  
***Standing Committee on Urban***  
***and Rural Development***

## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Urban and Rural Development (2002) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Twenty-third Report on Demands for Grants (2001-2002) of the Department of Urban Development (Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 20<sup>th</sup> April, 2001.

2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 34 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:

- |       |   |   |
|-------|---|---|
| (i)   | Recommendations which have accepted by the Government   | 2.6, 2.9, 2.18, 2.22, 2.27, 2.28, 2.35, 2.39, 3.3, 3.8, 3.14, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10, 4.15, 4.18, 4.21, 4.22, 4.25, 4.33, 4.34, 4.35, 4.36, 4.38, 4.54, 4.56 and 4.62 |
| (ii)  | Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies           | 2.12 and 3.7  |
| (iii) | Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee | 2.30, 3.16 and 3.23   |
| (iv)  | Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited                 | 4.39 and 4.42   |

**3. The Committee desire that final replies in respect of the recommendations for which only interim replies have been given by the Government should be furnished to the Committee within three months of the presentation of the Report.**

4. The Committee will now deal with action taken by the Government on some of these recommendations in the succeeding paragraphs.

**A. Enforcement of building bye-laws and conducting an independent survey to find out safety of existing buildings**

#### **Recommendation (Para Nos.2.27 and 2.28)**

5. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee note that 67.4% of the total geographical area of the country is vulnerable to various natural calamities like earthquake, cyclone, etc. It is also a matter of concern that nearly one percent of the housing stock is affected by such natural hazards every year. The Committee feel that serious consideration needs to be given to ensure construction of seismic proof houses in the earthquake prone areas in the country. While noting that certain provisions of building bye-laws governing the safety aspects of buildings in Delhi have been amended by the Government, the Committee find that besides making legal changes, the enforcement of the law is another area for concern. The Committee, therefore, urge that the Government should find out ways to ensure that the existing laws are scrupulously observed. The Committee also recommend that the Government should consider making an independent survey to find out the safety of the existing Government as well as private buildings in the country particularly in those areas which are earthquake prone and find out ways to retrofit those buildings which are not safe.

**(Recommendation Para No.2.27)**

The Committee while noting that the safety aspects of building is the State subject, feel that certain model guidelines be issued by the Central Government with instructions to the State Governments to make the requisite changes in their building bye-laws and also to look after the enforcement of the relevant laws.”

**(Recommendation Para No.2.28)**

6. The Government have stated as under:

“An Expert Group had been set up by the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment to formulate Vulnerability Atlas of India and evolve Technical Guidelines for Disaster Resistant Construction Technologies. The Group submitted its Report in 1997. Thereafter, a seminar was organised which was participated by representatives of the Ministry, HUDCO, BMTPC, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment, National Centre for Disaster Management, Ministry of Science and Technology, University of Roorkee, CPWD, etc.

In May, 1998, Guidelines were issued to all States and Union territories emphasizing the need to promote Vulnerable Atlas and to examine the recommendations of the Experts.@ The States were advised to bring necessary modifications in their respective Building Bye-laws, regulations, land use, zonal development control rules and town and country planning Acts. The States *inter alia* were advised to take up the programme for retrofitting and strengthening of the existing housing stock with a view to prevent their large scale damage and destruction in case of occurrence of any natural hazard.

In this respect, a note of the BMTPC on the recommendations of the Expert Group has been drafted. It has also brought out a film regarding ‘Build Safer Tomorrow’ for creating awareness on the concept of disaster mitigation and preparedness as recommended by Expert Group. Thereafter, several brochures and

---

@ Please see page 16-17 of the action taken notes  
manuals for wide-scale dissemination of the information were made. It was also decided to build demonstrative buildings on the disaster resistant features with

centrally sponsored loan-cum-grant scheme for retrofitting of houses in disaster prone regions.

