

## Comments from MoUD

### Dharamshala SCP Observations

#### **City level Criteria**

- Planning principles such as integrated and holistic planning and inclusive planning should not be listed as strategic focus areas. Focus areas should rather be public transportation and NMT , similar to environmental sustainability and resilience which is already listed.
- All listed goals have strategies, no measurable (quantitative and qualitative) outcomes
- Goal 2 City For All lists zero waste, sustainable water management and sustainable energy as strategies. They seem out of place for the goal.
- Goal 3 Climate and Disaster Resilience lists optimizing densities for resilient urban growth. What are the densities that are being targeted - densification or diffusion is not clear.
- The city declared outreach and active engagement of at-least 80% of citizens. It is doubtful that this target was reached if broadcast through radio is excluded.
- Citizen engagement process describes citizens were asked to submit entries for logo and brand name. In Annexure 4, the minutes of meeting lists TERI being requested to submit 2-3 versions of logo and more versions of brand name. Confusion about who's logo and brand name was selected as final one.
- Door to door surveys and 3 Smart City marches had 200 people. Quite low. On the other hand 8000 street plays (that is absurdly high)
- Floating tourist population which is about 30 times the permanent population have been excluded in solicitation of inputs
- Self-Assessment needs to be relooked at, to quantify the various existing levels of service. For eg, in Compact, the city is assessed at level 3 when the overall density within the urban boundary is projected at 38 pph (very low) in 2025. Similarly, the city is assessed at level 3 for IT connectivity while Official Information city profiles show only 13% of the households have internet connectivity at home. Similarly verify the assessment for sanitation.

#### **Area Based Development**

- Summarize idea - explains ABD not what ABD proposal of Dharamshala is

- 310 acres of retrofitting and redevelopment but does not articulate which parts (spatially) and how many acres will be fitted under each of the model.
- Selection of site - no explaining criteria. Problem areas of the city are listed and then suddenly the site is listed. What were the alternatives
- The ABD site is described as built up, compact (no quantification), dense (what densities) around nodes (which nodes?).
- Key components too general. Please look at Pune proposal to be specific number driven or geography driven. Key component No 6 development of precincts as places talks about 3 places. Kotwaali bazaar and Mcleodganj chowk have shown to retain vehicular traffic on very narrow streets. Wouldn't complete pedestrianization or limited access to light vehicles (e-rickshaws) make sense for place making?
- Smart Urban form emphasizes Urban-Nature-Culture connect. Yet no greenway as been listed running through the entire length of the area.
- Convergence has ring roads and parking areas ? Also convergence documentation is missing for the ring roads and parking areas.
- Convergence documents show projects already started(ropeway, parks plaza and viewing decks etc) and fully funded under existing budgets? What is the convergence being sought for? Needs more details
- Top three risks are correlated.
- Measurable Impact too general so doubtful if it can be measured(Please refer to Pune plan)

### **Pan City Proposal**

- City observatory but Official information lists city not connected to State Data Center as of 2012. Please verify
- What were the top priority areas as ranked by the citizens for pan city issues? The proposal mentions mobility as the first one and ineffective management as second. How does City Observatory tie the top ranked issues.
- City observatory does not ensure inclusion, on the contrary might perpetuate exclusion due to lack of data interpretation and technology skills in the citizens. Need to detail out how inclusion will be achieved.
- Cities that have data driven governance have evolved over a longer time with established rules coordination amongst city agencies to collect, integrate and for

periodically update the civic data. Dharamshala has only recently been accorded the Municipal Corporation and so needs to detail out at the minimum

- The initial planning areas of data collection and dissemination that will be housed under the city observatory, for eg 50 datasets that can be rolled out in Year 1 and so on.
- The agencies responsible for data collection, maintenance and updates to the city observatory.
- The coordination and funding mechanisms for the same.
- Signatories to the agreement for sharing the responsibilities of a city observatory.

These above details are missing.

- Convergence agenda is very weak. See the previous bullet point.
- Lack of internet penetration affected scale of citizen engagement. Yet, if urban data observatory is the city wide proposal, the administration should have demonstrated the role of ICT during the citizen engagement process

### **Implementation Plan**

- Ring road and tunnel proposed for Smart City Funding and the costs are grouped with other mobility initiatives. Possibly has to be removed from under SCP.
- Some of the ABD projects such as ropeway reported for convergence are already under execution. How do they get included under convergence when they have existing budgets.
- PCP indicators are very general. Need to be detailed out.
- All timelines need to be brought upto 2019.
- All India Radio endorsing commitment to DharamshalaSCP . Don't understand the relevance

### **Financial Plan**

- Ring road has shown to need 175 crores out of which 1 crore is shown to be sourced from convergence. Another 202 crores are shown for tunnel with no convergence. Similarly development of parking lots proposed. These need to be relooked at , for inclusion in SCP, they should rather be in AMRUT.
- No data on how many kms of roads or how many intersections to be retrofitted , even though it is the largest component in the resource requirement.
- More clarity needed on individual convergence (Refer to Pune plan)

- PCP budget in Annexure 3.10 needs component details.
- Details on O&M expenses lacking (Refer to Pune plan)

