



Re: Fw: Subject : SGM scheduled for 24-11-2024

From Gautam Padukone <gautam.padukone@gmail.com>

Date Mon 11/18/2024 4:51 PM

To Pai Shamala Vishnudas <pvishnudas90@gmail.com>

Cc MAHESH KALYANPUR (1/22-23-24) <mkalyanpur@hotmail.com>; SATYENDRA KUMBLE(1A/10) <kumsaty@gmail.com>; Society Office <talmakiwadi@hotmail.com>; Uday Andar <udayandar@gmail.com>; Shivdutt Halady <shivduttthalady1964@gmail.com>; Gokarn Vaishali Vivek <shruti.gokarn@gmail.com>; Gautam Padukone <gautam.padukone@gmail.com>; Aparnaa Kalbag <aparnaa.kalbag@gmail.com>; Deepa Uday Andar <deepaandar@gmail.com>; Dholakia Renu Himanshu <dr.dholakia@gmail.com>; Anand Hoskote <anahosi54@yahoo.com>; Ajit Madhusudan Bhat <ajitbhat1@yahoo.com>; Ravindra Ramakant Bijoor <bijoorravindra@gmail.com>; Devadutta Chandavar <chandavar@gmail.com>

Dear Mr. Pai,

Your email to TCHS has been forwarded to the Sub-Committee for comments, and we are therefore putting forth our point of view for your consideration, to each of the points made in your email.

Quote

1. Thanx a lot to the Managing committee and the Sub Committee members for removing MPNV as our PMC. Selecting MPNV was a blunderous decision of the general body based on the big dreams shown by MPNV in the first SGM. Unfortunately the Sub Committee and the Managing Committee had not done the due diligence of MPNV. It took us almost two years to realise that MPNV is useless. **[Comment: Since this refers to the work of the present Managing Committee and the previous Sub-Committee, this Sub-Committee has no comment to offer.]**
2. SGM's mandate was not there for considering new 4 PMC's. Without studying their past successful experience on redevelopment projects. We can't be experimenting with new unproven firms anymore. We can look at the developer/builder led model around us gaining pace. "Self/Hybrid redevelopment" project on this scale has never been proved anywhere so far. Hence it stands rejected in toto. We can gain insights into Santacruz Saraswat colony's model which is being hailed by many. **[Comment: You are correct in stating that the SC did not have the mandate for considering additional PMC candidates. To that extent, the SC has done some additional work. The GB has the option of rejecting this additional work. We have to disagree with your evaluation of these 4 PMCS as "unproven". All four consultants are well-established companies in their fields, with an extensive list of successful projects and it would be unfair to dismiss them as unproven companies. While we agree that there are a large number of societies who selected the builder option for their redevelopment projects, there are also a large number of societies who have successfully completed their self-redevelopment projects. And there are an even larger number of societies who selected the builder option, and have got stuck in their projects, with no solution in sight. The example of Saraswat Colony may not be a correct example to consider, as they have only chosen their option recently. Whether they have chosen correctly or not will be known only after they complete their project, not now.]**
3. Although the first few slides of the presentation sent with the notice mentions 4 consultants whereas the area and other calculations are given for only 3 consultants only? why? **[Comment: Out of the four consultants with whom the SC has had meetings and discussion, we are considering only three for the role of PMC. We have therefore requested only three consultants to provide us with their calculations and figures. These have been presented in the presentation.]**
4. In the status report given in the presentation we find too much of a variation in all the figures for different parameters like project costing, Income and expenditure statement etc..RSC shud have studied and reconciled all the figures before circulation?? **[Comment: You are correct in saying that there is variation in the figures. The differences will get ironed out only after we have detailed discussions with them, and sort out the differences. That work is still pending, and has been mentioned at the end of the table. By the way, in point no. 2, you have complained that the SC did not have the mandate to discuss and meet with the four consultants, and have gone above and beyond the call of duty, and yet, in this point you complain about the SC not doing enough. We are therefore confused as to exactly what you expect from the SC, that we discuss with the consultants or not discuss with them.]**