As far as Delhi is concerned, presently sanction of building plans is being accorded as per Building Bye-laws, 1983 applicable in Delhi. Clause 18 of Part III (Structural Safety and Services) provided for structural safety and services of the buildings. This has been modified to make it mandatory to follow the provisions of Indian Standards for earthquake protection in buildings. Copy of the Notification dated 21<sup>st</sup> March, 2001 amending the Delhi Building Bye-laws 1983 to provide for necessary safety measures to be followed in all buildings to be constructed in Delhi in future has been issued. All State Governments have also been advised to make requisite amendments in their Building Bye-laws to ensure structural safety.”

**7. While going through the action taken replies and the annexure enclosed thereto indicating the steps taken by the Government to ensure earthquake prone houses in the seismic proof areas in the country, the Committee find that various proposed works mainly launching of Centrally Sponsored loan cum grant Scheme for retrofitting of houses in disaster prone regions are still to be implemented by the Government. They also find that Working Group set up by the Planning Commission in connection with the formulation of the Ninth Plan had taken cognizance of the said recommendations of the Expert Group and recommended for launching the said Centrally Sponsored Scheme during the Ninth Plan. Even when the 9<sup>th</sup> Plan is about to end the Government are yet to take steps in this regard. Taking into consideration the havoc caused by the recent earthquake which occurred in Gujarat during the year 2001, the Committee urge the Government to implement the proposed works in pursuance of the recommendations made by the Expert Group without any further delay.**

## **B. Formulation of Urban Land Use Policy**

### **Recommendation (Para No.2.30)**

8. The Committee had noted as under:

“The Committee are concerned to note that more than three and a half decades have passed since a serious effort was made by the Ministry of Health for formulating the Urban Land Policy for which a Committee was set up and the report of which was also submitted to the Government. After that no thought has been given by the Government in this regard. The Committee find that the existing master plans in the respective cities do not reflect the factual position as it exists today for economically weaker sections specially slums as could be seen in the big cities like Delhi and Mumbai. The Committee feel that to solve this problem, there is an urgent need to formulate an Urban Land Use Policy.

The Committee feel that unless the master plans reflect the need and reality of the cities as it exists today, the majority of the slums in the city will automatically become illegal. Therefore, land-use maps and Development plans of every city must include the following:

- (a) Plans must be redrawn incorporating all existing realities. Land occupied under slums must be clearly recorded.

- (b) The land-use plan must reserve land for EWS housing in proportion to the population of the poor. Mere reservation of land for housing as is generally the trend is unacceptable. The land is then grabbed for housing of upper classes to a greater proportion.
- (c) Land for transit housing – Land – use plan must earmark adequate land for transit housing. Transit housing is required for several purposes and is a continuous need for any city. Even slums redevelopment projects often require this facility.
- (d) Land Bank – Every city must create a land bank in order to make land available for the city’s priority projects, including slum rehabilitation. Sites of important reservations that are occupied by slums have to be cleared for larger interest of the city.”

9. The Government have replied as below:

“Land being a State subject guidelines pertaining to Urban Land Use such as Urban Development Plans Formulation and Implementation Guidelines sponsored by Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation etc. have been circulated to all the State Governments from time to time.

It is up to the State Government to take note of these various policies pertaining to urban land and take necessary action to implement them. They may also formulate their specific urban land policy, which they deem suitable to their own condition. While preparing various master plans/development plans the State Government may incorporate the urban land policy suitable to their State.

The observations of the Hon’ble Committee have been brought to the notice of all the State Governments/Union territory Governments for necessary action/compliance.”

**10. On the recommendation of the Committee to expedite formulation of a National Land Use Policy, the Government have furnished a vague reply stating that land is a State subject. Further in the action taken reply, it has been stated that the observations of the Committee have been brought to the notice of all State Governments/Union territories. The Committee feel that mere circulation of their earlier recommendations to the States/Union territories will not provide tangible results. The Government must formulate a model land use policy that takes into account the needs of the economically weaker sections (EWS) with a view to provide social injustice.**

**C. Survey to judge level of satisfaction of allottees**

**Recommendation (Para No.3.16)**

11. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee note with concern that the Government have never thought of conducting a survey to judge the level of satisfaction of allottees of general pool as well as other pool accommodations from which the Directorate of Estates gets the licence fee. They feel that such a survey would definitely give an insight to the needs of the residents and can provide feedback to the Government to reorient their policy in this regard. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Government should

conduct a survey in this regard without any further delay and apprise the Committee accordingly.”

