

29 April 2025

Dear Member of Talmakiwadi,

Pursuant to our email dated 17 March 2025, we now provide our second update on the current status of our Redevelopment Project.

The Redevelopment Sub-Committee (RSC) advised the Managing Committee (MC) of having shortlisted the following 7 PMCs:

- I M Kadri Architects.
- R M Warriar & Associates.
- Toughcons Nirman Pvt. Ltd.
- Anil Nagrath & Associates.
- Ramnani & Associates.
- Masters Management Consultants (India) Pvt. Ltd.
- Samarth Enterprises.

The RSC asked if the MC would like to add to the above list. However, the MC declined in the interest of allowing the RSC to independently conduct this activity. The MC also queried reasons for elimination of two names (REE Structure & Sumedha Gore Architects) who had, as per details shared with us, handled both self-redevelopment, builder led and hybrid projects. The RSC mentioned that while recommending the shortlisted names, they had attempted to eliminate PMC applicants whom they felt were linked to or related to any of the builders or to members in decision-making positions in our Project. The MC being an elected decision-making body, we sought clarity on what was meant by the last part of this statement, but the RSC did not clarify the same adequately. The MC also inquired with the RSC if they had engaged with the initial 15 PMC names before narrowing down to 7 names, and if the MC and the RSC could have a joint call with the shortlisted names. The RSC mentioned that they had not engaged with the PMCs prior to shortlisting them, except for I M Kadri Architects. Anil Nagrath & Associates and Ramnani & Associates. The MC also requested the RSC to conduct Due Diligence of the 7 shortlisted PMCs. We were given to understand that the RSC would conduct the due diligence after Feasibility Reports had been received from all the 7 shortlisted PMCs.

The MC and RSC had a Joint Meeting on 07 April 2025, [Minutes of which have been attached](#) for your ease of reference. Also, all the Minutes of Meetings of the RSC as shared with the MC have been uploaded on the Society website ([www.talmakiwadi.com](http://www.talmakiwadi.com)) to enable our Members to view them.

During the above meeting, the RSC advised that they expected the shortlisted PMCs to share their Feasibility Reports by 10 April 2025. The MC requested the RSC to share the Feasibility Reports for the MCs review. Subsequently, the RSC advised that they had received Feasibility Reports from 5 of the 7 shortlisted PMCs and that the remaining 2 PMCs had been asked to submit the Reports by 20 April 2025. However, the RSC also mentioned that the Feasibility Reports would not be initially shared with anyone in order to maintain complete confidentiality. In view of this unexpected stand taken by the RSC, the MC was compelled to respond stating that there could be absolutely no element of confidentiality between the RSC and the MC, since the MC had been duly elected by the General Body. Moreover, Redevelopment was also a matter which was under the MC's purview, and the MC was therefore empowered to review the Feasibility Reports. The MC once again requested the RSC to share the Feasibility Reports that had been received by them.

The RSC thereafter shared 2 Feasibility Reports (from Samarth Enterprises and Toughcons Nirman Pvt. Ltd.) with us. The MC reviewed these Reports and advised the RSC of the below lacunae, which remain open as on date:

**Toughcons Nirman Pvt. Ltd.:** Their Feasibility Report mentioned a Total Plot Area of 8,873 sq. mtrs., whereas our Total Plot Area as per the PR Cards was only 7,961.60 sq. mtrs. The MC mentioned to the RSC that this error appeared to have emanated from incorrect details having been provided by the RSC to the PMC, because the PMC had stated 4 Plots, namely 311, 1/312, 1A/312 and 1A/278 in their Feasibility Report. The last Plot was not a part of the plots under consideration for our Redevelopment Project. The RSC attributed this anomaly to data shared with this PMC by the previous Sub-Committee but subsequently mentioned that they had asked the PMC to re-submit the Feasibility Report. A second Feasibility Report from this PMC was subsequently submitted to the MC, but the RSC also advised that the Plot Area reflected in this Report was also incorrect. We have sked the RSC to get the Report corrected and resubmitted before we review it and offer further comments.

**Samarth Enterprises:** This PMC had, in their initial submission of information, indicated that the Total BUA redeveloped by them as 400,630 square feet and it therefore did not meet the minimum eligibility criterion of 500,000 square feet stipulated by the General Body for shortlisting a PMC. Also, they had only provided a Feasibility Report for the Self-Redevelopment Option, whereas the General Body's mandate was that the shortlisted PMCs were required to provide Feasibility Reports for both Self-Redevelopment as well as the Builder/Developer Models, including the pros and cons for each. The RSC did not specifically respond to the MC on these gaps but generically stated that they had asked all the shortlisted PMCs to provide the pros and cons, including a risk mitigation plan for three options, self-redevelopment, builder-led redevelopment and hybrid model.

