NATIONAL MONUMENTS AUTHORITY
MINISTRY OF CULTURE
GOVT. OF INDIA
24, TILAK MARG, NEW DELHI 110001

MINUTES OF THE 21ST MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 14th February, 2012

List of Members present is attached.

The list of cases for the day was taken up and further detailed discussion the following decisions were arrived at.

Case No. 1

(Mr. Raman Malhotra, E-7, Green Park, Delhi-110016)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 2

(Sh. R.C. Budhwar, S-333, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 3

(Sh. Krishan Kumar and Sh. Satinder Kumar Mahindra, B-6, Hauz Khas, New Delhi-110016)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case No. 4

(Sh. Amit Chhabra and others, 22, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi-110049)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-sto etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 5

(Sh. Avi Malhotra and Smt. Meenakshi Malhotra, R/o B-40, NDSE-II, New Delhi-110049)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-sto etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 6

(Sh. Surender Kumar Mehra, 412 South Delhi Apartment, Sector-4, Dwarka, New Delhi-110049)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-sto etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 7

(Sh. Sanjeev Verma, S-86, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-sto etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 8

(Sh. Krishan Kumar Kansal and others, C-2/43, Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi-110002)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-sto etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case No. 9

(The Registrar, Delhi University (North Campus, Delhi))

The case was examined and it was noted that this is a proposed construction of a structural nature i.e. educational facility of Delhi University. It is also noted that the protected site is a cemetery which does not have any height aspect and therefore the question of line of vision is not very relevant. However, Members felt that the Delhi University/ Civil Lines area has certain distinction archaeological features (such as red brick façade, Colonel type buildings etc.) and the proposed construction should ideally reflected this, atleast in the façade. Therefore, while there may not be any objection to this project, Members felt that a presentation on the design of the building may be useful for clarity on the issue. The applicant may therefore make a presentation on the same on Monday 27th February, 2012.

Case No. 10

(District Surgeon, District Hospital, Dharwad, Karnataka)

After examining the application and accompanying documents, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case No. 11.

(R. Gunasekran, Chennai)

After examining the application and accompanying documents, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. Applicant may take some measures to see that the façade design has some reflection of the local architectural character.
MINUTES OF THE 22nd MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg,
        New Delhi 110001

Time & Date - 3.00 P.M. on 27th February, 2012

The first issue that was taken up was the case of Delhi University for the proposed
construction of new Arts Faculty building. As decided in the 21st meeting of NMA held on 14th
February, 2012, a presentation by Delhi University on the design aspect of the proposed
construction was made today. After the presentation and discussions it was felt by the Members that
a discussion should be held with MCD on this particular case to examine the feasibility of allowing
greater ground coverage in order that the design could be suitably modified, in order that overall
height of the building could be lower than what is currently proposed. It was felt that the current
design is too monotonous and there was scope to improve. The meeting with MCD may preferably
be held within the first fortnight of March, 2012.

Member Secretary put up a representation received from one Ms. Nalini Singh regarding NOC
for proposed construction at Hailey Road near 'Ugrasen ki Baoli'. It was agreed that the applicant
may be allowed to come for a personal presentation as requested.

It was informed that Delhi Metro has submitted impact analysis and social economic study
for its proposed Metro Heritage Corridor. Members were of the view that they needed time to study
the report in detail. It was also felt that the original proposal to get the impact assessment done by
IIT Delhi or Roorkee IIT should be pursued.

Member Secretary also informed Members about the reference made to the Ministry of
Culture on clarification as to what may constitute "services to public utility". He informed that the
Ministry had advised that individual reference may be made in each case where NOC was being
sought for construction within prohibited area on the grounds of being a public utility service. Three
such cases are presently under reference to NMA which would be put up in the next meeting.

Thereafter the cases listed for the day were taken up and after detailed discussions, the
following decisions were arrived at:-

Case No. 1:
(Ms. Rohini Jolly, C-80, East of Kailash, New Delhi) (Deferred case)

The clarifications as desired had been submitted. The case records were perused and noting that it
p pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it
was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs
(including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for
greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are
available.
Case No. 2

(Sh. A.N. Sachar, D-18, West Nizamuddin, New Delhi) (Deferred case)

The clarifications as desired had been submitted. The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 3

(Smt. Meena Sachar and others, D-17, West Nizamuddin, New Delhi) (Deferred case)

The clarifications as desired had been submitted. The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 4

(Mr. K.R. Divakaran, Chairman Thripayar Sreerama Hotels (Pvt.) Ltd., Thripayar, Valappad P.O., Thrissur (Kerala))

After examining the application it was noted that there are no Photographs of the monument and google map has also not been enclosed. This information may be called for and the case may be put up thereafter.

Case No. 5

(Mr. C.K. Davidson, Cheruvathur House, Kakkad P.O. Kunnankulam, Thrissur (Kerala))

After examining the application it was noted that there are no Photographs of the monument and google map has also not been enclosed. This information may be called for and the case may be put up thereafter.

Case No. 6

(Sh. Harbhajan Singh, Dana Mandi Road, Nurmahal, Dist. Jalandhar (Punjab))

After examining the application it was noted that there are no Photographs of the monument and google map has also not been enclosed. This information may be called for and the case may be put up thereafter.
Case No. 7

(Smt. Uma Gupta, F-9, Hauz Khas Enclave New Delhi-110016)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 8

(Sh. Balmohan Singh Sabharwal, B-2/31, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 9

(Sh. Vinod Malhotra and others, C-2/39, Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi-110016)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 10

(Sh. Vir Suri, 18, Siri Fort Road, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 11

(Smt. Pushpa Gupta, A-1/26, Panchsheel Enclave, New Delhi-110017)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case No. 12

(Smt. Shifali Gupta and others, 16, NDSE, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 13

(Smt. Tara Julka, H-70, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 14

(Sh. Ravi Nath Handa, C-1/25, Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi-110016)

The case records were perused and it was noted that part of the property falls within prohibited area. As such, no construction should take place before the 100 mtr limit. Subject to this condition, and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 14 (A)

(Sh. Manindra Kumar Jain, G-60 (3rd Floor), East of Kailash, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 15

(Smt. Indra Valsh, K-35, Green Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Two cases which could not be considered on 27.02.2012 were taken up at first.

Smt. Vandana N. Hingmire, Plot Bearing CTS.No. 598/C, At Panhala, Tal Panhala, Dist. Kolhapur- 41201 (Maharashtra)

The application was examined in detail along with accompanying documents. It was also noted that there are some orders of the Bombay High Court pertaining to this case where the High Court in its order of 18.01.2012 have requested that NMA may consider the application within a period of two months.

After examining the case, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the suggestion that the applicant should construct using stone/rubble masonry for the boundary wall and also include elements of protected monument in the façade of the building.

Total Waterproofing Company for Sh. F.T. DaCosta, 434, Fatorda- Goa

After going through the case it was observed that the applicant intends to construct a large housing complex consisting of 29 dwelling units. It was also observed from the google map that the proposed site appeared to be having forest cover. The applicant has a large plot of land around the protected monument and has kept the 100 m zone free from any construction as required by law.

It was felt that the proposal seem to have large density of dwelling units and a clarification was felt necessary on the issue of permissible ground coverage as per local building Bye laws. It was also felt appropriate that a clarification whether forest clearance was required/ obtained may be provided. Members also observed that it may perhaps be useful for a presentation on this case, either at NMA Headquarters or on site in the near future.

Thereafter the cases listed for the day were taken up;

Case No. 1

(Sh. Estevan D'Souza, B-120, Bauginim, Old Goa)

This was deferred case on the 4th meeting on 01.12.2011. The necessary clarification having being provided by the applicant and after going through the same it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.
Case No. 2

(K. Balaji, Vellore, Tamilnadu)

In response to the clarification cited, the applicant has submitted stability certificate from a Civil Engineer regarding the stability of the building. Members still felt that attempt should be made to preserve this building with suitable strengthening. It was agreed that since NMA meetings are scheduled in Chennai on 5th and 6th March, 2012, effort will be made to identify a local expert who can technically examine the building and give a report for technical support for preserving the building. In the meantime, having regard to the condition report, the applicant may take urgent steps to prop up the building pending such technical examination.