12. The Government have replied as below:

“Directorate of Estates is responsible for allotment of general pool residential accommodation under its administrative control. Licence fee is recovered by the administrative departments and is deposited in the major head ‘0216 Housing’. Directorate of Estates does not receive any licence fee in respect of the departmental pool accommodation maintained by various Ministries/Departments.

A survey has been conducted regarding satisfaction with the service being provided by CPWD in respect of civil, electrical, water supply, general maintenance and quality of material/service. Suggestions for improvement in services were also invited from the allottees. As per the feedback given by the allottees, 61% are satisfied with the services being provided by CPWD and 39% have indicated that service being provided by CPWD is not adequate. Position in respect of various items is given as under:

Area of work	Percentage of allottees, who are satisfied	Percentage of allottees who are unsatisfied
Civil	64	36
Electrical	66	34
Water supply	57	43
General maintenance	60	40
Quality of material/service	59	41

The residents have made various suggestions for improvement of service and quality of material. A list of suggestions made by the allottees is enclosed. The list has also been sent to DG(Works), CPWD, who are responsible for maintenance of Government residential accommodation, for implementation of the suggestions made by the allottees so that the needs of the residents could be fulfilled. It is proposed to conduct a survey again after a period of six months to ascertain as to whether there is improvement in the services being provided and as to whether the suggestions made by the allottees have been implemented by CPWD.

However, a similar survey could not be conducted in respect of ‘other pool accommodation’ as other Ministries/Departments have not so far furnished information against their departmental pool accommodation, despite repeated reminders.”

**13. The Committee find that all the receipts of licence fee in respect of Government residential accommodation for general as well as other pools accommodation is deposited under a common head i.e. Major Head ‘0216-housing’. Further the maintenance of general as well as other pool accommodation is being looked after by CPWD. In view of the said arrangement, they are at a loss to find out the step motherly treatment meted out to the residents occupying other pool accommodation. Since the employees residing in other pool accommodation are equally contributing towards the licence fee and also forgoing their house rent allowance, which is a substantial**

amount, their right to get the satisfactory services from CPWD, the Central authority responsible for maintenance, cannot be denied. They hope that all the quarters, whether belonging to general pool or other pool are treated at par and the Government take the desired steps in this regard.

The Committee note that a survey has been conducted with respect to satisfaction with the service provided by CPWD. The Committee are informed that percentage of allottees who were dis-satisfied with the performance of CPWD in various areas is 36% in the civil, 34% in electrical, 43% in water supply, 40% in general maintenance and 41% in quality of material/service. The Committee would like to know why the allottees as mentioned above are not satisfied with the performance of CPWD and would urge that the grievances of the aforesaid allottees are attended to at the earliest.

**D. Modernisation of Government of India Presses  
Recommendation (Para No.3.23)**

14. The Committee had noted as under:

“The Committee are deeply distressed to note that the issue of modernisation of Government of India Presses has been pending since long and the Government are yet to take any final decision in this regard. Besides, another noticeable fact is the under utilisation of capacity of fourteen Government of India Presses which is reported to be less than 50%. Further, in spite of having nine Government of India Presses fully modernized, the Government is depending upon to a large extent on private printers. There is under staffing to a large extent in all the Government of India Presses. In view of this scenario, performance of Government of India Presses is very dismal. The Committee have been recommending repeatedly to take a final decision in regard to modernisation of Government of India Presses. In spite of that, it seems that the Government have not taken any step to resolve the issue. In view of this, the Committee strongly recommend that the Government should take the decision to modernise the remaining Government of India Presses without further delay and provide the desired staff to ensure the working of these Presses to their full capacity. The Committee also desire that decision in this regard should be taken within three months of the presentation of the Report. The Committee are also of the view that dependence on private printers should be minimised specially when unutilised capacity in Government of India Press is available.”