5. The chairman of RSC while giving update on M/s MPNV in AGM dt 22-09-2024 had talked about proposing consultants not linked to builders but here it is shown RA is permanent PMC of Dosti group?? How are they different from MPNV?? Please explain. **[Comment: A PMC is considered to be linked to a builder, only if the PMC tries to bring in their favourite builder in our project. Just because a particular PMC has worked for a particular builder, as long as he does not try to bring that builder into our project, he should be considered as an independent PMC. And this PMC candidate has never once in all our discussions ever tried to suggest that we should consider Dosti Group as a builder.]**
6. We had presentations of 5 PMC's in our first SGM in January 2023 in which we had shortlisted two or three more firms as 2nd, 3rd and 4th options. Why can't we consider them now?? **[Comment: Please recall what happened in that SGM. Three of the five PMCs promoted the builder option, and therefore were rejected by the GB. Out of the balance two, MPNV gave the most attractive figures and were therefore selected by the GB. During subsequent discussions with Verite, they said that the MPNV figures were too good to be true, and Verite will never be able to match them or exceed them. The three PMCs we are now considering have shown us that the actual figures are substantially better than what MPNV had shown us to be the best in the market. We therefore believe that Verite is unlikely to offer us anything better than MPNV has offered us.]**
7. We can easily get 4-5 proven PMC's and proven builders. There is no dearth of them. Let us consider this option after discussing with our Santacruz colony and learn from them. If required an address by their MC to our SGM should be arranged on 24th November, 2024. **[Comment: The SC would not like to comment on this point, as we believe that this suggestion is made to the Managing Committee. We leave it to the Managing Committee to reply to this.]**

Warm regards,

Gautam Padukone

On Mon, 18 Nov 2024 at 10:51, Talmakiwadi Society <talmakiwadi@hotmail.com> wrote:

Dear Gautam & members of the Redevelopment Sub-Committee

Please find attached an email dated 15 November 2024 received from Mr. Vishnudas Pai, Associate Member, 15/04.

May we request you to respond to this email keeping us copied.

Best Regards,

For The Talmakiwadi Co-operative Housing Society Limited

Shivdutt Halady
Hon. Secretary

From: Vishnudas p <pvishnudas90@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2024 10:56 PM
To: Talmakiwadi Society <talmakiwadi@hotmail.com>
Subject: Subject : SGM scheduled for 24-11-2024

Dear respected Chairman General Secretary & the MC members,,

1. Thanx a lot to the Managing committee and the Sub Committee members for removing MPNV as our PMC. Selecting MPNV was a blunderous decision of the general body based on the big dreams shown by MPNV in the first SGM. Unfortunately the Sub Committee and the Managing Committee had not done the due diligence of MPNV. It took us almost two years to realise that MPNV is useless.

2. SGM's mandate was not there for considering new 4 PMC's. Without studying their past successful experience on redevelopment projects. We can't be experimenting with new unproven firms anymore. We can look at the developer/builder led model around us gaining pace. "Self/Hybrid redevelopment" project on this scale has never been proved anywhere so far. Hence it stands rejected in toto. We can gain insights into Santacruz Saraswat colony's model which is being hailed by many.
3. Although the first few slides of the presentation sent with the notice mentions 4 consultants whereas the area and other calculations are given for only 3 consultants only? why?
4. In the status report given in the presentation we find too much of a variation in all the figures for different parameters like project costing, Income and expenditure statement etc..RSC shud have studied and reconciled all the figures before circulation??
5. The chairman of RSC while giving update on M/s MPNV in AGM dt 22-09-2024 had talked about proposing consultants not linked to builders but here it is shown RA is permanent PMC of Dosti group?? How are they different from MPNV?? Please explain.
6. We had presentations of 5 PMC's in our first SGM in January 2023 in which we had shortlisted two or three more firms as 2nd, 3rd and 4th options. Why can't we consider them now??
7. We can easily get 4-5 proven PMC's and proven builders. There is no dearth of them. Let us consider this option after discussing with our Santacruz colony and learn from them. If required an address by their MC to our SGM should be arranged on 24th November, 2024.

With regards,

Vishnudas pai

17/4