The rationale for the MC seeking the preliminary Feasibility Reports is as follows:

- To review the Feasibility Reports and support the RSC in terms of identifying areas of improvement/corrections in a joined-up manner so that the Reports become more robust.
- Since the MC is responsible for all decision-making, it is imperative for the MC to not only review the Feasibility Reports, but to have complete oversight on the RSCs activities in light of the Redevelopment Project and provide a steer wherever required, in the interest of the General Body members and of the Redevelopment Project itself.

The MC continues to follow up with the RSC to submit the remaining Feasibility Reports.

The RSC also mentioned during the above meeting that the following Plot Areas had been mentioned in each of the 3 Property Cards relating to the Project:

- Plot No, 311 (in the name of TCHS): Plot Area of 5,075.29 sq.m.
- Plot No. 1/312 (in the name of TCHS): Plot Area of 2,099.51 sq.m
- Plot No. 1A/312 (in the name of KSA): Plot Area of 786.80 sq.m.

The RSC further stated that the Property Card of Plot No. 1/312 (TCHS) mentioned the Laughtons Survey No. as '1A/7030', and that of Plot No. 1A/312 (KSA) mentioned the Laughtons Survey No. as 'Part of 1A/7030'. The RSC therefore interpreted that the Area of Plot No. 1A/312 (786.80 sq.m.) was included in the Area of Plot No. 1/312 (2,099.51 sq.m.). Hence, in the RSC's view, the overall Plot Area available to the Project would reduce by 786.80 sq.m., and the RSC opined that the Total Plot Area may reduce from 7,961.60 sq.m. to 7,174.80 sq.m. This would result in a direct adverse

impact on the FSI available to the Project. The RSC stated that they expected the MC to take up this matter with the concerned authority for resolution.

To address the above, some MC members personally visited the Office of the Collector of Mumbai and made an application to the authorities for certified copies of the land plans and certified true copies of the property cards for all the 3 plots. Incidentally, during our visit, we were advised that such matters when associated with redevelopment were usually handled by Project Management Consultants (PMCs) and not by the Society. We were also informed that the details on the 3 Property Cards had been reflected correctly (Total Plot Area of 7,961.60 sq.m.) and that the rectification was required to be done only on the on-line platform (mahabhunakasha) where the mutation of Plot No. 1A/312 (786.80 sq.m.) was not visible. Hence, this should not adversely impact the continuation of work on the Redevelopment Project.

The RSC also requested the MC to expedite clarifications as to the exact area of our Plot that was likely to be lost due to the proposed road widening. The RSC also mentioned that information on the official website showed the setback on the basis of a road width of 42.75 mtrs., which was incorrect and that it was required to reflect correctly in the official website. The MC has extracted the latest Development Plan (DP) Remarks, which clearly show the revised road width of 27.45 mtrs., and the Plot Area is also correctly reflected therein. We have attached the same to this email and shared these details with the RSC as well. Incidentally, this information is available on-line and this activity ought to have been completed by the PMCs as a starting point, before preparing their Feasibility Reports.

1. [DP Remarks](#)
2. [RL Report](#)
3. [Map report](#)
4. [Plot area](#)

Once the remaining/corrected Feasibility Reports are received from the RSC, the MC and RSC will independently review the reports, corroborate their findings and seek clarifications from the PMCs as warranted. The MC members also propose to join the RSC members to visit the Projects undertaken by the PMCs and meet the office bearers of those Societies to obtain first hand information of their experience with the PMCs as well as to check on the quality as well as adherence to agreed timelines by the PMCs with regard to the respective Projects handled by them.

We will circulate the final PMC Presentations to the GB members and schedule Online Meetings with the PMCs to present their plans to the GB members before the SGM scheduled on 27 July 2025. This will enable the GB members to study the Presentations and have their specific queries addressed before the SGM is convened.

Should you have any questions on this update, please write to us at [talmakiwadi@hotmail.com](mailto:talmakiwadi@hotmail.com)

Best Regards,

**For The Talmakiwadi Co-operative Housing Society Limited**

**Shivdutt Halady**  
**Hon. Secretary**