15. The Government have noted as under:

“So far as the recommendation of the Committee regarding modernisation of the remaining Presses is concerned, it is submitted that a decision is yet to be taken on this issue. Secretary (Urban Development) discussed this issue in a meeting on 24.4.2001 and desired some more data regarding assets and liabilities of the presses proposed to be closed/merged and also the details of expenditure to be incurred on modernization of various presses. Details of manpower to be rendered surplus, their re-deployment etc., have also to be worked out. After going through this exercise, the draft note for Cabinet will have to be modified and then submitted for the approval of the Minister, Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation. After his

approval, the matter will be referred to the Cabinet for a decision. All this will take some more time.

Further, to ensure the working of Government of India Presses to their full capacity, it may be stated that the capacity utilisation of the Government of India Presses are regularly monitored every month through the Managerial Control Reports. Whenever, the deficiencies are found, suitable instructions are issued from time to time to the Managers of the Government of India Presses to achieve optimum capacity utilisation of printing work. This work is also reviewed through periodical visit of various senior officers of the Directorate of Printing to the presses.

As regards reduction of dependence on private printers, it is stated that only small jobs like letter heads, envelopes are entrusted to private printers as Government of India Presses do not have facilities for silk screen printing and special type of paper. Since Government of India Press, Rashtrapati Bhawan has silk screen printing facility, the action has now been initiated for procurement of paper so that some jobs could be got executed in Government of India Press, Rashtrapati Bhawan, New Delhi.

As regards understaffing in Government of India Presses, it is submitted that the Committee of Secretaries had imposed a ban on direct recruitment in Government of India Presses. Further, Ministry of Finance have also issued instructions not to fill up any vacancy without their approval except for live vacancies to be filled up by promoting only. Moreover, there is a ban on creation of new posts for one year. Due to this it is difficult to provide more staff to the presses.”

**16. The Committee note the steps taken by the Government, for optimum utilisation of capacity in Government of India Presses. However, they strongly feel that the management of all Government of India Presses (GIPs) is in a mess and the Government is only delaying the process of modernisation. The Committee therefore reiterate their earlier recommendation and urge that the final decision in this regard may be taken expeditiously.**

**E. Establishment of monitoring cell in the Ministry  
Recommendation (Para No.4.36)**

17. The Committee had recommended as below:

“The Committee are concerned to find out that there is no monitoring cell in the Ministry for monitoring various Central Sector Programmes. They find that in the Ministry of Rural Development, there is an area officers scheme under which an officer of the Ministry is given a set area for monitoring. They visit the implementing sites and ensure proper implementation of the programme. The Committee urge that the Department of Urban Development should think of having a separate monitoring and evaluation cell, as well as mechanism in line with the area officers scheme.”

18. The Government have replied as below:

“This Ministry shares the concern of the Hon’ble Committee and agrees that there should be a monitoring cell in the Ministry for monitoring various Central

Sector Programmes. A proposal for creation of MIS Cell at Centre and State levels was sent to the Department of Expenditure, Ministry of Finance, which was not approved.”

**19. On their recommendation to establish a monitoring and evaluation Cell, the Government have replied that such a request had not been approved in the past by the Ministry of Finance. In this regard the Committee desire that the Government should again approach the Ministry of Finance as well as the Planning Commission on the matter.**

**F. Violation of the Employment of Manual Scavengers and construction of Dry Latrines (Prohibition) Act, 1993**

**Recommendation (Para No.4.39)**

20. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee note that the Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation is responsible for the implementation of the Employment of Manual Scavengers and Construction of Dry Latrines (Prohibition) Act, 1993. In this regard, the Committee would like to be apprised of the details regarding the violation of the said Act and the action taken thereon, State-wise in the last three years.”