Case No. 3

(O.P Jindal University, Sonapet, Haryana, New Delhi)

The necessary clarification and changes in the design have been carried out by the applicant. It was noted that the design has been suitably modified to allow a clear line vision from different points within the campus to the monument. Taking note of the changes it was decided to recommend grant of NOC as per the revised design. The applicant may also consider provision for a walkway/gangway at a higher point connecting the two building blocks which can frame the view of the protected monument i.e., the Kos Minar.

Case No. 4

(Sh. Trived Kumar, Primary School Nagar II, Sikri Char Hissa, Fatehpur Sikri, Agra)

The application was examined and it was noted that this is a proposal for addition two rooms to an existing Government primary school. After examining the case it was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the condition that the façade design may be in conformity with the existing school building.

Case No. 5

(Sh. Babusab Madallikar, CTS No. 3123-A of Haveri, Karnataka)

The application was examined in detail along with the accompanying documents. After detailed perusal it was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the stipulation that the applicant may finish the façade of the building in keeping with the vernacular style of architecture.

Case No. 6

(Sh. Jayamma Nagaraj Masaldi, Plot No. 249, Sy. No. 9999, Holemath Road, Banavasi, Dist. Uttara Kannada, Karnataka)

The application was examined in detail along with the accompanying documents. After detailed perusal it was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the stipulation with the applicant to finish the façade of the building in keeping with the vernacular style of architecture.
Case No. 7
(Sh. Krishna Timappa Jamburamath, Haduvalli, Bhatkal Taluk, Dist. Uttara Kannada, Karnataka)

The application was examined in detail along with the accompanying documents. After detailed perusal it was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the stipulation with the applicant may finish the façade of the building in keeping with the vernacular style of architecture.

Case No. 8
(Sh. Manjappa Shambanna Kurdi, Hangal Town, Dist. Haveri, Karnataka)

The application was examined in detail along with the accompanying documents. After detailed perusal it was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the stipulation with the applicant may finish the façade of the building in keeping with the vernacular style of architecture.

Case No. 9
(Sh. Ravindra Baswaraj Biradar, Plot No. 53, Kailashnagar, Near Shahabazar Road, Brahmpur, Gulbarga (Karnataka)

The application was examined in detail along with the accompanying documents. After detailed perusal it was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the stipulation with the applicant may finish the façade of the building accompanying in keeping with the vernacular style of architecture.

Case No. 10
(Sh. Basant Kumar Agarwala and Smt. Kusum Agarwala, H-34, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including munty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 11
(Sh. Surender Singh Juneja, C-219, Sarvodaya Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including munty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case No. 12

(Sh. Shamsher Khan M Pathan and Sh. Imran Khan Shamsher Khan Pathan, Kenchgar galli, Ishwar Nagar, Tq. Hangal, Dist. Haveri, Karnataka)

The application was examined in detail along with the accompanying documents. After detailed perusal it was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the stipulation with the applicant may finish the façade of the building the vernacular style of architecture.

Case No. 13

(Sh. Anil Kumar Soni, C-1/68, Block C1, Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage byelaws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 14

(Sh. Gorla Venkata Sai Babu, H.No. 15-4-44, Jagannadhapuram, Bapatla, Dist. Guntur, Andhra Pradesh)

After examining the application in detail it was decided to recommend grant of NOC with maximum height of 12m from the proposed construction the proposed building architecture may be sympathetic to and in keeping with the ambience of the monument in whose vicinity it is located.

Case No. 15

(Sh. Polu Venkata Subbaiah, Brahmin Street, Eguvapat, Siddavatam, Y.S.R. Kadapa Dist., Andhra Pradesh)

The case was examined in detail and after considering the same it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case No. 16

(Sh. Shailesh Kumar Keshavlal Modi, Usmanpur, Ahemadabad city, Gujarat)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Ahemadabad where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage byelaws, as and when they are available.

Please look at lg-136 for remaining two cases.
NATIONAL MONUMENTS AUTHORITY,
MINISTRY OF CULTURE
GOVT. OF INDIA
24, TILAK MARG, NEW DELHI 110001

MINUTES OF THE 24th MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Chennai, Tamilnadu

Time & Date - 5th and 6th March, 2012

The 24th Meeting of NMA was held in Chennai as decided and was spread over two days namely 5th and 6th March, 2012.

2. On 5th March, the meeting started with presentation made by Chennai Metro R Ltd. (CMRL) on their proposal for construction of station box and ancillary buildings near the protected monument of ‘David Yale and Joseph Hymer’s Tomb’. After the presentation, visit to the site was also undertaken. Subsequently and after discussions it was decided to ask CMRL to consider the possibility of shifting the chilling unit to some locations fall outside the 100m limit which was felt to be feasible after the site visit. CMRL authority was accordingly requested to examine this and refer back to NMA on the matter.

3. Consideration of the NOC applications cases was taken up in the afternoon of 5th March. While examining the applications it was noted by the Members that there were a large number of cases from Kanchipuram and most of them seemed to be proposals for demolishing existing old houses and reconstructing the same. It also seemed that these houses represented the traditional architecture and lay out of a temple town i.e. houses with tiled roofing, open in door courtyards etc. Members felt that the new constructions proposed (which basically seemed to be houses with shops/showrooms on the ground floor and residences on the first floor) were box like concrete structures with no element of traditional architecture. After detailed discussions it was decided that consideration of all cases pertaining to Kanchipuram (as listed below) may be deferred for a short time due to which a conservation architect could be asked to conduct a quick survey in the town and suggest some appropriate design for proposed new constructions. It was also decided that the Members may undertake a quick visit to Kanchipuram the next day i.e. 6th March, 2012.

With these observations, the cases as listed below were deferred. It was also advised that if the study and report on suggested designs is not finalized within a period of one month from today, the deferred cases would be put up again for consideration as discussions already held regarding them.
Case No. 1: (Thiru S. Jayachandran, Post Box No. 307, No. 1762, Manojappa Street, Thanjavur-9, Tamilnadu)

Case No. 2: (Thiru B. Kugangandhi, IIInd Street, Abirami Nagar, Kannagap Thirupparur, Dist. Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

Case No. 3: (Thiru A. Ramachandran, Pl. No. 18, Sakthi Nagar, Sembakkam, Tambaram Taluk, Dist. Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

Case No. 4: (Thiru G. Nagasundram, No. 108 A/1, West Raja Street, Big Kanchipuram-2, Tamilnadu)

Case No. 5: (Thiru V. Srinivasan, No. 140 A, Kamatchi Amman Sannathi Street, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

Case No. 6: (Ms. J. Sengamula Selvi, No. 104/A1, Sangeetha Vidwan Nalna Street, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

Case No. 7: (Thiru T.S. Ganesh, Gowrivakkam Village, Tambaran Taluk, Dist. Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

Case No. 8: (Thiru M.E. Ramesh, D.No. 5, Pl. No. 19B III Kakkan Street, Mahasakthi Colony, Sembakkam, Tamilnadu)

Case No. 9: (Thiru G. Mani, Plot No. 3, Sakthi Nagar, Sembakkam, Tambaran taluk, Dist. Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

Case No. 10: (Thiru S. Baskaran, Old No. 8/ New No. 17, Kuppu Street, Big Kanchipuram Tamilnadu)

Case No. 11: (Thiru K. Anandan, 113, 5th Cross Street, Pattilipulam Village, ECR Road, Chengalpattu Taluk, Kanchipuram Dist., Tamilnadu)

Case No. 12: (Thiru V. Madhavan, 13B/2, Kalandar Street, Kancheepuram, Tamilnadu)

Case No. 13: (Medical Superintendent, No. 21'H, Hospital Road, Kanchipuram-631502)

Case No. 14: (Thiru K. Ramalingam, 17, Annai Illam, O.P. Kulam, New Street, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

Case No. 15: (Ms. J. Prema, No. 20, Ubathalaivar, Paramasivam Street, Big Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

[all deferred as explained above]
Case No. 16

(Commissioner, Vellore City Municipal Corporation, Vellore-632001 (Tamilnadu))

After examining the proposal and going through the designs of the building, Members were of the view that being a Government building, effort should be made to set an example in Heritage promotion and at least the building design should be representative of the local architecture in its façade etc. Accordingly, the design may be redone and thereafter the case may be put up for consideration.

