

NOTICE/40088/I of 31-1-67

Circular
No. 129
1966-67.

Sub:- Unauthorised (a) Semi permanent structures and (b) huts and Zavli sheds for non-residential purposes such as shops, cabins, garages etc.

When complaints are received from public asking us to take action for removal of unauthorised structures of the type mentioned above in Suburbs and Extended Suburbs, difficulty arises as to what should be considered as acceptable proof for determining when the structure was constructed. Quite often parties produce old rent receipts or some such other evidence which cannot be considered to be quite reliable. It has been verified that the assessment of semi-permanent structures was first taken up from 1-4-1962 and that of huts and Zavli sheds from 17-4-1964. In view of this, if a structure has been existing whether 'semi-permanent' or 'huts and Zavli sheds' prior to 1-4-62 or 17-4-1964 respectively, it will not be difficult to verify in every such case that it was existing before these respective dates as thereafter it would come under assessment.

Under the circumstances, M. C. has decided that for tolerating unauthorised structures of ~~non~~ non-residential users, the datum lines should be as follows:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| (a) Semi-permanent structures | 1.4.1962 |
| (b) Huts and Zavli sheds | 17.4.1964 |

If a complaint is received about a non-residential structure of either of the above types and it is not found to be on assessment record on the above respective dates, it should be deemed to be a structure that came later to the relevant date mentioned above and action for removal taken irrespective of rent receipt or any such evidence produced by the party to ~~show~~ show that the structure was standing before 1.4.1962 or 17.4.64 as the case may be.

It should be noted that these orders should not be applied to unauthorised structures, sheds or huts required to be removed for any of our development works.

Sd/- S.V.Desai
25.1.67
City Engineer.

No.CE/40088/I of 31-1-67

Copy forwarded for information, guidance and necessary action please.

Sd/-
City Engineer.
25/1/67

Ms.27.1.
CE/40088/I
400 copies.

NOTICE/40088/I of 31-1-67

Circular
No. 129
1966-67.

Sub:- Unauthorised (a) Semi permanent structures and (b) huts and Zavli sheds for non-residential purposes such as shops, cabins, garages etc.

When complaints are received from public asking us to take action for removal of unauthorised structures of the type mentioned above in Suburbs and Extended Suburbs, difficulty arises as to what should be considered as acceptable proof for determining when the structure was constructed. Quite often parties produce old rent receipts or some such other evidence which cannot be considered to be quite reliable. It has been verified that the assessment of semi-permanent structures was first taken up from 1-4-1962 and that of huts and Zavli sheds from 17-4-1964. In view of this, if a structure has been existing whether 'semi-permanent' or 'huts and Zavli sheds' prior to 1-4-62 or 17-4-1964 respectively, it will not be difficult to verify in every such case that it was existing before these respective dates as thereafter it would come under assessment.

Under the circumstances, M. C. has decided that for tolerating unauthorised structures of ~~an~~ non-residential users, the datum lines should be as follows:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| (a) Semi-permanent structures | 1.4.1962 |
| (b) Huts and Zavli sheds | 17.4.1964 |

If a complaint is received about a non-residential structure of either of the above types and it is not found to be on assessment record on the above respective dates, it should be deemed to be a structure that came later to the relevant date mentioned above and action for removal taken irrespective of rent receipt or any such evidence produced by the party to ~~show~~ show that the structure was standing ~~as the case may be.~~ as the case may be.

....

"The problem of hutment dwellers has been very much in the limelight in the past few days. It is, therefore, highly desirable that a clear-cut statement is made as far as the Corpn.'s policy in this respect is concerned.

It is a fact that hundreds of families are pouring into the city with the hope of getting employment and rarely do any of these go back. They never bother about accommodation or anything, and once they enter the city, they park themselves at the most convenient place suitable to them/ them that most of the open spaces not built upon footpaths and even public streets are encroached upon by these hutments. Dwellers where they erect their huts. This problem is not going to ease. On the contrary, I anticipate it is going to be aggravated in the near future, and unless immediate steps are taken, the situation may very well get out of control.

It will be appreciated that no one wants to see these hutments in bad and filthy conditions along the main streets in the city, but at the same time, one cannot ignore the fact that they have to be somewhere in the city, since hutments once demolished are bound to spring up somewhere else as the occupants are not likely to leave the city. By demolishing hutments, the problem is not only not being solved but on the contrary, there is bitterness on both the sides and it is but natural that these poor people whose huts are demolished feel very much aggrieved, since their daily life is disrupted.

The problem, therefore, has to be looked at from its logical and human angle. As things are going on at present, I do not see in the foreseeable future any solution to this problem unless it is taken on a war footing. The only solution to this problem is cheap accommodation for all concerned and until this is achieved, the hutment dwellers will have to be properly organised in places where they are given reasonable civic amenities and like water, etc. and where they are assured that they will not be disturbed in the near future or until cheap accommodation is provided, as it would not be fair and human to the hutment dwellers to live in a constant fear of being removed and getting their family life completely dislocated. There is no solution to the problem unless alternate site is given to these people, if necessary, on temporary basis, for merely removing them from one place, they are bound to go somewhere else in the vicinity.

I discussed this matter recently with the Chief Minister and Home Minister who have appreciated my point of view and are in full agreement with me. I have impressed on them the necessity of giving alternate sites. They have also agreed with me that alternate sites must be given to these people from where they are not likely to be disturbed and the Chief Minister has told the Collector of Bombay, in my presence, and the Revenue Department, to see that some land is given immediately for such hutment dwellers' colonies which can then be properly organised. Most of the Government land in Bombay need a lot of filling in, but we have found that the hutment dwellers themselves are prepared to do the filling in for their huts if they are assured of water supply and are not likely to be removed from them. I have been assuring everyone that wherever a disciplined hutment colony comes up in the place earmarked for it, all civic facilities would be made available and would be made available and that alone will make their life livable.

(63) C-

As far as organised cheap housing is concerned, it will be appreciated that even middle class people are living in unauthorisedly constructed tenements without knowing when they would be thrown out of them. They have paid huge paguees to unscrupulous people who have done lots of unauthorised constructions at the expense of the Corporation, Govt and the public. To avoid this, I am proposing to build cheap tenements in the very near future, at the a cost of roughly one thousand rupees ~~in-the~~ per tenement. Each tenement will have a decent room of approx. 100 sq.ft. well lighted and ventilated with a bathroom and a water tap and an electric point within this amount. There will be common Water-Closet and sanitation and public lighting and also the roads will be done by the Corpn. These will be given on long term leave and licence or such other basis as the Corporation may decide. A nominal charge of Rs.5/- per month would be taken for water and other sanitary conveniences. Electricity charge would be separate. The tenement will be given ~~to be given~~ on leave and licence basis with a clear understanding that it cannot be transferred and if not required by the party it will be returned back to the Corporation. A unit of this type is built just opposite the Corporation building in the Sports Club compound which most of the Councillors have seen and have agreed that it would be a good and cheap unit for a small family. The mode of distribution of these hutments can be decided by the Corporation.

I am undertaking this scheme as far as possible on 'No Profit No Loss' basis to the Corporation. Once a tenement is allotted on 'as is whose is' basis to a person it would be his responsibility to maintain it. The Corporation will not undertake the same. The only charges that he would be required to pay for water and sanitation would be a nominal amount of Rs. 5/- per month. It is estimated that the life of these semi-permanent hutments would be at least 10 years. I immediately intend to build 500 of these at Malavani near Malad and later at Ghatkopar and if the same is successful and is accepted by the public, it would be repeated in other places.

As far as the demolition policy of the Corporation is concerned, only those hutments which are on public road and foot-paths and those that are on Municipal sites which are immediately required for construction purposes are being demolished. There is no proposal or likelihood for wholesale demolition of hutments as feared by some. While demolishing these hutments, the occupants are requested to go to the alternate sites at Ghatkopar or Malavani from where they would not be disturbed, and where water at standpipe connection would be given. No new hutments are allowed to be constructed. If any one wants to do so, he would be permitted at these two centres at his own expense on site which will be shown to him from where he will not be disturbed".

[The Commissioner further informed the House that the new Municipal loans for Budgets 'A', 'C' and 'E' aggregating to Rs. 475 lakhs, which had been floated that day, had been fully subscribed.

At this stage, it being nearly 5-15 P.M., the Mayor, with the consent of the Councillors present, adjourned the Meeting and announced that he had fixed Thursday, the 19th November, 1964 to hold the meeting.]