21. The Government have replied as below:

“The Employment of Manual Scavengers and Construction of Dry Latrines (Prohibition) Act, 1993 (46 of 1993) received the President’s assent on 5.6.93. This enactment was sequel to the legislatures of Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Tripura and West Bengal passing resolutions empowering the Parliament to enact legislation on this subject. This Act has been passed considering the subject matter to be returnable to Entry 6 of List II of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution of India and considering that the Parliament has no power to make laws for the States with respect to this matter except as provided in Article 249 and 250 of the Constitution of India. The Parliament can legislate on the subject under Article 252 of the Constitution only after resolution to this effect is passed by two or more State Legislatures. This Act has become applicable to Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Tripura, West Bengal and UTs with effect from 26.1.97. The State Assemblies of Orissa, Punjab, Assam, Haryana, Bihar, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Gujarat have also adopted this Act. The UTs of Andaman and Nicobar, Chandigarh, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu, Lakshadweep, Pondicherry and States of Goa, Gujarat, Kerala, Manipur, Mizoram, Sikkim and Tripura have declared themselves as scavenger-free.

This Ministry wish to inform the Hon’ble Committee that a meeting to review the implementation of the Employment of Manual Scavengers and construction of Dry Latrines (Prohibition) Act, 1993 was held in this Ministry on 7<sup>th</sup> June, 2001 in which all the State representatives were requested to provide information relating to implementation of the Act. The desired information has not yet been received.”

**22. On their query regarding violation of the Employment of Manual Scavengers and Construction of Dry Latrines (Prohibition) Act, 1993 and the action taken thereon the Government have replied that the desired information has not yet been received. The Committee would like to be apprised of the said information, when received from the States/UTs.**

**G. Access to sewerage and sanitation facility in urban areas  
Recommendation (Para No.4.42)**

23. The Committee had recommended as below:

“As regards the position of overall sanitation of the country although the Government claims that 60 per cent of the urban population have access to sewerage and sanitation facility, the Committee have their own doubts about the authenticity of data in view of the position at field level. The Government should seriously think over this issue and consider to launch a centrally sponsored scheme to assist the State Governments to provide sewerage and sanitation in urban areas.”

24. The Government have replied as below:

“This Ministry wish to inform the Hon’ble Committee that the information regarding accessibility of sewerage/sanitation facilities to urban population, is based on the data received from the different State implementing agencies, such as, Public Health Engineering Department and Water Supply & Sewerage Boards. In order to collect realistic data/information relating to details such as population of the town, availability of sewerage/drainage and sewerage treatment facilities and coverage of the population with such facilities, etc. it has been decided to entrust a study through an independent agency, such as NEERI, NIUA, All India Institute of Local Self Government.”

**25. While appreciating the stand taken by the Government to collect realistic data/information relating to access to sewerage and sanitation facilities in urban areas through an independent agency, the Committee would like to be apprised of the results of the said study when completed. They further find that the Government have not addressed to the part of the recommendation to launch a Centrally Sponsored Scheme to assist the State Governments to provide sewerage and sanitation in urban areas. They would like the reaction of the Government in this regard.**

**H. Steps taken by DDA to solve the problem of unoccupied flats  
Recommendation (Para No.4.62)**

26. The Committee had recommended as below:

“The Committee are concerned to note that DDA, which is the premier institution for housing in Delhi, during its 39 years of existence could assist in constructing 2,80,000 housing units. But unfortunately the growth of population since 1962 in Delhi is manifold resulting in severe shortage of housing stock, which gave rise to unauthorised colonies and slums. The Committee, therefore, conclude that the ineptness of DDA to provide adequate housing in Delhi is the main reason for the growth of unauthorized colonies and slums. Besides, another area of concern as pointed out by the Committee in their 10<sup>th</sup> Report (13<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) (para 4.38) is

that the 7,510 flats could not be allotted due to absence of electricity. In spite of pointing to this issue in their earlier Report, DDA still is not able to provide electricity to such houses during 2000-2001. The Committee are unhappy about the state of affairs in DDA and strongly recommend that the houses should be constructed with proper planning after reassuring about the provision of electricity and water. As recommended in their earlier Report they would like the Government to identify those responsible for the terrible loss and initiate punitive action, which may be deterrent for the others.”