Case No. 17

(Sh. A.R. Madanagopal, Othavadal Street, Mamallapuram, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After examining the application, it was observed that the proposed construction site appears to fall beyond the regulated area (and would not require consideration by NMA). The application may accordingly be sent back to CA, Tamilnadu for clarifying this point and disposing of the matter accordingly.

Case No. 18

(Thiru T. Swaminathan, No. 2/1604, Patchanna Lane, West Main Street, Thanjavur-613001)

After examining the application and going through the accompanying photographs, it was observed that the existing building is constructed in a traditional pattern and merits consideration for either being observed in situ or if fresh construction is involved elements of the existing architecture could be incorporated. CA, Tamilnadu may accordingly have a discussion with the applicant in the matter on these lines.

Case No. 19

(Thiru S. Ganapathy, Chettiyar Koil Street, Algar Koil Road, Gangaikonda Cholapuram Udayarpalayam Taluk, Ariyalur Dist., Tamilnadu)

After examining the proposal it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. Applicant may be advised to use indigenous tiles, local materials etc. in the construction.

Case No. 20

(N. Dhanalakshmi, No. 4/883, 14 Manai Street, Darasuram Post, Kumbakonam Taluk, Thanjavur Dist. Tamilnadu)

After examining the application in detail it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in
Case No. 21

(Thiru K. Mani, No. 51, Vinayanagar Koil Street, 105, Narasamangalam Village, Dusimandoor Post, Cheiyar Taluk, Thiruvananalai Dist., Tamilnadu)

After examining the application in detail it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

Case No. 22

(Thiru R. Ramalingam, B-9, Indian Oil Officers Quarters No. 2, Race Course Road, Chokkikulam, Madurai-2, Tamilnadu)

After examining the application in detail it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

Case No. 23

(Thiru T.R. Aravindan, No. 6, Old No. 19, Tank Street, Lakshmilipuram Chromepet, Chennai-73, Tamilnadu)

The application was examined and accompanying documents gone through. It was observed that there are some discrepancies in the proposed height of the building, number of floors etc. This may be clarified and matter would then be taken up.

Case No. 24

(Thiru B. Gnanapragasam, W/27, Ambal Nagar, Perumaleri Village, Vadakadumbadi Post, Mamallapuram, Dist. Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

The proposal was examined and during the course of examining the documents it was observed that the construction already seems to have started. Keeping that in mind it was decided to request CA to obtain and submit a status report in this matter and clarify as to how the construction started without NOC. Latest photographs of the site indicating the present position should also be provided.

Case No. 25

(Thiru A. Arul Thomás, T.S. No. 743 Part, East Rampart, Thanjavur-613001 (Tamilnadu)

After examining the application in detail it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.
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MINUTES OF THE 25th MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg,
New Delhi 110001

Time & Date - 3.00 P.M. on 12th March, 2012

During the 25th meeting of NMA, the following issues were first taken up:

a) Meeting with NDMC and MCD regarding building bye laws.
b) Points raised by Ms. Meera Ishwar Dass, Full Time Member.
c) Presentation on suggested designs for Kanchipuram by Dr. Sanghamitra Basu,
   Part Time Member.

Record of discussion on the above matters have been issued separately. Thereafter
cases listed for the day were taken up for consideration.

Case No. 1

(Sh. Sunil Lakshmanrao Ganadevikar, Vibhag B Tika No. 12/4, C.S. No. 126, Dandia
Bazar, Vadodara (Gujarat)

This was a deferred case. The applicant has made a representation that his case may all
be disposed off in the same manner as similar cases disposed off earlier relating
Baroda. After perusing the papers again and noting that the earlier construction has al
been demolished and keeping in mind the norms followed while recommending cases for
Baroda earlier, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case, with stipulation of ground+3 floors and maximum height of 15 meters including mummy etc.

This is noted that recess has already been provided in the design on the 2nd floor and
applicant may also incorporate some elements of the earlier building in the façade of
new one.

Case No. 2

(The Secretary, India International Centre, 40, Max Mueller Marg, New Delhi)

The proposal was examined in detail and after consideration it was agreed in principal
recommend grant of NOC in this case. This is however subject to the following:

conditions:
a) Adequate care should be taken to ensure that there is no construction before the 100 m limit.

b) Since this is an area located in the vicinity of the Lodhi group of monuments and may be archaeologically important, before construction, a trial trench may be dug in association with ASI to ascertain if there is any archaeological remains below the ground and if there are any such remains, they may be properly documented and arrangements could be made to display such remains either in situ or at an appropriate location near the site.

Case No. 3

(Goa State Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd., 7th Floor EDC House, Dr. Atmaram Borkar Road Panaji- Goa)

While going through the application and accompanying maps and documents in detail, it is observed that SA, Goa Circle has made certain observations suggesting that in the area which is nearest the protected monument, widening of the road may be avoided and the alignment could possibly be shifted some distance away at that point. These observations of the SA may be followed by the applicant.

Case No. 4

(Executive Engineer, AIIMSPD, CPWD, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 5

(Sh. S.K. Kapur, D-7, Rana Pratap Bagh, New Delhi-7)

This case pertains to renovation falling within the prohibited area of the monument. After examining the same it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for the proposed renovation with the clear stipulation that the renovation should be only as per the map and plans submitted by the applicant and there should be no additional construction whatsoever.
Case No. 6

(Shri Naveen Chander Kapur, 3, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi-13)

This case pertains to renovation as it involves installing a lift within an existing building, located within the prohibited area. Having noted that no external constructions are proposed, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for this renovation namely Installation of lift within the existing building with the stipulation that the entire lift structure would be accommodated within the building and would not go beyond the existing total height of the building which is 14.7m.

Case no. 7.

(Shri Rahul and Smt. Rekha Bhatnagar, D-225, Sarvodaya Enclave, New Delhi-17)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mouldy, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 8

(Shri Navin Dang and Smt. Manju Dang, 65, Jor Bagh, New Delhi-16)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mouldy, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 9

(Smt. Sarita Kapoor and Shri Deepak Kapoor, K-43, NDSE-II, New Delhi-49)

After examining the proposal in detail it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for total height of 14.63m as requested for by the applicant.

Case no. 10

(Smt. Sarita Kapoor and Shri Deepak Kapoor, K-42, NDSE-II, New Delhi-49)

After examining the proposal in detail it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for total height of 14.63m as requested for by the applicant.
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MINUTES OF THE 26th MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001

Time & Date - 11.00 P.M. on 13th March, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Case no. 1
(Baby Welfare Association, Ahmadnagar (Maharashtra))

This was a deferred case from the 8th meeting. The report received from CA in connection with the clarifications called for were gone through. After consideration of the same and keeping in mind the earlier observations of the Authority, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the following conditions:

(a) The prevalent setback if any should be confirmed with to maintain the road line.
(b) The predominant height of buildings of the area should be maintained.
(c) To provide relief in the scale of construction, this could be broken into similar blocks of buildings and roof line should be maintained. A courtyard based plan/design would be appropriate.
(d) Colour and texture for the new construction may be in harmony with prevalent structures.

