

REPORT ON THE MEETING IN MKDM OFFICE AT 6 PM ON 4TH AUG 2025

ATTENDEES: MKDM – Mr. Mandar Kelkar, Arch. Nene and Adv. Shrotri Pethe

RDC – Mr. Umesh Gite, Mr. Amanullah Khan, Mr. Amit, Mr. Sagar Munot and Mr. Tanveer

MC – Mr. Ajay Joshi, Mr. Anand Kulshrestha, Adv. Waghmare, Mr. Suhail Ansari & Mrs Rashida Ansari

The following is in brief the discussions that took place between 6pm and 8.10pm in the meeting.

1. Mr. Amanullah expressed his extreme displeasure that Mr. Mandar had not replied to his emails except the first one and also did not return his calls. Mr. Mandar explained that one day he was travelling and the other day they had a software audit in progress. However, he explained that as a matter of principle he has been exchanging mails only on the official society email. Further it is incorrect that he should enter into correspondence on an individual basis as there would then be no end to members seeking response from him.
2. Mr. Gite inquired whether the comments made by RDC have been addressed in the Agreement. Mr. Mandar replied that all the comments sent to us have been deliberated and considered in the Agreement.
3. Mr. Sagar requested that stage wise exit cost to be provided. Mr. Mandar said they would work out and inform.
4. Mr. Mandar then explained that he will be able to recover his cost only in the second stage and that too after a maybe a year's time into the works. So, it inconceivable that they would want to leave.
5. Mr. Gite pointed out about the clause wherein the PMC can exercise the option of voluntary exit with no financial liability. Adv. Shrotri informed that these were only under exceptional circumstances when the project cannot proceed any more and therefore there was no point in them staying in the contract. Adv. Shrotri then read all the special conditions and these were further explained by Mr. Mandar.
6. Further discussions ensued especially between Mr. Amit, Mr. Sagar and Mr. Mandar during which Mr. Mandar explained that the cost calculation depicted the modality, on which the feasibility would be prepared. He further explained how the society's expectation of higher fsi would be built into the tender. It would be then up to the developer to accept this demand or provide alternative. Initial block drawings which would be developed by MKDM suggesting the maximum fsi benefit to the society will form part of the tender. He explained how the fsi would be related to many factors like what the developer would like to construct there, maybe a hospital, mall, commercial complex or pure residence and how each one will come with its own offering of fsi from the developer. It will also depend on the specifications that will be built into the tender, which would be the wish list of the society members.

7. To Mr. Sagar's query Mr. Mandar clarified that the project cost will be calculated based on the Developers cost statement that will be provided in the tender.
8. To Mr. Amanullah's query, Mr. Mandar explained the scope of his responsibility in detail and how it differed from the responsibility of the Developers own engineers and staff. He emphasised the minute attention to specifications adherence and daily control of the work progress especially related to the QA/QC and Time Control. Mr. Amanullah maintained that this could be done by the Developers staff as well.
9. Mr. Ajay queried why there is a different in the charges between MKDM and the very low charges by others. Mr. Mandar explained the scope of work considered by them and as required for a PMC. He referred to the pre and post tender scope of works enumerated in the agreement and their responsibility for the outcome of the project. A copy of the signed agreement was referred for the same. Mr. Mandar commented that the prices which we are talking about would barely suffice to pay one year's salary of the engineers which he would maintain on site, and the project could run for 3 years at least.
10. Mr. Sagar commented on the time lines considered that 36 months for the project completion is very ambitious. It would require a considerable amount of time for people to move out as well.
11. To Mr. Tanveer's query, it was clarified that the electricity bill for his flat is which is still in the 1st owners name should be changed to his name.
12. Mr. Anand then handed over to Arch. Nene all the documents that were requested by MKDM to proceed with the works. All the documents were checked and tallied and so also the documents that could not be provided yet.
13. RDC members informed that they can be available should any support be required further in the process.
14. There were further pleasant discussions related to the project.

The meeting concluded at 8.10 pm with thanks to all the attendees and a photo session.