27. The Government have replied as below:

“DDA has built 2,75,544 housing units comprising of 51,197 SFS, 61,814 MIG, 75,596 LIG and 86,937 Janta/EWS categories upto 31.3.2001. In addition to this, 14,751 houses are in progress as on 1.4.2001 and about 23,000 houses of various categories are targeted to be taken up during the year 2001-2002. DDA in fact has assisted in production of more than a million units (for about 5 million population) by way of allotment of developed land to Cooperative House Building Societies and Cooperative Group Housing Societies, developed plots to individuals in regular residential colonies as well as in J.J. colonies for housing.

There has been some constraints in land development in Delhi due to paucity of infrastructural inputs like water, power etc. and cumbersome procedure of acquisition of land. It is also a fact that growth of population in Delhi is very high due to immigration.

The details of the other Government agencies involved in the planned development of Delhi mainly for providing physical infrastructure support had already been apprised to the Committee with reference to the 10<sup>th</sup> Report. The interaction with these agencies as also the coordinated efforts made in the past had also been apprised earlier in response to para 25 of the Recommendations contained in the 16<sup>th</sup> Report (13<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha of the Committee on Demands for Grants 2000-2001). In order to reduce this coordination problem, DDA endeavors to take more and more responsibilities for development of infrastructure facilities as far as possible. In new development areas, DDA has adopted the policy of taking up of construction of Master Plan roads itself as against the responsibility of PWD as per earlier policy. Similarly, to reduce the dependency on the DVB, DDA in consultation with DVB has decided to take up the external electrification of the housing pockets up to 11 KV sub-station level in-house in future. But the generation of electricity and the availability of raw water remain beyond the authority of the DDA. The Government, however, has advised the DDA that in order that the resources used for construction of houses is not blocked it should embark upon new housing projects only after ensuring availability of adequate quantity of water and electricity and getting firm commitment from the Delhi Jal Board and Delhi Vidyut Board or after making alternative arrangements for these two essential and basic items.”

**28. The Committee appreciate the stand taken by the Government to take up new housing projects by Delhi Development Authority (DDA) only after ensuring the availability of adequate quantity of water and electricity and**

**getting firm commitment from Delhi Jal Board(DJB) and Delhi Vidyut Board (DVB) or after making alternative arrangements for these two essential and basic items. They would like that the said facilities are provided expeditiously to the flats constructed by DDA which could not be allotted due to the absence of electricity.**

**ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE  
RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE TWENTY THIRD REPORT  
OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL  
DEVELOPMENT  
(13<sup>TH</sup> LOK SABHA)**

<b>I.</b>	<b>Total number of recommendations</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government (Para Nos.2.6, 2.9, 2.18, 2.22, 2.27, 2.28, 2.35, 2.39, 3.3, 3.8, 3.14, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10, 4.15, 4.18, 4.21 4.22, 4.25, 4.33, 4.34, 4.35, 4.36, 4.38, 4.54, 4.56 and 4.62)</b>	<b>27</b>
	<b>Percentage to the total recommendations</b>	<b>(79.41%)</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies (Para Nos. 2.12 and 3.7)</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>Percentage to total recommendations</b>	<b>(5.88%)</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee (Para Nos. 2.30, 3.16 and 3.23)</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>Percentage to total recommendations</b>	<b>(8.83%)</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited (Para Nos. 4.39 and 4.42)</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>Percentage to total recommendations</b>	<b>(5.88%)</b>