Case no. 2
(Sh. Vithu Bhomkar, H.No. 63/8, Near St. Paul Gate, Old Goa)

After examining the proposal in detail it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 3
(Museum of Christian Art, Goa)

This case pertains to renovation of an existing structure and is located within the prohibited area. After perused the details it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for the proposed renovation work. With regard to MS grill for window protection, the applicant may consider use of material and design (such as wood, wrought iron) which is more in character with the existing structure.
Case no. 4

(M/s Sumit Woods Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. D-2, Survey No. 16/1-B, Bainguinim, Tiswadi, Goa)

After perusal of the application it was noted that this seems to be a fairly big project and accordingly impact assessment and environmental impact assessment may be undertaken and the case put up thereafter.

Case no. 5

(Sh. Yeshwant R Naik, Near Safa Masjid Shahpur, Ponda- Goa)

After perusal of the application and noting the existing structures in the vicinity, it was decided that grant of NOC may be recommended in this case with the condition with overall height of the building would be limited to 9 m including sloping roof. The façade design may also be such so as to be in harmony with the protected monument.

Case no. 6

(Smt. Piedade Moraes, H. No. 88, Sinquerim, Bardez, Goa- 403519)

After examining the proposal in detail it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 7

(Sh. Shambhu G Volvolkar, H. No. 10, Ferry Jetty Road, Ella, Old Goa, Goa)

After perusing the application and observing from the reports of SA, Goa Circle that the application is actually for reconstruction and is within the prohibited area, the case cannot be considered and accordingly it was recommended that NOC may not be granted in this case.

Case no. 8

(Sh. Joaquim F. Brass Remedios and Dominic T remedies, H. No. 49, Near Church, Carambolim, Goa)

From perusal of the case it was felt that this appears to be a fairly big commercial cum residential complex. Decision on the same is being deferred for the time being as Members felt that this may be considered during a proposed visit to Goa in the near future.
Case no. 9
(Smt. Neeru Khare, 7/6, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms
had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to
recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs
(including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to
apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws,
as and when they are available.

Case no. 10
(M/s Veera Builders through Sh. Ramesh Jain and others, C-8/3, Rana Pratap Bagh, New
Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms
had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to
recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs
(including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to
apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws,
as and when they are available.

Case no. 11
(Shri Inderpal Singh and Smt. Gurmeet Kaur, D-243, Sarvodaya Enclave, New Delhi-17)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms
had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to
recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs
(including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to
apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws,
as and when they are available.

Case no. 12
(Sh. Jai Prakash Gupta and others, B-2/37, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi-29)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms
had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to
recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs
(including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to
apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws,
as and when they are available.
Case no. 13
(Sh. Snehl Dutta and Smt. Alka Dutta, U-39, Green Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 14
(Shri Nitin Batra and others, N-15, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 15
(Smt. Sneh Sahuja, N-107, Panchshila Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 16
(Sh. Ramesh Chandra Gupta and others, D-2, Hauz Khas, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case no. 17

(Sh. Sudhir Aggarwal and Smt. Asha Aggarwal, Y-45, Hauz Khas, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to *recommend* grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 18

(Sri Sankara Vidyalayam, Bapatla, Andhra Pradesh)

This case pertains to proposed repairs/ renovation of an existing building located in the prohibited area of the protected monument. After perusal of the case it was decided to *recommend* grant of NOC to undertake the repairs and the applicant would be advised to make use of traditional materials for the repairs. Local ASI may be associated for this work.

Case no. 19

(Sri K. Veera Brahmaiah, Bapatla, Guntur Dist.-522101, Andhra Pradesh)

After perusal of the application and observing that this case comes from a town which can be termed as "temple town" it may be appropriate to prescribe some design suggestions for new structures that are being proposed. As such, while it was decided to *recommend* grant of NOC, the new construction may be taken up on the lines of the suggested designs which would be enclosed with the NOC permission.

Case no. 20

(Sri Javangula Haranath Babu, Bapatla, Guntur Dist., Andhra Pradesh)

The proposal was examined and after due consideration it was decided to *recommend* grant of NOC in this case with the following stipulation:

a) Applicant may have edge to edge construction with open courtyards for light and ventilation.

b) Front elevation may be designed on the lines of an existing building, highlighted in the photographs enclosed with the NOC permission.
Case no. 21

(Fr. Joseph Rowland-Salema, Director Pastoral Institute, St. Pius X, Old Goa, Tiswadi -403402)

After perusing the application it was observed that this is a proposal for undertaking repair and renovation and some alteration/additions to an existing building. This building is located within the prohibited area of the protected monument. After perusing the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for undertaking the repair/renovation but no alterations or additions are permissible. SA, Goa Circle may be associated during the repair works.

Case no. 22

(Sh. Burramsetty Govidiah, Pardhasardhi vari Street, Bapta, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh)

After perusing the application it was observed that this is already a partly constructed building. It was felt necessary that a status report on the present condition of the construction site and reasons as to why NOC was not sought earlier may be obtained and thereafter the case may be put up for consideration.

Case no. 23

(Sh. M. Ravinder, H. No. 16-4-168, Fort Road, Warangal, Andhra Pradesh)

After perusal of the application and accompanying documents, it was observed that substantial construction has already take place. No reasons for the same have been indicated and why NOC was not applied for earlier has also not been mentioned. Necessary clarifications are required to be obtained and thereafter the matter would be gone into again.

Case no. 24

(Chennai Metro Rail limited)

The CMRL had submitted revised designs and plans after incorporating suggestions made during the meeting in Chennai to shift the chiller unit further away so as to take it outside the 100 m limit. The revised plan was examined and it was noted that with the proposed shifting, the consideration of the chiller unit would now be at 92.5 m from the protected monument. After due consideration it was decided to clear the proposal and recommend grant of NOC with the specific observation that in the design for the chiller unit building, “Champher” (round off the corner/edge) may be provided at the side of the building nearest towards the protected monument so that the distance can go just beyond the 100 m.
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MINUTES OF THE 27th MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg,
New Delhi 110001

Time & Date - 3.00 P.M. on 19th March, 2012

All members of NMA attended a meeting taken by the new Secretary (Culture). The meeting was held at ASI headquarters and also included an item on status of AMASRA Amendment Act and NMA/ CAs. During this meeting, a presentation on the above subject was made by Member Secretary.

2. Whole Time Member mentioned that appropriate importance and impetus has to be given to preparation of heritage bye laws and such steps as necessary may be taken to strengthen the setup of the CA for the purpose of preparation of the draft bye laws.

3. Secretary (Culture) stated that pending actions should be expedited and a blue print may be prepared for various activities of NMA which would indicate time schedules and milestones.

4. In the afternoon there was a meeting with members of Delhi High Court Bar Association on the issue of ground coverage, FAR and height in relation to the proposed expansion plans of Delhi High Court. After detailed discussions on this issue, it was agreed that the High Court Bar Association would make a presentation to NMA on the proposed expansions plans shortly so as to enable a better appreciation of the views of the Bar Association particularly the request for consideration of increase in height limit beyond 21m as provided for in heritage bye laws for Shershah Gate.

No cases of NOC applications were listed for the day.
MINUTES OF THE 28th MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg,
New Delhi 110001

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 20th March, 2012

The meeting started with a presentation made by INTACH and CA for heritage bye
laws on the progress of preparation of heritage bye laws. A detailed presentation was
also made on the draft bye laws which have been prepared by INTACH for Begumpuri
Mosque, Delhi. A separate record of discussions on this meeting is being issued.

The next issue for discussion was some matters raised by Whole Time Member in
her note of 16.03.2012. These issues were discussed and actions as required are being
processed separately.

There after the cases listed for the day were taken up.

Case no. 1

(Major Prámod Chandra Puri, S-164, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi-48)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms
had been adopted (In the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) It was decided to
recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs
(including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to
apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws,
as and when they are available.

Case no. 2

(Sh. Sorabh Gupta, S-368, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

The applicant has requested for total height of 15m including mumty etc. and after
perusal of the case it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for total 15m height.
Case no. 3

(Smt. Santosh Rani, 3859/1, Nita Street, Mehna Chowk, Bhatinda Punjab)

After perusal of the application and accompanying documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC.

Case no. 4

(Smt. Urmila Devi, Plot No. 14, Street No. 6, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi)

It was noted that this application pertains to property located near ‘Bijai Mandal’ for which the draft bye laws have been prepared by INTACH and are being submitted to NMA shortly. In view of this it was decided to defer the case so as to enable examination of the same with reference to the proposed bye laws.

Case no. 5

(Sh. Chaman Lal Arora, A-53/B, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 6

(M/s Avantha Realty Ltd., 40, Amrita Shergill Marg, New Delhi)

After examining the application it was noted that the proposed construction is for total height of 19 m including mumty etc. it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for total height of 9 mts.

In the afternoon a meeting was scheduled with Vice Chairman, DDA to discuss the issues of ground coverage, height expansion and land use in relation to the prohibited and regulated area around protected monument from the point of view of consideration of NOC applications of Delhi. A separate record of discussions of this meeting would be issued.
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MINUTES OF THE 29th MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg,
New Delhi 110001

Time & Date - 3.00 P.M. on 26th March, 2012

First, some general issues were taken up. Member Secretary had circulated a note
on certain administrative matters relating to office accommodation. This was noted by
the Members.

2. Member Secretary also informed that on the reference to Ministry of Culture/ Law
Ministry on interpretation of 100 m in all directions, a report had been sent from MOC to
DG, ASI asking to indicate whether there were any precedents on this matter.
A response from NMA would also need to be sent.

3. Reference has also been received from MOC forwarding a re-presentation from
MP's on certain proposed amendments to AMASRA Act. These were noted by Members
and response would be drafted shortly to be sent to MOC.

4. Member Secretary also informed of one representation received by NOC applicant
from Delhi drawing attention to grant of NOC in some cases for height more than
15 meters and praying for similar dispensation. The cases referred to were examined and
it was noted by the Members that these pertained to the initial few cases, soon after
NMA had been constituted, when internal guidelines had not been framed. There had
been some discussions on the subject, even in December, 2011 itself, and one yardstick
that was applied was to consider the horizontal distance designs from the protected limit
for recommending height (for up to 150 m distance, 15 m height and beyond 150 m
higher height). Subsequently when the internal guidelines were thoroughly discussed and
adopted in 12th meeting held on 16.01.2012, it was stated that for residential buildings
in Delhi, a restriction of 15 m in height would be uniformly applied with the condition that
applicant could apply for higher height if the heritage bye laws, when prepared, so
provided.

Thereafter, the following cases were taken up for consideration:
Case no. 1

(Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER), Plot No. 16 & 17, Pushp Vihar Institutional Area, M.B. Road, New Delhi.)

The proposal was examined. This pertains to proposed construction in a designated institutional area. Apart from the monument in question (satullah) there are some other protected monuments in the vicinity. After examining the case and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available. The applicant may also be advised to report to the ASI if any material of archaeological value is found during excavations for the construction.

Case no. 2

(Sh. Krishan Kant Kohli, A-2, Geetanjali Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 3

(M/s Uppal Housing Pvt. Ltd. and Shri Arindam Bhattacharya, L-1/4, Hauz Khas Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case no. 4

(Sh. Shashishekshwar Prasad Narain Singh, 2, Hailey Road, New Delhi)

In this matter, and on a request by the applicant, a presentation have been made before NMA during its 22nd meeting held on 27.02.2012. the presentation was made, in connection with the proposed location of the property, part of which falls within the prohibited limit of 'Ugrasen Ki Baoli' (protected monument), ground coverage in FAR and nature of construction.

After examining the proposal in details and keeping in view the points made during the earlier presentation as well as the guidelines with the Authority has been following in respect of cases pertaining to Delhi, Members were of the view that the applicant may be advised to submit a fresh presentation indicating how much increased ground coverage would be required if approximately the same total built up area is to be retained with the height restrictions currently being followed for Delhi cases.

Case no. 5 and Case no. 6

(Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd., Plot No. 07 and Plot No. 8, Near Arya Samaj Mandir, Green Park Main, New Delhi)

After perusing the application, it was noted that this is a proposal for addition of one more floor to an already existing building. After examining the enclosed documents and after going through the building design etc. it was decided that NOC may be recommended in this case provided that the additional floor (IIIrd floor) can be accommodated within the total height of 15 m including mumty, parapet etc.

These two cases are adjacent plots of the same applicant and have accordingly been disposed off together.

Case no. 7

(Shri Moinuddin S. Shaikh and others, 1771 Khatri ni Khadi, Near Topiwala ni Pole, Ahmedabad- 380001 (Gujrat)

The case was examined and deferred till 27.03.2012 in order to examine some more documents in detail.

Case no. 8

(Shri Mehul Padmakant Trivedi and Smt. Krupali M. Trivedi, Vasna, Ahmedabad, Gujrat)

After examining the proposal and accompanying documents etc., it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for a total height of 9.32 meters as applied for.
Case no. 9
(Shri Prafulchandra P Seth and Smt. Harshida P Seth, Isanpur, Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

The application was examined in detail and it was noted that the proposed construction is in an area which still predominately has buildings which are of two floors or about 10 m in height. Keeping that in mind, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the stipulation that total height would not exceed 10.5 m in all (i.e. stilt+ II floors with mumty, parapet etc.)

Case no. 10
(Shri Bhagwanbhai Manorbhai Patel, Village Sandesarapati, Patan, Gujarat)

This case was examined in detail and it was noted that this is a proposal for construction of small dwelling units of single storey construction. The location is in Patan, Gujarat, which is historically a very important city. There are other protected monuments in this town, notable amongst them being the Rani ki Vav which is on the UNESCO tentative list. Keeping these factors in view it was felt that specific views of ASI (Vadodara Circle) may be obtained on the issues of whether the Sarovar of which the monument is the Gate is also protected and whether any site management plan for Patan which may include the present monument is in the process of being framed.
At the request of Delhi University, a meeting had been fixed to discuss the proposal of the University for construction of Arts Faculty building which had earlier been taken up for consideration in 22nd meeting held on 27th February, 2012. After detailed discussions, it was informed to Delhi University officials, who had come for the meeting that the maximum height that could be considered in this case, as an educational Institute building, can be 21 m (which was incorporated in the case of Delhi High Court). It was also decided by the Members that in case the University wanted to utilize the front setback for construction purposes, this could be allowed with a maximum height of 15 m. However, Part Time Member (Dr. Rima Hooja) was not in complete agreement with the height restriction aspect of this case and felt that as an institutional building, that too educational, the case could have been considered differently.

2. A presentation on the work being done by the National Mission on Monuments and Antiquities (NMMA) was made by Director (NMMA). This was appreciated by all Members and it was requested that the NMMA should share relevant data base with NMA and to start with documentation on protection notifications etc. may be send in soft copy and hard copy.

3. The case relating to Shri Moinuddin Sheikh of Gujrat, deferred from yesterday was then taken up. The proposed design of the building, site map and other details were examined in detail. The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Ahemadabad where certain norms had been adopted (In the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mummy, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Thereafter cases listed for the day were taken up:
Case no. 1

(Pharlecha Khomsaran Joint Secretary Mulnidi Wat Thai Kusanara, Mahavihar Society, P.O. Deoria, P.S. Bairampur Dehat, U.P)

The case was examined and it was decided to **defer** consideration of the same so that Members could look into the proposal in more detail.

Case no. 2

(Mahamongkolchai Chhamma Devoted land for World Peacefulness Foundation, Katra, Sravasti, U.P)

After examining the proposal, it was observed that this proposal relates to construction of boundary wall around the property which lies adjacent to the centrally protected site at Shravasti (U.P). The proposed design of the boundary wall was also seen and was found satisfactory. It was noted that some portion of the boundary wall falls within the prohibited area where no construction is permissible. The Members noted that construction of the boundary wall seemed to be a positive step as it would afford further protection to and around the environs of the protected site. As such it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for construction of the boundary wall by the applicant for the portion which falls within the regulated area and for the small portion which falls in the prohibited area, this can be taken up by ASI (perhaps as a deposit work on behalf of the applicant) keeping in mind that construction of the boundary wall would be in the overall interest of affording better security to the site.

Case no. 3

(Chief Superintendent, Avanti Bai Female Hospital, Lucknow)

After examining the application in detail and noting that it is a proposal to add 3rd floor to an existing Government Hospital building, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOI in this case. The applicant may however take appropriate steps so that façade design and colour scheme are in harmony with the protected monument.

Case no. 4

(Shri Ajit Kumar Seth and others, 574, Bargawan, Kanpur Road, Lucknow, U.P.)

While this case was put up it could not be considered by the Authority due to paucity of time and has been **deferred** for the next meeting.

Similarly due to the paucity of time, the remaining cases listed for the day have also been **deferred**.
MINUTES OF THE 31st MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001

Time & Date - 3.00 P.M. on 2nd April, 2012

The proposal of NDMC for K.G. Marg multi level car parking was discussed in the light of clarification received from SA Delhi Circle. It has been mentioned in the report of SA Delhi that the Delhi High Court in an order in 2002 had opined that further construction around Ugarsen ki Baulli was not in the interest of this protected monument. A report of CBRI in December, 2001 also reflected the same opinion. After considering this report it was decided that a copy of the CBRI report may be called for and SA Delhi circle may also be requested to clarify whether any high rise constructions after the Delhi High Court orders of 2002 have been permitted by ASI in the prohibited/regulated area of bauli.

Thereafter the cases listed for the day were taken up.

Case no. 1 (Deferred case)

(The procurator/Treasuries, St. Joseph's college, Trichy, Tamilnadu)

The clarifications given by the applicant in response to the queries made were examined by the Members. It was noted that even now, there is no clarification on the distance aspect which was indicted as 45.9m in regard to one of the plots in the construction site. As this clarification has not been given, it was decided not to recommend grant of NOC in the case.

Case no. 2 (Deferred case)

(S. Rajyashree and B. Ravi Kumar, Mylapore, Tamilnadu)

This case was deferred till tomorrow to compare the revised plan submitted by the applicant although NOC had been granted when the case was taken up for consideration in the 14th meeting on 23rd January, 2012.
**Case no. 3** (Deferred case)

(Valsa M. V. Sacred Heart Girls Higher Secondary School, Thalaserry, Kerala)

The clarifications were perused. It was noted that a clear google map was not available. Members also felt that instead of new construction, reconstruction may be more appropriate. A response may be awaited on this.

**Case no. 4** (Deferred case)

(Mr. Santhosh M.V., Kunnamkulam, Kerala)

The necessary clarification have been provided to the applicant and after examining the same, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case and the applicant may be advised to have sloping roof for the proposed new construction.

**Case no. 5**

(Sh. Trilochan Singh, H-2832, Kokomajri Near Saheb Cycle Store, Ropar, Punjab)

This proposals is for repair of wall and roof of the building located within the prohibited area. After examining the proposal it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed repairs with clear stipulation that there would be no changes in vertical or horizontal limits of the existing structure.

**Case no. 6**

(Smt. Krishna Devi, B-5, 344 & 345, Nurmahal Sarai, Dist. Jalandhar, Punjab)

This proposal also relates to repairs but on perusal of some of the enclosed photos it was not clear as to how the repair work would be undertaken. No Google Map or additional photos were provided. Drawing/plan of the repair work has also not been given. It was decided to call for above information to consider the case further.
Case no. 7

(Sh. Sham Lal, Phool chakkar, Rupnagar, Punjab)

This is also a case of repair for existing building located within prohibited area. After examining the details it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for the specific repair only.

Case no. 8

(Shri Dev Narayan Pujari, Secretary, Mahamahind International Buddhist Mission Baraipur, Samath, Varanasi, U.P.)

The case was examined and it was noted that there had been another application involving this protected monument earlier also. As decided earlier, keeping in mind the importance of Samath, it was decided to defer consideration of the case till the Bye-laws are in place which should be prepared quickly.

Case no. 9

(Shri Dalip Singh, Purani Mondi, near Jal Mahal, Narnaul, Haryana)

This case pertains to repair and renovation of existing building located within the prohibited area. After examining the case it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for the proposed repairs with the suggestions that Façade, colour scheme etc. for the repair should match with the monument in question (i.e. Jal Mahal).

Case no. 10

(Dr. S.B. Bennur, Shivalinga Nilaya, P&T colony, Near Railway Station, Haveri, Kamataka)

The application was examined in detail and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case and applicant would be advised to follow traditional architectural pattern for façade of the building.
Case no. 11

(Sh. Abuthaheer Abdul Sattar Khaji, Near Tippu Masjid Circle, Koti Oni, Rattihalli.
Hirekerur Taluk, Dist. Haveri, Karnataka)

This proposal relates to repairs to existing structure only. After examining the proposal it
was decided to recommend grant of NOC for the proposed repairs with the advice to the
applicant to follow the vernacular style of a Architecture while undertaking repair work.

Case no. 12

(Assistant Executive Engineer (HSDR Project), Near Dist. Hospital Killa, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was noted that the proposed construction site falls in the
prohibited area where new construction is not permissible and accordingly it was decided
to reject the application.

Case no. 13

(HPCL Biofuels Limited, Kahata No. 735, Lauriya Village, Patna)

The application was perused in detail and after going through the same the following was
decided:

a) For reconstruction and repair of compound wall this falls in the prohibited area and
accordingly the reconstruction of the boundary wall may be taken up by ASI, perhaps
a deposit work on behalf of HPCL.

b) NOC for repair of canteen is recommended and this may be done following general
ASI guidelines for conservation work in line with the monument/ site.

c) It was noted that heavy machinery such as JCB was in use at the site. This should
not be allowed as it was likely to cause damage to archaeological remains that may
be present in the vicinity of this important site.
Case no. 14

(Smt. Amita Dutta and Sh. Abhijeet Dutta, 6/21, Ashok Marg, Lucknow (U.P))

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case and the applicant may be advised to keep the façade of the building in character with the local construction and colonial type of structures.

Case no. 15

(Sh. Ashok Awasthi, A-103, Sector-B, L.D.A. Colony, Kanpur Road, Lucknow)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 16

(B.R. Rajasekran and others, Vellore City, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may keep the façade and other finishing work in harmony with the monument.

Case no. 17

(Shri R.D. Shenoy, M/s Ramnani and Associates, Tokarshi Jivraj Road, Sewri, Mumbai)

The application was perused and it was noted that this is a large multi-storey construction project and would require Heritage Impact Assessment. The applicant may be advised that the HIA could be got done either from IIT Bombay or Raheja Institute of Architecture, Bombay.
Case no. 18

(M/s P.N. Bhobe and Associates, Parel Village Road, Mumbai)

The application was perused and it was noted that this is a large multi-storey construction project and would require Heritage Impact Assessment. The applicant may be advised that the HIA could be got done either from IIT Bombay or Raheja Institute of Architecture, Bombay.

Case no. 19

(Smt. Kanchan Sharma, D-27, Hauz Khas, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 20

(Centre of Indian Trade Unions, Plot No. 20, Pushp Vihar Institutional Area, M.B. Road, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case no. 21

(Sh. Kailash Dargan, A-53/A, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 22

(Shri Pal Jain and Sh. Vaneet Jain, C-5/10, Rana Pratap Bagh, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 23

(Shri Satya Prakash Sharma, F-45, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available. The property is located at 98 meters from the protected monument and while conveying permission and when construction work is taken up, it is to be ensured that the work will begin only beyond the 100 m prohibited limit.
Case no. 24

(Ms. Renu Gupta and others, E-27, Geetanjali Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including munt, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
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MINUTES OF THE 32nd MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg,
New Delhi 110001.

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 3rd April, 2012

The meeting with INTACH and CA for bye laws was held in the morning for which a separate record of discussions is being issued.

The following cases were thereafter taken up for consideration:

**Case no. 1**

(M/s Albina Real Estates Ltd., Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

This was a deferred case from the 17th meeting held on 31st January, 2012 wherein the applicant had made a presentation before the Authority on his proposal. Some clarifications had been sought therein and the applicant was also advised to get Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) conducted the necessary clarifications have now been provided and the HIA has also been submitted by the applicant. It was noted by the Members that the applicant has accepted all the suggestions made by the Members and has reduced the number of floors from his original proposal so that there is a clear line of vision from the proposed construction to the monument. The HIA has examined various aspects of the proposal and has stated that there would be no adverse impact of the proposal on the protected monument. Keeping in mind the changes incorporated (and appreciated the effort made by the applicant to accommodate the suggestions of the Authority) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case, for construction of commercial complex with ground+4 storeys, as per revised design submitted by the applicant.

**Case no. 2**

(M/s Talib Dikshit Sheikh Risbud Associates, Perel, Mumbai)

This is a deferred case from 13th meeting held on 17th January, 2012. The applicant has not provided Heritage Impact Assessment as expected for earlier. This may be completed before the case can be considered further.

**Case no. 3**

(S. Rajyashree and B. Ravi Kumar, Mylapore, Tamilnadu)

This was deferred from the meeting of 02.04.2012 in order to examine what changes in the building were being asked for. After examining the same, it was noted that different type of constructions has now been proposed by the applicant and cannot be treated as a minor change in the plan for which NOC was recommended earlier. This should be treated as a new case and a fresh application would be necessary.
Case no. 4

(Sh. Shashishekreshwar Narain Singh, Hailey Road, New Delhi)

In respect to the observations of the Authority to the applicant to submit revised plans keeping the height factor in mind and processing more ground coverage, the applicant has submitted a fresh proposal giving two options for more ground coverage, keeping the height limit at 15 mtr and the same original total coverage area. After examining the two options, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for the second option proposed which is for two basements and stilt+4 floors for which total ground coverage required would be 57.5 %, with total height of 15 mts.

Case no. 5

(Smt. Ushaben Desai and others, Paldi, Gujarat)

The basis on which the general principle adopted for the residential buildings for Ahmedabad in the meeting held by the Authority on 3rd January, 2012, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for ground+3 storeys in all in this case.

Case no. 6

(Sh. Amar Deep Dwivedi, Ramabai Nagar, Kanpur Dehat, Lucknow)

After examining the application in detail it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case which relates to construction of a boundary wall only.

Case no. 7

(Indian Red Cross Society, 1, Red Cross Road, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 8

(Smt. Zena B Vijay Kumar, S-331, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case no. 9

(Shri Deepak Chopra and Smt. Veena Chopra, C-1/59, Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 10

(Shri Sanjiv Goel and Shri Rajiv Goel, D-19, Geetanjali Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 11

(Shri A.K. Arora and others, E-44, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 12

(Smt. Bimla Nath and Shri Gaurav Singh, S-49, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case no. 13
(Bishnu Impex Pvt. Ltd., B-7/69, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 14
(Veera Apartments Pvt. Ltd., N-1, Green Park, New Delhi)

Noting that this is a proposed renovation/alteration to an existing building in a prohibited area, it was decided to defer the case to enable Members to examine it in more detail.

Case no. 15
(Sh. V.K. Dhawan, 71, Amrit Nagar, New Delhi)

On examination of the application, Members noted that there was some discrepancy in the proposal namely although total height of the proposed construction was mentioned as 15.5 m, the enclosed drawings/design did not show provision for mumty. This discrepancy needs to be re-verified.

Case no. 16
(Om Paul, 8/6 A, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi)

It was noted by the Members that this proposal pertains to 'Bijai Mandal' monument for which the Heritage bye laws are in the final stages of being prepared and therefore it was decided to take up the case when the bye laws are received.

Case no. 17
(Smt. Lalita w/o Late Nagashetty Chipati, Brahmaput, Gulbarga, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal and going through the accompanying maps and documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 18
(Ms. Sanjeev G Mutramatti, Karnataka)

It was noted that this proposal is only for repair (water proofing of the roof) for the building which is located within the prohibited area. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC only for this specific repair namely water proofing of roof.
Case no. 19

(Sh. Sureshchandra Jivandas Mavani, Gujarat)

The proposal was examined in detail and Members took note of the surroundings and vicinity of the protected monument and the construction site. Keeping that in mind, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of ground+ 1 floor and with mumty etc, the total height of the construction should not exceed 8 mtrs.

Case no. 20

(Mr. P.K. Narayanan, Kerala)

The application was examined in detail and Members appreciated the proposed design which is in character with the protected monument in question. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.
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MINUTES OF THE 33rd MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg,
New Delhi 110001

Time & Date - 4.00 P.M. on 23rd April, 2012

Before taking up NOC applications, discussions were held on the following issues:

a) Preparation of Heritage Bye-laws

Status regarding preparation of the Heritage Bye-laws was reviewed. It was the
general consensus that this is a critical area in so far as NMA’s functioning is concerned
and the progress relating to preparing bye-laws was quite slow. Not only that, the draft
bye-laws which were prepared for Shersah Gate and Begumpuri Mosque were not found
to be quite satisfactory. It was agreed that NMA would need to closely monitor the
progress on this important matter even though the draft bye-laws to be prepared by the
CA in consultation with INTACH. However there is inherent responsibility upon NMA to
review such work.

2. It was felt that the first important thing that needs to be done is to get template
prepared for the format of bye-laws so that uniformity in the same. It was also agreed
that the issue of appointment of large number of CAs has to be pursued with ASI as it is
felt that larger number of CAs for the bye-laws were necessary if this work has to be
speeded up. It was also agreed that NMA may initiate an exercise for preparing panel of
individuals/organizations who could prepare the draft heritage bye-laws. In this context,
it was also discussed about the need to have a approved panel of individuals/institutions
through whom Heritage Impact Assessment could be get done as well.

3. As far as Heritage bye-laws are concerned, as the first step a small team of
consultants would be set up by NMA which will prepare the template within a period of
30 days.
b) **Height restrictions for Delhi**

For residential construction in Delhi, NMA has adopted interim internal guidelines by which the height of residential buildings has been at 15 m including provisions for mumty, water tank, parapet etc. Several applications have subsequently being received from individuals asking for additional height limits for mumty etc. The matter has been considered in NMA on several occasions in the past. The matter would be discussed again on the next meeting.

c) **Height limit for institutional buildings**

Member Secretary informed that several representations were being received from institutional NOC applicants requesting that cases of consideration of their buildings being institutional in nature (such as educational, social etc.) needed to be dealt with separately especially if these were located in the designated institutional areas like Qutub institutional area, Siri fort institutional area etc. The matter was considered by the Members and it was agreed to discuss the matter in more detail in the meeting next week.

Consideration of NOC applications was deferred till tomorrow due to paucity of time.
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The cases carried over there taken up first.

(Deferred Cases)

Case No. 1

(Sh. Om Paul, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi)

After consideration of the application and keeping in view the circumstances it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 2

(Smt. Ugama Devi, Karnataka)

The clarifications provided by the applicant were examined as also the accompanying video. However certain aspects were still not clear namely the proposed design of the residential/commercial buildings, the nature of commercial usage proposed etc. It was observed that the area has very few constructions and therefore care needed to be taken while considering the proposal for any new construction. It was also noted that this is a large open area, adjacent to the Hampi, World Heritage Site and therefore there may be high possibility of finding archaeological remains. This point needed to be kept in view when the matter was taken up again.
Case No. 4

(Veera Builders, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

(Fresh Cases)

Case No. 1

(Shri Prakash Chandra Patidar, Banswara, Rajasthan)

After examining the application and enclosed documents and noting that the proposed construction is at a largely undeveloped area and also since proposed designs of the building has not been sent, it was decided to defer the case till this information is received.

Case No. 2

(Sh. Amarni, Patidar, Banswara, Rajasthan)

After examining the application and enclosed documents and noting that the proposed construction is at a largely undeveloped area and also since proposed designs of the building has not been sent, it was decided to defer the case till this information is received.

Case No. 3

(Sh. Basappa Nagappa Shetter, Karnataka)

This is a proposal for repair to an existing house and after consideration of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for repair with the specific stipulation that the permission is to be granted only for repairs.
Case No. 4
(Sh. Chidrupanandaji Saraswati Swamiji, Karnataka)

The application was examined in detail. It was noted that proposal is for construction of a single storey building for a school. While purpose itself is worthwhile, it was observed by the Members that the proposed construction is practically the first construction in this area and likely to have implications for the future development of this area. The inspection report also mentions that even though it is a single storey construction, it is likely to have a visual impact on the monument for the reasons as mentioned above. After discussions it was felt that a discussion with the local ASI officials would be useful to know about the archaeological importance of the monument and surrounding areas, the historic foot prints etc.

Case No. 5
(Director, Council of Science and Technology, Lucknow)

The application was examined and it was seen from the accompanying documents that the building has already been constructed up to 3 storeys but there was no indication in the file as to whether any NOC was sought earlier and/or whether the applicant had mentioned the reasons as to why the NOC had not been sought for earlier. It was therefore decided to call for these clarifications as well as a status on the latest position of construction.

Case No. 6
(Smt. Mumtaz Khan and Shamim Khan, Lucknow)

After examining the proposal it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for total height of 13.2 m inclusive of mumty etc. The applicant would also be advised to complete the façade work and colour scheme keeping in character with the monument in question.

Case No. 7
(Smt. Singari Devi, Faizabad)

After examination of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. As far as the design of the façade of the building is concerned the applicant may follow the design guidelines as per NMA which are attached herewith.
Case No. 8

(Smt. Sobha P, Thrissur)

After examination of the application, it was noted that this is a application for construction of 1st floor on an existing building. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC for this purpose.

Case No. 9

(Sh. Vikas Vashist, 20 Amrit Nagar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (In the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 10

(Sh. Vikas Vashist, 21 Amrit Nagar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (In the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 11

(Smt. Sheela Gehlot, 46, Anand Lok, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (In the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case No. 12

(Ministry of Urban Development, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi)

After examining the application it was noted that this is a proposal for construction of an Government housing colony by demolishing existing one. It was decided that the applicant may be asked to make a presentation on the case covering all aspects.

Case No. 13

(Sd. Romy Dhingra, A-38 South Extn. Part-I, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mummy, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 14

(Smt. Rita Sektoo, D-84, Panchsheel Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mummy, parapet, water-storage tank) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 15

(Smt. Shakuntala Nayer, H-24, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mummy, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case No. 16

(Sh. Satish Kumar Saxena, C-7/8, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 17

(Sh. Parkash Kanwal, B-2/44, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 18

(Sh. Pritam Fatnani, C-7/8, Rana Pratap Bagh, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 19

(Sh. Subhash Taparia, C-2/23, Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case No. 20

(Sh. Bir Singh Gandhi and others, Y-20, Green Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including munty, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 21

(Sh. Raj Kumar and others, 4370, Kikar Bazar, Bathinda, Punjab)

After examining the application and accompanying documents, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case and applicant may be advised to keep the local architecture of the monument in his constructions, separately in the façade work.

While discussing cases pertaining to Delhi it was felt by Members that there is perhaps now a need to examine the interim guidelines from the point of view of height criteria and whether there is a need to have a re-look at the height limits keeping in view the distance of the proposed site of construction from the monument i.e. a certain height limit up to a distance of 150 m from the monument, another criteria from 150-200 m etc. This issue would be discussed in detail in the meeting next week.

Thereafter the cases listed for the day were taken up.
Cases listed for 24.04.2012: 

One deferred case of Gujarat State Road Corporation (GSRC) was listed for discussion being a deferred case. This case was considered in the NMA meeting held in Ahmadabad on 02.01.2012 where a presentation had also been made on the proposed new bus terminal near Astodia Gate protected monument in Ahmadabad. At that time while examining the designs and other features of the proposed new bus terminal Members, while stating that there was broad agreement to the project in principle, suggested certain changes in design, providing a viewing/observation etc. and also suggested that Heritage Impact Assessment may be got done for this project. The HIA was accordingly prepared by the applicant and submitted to NMA, a copy of which was circulated to all the Members. After perusal of the same, it was felt that while NOC in principle could be issued in this case it may be a conditional one and revised design showing viewing platforms etc. should be submitted in advance. Further, it was decided that as a few other infrastructure projects of Gujarat such as BRT corridor and so on had also been discussed during the meeting in Ahmadabad and decision on them had also been deferred. Keeping in mind that several infrastructure projects of Gujarat have been kept on hold for detailed consideration, it was decided that all these projects may be discussed with a group of experts sometime in mid May, 2012. The suggested names of these experts are Ms. Abha Narayan, Sh. Debashish Mohanty, Sh. Nimesh Patel and Sh. Navin Pipiani. The meeting may be held in Delhi.

**Case No. 1**

(Smt. Vinita Seth, H-50, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including muntl, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case No. 2

(Smt. Bimla Malik, 110, Anand Lok, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mummy, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 3

(M/s BDR Real Estates (P) Ltd., B-31, Nizamuddin West, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mummy, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 4

(Sh. Satya Prakash Sharma, 4269-A/3, Ansari Road, Darya Ganj, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mummy, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case No. 5

(Sh. Raghunath Mathur and Sh. Krishan Bihari Mathur, 49, Anand Lok, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 6

(Smt. Indira Singh, C-98, East of Kailash, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 7

(Sh. Paramjit Kaur, A-14, Nizamuddin West, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case No. 8

(Sh. Balraj Krishan Sharma, X-7, Green Park Main, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 9

(Sh. Prabhakar Jain and others, F-36, Green Park Main, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 10

(Sh. Harish Bhatia and Umesh Bhatia, H-72, NDSE-1, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case No. 11

(Sh. Puran Chand Mehra and others, C-47, Green Park Main, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mummy, parapet, water-storage tank and lift room) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
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MINUTES OF THE 35th MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Held at Mumbai
Date - 27th & 28th April, 2012

The cases carried over there taken up first.

As per programme fixed up, the 35th meeting of NMA was held at Mumbai on 27th and 28th April, 2012.

On the first day that is 27.04.2012, a meeting was held with State Government officials of Maharashtra from Culture/Archeological Department, Urban Development Department, Municipal Authority, CA Mumbai and SA Mumbai Circle. From the NMA side the role and functions of NMA, its operating procedures and various issues pertaining to implementation, specifically relating to Mumbai city, were highlighted. From the State Government side, the officials stressed upon the need to have clarity regarding various provisions and issues relating to the AMASR Amendment, and the role of State Government agencies therein. It was also emphasized that there was a need for creating awareness amongst the general public about the revised provisions of law.

Later in the evening detailed discussions was held with some professional conservation architects especially on issue of preparing Heritage Bye-laws and methodology for preparing Heritage Impact Assessment Reports.

Saturday, 29.04.2012

In the morning the NMA team visited two monuments namely Jogeshwari Caves and Parel Shiv Murti locations. Several NOC applications from these areas have been received at NMA headquarters, many of them being proposed “slum” rehabilitation projects which involved construction of Multi Storey high rise Residential-cum-Commercial complexes. The NMA team had a detailed visit at each monument as well as its surrounding areas and also inspected a few of the proposed constructions sites.

Thereafter, the meeting of NMA to consider the NOC applications cases of Mumbai city was held in the conference room of SA Mumbai Circle.
(Deferred Cases)

Case No. 1

(M/s Sahana properties & Resorts Pvt. Ltd., At Ram Tekdi Road and S.D. Rd, Shivree, Mumbai)

This case is deferred.

Case No. 2

(Principal, District and Session Judge, Ali Bag, