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## Preface

Saiban, a well-known Pakistan NGO, working for providing land and supporting incremental housing, has prepared a plan for its new project, Saiban City Lahore. I offered to redesign this plan on the basis of the guidelines developed by me and my colleagues (Architects Asiya Sadiq and Suneela Ahmed) through an IIED supported research project in 2009-2010. However, this simple objective turned into an exploration of looking at various planning alternatives for Saiban City. This exploration has raised a number of issues related to designing housing for low income settlements. These issues are discussed in Section 4 of the Study.

I would like to thank the IIED for its support in making this study possible. I would also like to acknowledge the three months' hard work and the dedication that Architect Durreshahwar Alvi has put into the design, drafting and various calculations for this study, without which it could not have been completed.

## Arif Hasan

05 September 2011

# The Redesigning of Saiban City, Lahore 

By<br>Arif Hasan<br>(First Draft, 07 September 2011)

## 1. BACKGROUND

In 2008-09, the author and his colleagues were involved in a study to understand density related issues in low and lower middle income settlements in Karachi. This study was supported by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), UK. For the study three settlements and one apartment complex were chosen. The settlements and the complex that were chosen were very different from each other both in physical and sociological terms. A brief description of them is given below. ${ }^{1}$

1. Khuda-ki-Basti-3 (KKB-3) is a recently developed suburban settlement with a population density of 501 persons per hectare. It is estimated that in another ten years, it will have a density of at least 1300.
2. Nawalane is one of Karachi's oldest settlements. It has densified overtime and has a density of 3376 persons per hectare. Due to this high and unplanned density, it has many social problems in certain parts of it.
3. Paposh Nagar was a government scheme of single storey core housing. It was planned for a density of 240 persons per hectare. Today it has a density of 1181 persons per hectare and has houses of two to five storeys high.
4. Fahad Square is a 10-year old apartment complex in a planned government sector and as such, unlike the other examples, makes use of the sectors' social and commercial planned facilities. Its current density is 942 persons per hectare.

The number of persons per family and per housing unit also varies from 5.7 (Fahad Square) persons per family to 13.56 persons (Nawalane). In the same manner, the number of persons per housing unit varies from 6.7 (KKB-3) to 36.8 (Nawalane) persons. In addition, a study was also made of Labour Square, a 35 year old apartment complex so as to analyse the difference between it and Fahad Square.

These settlements were hypothetically remodelled to: i) see if the densities and land-use prescribed by the Karachi Building Control Authority (KBCA) for apartment blocks for low income groups could be achieved by developing individual houses on small plots in these settlements and on the Fahad Square plot; ii) understand the preferences of the residents regarding the type of accommodation they prefer and the reasons for it; and iii) to see what extent could the existing densities in these settlements and apartment blocks be achieved by catering to the preferences of the residents and by replacing apartments and ad-hoc densification by planned densification on small plots. The results of this remodelling and its comparisons with the existing situation are given in Appendix - 1: Physical Comparisons between the Existing Situation and the Remodeling of KKB-3, Nawalane, Paposh Nagar and Fahad Square.

The high densities achieved in remodelling were due to a number of reasons, the most important being the fact that at an average two families were accommodated on one residential unit, which is normal in Pakistan and is borne out of the case studies and also by the fact that an apartment in Labour Square housed one family 35 years ago but today houses two or more. The high density for

[^0]Nawalane has been achieved due to the fact that the family size is 13.5 persons which means 27 persons on one plot. The other reasons are obvious from a study of the matrix in Appendix -1.

The study also resulted in the following conclusions.

1. Higher densities could be achieved by planning clusters rather than developing a plan on a grid iron concept.
2. If the width to depth ratio of the plot or the housing unit could be increased, say from 1:2 to $1: 3$, the number of units could be substantially increased and costs of infrastructure reduced.
3. Through cluster planning, road space could be reduced and as a result, public space for social activities can be increased.

The residents' preferences were for houses on small plots rather than apartments for the following reasons.

1. They can begin small and then expand their house incrementally over time. This makes construction affordable.
2. They can carry out any kind of economic activity in their homes as long as it does not create pollution in the neighbourhood. This is not possible in apartments.
3. By building upwards on their plot they can provide accommodation to at least one of their sons after he gets married. This saves money either as rent or investment in a new housing unit.
4. In plot settlements one lives in a neighbourhood, in apartment blocks one lives in isolation.

For the March 2010 Study IIED Study, the authors also designed housing units for the remodelled settlements. In redesigning them it was understood that there is a limit to the density that can be reached without compromising on residents' needs. Houses higher than ground plus three floors are uncomfortable, and their living spaces on lower floors lack light and ventilation; decreasing spaces for amenities and social facilities adversely affects social and environmental conditions. In the replanning exercises, the authors avoided increasing house heights above ground plus three floors or cutting back on amenities and social facilities. In the designs the authors always kept a courtyard in the centre for providing light, air and an open family get together space.

## 2. SAIBAN CITY, LAHORE

Saiban is a Karachi based NGO that develops initially unserviced plot settlements. The residents make shacks and pay for the land in instalments over a five year period. They get together to develop their own neighbourhood water and sewage infrastructure and build their homes incrementally. Meanwhile, Saiban with payment received from the plot owners develops the trunk infrastructure and gets NGOs to develop the social infrastructure such as schools, health clinics, parks and community centres. With its links with government organisations and transporters, it helps in establishing transport facilities for the settlement.

Saiban is planning to develop a site in Lahore on these principles. The site area is 17.18 acres (6.87 hectares). Saiban has already developed a concept plan for its project called "Saiban City Lahore". The author offered to replan the settlement on the principles developed for the March 2010 Study IIED. Saiban agreed but it had certain definite requirements. These are given below:

1. Minimum plot size of 75 square yards (SY) ( 62.6 square metres) whereas the plot size worked out for the March 2010 Study IIED study was 47 square metres (SM).
2. A mix of populations. For this, Saiban wishes to have 40 plots of 240 SY (209 SM). The rest will be small plots. There are two reasons for this decision: i) Different income groups will live
together; and ii) that by increasing per square yard cost of the larger plots, the small plots can be subsidised.
3. About 50 percent of the site area should be residential as per the zoning regulations in Lahore.
4. Space for a graveyard should be provided and commercial facilities of about 4 percent of the area.

When the site was developed as per Saiban's requirements, very low densities were arrived at. So it was decided to look at various options to understand the density issues related to Saiban's requirements. Plans of this exercise have been developed and delivered to Saiban.

## 3. THE OPTIONS

The following options have been developed and the issues that surface and the lessons learnt from them are discussed in the subsequent sections.

## A. As per Saiban's requirements: All plot dimensions are 75 SY (62.7 SM) and 240 SY (209 SM)

1. Plot width to depth ratio: $1: 3$ for 62.7 SM

Plot width to depth ratio: 1:2 for 209 SM Cluster plan
2. Plot width to depth ratio: $1: 2$ for 62.7 SM Plot width to depth ratio: 1:2 for 209 SM Cluster plan
3. Plot width to depth ratio: $1: 2$ for 62.7 SM Plot width to depth ratio: 1:3 for 209 SM Grid iron plan
4. Plot width to depth ratio: $1: 2$ for 62.7 SM Plot width to depth ratio: 1:2 for 209 SM Grid iron plan
B. Options tested for having all plots for 75 and 72 SY ( 62.7 and 60.5 SM)
5. Plot width to depth ratio: 1:3 for both sizes Cluster plan
6. Plot width to depth ratio: 1:3 for both sizes Grid iron plan
7. Plot width to depth ratio: 1:2 for both sizes Cluster plan
C. Options tested for plot sizes 56.3 and 56.9 SY (47.1 and 47.6 SM)
8. Plot width to depth ratio: 1:3 for both sizes Cluster plan
9. Plot width to depth ratio: 1:3 for both sizes Grid iron plan
10. Plot width to depth ratio: 1:2 for both sizes Cluster plan

The subsequent discussion on issues in this study is further derived from the following appendices.
Appendix - 2: Density and Land-use Matrix. This compares the different proposals developed (with regard to density and land-use) with each other and with Saiban's original proposals. The comparison also includes the results of the IIED supported Bangkok Density Study 2011. ${ }^{2}$

Appendix - 3: Planning Options. This appendix consists of the layout plans from which the matrix in Appendix -2 has been developed, along with detail land-use and cost calculations for each option and separate land-use colour coding layouts. In redesigning the Saiban City options, the author has respected the desire of the Saiban and byelaws to use only 50 percent of the site area for residential purposes. The commercial area, however, was reduced from the Saiban proposal of 4 percent of the site area to between 1.8 and 2 percent. This is because in the experience of the author, these commercial areas are subject to speculation and the remain unoccupied for a long period of time while commercial activity that serves the needs of the residents develops in the homes of the settlements.

Appendix - 4: House Plans. This consists of house plans on different sizes of plots giving the possible stages of incremental development, their surface areas and costs.

Appendix - 5: Construction and Land Costs for Different House Plan Options.

## Appendix - 6: What the Poorer Poor Can Afford as Housing Loans.

Appendix - 7: The Impact of Saiban Proposed Cross Subsidy on Land Costs
Appendix - 8: Finding of the Bangkok Density Study 2011. These are derived from the Bangkok Density Study.

Appendix - 9: Bill of Quantities and Costs for House Plans.

## 4. PLANNING RELATED ISSUES

### 4.1 Research Questions

The redesign options for Saiban City raise a number of research questions. Some of them can be answered intuitively with considerable accuracy. Others need a better understanding of the issues that are raised below. Such an understanding would lead to a more appropriate redesign for Saiban City and/or for other settlements and complexes as well.

### 4.2 Population mix

Saiban wants 40 large 240 SY (209 SM) plots so that a mixed population should stay together. The rest of the plots should be a minimum of 75 SY ( 62.7 SM ). It also wishes to subsidise the smaller plots by increasing the cost of the larger plots by 20 percent more than the smaller plots. Comments on this are given below:

## 1. 40 larger plots reduces density:

- High density with larger plot mix is in Scheme - 1: 859 persons per hectare
- High density without large plots but with 62.7 SM (Saiban's minimum) is in Scheme - 5: 1018 persons per hectare
- Highest density with plot size 41.7 SM (as per IIED March 2010 study) is in Scheme 8 1,277 persons per hectare
- The result is a substantial decrease of 418 persons per hectare

[^1]
## 2. Subsidy:

The effect of subsidy on plot costs is given in table below and its detail calculations are given in Appendix - 7.

Impact of Subsidy on Land Costs: Cost in Rupees per Plot

|  | Scheme - 4 <br> Saiban Requirements | Scheme - 5 <br> As per Saiban's <br> Minimum Plot Size | Scheme - 8 <br> As per IIED (2009-10) <br> Study |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | SM plots and 466 <br> 60.5 SM plots | 59060.5 and 62.7 SM <br> plots | 74047.1 SM plots |
| Land cost without subsidy | Rs 58,608 <br> (for the 60.5 SM plot) | Rs 56,497 | Rs 44,449 |
| Land cost with 20 percent <br> subsidy from commercial <br> areas | Rs 58,021 | Rs 56,452 | Rs 44,051 |
| Land costs with subsidy <br> from large plots | Rs 54,786 | - |  |
| Subsidised from both | Rs 54,198 |  |  |

(Rupees $138=1$ Pound Sterling)

From the above table the following can be derived. i) In Scheme -4 by having 40 large plots, the small plots can be subsidised by 6.2 percent; ii) By not having the large plots but having all 62.7 SM plots (as per Saiban's minimum requirements for plots), the cost of the plot is 6.25 percent more than the cost of the subsidised plots in Scheme - 4. And iii) By reducing the plot size to 47.1 SM and increasing their number (as in Scheme 8) the plot cost becomes 18.86 percent lower than the small plot cost in Scheme - 4 .

The cross subsidy does not make a substantial difference to reducing the cost of the plot. For the difference to be substantial a much larger area would have to be allocated for the larger plots. It is normal in Malaysia and was normal in Karachi before, that 15 to 30 percent of the plots were for low income groups and hence smaller. ${ }^{3}$ Thus, costs of smaller plots were substantially reduced. However, this reduces density further. On the other hand, by reducing the size of the plot and increasing their number, as per Scheme - 8, an 18.86 percent reduction in the cost of the plot can be achieved. This percentage will increase substantially after Saiban adds its overheads and development expenditure costs to the plots.

## 3. Different Groups Living Together

Where a population mix has been created with a majority of housing for the poor, it has been observed that the population purchasing the larger units uses their property for speculation purposes since they do not wish to live in poor neighbourhoods. On the other hand, where regulations force them to build, they build in a manner that can accommodate a number of low income families or for rental purposes. If the majority of the units are for the higher income groups, the smaller units also eventually get purchased by them. A lot also depends on the location of the site. If a site or apartment complex is in an area where real estate properties are high, then both the smaller and larger units/plots are purchased by the middle/higher income groups. ${ }^{4}$ The population mix and related subsidy issue raises three questions. i) Should population mix be promoted?; ii) if yes, then

[^2]how can multiclass settlements/apartments be promoted?; and iii) should the mix be determined by subsidy or sustainability?

### 4.3 Width to Depth Ratio

To make cluster planning possible, it is helpful if the depth of the plot/unit is a multiple of its width. Also, in the remodelling of Karachi settlements for the March 2010 IIED study and the attached proposals, it is seen that higher density and hence lower infrastructure and per plot land costs are achieved by a width to depth ratio of $1: 3$ as opposed to $1: 2$. However, it is obvious in the plans developed in Appendix - 4 that the 1:2 ratio gives more flexibility in planning and also makes the development of an additional independent unit with a separate access on the floor above possible. This can be given out on rent. This observation poses a new research question. The density in 1:3 (Scheme -9) is 1277 and in 1:2 (Scheme - 10) is 1155 . It is fair to deny this flexibility to low income groups for the sake of increasing the density by $\mathbf{1 2 2}$ persons per hectare?

### 4.4 Size of Plot and Related Environmental Conditions

The size of the plot makes a considerable difference in built-density/capita. For plot size of 62.7 SM it works out to between 8.775 and 9.6 SM . For plot sizes of 47.1 it works out to 6.85 SM . If we look at the house plans for the two plot sizes, we find that the 62.7 SM plot has larger rooms, better ventilation, more than one toilet and substantially more roof space which in Lahore is used for various social activities and for sleeping at night in summer. However, there is a substantial difference in the cost of land and also of construction between the two options. (For details see Appendix - 4 and 5). The difference is not so high that it cannot be afforded by the better poor. Should they be denied this option? If no, then there could be a mix of the two plot sizes within the clusters or around the lanes of the grid iron plans.

### 4.5 Grid Iron Plan versus Cluster Planning

The March 2010 IIED Study process established that the grid iron plan gives lower densities for large settlements than cluster planning. Cluster planning through appropriate physical plans can also help in decentralising management and infrastructure operation and maintenance to the cluster level. However, for a scheme of 17.18 acres, such as Saiban City Lahore, the same densities can be achieved through cluster and grid iron planning.

In Scheme - 8, seven clusters of approximately 100 houses have been created. They can manage their infrastructure O\&M and tax collection independently of a central settlement level management committee. This would force 100 house owners to work together to look after their area.

For the grid iron Scheme - 9, the same densities as clusters Scheme - 8, can be achieved. Here, there are about 18 lanes having an average of 39 units per lane. These 18 lanes would have to be represented in the central settlement management committee. As a result, the central management committee would have to be stronger to coordinate 18 groups than coordinating seven as in the case of Scheme 8. On the other hand, the Orangi Pilot Project experience is that the best coordination and management takes place if the unit of organisation is between 20 to 40 households. This is because there is a greater level of trust between individuals in a smaller unit than in a larger one. The lanes can also be designed in a manner that there is no thorough traffic in them and as such they can be used as public space. The question here is that after what size of site area does cluster planning become necessary? Should this decision be left to the designer or should the communities decide? If the community is to decide, then it should exist before the design exercise. This is possible for redevelopment projects but now for new real estate development.

### 4.6 Built Density Per Capita

The built density/capita is related to family size as this determines the size of the housing unit. For the Saiban City replanning options 12 persons per housing unit has been assumed. This is because the family size in Pakistan is 6.7 and we have assumed that there will be two families on each plot. We have further assumed that there has already been a drop in the family size since the last census in 1998. Working on this assumption the house plans developed have an eventually built-up area of between 82.2 (for plots of 47 SM ) and 115.2 SM (for plots of 62.7 SM ). At Stage One of the
incremental growth, the built-up area is between 32.5 and 49.7 SM for plot sizes 47 and 62.7 SM respectively. (For details see Appendix 4 and 5). This makes the situation very different from Bangkok where the average family size is 4.33 and there is only one family living in one unit. As a result, the average built- up area for the Bangkok housing units works out to 39.32 SM. (See Appendix - 8 for details of the Bangkok Findings).

It is interesting to note that for both the Bangkok study and the redesigning options for Saiban City, the built density/capita is not dissimilar. It is 8.79 SM for Bangkok and 8.04 SM for the Saiban options. In the case of Hong Kong, it is 3.20 SM. ${ }^{5}$ For Nawalane (March 2010 IIED Study) remodelling, it worked out to 3.87 SM. Looking at Nawalane plans again the author feels that the area is too small for the number of people living in it, although it is better than the existing conditions in Nawalane. Similarly, there has been a lot of criticism about the inhumane conditions in Hong Kong apartment complexes. ${ }^{6}$

Based on the Bangkok study and the replanning options for Saiban City, the author feels that the built density per capita should not be less than 6.5 SM. Given high land prices and construction costs of developers, such a high built density per capita is unaffordable through the existing financial loan arrangements for the poor (see Appendix - 6). The question is whether affordability alone (which can lead to producing inhuman conditions) or appropriate environmental and social concerns should determine the design and size of housing units and ways discovered to make them affordable?

### 4.7 Footprint of Residential Area

There is a difference in planning for a new settlement and for a plot of land in an already formally planned sector of the city. In the case of the planning of a settlement, amenities and commercial areas are required along with a road system and related public spaces. In the case of the development on a plot, these facilities have already been provided in the sector plan.

From the remodelling of Paposh Nagar and Fahad Square (March 2010 IIED Study), the author has come to the conclusion that up to 58 to 60 percent of the site can be used for residential purposes for a settlement plan. On the other hand, 77 to 80 percent of the site can be used for residential purposes in the case of a plot in an officially planned sector. In both cases, the design is for individual houses on 47 and 30.72 SM plot. However, in the case of Bangkok, there are schemes where the open area of the plot is only 8 percent (see Matrix in Appendix - 2).

### 4.8 Density in Relation to Individual Houses versus Apartments

A comparison between the Bangkok, Karachi and the Saiban City Remodelling case studies, it is obvious that much higher densities (between 2275 and 4184 persons per hectare) can be achieved by building small apartments of 32 to 35.75 SM . Individual houses on small plots, on the other hand, can achieve higher densities (of up to 1300 persons per hectare) than the prescribed KBCA regulations of 1225 persons per hectare. ${ }^{7}$ The question here is to what extent should peoples' preferences be given more importance than higher densities?

### 4.9 Social Relations: Individual Houses versus Apartments

The Bangkok Density Study clearly establishes that social relations in low income housing settlements are better than in apartment complexes. They are especially better in relation to security, community activity, entrusting house to neighbour and especially for entrusting children with neighbours. (For details see Appendix - 8). The study for three Karachi settlements and one apartment complex (March 2010 IIED Study) also points to the fact that social conditions in the settlements are better than in the apartment complex. This is in spite of the fact that all three surveyed settlements were informally planned and at least one of them had a number of social problems. Given high land and

[^3]construction prices of formally developed housing, to what extent should the issue of social relations determine whether apartments or individual houses should be built on a particular site?

### 4.10 The Affordability Issue

Detractors to the Saiban concept feel that the houses built by the people themselves are "shabby" and create an unaesthetic environment. They feel that the street facades should be properly built. There have also been proposals that the facades should be completed along with the structure of the house and the internal finishing/completion should be done by the owner at his own cost. This negates the concept of incremental building.

Here the question arises as to what the poor can afford for formal built housing through a loan process in 15 years. This has been worked out in Appendix - 6. It is obvious from the figures in the appendix that the poor cannot build the complete house through a loan process although they may manage to build Stage One and repay it in a 15 year period.

This issue can only be solved by; i) providing a subsidy of about 50 percent of construction cost; ii) providing for a 20 year loan which the House Building Finance Corporation (HBFC) is not willing to do for persons over 40 years of age; ${ }^{8}$ and iii) providing small loans for large items such as roofs (which constitutes about 20 percent of the cost of construction ${ }^{9}$ ) and utilities in a process where the owner builds his own house incrementally over time. In any of these cases, design and technical advice and managerial guidance needs to be provided to the owner so that a pleasant social and physical environment can be created. The question is who will provide these design and technical services to the owners and through what process?

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

### 5.1 General Conclusion

The issues raised in Section 4 of this Study are important for a number of reasons. In many Asian cities, state subsidised public housing, is no longer being provided, except for redevelopment schemes for "squatter" settlements. Most of the redevelopment schemes consist of apartment blocks. Evidence suggests that the residents are unhappy with these schemes as they make them poorer since they burden them with loans, prevent them from carrying on economic activity in their homes, destroy existing community life and create social problems. ${ }^{10}$ It is true that more sensitive alternatives have also been developed but so far they are limited in scale and location as compared to the scale of the problem. ${ }^{11}$ Meanwhile, the creation of informal settlements, common in the pre-1990 decades, has become difficult if not impossible.

The resulting demand-supply housing gap for low income communities is increasingly being met by real estate developers. In many cases, their work is being supported through market based subsidies and long term housing loans. To make the product affordable, the housing units are becoming increasingly smaller, sometimes as low as 15 to $18 \mathrm{SM} .{ }^{12}$ These developments are creating a degraded physical and social environment and this will deteriorate further through densification and maintenance related problems. What will these new developments look like 10 years from today? It seems that self or community built incremental housing is the only affordable option which can produce a better environmental quality, provided it is guided and takes into consideration the issues raised in Section 4.

[^4]
### 5.2 Saiban City Specific Conclusions

A number of specific conclusions for the future design of Saiban City, which try to relate to the issues raised in Section 4, are given below.

1. Plot sizes in the settlement should be a mix. The maximum size should be 62.7 SM and the minimum should be 47 SM. Width to depth ratios of plots should also vary between 1:2 and 1:3. These different sizes and ratios should not be segregated from each other but should be woven together in clusters or along grid iron roads. Per SM cost of the plots should be kept the same. As such, residents will have a choice according to what they can afford or what they prefer.
2. Commercial plots should not cover more than 1.5 percent of the site. Their cost per SM should be 50 percent more than the residential plots. This is because commercial plots are seldom occupied or used for the benefit of the residents of the settlements whose needs are catered to by shops in the houses in the lanes. The possibility of providing small plots for commercial activities within the clusters is a possibility that needs to be explored. In Schemes 5 and 7, this has been attempted.
3. The residential footprint should be increased to $65-68$ percent of the residential area. This will increase the number of plots and reduce the sale price of the plots considerably. The results of the remodelling for March 2010 IIED Study establish that this increase does not adversely affect the physical and social environment.
4. The partially contractor-built option, as suggested by the Saiban detractors, is unaffordable and cannot be incremental. As such, it should not be considered. People should build their own houses but they should be supported by a design and construction supervision cell. How best such a cell can be organised, financed and sustained and by whom needs to be determined.
5. Separate loan packages should be developed for roof elements, cement purchase, bricks, utility connections and for tiling the wet areas of the house to make them hygienic. The owners can choose the package they prefer. The tiling option should carry a low or no interest rate.
6. The possibility of a loan package for DC fan and light appliances on solar energy should be developed. Companied in Pakistan offer one fan, two lights, dry batteries and a solar panel to fire them for Rs 16,000 . The long term benefits of this have been worked out in numerous reports and news items. ${ }^{13}$
[^5]Appendix 1- Physical Comparisons with New Proposal

|  | Khuda Ki Basti |  | Nawalane |  | Paposh Nagar |  | Fahad Square |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing | Proposed | Existing | Proposed | Existing | Proposed | Existing | Proposed |
| Total Area | 40.8 acres(16.51 hectares) |  | $\begin{gathered} 10.9 \text { acres } \\ \text { (8.4 hectares) } \end{gathered}$ |  | 15 acres(6.07 hectares) |  | 1.50 acres(0.607 hectares) |  |
| Total no. of plots | 1237 | 2112 | 769 | 1000 | 714 | 777 | 248 | 171 |
| Average <br> Family <br> Size | 6.7 persons | 6.7 persons | 13.56 persons | 13.56 persons | 6.7 persons | 6.7 persons | 5.7 persons | 5.7 persons |
| Number of families per plot | 01 | 02 | 2.72 | 02 | 1.5 | 02 | 01 | 01 |
| Average number of people per plot | 6.7 persons | 13.4 | 36.8 persons | 27.0 persons | 10.05 persons | 13.4 persons | 5.7 persons | 5.7 persons |
| Total Populatio n (Resident ial) | 8287 persons | 28300 persons | 28299 people | 27000 persons | 7175 persons | 10411 persons | 1414 persons | 975 persons |
| Populatio <br> n Density <br> (total <br> populatio <br> n / total <br> area) | 203 ppl per acre 501 ppl per hectare | 693 ppl per acre 1712 ppl per hectare | 1356 ppl per acre 3349 ppl per hectare | 1291 ppl per acre 3189 ppl per hectare | 478 ppl per acre 1181 ppl per hectare | 694 ppl per acre 1715 ppl per hectare | 942 ppl per acre 2327 ppl per hectare | 650 ppl per acre 1606 ppl per hectare |

APPENDIX - 1- PHYSICAL COMPARISONS WITH NEW PROPOSAL

| Average residential plot size | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 80 \text { sq. yards } \\ & (67 \text { sq. meters) } \end{aligned}$ | 56 sq. yards (47.0 sq. meters) | $\begin{gathered} 120 \text { sq. yards } \\ \text { (100 sq. meters) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 56 \text { sq. yards } \\ \text { (47.0 sq. meters) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 81.6 \text { sq. yards } \\ & \text { (68.2 sq. meters) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 56 \text { sq. yards } \\ \text { (47.0 sq. meters) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 66.6 \text { sq. yards } \\ \text { ( } 55.7 \text { sq. meters) } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost of Land per sq. yds. | PKR 5000 (\$ 61) per sq. yards for an average 80 sq. yds. (67 sq. meter) house of $\mathrm{G}+1$. | PKR 5000 (\$ 61) per sq. yards for an average 56 sq. yds. (47 sq. meter) house of G+2. | PKR 7352 (\$ 90) per sq. yards for an average 120 sq. yds. (100 sq. meter) house of $\mathrm{G}+2$. | PKR 7352 (\$ 90) per sq. yards for an average 56 sq. yds. (47 sq. meter) house of G+2. | PKR 10,000 (\$ 123) per sq. yards for an average 66.16 sq. yds. ( 55.73 sq. meter) house of $\mathrm{G}+2$. | PKR 10,000 (\$ 123) per sq. yards for an average 56 sq. yds. (47 sq. meter) house of G+2. | PKR 9752 (\$ 120) per sq. yards for an average 81.6 sq. yds. (68 sq. meter) house of G+2. |  |
| Cost of Unit | Overall covered areas $=160$ sq. yds ( 134 sq. meter). Overall cost = RKR 800,000 (\$9,876) | Overall covered areas = 168 sq. yds (141 sq. meter). Overall cost = RKR 840,000 (\$ 10,370) | Overall covered areas $=360$ sq. yds ( 302 sq. meter). Overall cost = RKR 26,46,720 (\$ 32,675) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Overall covered areas } \\ =168 \text { sq. yds (141 } \\ \text { sq. meter). Overall } \\ \text { cost = RKR } \\ 12,35,136 \\ (\$ 15,248) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Overall covered areas $=$ 200 sq. yds (168 sq. meter). Overall cost = RKR 1,998,000 (\$ 24,666) | Overall covered areas $=168 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{yds}$ (141 sq. meter). Overall cost = RKR 16,80,000 (\$20,740) | Overall covered areas $=81.6$ sq. yds ( 68 sq. meter). Overall cost = RKR 7,95,763 (\$ 9,824 |  |
| LANDUSE | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |  |
| Residential | 40.27 | 55 | 60.5 | 55 | 60.5 | 55 | 70.6 |  |
| Residential cum Commercial | 7.14 |  | 10.65 |  | 6.66 |  | 0 |  |
| Commercial | 1.85 | 5 | 0.02 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 0 |  |
| Parks (area level, neighborhoo d parks)) | 7.24 | 8 | 0.12 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 0 |  |
| Amenities | 2.86 | 4 | 1.81 | 4 | 2.85 | 4 | 0 |  |
| Educational | 3.19 | 4.5 | 2.32 | 4 | 2.60 | 4 | 0 |  |
| Empty Plots | 1.85 | 0 | 4.98 | 0 | 3.36 | 0 | 0 |  |

APPENDIX - 1- PHYSICAL COMPARISONS WITH NEW PROPOSAL


| DENSITY \& LANDUSE MATRIX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROPOSALS FOR IIED DENSITY STUDY (2010) |  |  |  |  | KKB, LAHORE PROPOSALS (2011) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Thailand Density Study (2011) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | KKB | NAWALANE | P. NAGAR | F. SQUARE | SCHEME 1 | SCHEME 2 | SCHEME 3 | SCHEME 4 | SCHEME 5 | 5 SCHEME 6 | SCHEME 7 | SCHEME 8 | SCHEME 9 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { SCHEME } \\ 10 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { SCHEME } \\ 11 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | BK(NHA) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { BMBK } \\ & \text { (CODI) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BUSP } \\ & \text { (NHA) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BMSP } \\ & \text { (CODI) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | WP(NS) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BMWP } \\ & \text { (CODI) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Settlement Area : ha | 16.32 | 8.4 | 6.07 | 0.67 | 6.95 | 6.95 | 6.95 | 6.95 | 6.95 | 6.95 | 6.95 | 6.95 | 6.95 | 6.95 | 6.95 | 6.08 | 0.8808 | 1.36 | 1.0762 | 1.48 | 0.24 |
| Total No. of plots | 1910 | 982 | 749 | 152 | 498 | 447 | 442 | 466 | 590 | 542 | 510 | 740 | 704 | 669 | 412 | 3272 | 202 | 1120 | 249 | 56 | 80 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 209 | 209 | 209 | 209 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sq.m | 47 | 47 | 47 | 30.72 | 62.7 | 60.5 | 62.7 | 60.5 | 62.7 | 62.7 | 60.5 | 47.1 | 47.1 | 47.6 | NA | 32 | 35 | 35.75 | 61.25 | 32.63 | 60.995 |
| $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Number of } \\ \text { families per } \\ \text { plot } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Plot width to depth ratio | 1:3 | 1:3 | 1:3 | NA | 1:2 | 1:2 | 1:2 | 1:2 | 1:3 | 1:3 | 1:2 | 1:3 | 1:3 | 1:2 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Average No. } \\ \text { of persons } \\ \text { per plot } \end{array}$ | 15 | 27 | 13.4 | 9 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 4.19 | 5 | 4.31 | 4.71 | 4.8 | 3 |
| Built-up Area per Capita : sq.m | 6.96 | 3.87 | 7.79 | 8.26 |  |  |  |  | 8.775 | 8.775 | 9.6 | 6.85 | 6.85 | 7.42 | N.A | 7.64 | 7 | 8.29 | 13 | 6.8 | 17 |
| Gross. <br> Density: ha | 1755 | 3157 | 1653 | 2280 | 859.8 | 771.8 | 763 | 804.6 | 1018.7 | 935.8 | 880.6 | 1277.7 | 1215.5 | 1155 | 711.4 | 4184.1 | 2257.3 | 3558.7 | 1089.3 | 506.1 | 1000 |
| LANDUSE in percentages of settlements area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential | 55 | 55 | 58 | 77 | 54 | 48 | 48.5 | 48.9 | 53.2 | 48.9 | 44.2 | 50.1 | 47.7 | 45.7 | 51.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 3 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 4.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ameneties | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4 | 0 | 5.6 | 6.1 | 4.6 | 4.2 | 5.2 | 3.95 | 5 | 4.6 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 2.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Spaces | 8 | 8 | 8 | 5.35 | 17 | 20 | 13 | 13.2 | 18.8 | 11.35 | 17.9 | 16.3 | 11.1 | 19.6 | 8.64 | 27 | 20 | 32 | 20 | 8 | 18 |
| Educational | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4 | 0 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 1.26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Vehicular } \\ \text { circulation } \end{array}$ | 23 | 23 | 22 | 17.65 | 19 | 21.5 | 28.5 | 29.5 | 18.8 | 30.4 | 27.9 | 24.4 | 31.8 | 26.4 | 30.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| No. | Plot Size | width/depth ratio | Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | As per Saiban requirements |  |  |
| scheme 1 | $33^{\prime}-6$ " $\times 67^{\prime}(10.21 \mathrm{~m} \times 20.42 \mathrm{~m}) \& 15^{\prime} \times 45^{\prime}(4.57 \mathrm{~m} \times 13.72 \mathrm{~m})$ | 1:2, 1:3 | Cluster |
| scheme 2 | $33^{\prime}-66^{\prime \prime} \times 67^{\prime}(10.21 \mathrm{~m} \times 20.42 \mathrm{~m}) \& 18^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}(5.5 \mathrm{~m} \times 11 \mathrm{~m})$ | 1:2, 1:2 | Cluster |
| scheme 3 | $33^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime \prime} \times 67^{\prime}(10.21 \mathrm{~m} \times 20.42 \mathrm{~m}) \& 15^{\prime} \times 45^{\prime}(4.57 \mathrm{~m} \times 13.72 \mathrm{~m})$ | 1:2, 1:3 | Grid-iron |
| scheme 4 | $33^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime \prime} \times 67^{\prime}(10.21 \mathrm{~m} \times 20.42 \mathrm{~m}) \& 18^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}(5.5 \mathrm{~m} \times 11 \mathrm{~m})$ | 1:2, 1:2 | Grid-iron |
| B | Options tested - 60.5 sq.m \& 62.7 sq.m ( 72 sq.yds \& 75 sq.yds) |  |  |
| scheme 5 | $15^{\prime} \times 45^{\prime}(4.57 \mathrm{~m} \times 13.72 \mathrm{~m})$ | 1:3 | Cluster |
| scheme 6 | $15^{\prime} \times 45^{\prime}(4.57 \mathrm{~m} \times 13.72 \mathrm{~m})$. | 1:3 | Grid-iron |
| scheme 7 | $18^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}(5.5 \mathrm{~m} \times 11 \mathrm{~m})$ | 1:2 | Cluster |
| C | Options tested - 47.1 sq.m \& 47.6 sq.m ( 56.3 sq.yds \& 56.9 sq.yds) |  |  |
| scheme 8 | $13^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}(3.96 \mathrm{~m} \times 11.89 \mathrm{~m})$ | 1:3 | Cluster |
| scheme 9 | $13^{\prime} \times 39{ }^{\prime}(3.96 \mathrm{~m} \times 11.89 \mathrm{~m})$ | 1:3 | Grid-iron |
| scheme 10 | $16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}(4.88 \mathrm{~m} \times 9.75 \mathrm{~m})$ | 1:2 | Cluster |
| D | KKB Scheme |  |  |
| scheme 11 | Scheme prepared by KKB team, having plots of many sizes. | NA | NA |

NHA-Bon Kai : 14, 4-8 storey apartment buildings
CODI-Baan Mankong Bon Kai : 2 and 2.5 story row houses
NHA- Baan Uea-arthorn Suan Plu: 14,5 storey apartment buildings
OD Man Mar Watphrayakrai Community : 2 , four storey, low-rise condominium scheme
CODI-Baan Mankong Watphrayakrai $: 2$, four storey, low-rise condominium scheme



SCHEME 1



SCHEME 2

| LANDUSE CODING |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| colour CODE | TYPE OF PLOT | AREA (PERCENTAGE) |
|  | RESIDENTIAL | 48.0 |
| $\square$ | 10 maria plots |  |
| $\square$ | 3 marla plots |  |
|  | COMMERCIAL | 2.0 |
|  | AMENETIES | 8.5 |
| $\square$ | Schools |  |
| D8 | Mosque |  |
|  | Community centres |  |
|  | Services |  |
| V1/ | Graveyard |  |
|  | PUBLIC OPEN SPACES | 20.0 |
|  | Park |  |
| Whuld | Community open spaces |  |
|  | Pedestrian Circulation |  |
| $\square$ | VEHICULAR CIRCULATION | 21.5 |
|  |  |  |


| Project: SABAN CITY LAHORE | SCHEME 2 | $w-\sum_{s}^{N}=$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drawng Tise: LANDUSE CODING |  |  |
| Architeot/ Planner: ARIF HASAN |  |  |
| Dato : 07-09-2011 Scalo: $1_{1 / 20}{ }^{*}=$ |  |  |



## SCHEME 2

| LANDUSE DETAILS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type of Plots | No. of plots | Area of each plot | Total Area of plots. | \% |
|  |  |  | (sq. yds.) | (sq.yds.) |  |
| 1. | RESIDENTLAL PLOTS |  |  |  | 48 |
|  | 10 marla plots | 42 | 250 | 10500 |  |
|  | 3 marla plots( $1: 2$ ) $=18^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$ | 405 | 72 | 29180 |  |
| 2. | COMMERCLAL PLOT8 |  |  |  | 2.0 |
|  | 1.5 marla plots | 36 | 39 | 1404 |  |
|  | 1 marla plots | 18 | 24 | 432 |  |
| 3. | AMENETIES |  |  |  | 8.5 |
|  | Community Centros |  |  |  |  |
|  | At cluster level | 6 | 144 | 884 |  |
|  | Main Center | 1 | 78 | 778 |  |
| 3.2 | Schoot | 1 | 2000 | 2000 |  |
| 3.3 | Mosque | 1 | 720 | 720 |  |
| 3.4 | Graveyard | 1 | 1418 | 1419 |  |
| 3.6 | Services and Utillies | 2 | varlos | 442 |  |
| 4. | Public Opon Spacos |  |  |  | 20.0 |
| 4.1 | Park | 1 | 6062 | 6062 |  |
| 4. | Community Open Spaces |  |  |  |  |
|  | At cluster level | 6 | 676 | 4056 |  |
|  | Podestrian Walloways |  |  | 6688 |  |
| 5. | Roads for Vehlcular Traflic |  |  | 17745 | 21.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LANDUSE COSTING |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Area of PLOT $=83160 \mathrm{sc} . \mathrm{yds}$. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Area of PLOT $=17.1818$ acres |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost © Rs: $2,000,000 /$ - per acro $=$ Rs: $34,363,600 /$ - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sale-able area $=10,500 \mathrm{sq} \cdot \mathrm{yds}$. |  |  | 0 maria resid | dental |  |
| 29,160 sq.yds. |  |  | 3 marla resic | dental |  |
| 1404 sq. yds. 1 |  |  | 1.5 marla com | mmerctal |  |
| $432 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{yds}$. |  |  | marla comm | nercial |  |
| Total sale able area $=41,496 \mathrm{sq}$. yds |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Cost of Plot = Rs. $34,363,600 /-$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per sq.yd of selo-eble eree $=$ Re. $34,363,600 / 41,496=$ Rs $828 / \mathrm{sq}$.yd |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of sq. yds. COST of sale-able areas |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 marla residential $=$ |  | Rs, 8,69 | 94,000 /- for 4 | 42 plots |  |
|  |  | Rs. 207 | 7,000 1 -per plo |  |  |
| 3 maria residentlal $=$ |  | Rs. 24, | 144,480 f -for | 405 plots |  |
|  |  | Rs. 59,8 | ,816 1 - per plot |  |  |
| 1.5 maria commercial $=$ |  | Rs. 1,102 | 62,512 $/$ - for 3 | 36 plots |  |
|  |  | Rs. 32, | 2921 -per plot |  |  |
| 1 merle commerclal $=$ |  | Rs. 357 | ,898 $/$ - for 18 | plots |  |
|  |  | Rs. 19,872 - por plot |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Note: 1 Marla $=\mathbf{2 5}$ sq.yards |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | joct: 3 ABAN CTTY LCHORE |  | CHEME 2 |  |  |
| Drawing TIEe: LANDUSE DETALS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Architbet/ Planner: ARIF HASAN |  |  |  | A-02-02 |  |
| Dato : 07-09-2011 Scale : $\mathrm{Y}_{\text {120 }}{ }^{\circ}=110^{1} 0^{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |



SCHEME 3

| LANDUSE CODING |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COLOUR CODE | TYPE OF PLOT | AREA (PERCENTAGE) |
|  | RESIDENTIAL | 48.5 |
| $\square$ | 10 marla plots |  |
| $\square$ | 3 marla plots |  |
|  | COMMERCIAL | 3.0 |
|  | AMENETIES | 7.0 |
| $\square$ | Schools |  |
| DD | Mosque |  |
|  | Community centres |  |
|  | Services |  |
| 7/7 | Graveyard |  |
|  | PUBLIC OPEN SPACES | 13.0 |
|  | Park |  |
| आMm | Community open spaces |  |
|  | Pedestrian Circulation |  |
| $\square$ | VEHICULAR CIRCULATION | 28.5 |
|  |  |  |




SCHEME 3




SCHEME 4




SCHEME 5





SCHEME 7

| LANDUSE CODING |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| colour CODE | TYPE OF PLOT | AREA (PERCENTAGE) |
|  | RESIDENTIAL | 442 |
| $\square$ | 10 marla plots |  |
| $\square$ | 3 marla plots |  |
|  | COMMERCIAL | 2.5 |
|  | AMENETIES | 7.4 |
| $\square$ | Schools |  |
| DD | Mosque |  |
|  | Community centres |  |
|  | Services |  |
| V/7 | Graveyard |  |
|  | PUBLIC OPEN SPACES | 18.0 |
|  | Park |  |
| प्याMa | Community open spaces |  |
|  | Pedestrian Circulation |  |
| $\square$ | VEHICULAR CIRCULATION | 27. |
|  |  |  |



SCHEME 7

| LANDUSE DETAILS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type of Plots | No. of plots | Area of each plot | Total Area of plots. | \% |
|  |  |  | (sq. yds.) | (sq. yds.) |  |
| 1. | RESIDENTIAL PLOTS |  |  |  | 44.2 |
|  | 3 marla plots(1:2) $=18^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$ | 510 | 72 | 36720 |  |
| 2. | COMMERCLAL PLOTS |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1.6 marla plots | 40 | 38.9 | 1556 | 2.5 |
|  | 1.28 marla plots | 4 | 31.1 | 124.4 |  |
|  | 1.12 marta plots | 18 | 24 | 432 |  |
| 3. | AMENETIES |  |  |  | 74 |
|  | Communlty Contre |  |  |  |  |
|  | Main Contro | 1 | 778 | 778 |  |
|  | Centre at cluster loval | 6 | 144 | 884 |  |
| 3.2 | School | 1 | 2040 | 2040 |  |
| 3.3 | Mosque | 1 | 720 | 720 |  |
|  | Graveyard | 1 | 1419 | 1419 |  |
| 3.5 | Services and Uulllies | 2 | varios | 380 |  |
| 4. | PUBLIC OPEN SPACE |  |  |  | 18 |
| 4.1 | Park | 1 |  | 5077 |  |
| 4. | Communlty Open Spaces |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 6 | varies | 3952 |  |
|  | Pedestrian wallways |  |  | 5896 |  |
|  | 5. ROADS FOR VEHICULAR |  |  |  |  |
|  | TRAFFIC |  |  | 23228 | 27.9 |
| LANDUSE COSTING |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Area of PLOT $=83,160 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{yds}$.Total Area of PLOT $=17.1818$ acres |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost © Rs: 2,000,000/-per acre $=$ Rs: 34,363,600/- |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salo-able area $=38,720$ sq. yds . |  |  | 3 marla resic | dental |  |
| 1,556 sq.yds. |  |  | 1.6 maria com | mmercial |  |
| 124.4 sq.yds. 1 |  |  | 1.24 marla com | mmercial |  |
| 432 sq. yds. |  |  | 0.98 marla co | mmercial |  |
| Total salo-able area $=38,832.4$ sq. yde |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Cost of Plot $=$ Rs, 34,363,600/- |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per sq.yd of sale-able aree $=$ Rs. $34,363,600 / 38,832.4=$ Rs $885 / \mathrm{sq} . y \mathrm{yd}$ Percentage of sq. yds. COST of sale-able areas |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 marta residential $=$ |  | Rs. 32,4 | 497,200/-for | 510 plots |  |
|  |  | Rs. 63,7 | 720 1 -per plot |  |  |
| 1.8 marla commercial $=$ |  | Rs. 1,37 | 77,060/-for 4 | 40 plots |  |
|  |  | Rs. 34,4 | 426.5 -per pl |  |  |
| 1.24 marta commortal = Rs. 110,0941 - for 4 plots |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rs, 27,523.5/-per plot |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.96 marla commercial $=$ Rs, $382,320 \mathrm{f}$-for 18 plots |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rs. 21,240 -per plot |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Note: 1 Marla $=25$ sq.yards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Projed: SARAN CTTY LAHORE |  |  | SCHEME 7 |  |  |
| Drawng Tita: LANDUSE DETALS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arctilect/ Planner. ARIF HASAN |  |  |  | A-07-02 |  |
| to: 07-09-2011 Scalo : $\mathrm{Y}_{\text {/m" }}=1{ }^{1-1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |



SCHEME 8

| LANDUSE CODING |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COLOUR CODE | TYPE OF PLOT | AREA (PERCENTAGE) |
|  | RESIDENTIAL | 54.0 |
| $\square$ | 10 marla plots |  |
| $\square$ | 3 marla plots |  |
|  | COMMERCIAL | 2.0 |
|  | AMENETIES | 8.0 |
| $\square$ | Schools |  |
| DV | Mosque |  |
|  | Community centres |  |
|  | Services |  |
| V/7 | Graveyard |  |
|  | PUBLIC OPEN SPACES | 17.0 |
|  | Park |  |
| अMm | Community open spaces |  |
|  | Pedestrian Circulation |  |
| $\square$ | VEHICULAR CIRCULATION | 19.0 |
|  |  |  |




SCHEME 8



SCHEME 9

| LANDUSE CODING |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| colour CODE | TYPE OF PLOT | AREA (PERCENTAGE) |
|  | RESIDENTIAL | 48.5 |
| $\square$ | 10 maria plots |  |
| $\square$ | 3 marla plots |  |
|  | COMMERCIAL | 3.0 |
|  | AMENETIES | 7.5 |
| $\square$ | Schools |  |
| 518 | Mosque |  |
|  | Community centres |  |
|  | Services |  |
| $\square 7 /$ | Graveyard |  |
|  | PUBLIC OPEN SPACES | 12.5 |
|  | Park |  |
| IMm | Community open spaces |  |
|  | Pedestrian Circulation |  |
| $\square$ | VEHICULAR CIRCULATION | 28.5 |
|  |  |  |


| Project: SARAN CTTY LAHORE |  | SCHEME 9 | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drawng TEE: LANDUSE CODING |  |  |  |
| Architect/ Planner. ARIF HASAN |  |  |  |
| Dato :07-09-2011 | Scale : $\mathrm{y}_{\text {2a* }}=11^{\circ} 0^{\circ}$ |  |  |



SCHEME 9



SCHEME 10

| LANDUSE CODING |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| colour CODE | TYPE OF PLOT | AREA (PERCENTAGE) |
|  | RESIDENTIAL | 45.7 |
| $\square$ | 2.28 marla plots |  |
|  | COMMERCIAL | 2.1 |
|  | AMENETIES | 6.2 |
| $\square$ | Schools |  |
| D18 | Mosque |  |
|  | Community centres |  |
|  | Services |  |
| 7/7 | Graveyard |  |
|  | PUBLIC OPEN SPACES | 10.6 |
|  | Park |  |
| अMan | Community open spaces |  |
|  | Pedestrian Circulation |  |
| $\square$ | VEHICULAR CIRCULATION | 20.4 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |





SCHEME 11



Ground Floor - 48.3 sq.yds ( 40.4 sq.m) (A) PLOT SIZE: $16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}-56.9$ sq.yds ( $\left.47.6 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{m}\right)$

First Floor - 42.9 sq.yds ( 35.9 sq.m)


Second Floor - 15.2 sq.yds ( $12.7 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{m}$ )


Ground Floor - 59.4 sq.yds ( $49.7 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{m}$ )

BUILT-UP AREA PER CAPITA: $11.5 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{yds}$ ( 9.6 sq


First Floor - 55.6 sq.yd (46.5sq.m)


Second Floor - 22.7sq.yds ( 19 sq.m)


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHEDULE OF DOORS \& WNDOWS } \\ & \hline \text { STE } \\ & \hline \text { MO. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Descapplow |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wอก(\%) | HEOHT (T) |  |
| D1 | 3-3* | 7 -0* | Steel: 1, side hinged |
| D2 | 3-0* | 7-0* | Steel: 1, side hirgeed |
| D3 | $2^{1-6}$ | 7 -0* | Steel: 1, side hinged |
| W1 | 4-3 ${ }^{\text {¹}}$ | 5'6. | Steel: 3, Glass panel , stide hinged |
| w2 | 2'-10 1/2' | 5.6. | Steel: 2, Glass panels ssla hingod |
| W3 | 1'-6" | 5-6* | Steel: 1, Glass panets side hinged |
| W4 | 2'-10 $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ | 3-6* | Steel: 2, Glass panes side hinged |
| vi | 1-6* | $2^{2-0}$ | Steel: 1, Glass panels side hinged |


| Project: SAIBAN CTTY LAHORE | scheme: 2,4,7 \& 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drawing Tise: HOUSING UNTTS-RATIO-1:2-PLAN/COST |  |  |
| Archilect/ Planner: ARIF HASAN |  | A-12-01 |
| Dato: 07-09-2011 Scalo: $1 / 8^{+⿻}=11^{-00}$ |  |  |


(C) PLOT SIZE: $13^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}-53.6$ sq.yds ( 47.1 sq.m) BUILT-UP AREA PER CAPTTA: 8.2 sq.yds ( $\mathbf{6 . 8 5} \mathrm{sq.m}$ )

| (C) CONSTRUCTION COST STMAE ONE (OROUNO FLOOF) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| सwक: | Fatiso | Coneodnow | Commedracost | Omercoiod | Toul cat |
| 1:3 | $13^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}$ 56.3 sq..yds (47.1 sq.m) | $\begin{aligned} & 38.9 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{yds} \\ & (32.5 \mathrm{sq} \cdot \mathrm{~m}) \end{aligned}$ | Rs 509,975 | Rs 94,760 | Rs 604,735 |
| TTMOE TWO(FRNTROON |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fatam | Conordioe | Contacosicos | anatiout | Todock |
| 1:3 | $13^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}$ $56.3 .39 . \mathrm{c}^{\prime} \mathrm{ds}$ $(47.1 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{m})$ | 38.9 sq.yds ( $32.5 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{m}$ ) | Rs 266,488 | Rs 114,070 | Rs 380,558 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Patas | Conendine | Carnecoricos | Onestioas | Totices |
| 1:3 | $13^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}$ 56.3 sq.yds (47.1 sq.m) | $\begin{aligned} & 20.6 \mathrm{sq} . y \mathrm{ds} \\ & (17.2 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ | Rs 178,247 | Rs 87,599 | Rs 265,836 |
| Teat consendena |  | $\begin{aligned} & 98.4 \text { sq.yds } \\ & (82.2 \text { sq.m) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \begin{array}{c} \text { Ton } \\ R S 296,419 \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8.2 \text { sq.yds } \\ & (6.85 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{m}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |


| Prolect: SAIBAN CITY LAHORE | SCHEME: 8 \& 9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drawing 7ie: HOUSING UNTTS - RATIO-1:3-PLANCOST |  |  |
| Architect/ Planner: ARIF HASAN |  |  |
| Dato : 07-09-2011 Scato: $^{1 / 88^{*}}=$ |  |  |



| APPENDIX - 5- CONSTRUCTION AND LAND COST FOR DIFFERENT HOUSE PLAN OPTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scheme | Ratio | Plot size (sq.m) | Type of settlement | Plot Price (Rs) | Plot price with susidy (Rs) | Cost of Construction - Stage-1 (Rs) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Contractor's cost | Owner's <br> cost | Total |
| A | As per Saiban requirements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1:2 | 209 | cluster | 186,500 |  | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 1:3 | 62.7 |  | 55,950 |  | 526,876 | 89,952 | 616,828 |
| 2 | 1:2 | 209 | cluster | 207,000 |  | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 1:2 | 60.5 |  | 59,616 |  | 540,873 | 99,253 | 640,126 |
| 3 | 1:2 | 209 | grid-iron | 202,750 |  | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 1:3 | 62.7 |  | 60,825 |  | 526,876 | 89,952 | 616,828 |
| 4 | 1:2 | 209 | grid-iron | 203,500 |  | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 1:2 | 60.5 |  | 58,608 | 54,198 | 540,873 | 99,253 | 640,126 |
| B | Options tested - 62.7sq.m \& 60.5 sq.m ( 75 sq.yd \& 72 sq.yd) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 1:3 | 62.7 | cluster | 56,497.50 | 56,452 | 526,876 | 89,952 | 616,828 |
| 6 | 1:3 | 62.7 | grid-iron | 59,700 |  | 526,876 | 89,952 | 616,828 |
| 7 | 1:2 | 60.5 | cluster | 63,720 |  | 540,873 | 99,253 | 640,126 |
| c | Options tested - 47.1 sq.m \& 47.6 sq.m ( 56.3 sq.yd \& 56.9 sq.yd) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 1:3 | 47.1 | cluster | 44,449 | 44,051 | 509,975 | 94,760 | 604,735 |
| 9 | 1:3 | 47.1 | grid-iron | 45,771 |  | 509,975 | 94,760 | 604,735 |
| 10 | 1:2 | 47.6 | cluster | 48,991 |  | 503,581 | 87,532 | 591,113 |
| D | Scheme prepared by KKB team, having plots of various sizes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | NA | varies | NA | varies |  | NA | NA | NA |

## What the Poorer Poor Can Afford as Housing Loans

1. KKB-3 residents (March 2010 IIED Study) in 2009 had an average income of Rs 8,000 per month. Since the daily minimum wage has increased since then by 20 percent, it is assumed for the calculations below that the average per month earning of the future Saiban City residents will be Rs 10,000 and that they will be able to initially pay 20 percent of it for servicing a housing loan. After every three years the instalment can be increased by 25 percent.
2. Affordability in Rupees:

| Down <br> Payment | Ist 3 Years <br> at Rs 2,000 <br> per month | Next 3 years <br> at Rs 2,500 <br> per month | Next 3 years <br> at Rs 3,000 <br> per month | Next 3 years <br> at Rs 3,500 <br> per month | Next 3 years <br> at Rs 4,000 <br> per month | Total <br> Amount |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20,000 | 72,000 | 90,000 | 108,000 | 126,000 | 144,000 | 540,000 |

3. Costs of Construction (from Appendix 4 and 5):

|  | 62.7 SM plot (in Rupees) | 47.1 SM plot (in Rupees) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |
| Total house cost | $1,452,825$ | $1,223,880$ |
| Contractor's share | $1,110,301$ | 924,044 |
| Owner's share | 342,524 | 299,836 |
|  |  |  |
| Phase - 1 Cost | 616,828 | 604,735 |
| Contractor's share | 526,876 | 509,975 |
| Owner's share | 89,952 | 94,760 |

4. Repayment at $4 \%$ compound interest in 15 years for design proposals in Appendix 4 is unaffordable.
5. Repayment at $12 \%$ compound interest in 15 years for design proposals in Appendix 4 is unaffordable.

## The Impact of Saiban Proposed Cross Subsidy on Land Costs

|  | Scheme - 4 | Scheme - 5 | Scheme - 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total land cost | Rs 34,363,600 | Rs 34,363,600 | Rs 34,363,600 |
| Land cost per square yard of sellable area (per square yard) | 814 | 753.3 | 789.5 |
| Land cost for commercial area | Rs 1,250,304 | Rs 1,032,021 | Rs 1,471,770 |
| Land cost for commercial area plus 20\% | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Rs } 1,500,365 \\ (20 \%=\text { Rs } 250,061) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Rs } 1,238,425 \\ (20 \%=\text { Rs } 206,404) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Rs 1,766,124 } \\ (20 \%=\text { Rs 294,354 }) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Land cost for larger plots | Rs 8,140,000 | Nil | Nil |
| Land cost for larger plots plus 20\% | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Rs 9,768,000 } \\ (20 \%=\text { Rs } 1,628,000) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Nil | Nil |
| Land cost for small plots minus <br> - Commercial area subsidy <br> - Large plot subsidy <br> - Both commercial and large plot | Rs $24,967,008$ Rs $24,716,947$ Rs $23,339,000$ Rs $23,088,497$ | Rs $33,333,525$ Rs $33,307,121$ Rs $00,000,000$ Rs $33,307,121$ | Rs 32,892,149 <br> Rs 32,597,795 <br> Rs 00,000,000 <br> Rs 32,597,795 |
| Number of small plots | 426 | 590 | 740 |

## FINDINGS OF THE BANGKOK DENSITY STUDY

## Brief description of Communities surveyed

1. Baan Mankong Bon Kai Community

Baan Mankong Bon Kai Community is one of Baan Mankong's pilot projects since 2003. The community is comprised of 70 households that are paying rent on the Crown Property Bureau's land. The majority of the dwellers generate their income from informal businesses- they work as street vendors, hawkers, taxi drivers etc.
2. Bon Kai NHA Community

Bon Kai NHA community is one of the oldest communities initiated by the NHA. It was built in 1975 and comprises of fourteen, four-story apartment buildings that house 3,200 dwelling units. Each unit covers an area of 32.75 sqm .
3. Baan Uea-Arthorn Suan Plu Community (NHA)

Baan Uea- Arthorn Suan Plu is a part of the Suan Plu Community that was completely destroyed by a fire in 2004.To alleviate the housing shortage that followed in the community, the cabinet assigned it to the National Housing Authority (NHA) which took measures under the Baan Uea-Arthorn Program. As a result, 1024 housing units in the form of apartment blocks were built to accommodate the people who were affected. Each unit covers an area of 37.4sq.m.
4. Baan Mankong Suan Plu Community (CODI)

Baan Mankong Suan Plu is a part of the Suan Plu Community. Some members of this community joined the Baan Mankong Program that was offering a long tenure from the Treasury Department on 1.08 hectares of land. These members decided to build four different housing types to accommodate 330 households on 278 plots of land. They adopted the two stories row house, two and a half stories row house, three stories row house and apartment blocks.
5. Baan Mankong Wat Phrayakrai Community and Wat Phrayakrai Community (CODI) Baan Mankong Wat Phrayakrai Community was originally a part of the Wat Phrayakrai Community. In 2005, 0.24 hectares of the Wat Phrayakrai community land were destroyed by a fire that left 80 families temporarily homeless. These families joined the Baan Mankong Program under the thirty years land tenure on the Crown Property Bureau land. The dwellers opted for a low-rise condominium scheme and built two buildings, four stories each. Each dwelling covers an area of 41.25sq.m.

## 6. Wat Phrayakrai Community (Slum)

The Wat Phrayakrai Community has existed since the time of King Rama V. It covers an area of 17.62 hectares of Crown Property Bureau land and has been registered as a community since 1983. At that time it was not very densely populated but as development projects and urban infrastructure were introduced to the area the vacant lands were occupied turning it into a very crowded community.

Table 1 Comparison of open spaces among the case studies

| Spatial analysis | Cases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Suan Plu <br> (NHA) |  | Suan Plu (CODI) |  | Bon Kai (NHA) |  | Bon Kai (CODI) |  | Phraya-krai (Slum) |  | Phraya-krai (CODI) |  |
| Plot size | $\begin{aligned} & 13,600 \\ & \text { sq,m } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,120 \\ & \text { units } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10,762 \\ & \text { sq,m } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 249 \\ & \text { units } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60,800 } \\ & \text { sq,m } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,272 \\ & \text { units } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8,808 \\ & \text { sq,m } \end{aligned}$ | 202 <br> units | $\begin{aligned} & 14,800 \\ & \mathrm{sq}, \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 156 \\ & \text { units } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2,400 } \\ & \text { sq,m } \end{aligned}$ | 80 units |
| Plot density (cap/hec) | 3,558.7 |  | 1,089.3 |  | 4,184.1 |  | 2,257.3 |  | 506.1 |  | 1,000 |  |
| Percentage <br> of open <br> space | 32\% |  | 20\% |  | 27\% |  | 20\% |  | 8\% |  | 18\% |  |
| Open <br> space <br> density <br> (cap/hec) | 11,111.1 |  | 5,464.5 |  | 15,384.6 |  | 11,236 |  | 6,329.1 |  | 5,555.6 |  |

Table 2 Comparison of living density from various cases and aspects

| Spatial analysis | Cases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Suan Plu <br> (NHA) |  | Suan Plu <br> (CODI) |  | Bon Kai (NHA) |  | Bon Kai (CODI) |  | Phraya-krai (Slum) |  | Phraya-krai (CODI) |  |
|  | Unit size | Size <br> of hh | Unit <br> size | $\begin{gathered} \text { Size } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { hh } \end{gathered}$ | Unit <br> size | Size <br> of hh | Unit <br> size | $\begin{gathered} \text { Size } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { hh } \end{gathered}$ | Unit <br> size | Size of hh | Unit <br> size | $\begin{gathered} \text { Size } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { hh } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 35.75 | 4.31 | 61.25 | 4.71 | 32.00 | 4.19 | 35.00 | 5.00 | 32.63 | 4.80 | 51.0 | 3.00 |
| Living unit's density (sqm./cap) | 8.29 |  | 13.00 |  | 7.64 |  | 7.00 |  | 6.80 |  | 17.0 |  |
| Plot size | $\begin{aligned} & 13,600 \\ & \text { sq,m } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,120 \\ & \text { units } \end{aligned}$ | $10,762$ <br> sq,m | 249 <br> units | $60,800$ <br> sq,m | 3,272 <br> units | $\begin{aligned} & 8,808 \\ & \text { sq,m } \end{aligned}$ | 202 <br> units | 14,800 sq,m | $\begin{aligned} & 156 \\ & \text { units } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,400 \\ & \text { sq,m } \end{aligned}$ | 80 units |
| Plot density (cap/hec) | 3,558.7 |  | 1,089.3 |  | 4,184.1 |  | 2,257.3 |  | 506.1 |  | 1,000 |  |
| Percentage of open space | 32\% |  | 20\% |  | 27\% |  | 20\% |  | 8\% |  | 18\% |  |
| Open <br> space <br> density <br> (cap/hec) | 11,111.1 |  | 5,464.5 |  | 15,384.6 |  | 11,236 |  | 6,329.1 |  | 5,555.6 |  |

Source: Literatures and survey, 2010
Remarks: Generally, some units of residence contain more than one family which causes the number of households higher than the number of units.

Table 3 Level of neighborliness

| Relation |  | average |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NHA: Bon <br> Kai | CODI: <br> BonKai | NHA: <br> Suan Plu | CODI: <br> Suan Plu | Watprayakrai <br> Community | CODI: <br> Watprayakrai |
| 1) Neighborhood relation | 3.8 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 |
| 2) security | 3.3 | 4.1 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.7 |
| 3) Community activity | 3.0 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 2.7 | 3.5 |
| 4) Neighbor visiting | 3.2 | 3.9 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 3.0 |
| 5) Entrust house to neighbors | 2.4 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 2.2 |
| 6) Entrust children with <br> neighbors | 1.7 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| 7) Lend various utensils | 2.1 | 3.1 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 1.8 |
| 8) Borrow various utensils | 2.1 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 1.5 |
| 9) Lend money (no interest) | 1.9 | 2.7 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.6 |
| 10) Borrow money (no <br> interest) | 1.6 | 2.5 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 2.0 |
| 11) Overall satisfaction as a <br> resident | 3.7 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 4.1 |

Level of relationship

| Low | Fairly | Much | Most |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.0-2.0 | 2.1-3.0 | 3.1-4.0 | 4.1-5.0 |

Table 4. The comparison of living satisfaction in six neighborhoods

| Items | Average satisfaction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bon Kai <br> NHA | Baan <br> Mankokng <br> Bon Kai | Baan <br> Uea- <br> arthorrn <br> Suan <br> Plu | Baan <br> Mankong <br> Suan Plu | Wat <br> Phrayakrai <br> Mankong <br> Wat <br> Phrayakrai |  |
| Satisfaction with neighbors | 3.9 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.1 |
| Satisfaction with local environments and <br> neighborliness | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 4.2 |
| Satisfaction to safety | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 4.2 |
| Satisfaction to children environment | 3.4 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 4.3 |
| Satisfaction to work and job opportunities | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 4.3 |

## Unit size : $13^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}-56.3$ sq yards -47.1 sq.m (1:3 width to depth ratio

## Part (A) - Items to be Taken care of by the Contractor

## (1) Till Plinth Level - Stage 1

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Excavation | CF | 12 | 580 | 6,960 |
| 2 | $1: 4: 8$ Foundation base | CF | 200 | 75 | 15,000 |
| 3 | Brick-work with cement mortar in foundation | CF | 150 | 572 | 85,800 |
| 4 | Earth filling | CF | 8 | 322 | 2,576 |
| 5 | Brick-bat soling in plinth | SF | 30 | 435 | 13,050 |
| 6 | 3 inches, 1:6 concrete under floor (excluding <br> courtyard floor) |  | SF | 140 | 303 |

## (2) Ground Floor - Stage 1

| Serial No | Description |  |  |  | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 9 " brick wall in mud mortar |  |  |  | SF | 90 | 868 | 78,120 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 4-1/2 " brick wall in mud mortar |  |  |  | SF | 60 | 649 | 38,940 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Girder and tile roof |  |  |  | SF | 200 | 455 | 91,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Staircase |  |  |  | SF | 300 | 115 | 34,500 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Plaster on wall surfaces in bathrooms, toilets and kitchen |  |  |  | SF | 45 | 160 | 7,200 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Ceramic tiles in bathroom and kitchen |  |  |  | SF | 80 | 310 | 24,800 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Plumbing |  |  |  | job | X | 1 | 20,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Electrification |  |  |  | job | X | 1 | 20,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Service Connections |  |  |  | job | x | 1 | 10,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Main Door |  |  |  | SF | 200 | 22.72 | 4,544 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Steel Window on street |  |  |  | SF | 150 | 23.37 | 3,355 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 332,459 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(3) First Floor - Stage 2

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $9 "$ brick wall in mud mortar | SF | 90 | 1026 | 92,340 |
| 2 | $4-1 / 2$ " brick wall in mud mortar | SF | 60 | 263 | 15,780 |
| 3 | Girder and tile roof | SF | 200 | 455 | 91,000 |
| 4 | Staircase | SF | 300 | 115 | 34,500 |
| 5 | Plaster on wall surfaces in bathrooms and toilets | SF | 45 | 290 | 13,050 |
| 6 | Ceramic tiles in bathroom and toilets | SF | 80 | 204 | 16,320 |
| 7 | Plumbing | job | x | 1 | 12,000 |
| 8 | Electrification | job | x | 1 | 8,000 |
| 9 | Steel window on street | SF | 150 | 23.27 | 3,490 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 266,488 |

(4) Second Floor - Stage 3


Part (B) - Items to be done through Self-help by the Owner
(1) Ground Floor - Stage 1

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Floor finish in rooms and courtyard | SF | 70 | 203 | 14,210 |
| 2 | Internal plaster on wall surfaces | SF | 38 | 1100 | 41,800 |
| 3 | Distemper on wall surfaces | SF | 8 | 1100 | 8,800 |
| 4 | Doors (inclusive of paint) | SF | 200 | 100 | 20,000 |
| 5 | Windows (inclusive of paint) | SF | 125 | 42 | 5,250 |
| 6 | Light fittings and fans | number | 200 | 11 | 2,200 |
| 7 | Sanitary fittings | number | 500 | 3 | 1,500 |
| 8 | Paint on roof steel girders and T- sections |  | x | job | 1,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 94,760 |

(2) First Floor - Stage 2

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Floor finish in rooms | SF | 70 | 250 | 17,500 |
| 2 | Internal plaster on wall surfaces | SF | 38 | 795 | 30,210 |
| 3 | Distemper on wall surfaces | SF | 8 | 795 | 6,360 |
| 4 | Doors (inclusive of paint) | SF | 200 | 77 | 15,400 |
| 5 | Windows (inclusive of paint) | SF | 125 | 70 | 8,750 |
| 6 | Light fittings and fans | number | 200 | 10 | 2,000 |
| 7 | Sanitary fittings | number | 500 | 2 | 1,000 |
| 8 | Paint on roof steel girders and T- sections | SF | $x$ | job | 1,000 |
| 9 | 2 inches, 1:6, concrete on ground floor roof | SF | 70 | 455 | 31,850 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 114,070 |

(3) Second Floor - Stage 3

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Floor Finish in rooms | SF | 70 | 156 | 10,920 |
| 2 | Internal plaster on wall surfaces | SF | 38 | 514 | 19,532 |
| 3 | Distemper on wall surfaces | SF | 8 | 514 | 4,112 |
| 4 | Doors (inclusive of paint) | SF | 200 | 77 | 15,400 |
| 5 | Windows (inclusive of paint) | SF | 125 | 53 | 6,625 |
| 6 | Light fittings and fans | number | 200 | 7 | 1,400 |
| 7 | Sanitary fittings | number | 500 | 3 | 1,500 |
| 8 | Paint on roof steel girders and T- sections |  | x | job | 800 |
| 9 | Insulation tiles on floor exposed to sunlight | SF | 60 | 455 | 27,300 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 87,589 |


| COST OF LAND (Rs) | 44,477 |
| :---: | :---: |
| ESTIMATES FOR CONTRACTOR'S ITEMS (Rs |  |
| STAGE 1 | 509,975 |
| STAGE 2 | 266,488 |
| STAGE 3 | 178,247 |
| Total | $\mathbf{9 5 4 , 7 1 0}$ |
| SELF HELP ESTIMATES (Rs) |  |
| STAGE 1 |  |
| STAGE 2 | 94,760 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Unit size : $16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}-56.9$ sq vards -47.6 sq.m (1:2 width to depth ratio)

Part (A) - Items to be Taken care of by the Contractor
(1) Till Plinth Level - Stage 1

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Excavation | CF | 12 | 485 | 5,820 |
| 2 | $1: 4: 8$ Foundation base | CF | 200 | 60 | 12,000 |
| 3 | Brick-work in cement mortar in foundation | CF | 150 | 490 | 73,500 |
| 4 | Earth filling | CF | 8 | 368 | 2,944 |
| 5 | Brick-bat soling in plinth | SF | 30 | 480 | 14,400 |
| 6 | 3 inches, $1: 6$ concrete under floor (excluding <br> lourtyard floor) | SF | 140 | 394 | 55,160 |
| 7 | $1: 6$ DPC with Pudlo mix | RF | 30 | 135 | 4,050 |
|  |  |  |  | 167,874 |  |

## (2) Ground Floor - Stage 1

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 9 " brick wall in mud mortar | SF | 90 | 693.24 | 62,391.60 |
| 2 | 4-1/2 " brick wall in mud mortar | SF | 60 | 564.87 | 33,892.20 |
| 3 | Girder and tile roof | SF | 200 | 416 | 83,200 |
| 4 | Staircase | SF | 300 | 115 | 34,500 |
| 5 | Plaster on wall surfaces in bathrooms, toilets and kitchen | SF | 45 | 255 | 11,475 |
| 6 | Ceramic tiles in bathroom and kitchen | SF | 80 | 320 | 25,600 |
| 7 | Plumbing | job | x | 1 | 20,000 |
| 8 | Electrification | job | x | 1 | 20,000 |
| 9 | Service Connections | job | x | 1 | 10,000 |
| 10 | Main Door | SF | 200 | 22.72 | 4,544 |
| 11 | Steel Window on street | SF | 150 | 23.37 | 3,505 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 335,707 |



Part (B) - Items to be done through Self-help by the Owner
(1) Ground Floor - Stage 1

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Floor finish in rooms and courtyard | SF | 70 | 336 | 23,520 |
| 2 | Internal plaster on wall surfaces | SF | 38 | 751 | 28,538 |
| 3 | Distemper on wall surfaces | SF | 8 | 751 | 6,008 |
| 4 | Doors (inclusive of paint) | SF | 200 | 96.27 | 19,254 |
| 5 | Windows (inclusive of paint) | SF | 125 | 42.5 | 5,312 |
| 6 | Light fittings and fans | number | 200 | 12 | 2,400 |
| 7 | Sanitary fittings | number | 500 | 3 | 1,500 |
| 8 | Paint on roof steel girders and T- sections | job | x | job | 1,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 87,532 |
| (2) First Floor - Stage ? |  |  |  |  |  |

## (2) First Floor - Stage 2

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Floor finish in rooms | SF | 70 | 278 | 19,460 |
| 2 | Internal plaster on wall surfaces | SF | 38 | 1050 | 39,900 |
| 3 | Distemper on wall surfaces | SF | 8 | 1050 | 8,400 |
| 4 | Doors (inclusive of paint) | SF | 200 | 59.5 | 11,900 |
| 5 | Windows (inclusive of paint) | SF | 125 | 96 | 12,000 |
| 6 | Light fittings and fans | number | 200 | 9 | 1,800 |
| 7 | Sanitary fittings | number | 500 | 1 | 500 |
| 8 | Paint on roof steel girders and T- sections |  | x | job |  |
| 9 | 2 inches, 1:6, concrete on ground floor roof | SF | 70 | 416 | 29,120 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 124,020 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Unit size : $15^{\prime} \times 45$ ' -75 sq vards -62.7 sq.m ( $1: 3$ width to depth ratio)

Part (A) - Items to be Taken care of by the Contractor
(1) Till Plinth Level - Stage 1

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Excavation | CF | 12 | 743.03 | $8,916.36$ |
| 2 | $1: 4: 8$ Foundation base | CF | 200 | 93 | 18,600 |
| 3 | Brick-work with cement mortar in foundation | CF | 150 | 616 | 92,400 |
| 4 | Earth filling | CF | 8 | 458 | 3,664 |
| 5 | Brick-bat soling in plinth | SF | 30 | 611 | 18,330 |
| 6 | 3 inches, 1:6 concrete under floor (excluding <br> courtyard floor) | SF | 140 | 340 | 47,600 |
| 7 | $1: 6$ DPC with Pudlo mix | RF | 30 | 128 | 3,840 |
|  |  |  |  | 193,352 |  |

(2) Ground Floor - Stage 1

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 9 " brick wall in mud mortar | SF | 90 | 890.5 | 80,145 |
| 2 | $4-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ brick wall in mud mortar | SF | 60 | 320.68 | $19,240.80$ |
| 3 | Girder and tile roof | SF | 200 | 510 | 102,000 |
| 4 | Staircase | SF | 300 | 115 | 34,500 |
| 5 | Plaster on wall surfaces in bathrooms, toilets and <br> kitchen | SF | 45 | 270 |  |
| 6 | Ceramic tiles in bathroom and kitchen | SF | 80 | 343 | 12,150 |
| 7 | Plumbing | job | $x$ | 27,440 |  |
| 8 | Electrification | job | $x$ | 1 | 20,000 |
| 9 | Service Connections | job | $x$ | 1 | 20,000 |
| 10 | Main Door | SF | 200 | 22.72 |  |
| 11 | Steel Window on street | SF | 150 | 23.37 | 4,544 |

(3) First Floor - Stage 2

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 9 " brick wall in mud mortar | SF | 90 | 874.88 | $78,739.20$ |
| 2 | $4-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ brick wall in mud mortar | SF | 60 | 627.87 | $37,672.20$ |
| 3 | Girder and tile roof | SF | 200 | 510 | 102,000 |
| 4 | Staircase | SF | 300 | 115 | 34,500 |
| 5 | Plaster on wall surfaces in bathrooms and toilets | SF | 45 | 120 | 5,400 |
| 6 | Ceramic tiles in bathroom and toilets | SF | 80 | 95 | 7,600 |
| 7 | Plumbing | job | $x$ | 1 | 12,000 |
| 8 | Electrification | job | $x$ | 1 | 8,000 |
| 9 | Steel window on street | SF | 150 | 23.37 | 3,505 |
| 10 | Parapet -4-1/2" brick work | SF | 60 | 113 | 6,780 |

(4) Second Floor - Stage 3

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 9 " brick wall in mud mortar | SF | 90 | 480.63 | $43,256.70$ |
| 2 | $4-1 / 2$ " brick wall in mud mortar | SF | 60 | 633.12 | $37,987.20$ |
| 3 | Girder and tile roof | SF | 200 | 430 | 86,000 |
| 4 | Plaster on wall surfaces in bathrooms and toilets | SF | 45 | 120 | 5,400 |
| 5 | Ceramic tiles in bathroom and toilets | SF | 80 | 95 | 7,600 |
| 6 | Plumbing | job | x | 1 | 3,500 |
| 7 | Electrification | job | x | 1 | 3,000 |
| 8 | Steel window on street | SF | 150 | 23.37 | 3,505 |
| 9 | Parapet -4-1/2" brick work | SF | 60 | 200 | 12,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 204,248 |




Unit size: $1^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}-72$ sq vards -60.5 sq.m ( $1: 2$ width to depth ratio)

Part (A) - Items to be Taken care of by the Contractor

## (1) Till Plinth Level - Stage 1



## (3) First Floor - Stage 2

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 9 " brick wall in mud mortar | SF | 90 | 1106.87 | $99,618.30$ |
| 2 | $4-1 / 2$ " brick wall in mud mortar | SF | 60 | 582 | 34,920 |
| 3 | Girder and tile roof | SF | 200 | 558 | 111,600 |
| 4 | Staircase | SF | 300 | 115 | 34,500 |
| 5 | Plaster on wall surfaces in bathrooms and toilets | SF | 45 | 160 | 7,200 |
| 6 | Ceramic tiles in bathroom and toilets | SF | 80 | 205 | 16,400 |
| 7 | Plumbing | job | x | 1 | 12,000 |
| 8 | Electrification | job | x | 1 | 8,000 |
| 9 | Steel window on street | SF | 150 | 23.37 | 3,505 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 327,743 |

(4) Second Floor - Stage 3

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 9 " brick wall in mud mortar | SF | 90 | 530 | 47,700 |
| 2 | $4-1 / 2^{~ " ~ b r i c k ~ w a l l ~ i n ~ m u d ~ m o r t a r ~}$ | SF | 60 | 561 | 33,660 |
| 3 | Girder and tile roof | SF | 200 | 558 | 111,600 |
| 4 | Plaster on wall surfaces in bathrooms and toilets | SF | 45 | 160 | 7,200 |
| 5 | Ceramic tiles in bathroom and toilets | SF | 80 | 205 | 16,400 |
| 6 | Plumbing | job | $x$ | 1 | 3,500 |
| 7 | Electrification | job | $x$ | 1 | 3,000 |
| 8 | Steel window on street | SF | 150 | 23.37 | 3,505 |
| 9 | Parapet -4-1/2" brick work | SF | 60 | 252 | 15,120 |

Part (B) - Items to be done through Self-help by the Owner
(1) Ground Floor - Stage 1

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Floor finish in rooms and courtyard | SF | 70 | 390 | 27,300 |
| 2 | Internal plaster on wall surfaces | SF | 38 | 943 | 35,834 |
| 3 | Distemper on wall surfaces | SF | 8 | 943 | 7,544 |
| 4 | Doors (inclusive of paint) | SF | 200 | 94 | 18,800 |
| 5 | Windows (inclusive of paint) | SF | 125 | 39 | 4,875 |
| 6 | Light fittings and fans | number | 200 | 12 | 2,400 |
| 7 | Sanitary fittings | number | 500 | 3 | 1,500 |
| 8 | Paint on roof steel girders and T- sections |  | x | job | 1,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 99,253 |

(2) First Floor - Stage 2

| Serial No | Description | Unit | Rate (Rs) | Quantity | Amount (Rs) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Floor finish in rooms | SF | 70 | 300 | 21,000 |
| 2 | Internal plaster on wall surfaces | SF | 38 | 1323 | 50,274 |
| 3 | Distemper on wall surfaces | SF | 8 | 1323 | 10,584 |
| 4 | Doors (inclusive of paint) | SF | 200 | 77 | 15,400 |
| 5 | Windows (inclusive of paint) | SF | 125 | 61 | 7,625 |
| 6 | Light fittings and fans | number | 200 | 10 | 2,000 |
| 7 | Sanitary fittings | number | 500 | 2 | 1,000 |
| 8 | Paint on roof steel girders and T- sections | SF | x | job | 1,000 |
| 9 | 2 inches, 1:6, concrete on ground floor roof | SF | 70 | 558 | 39,060 |
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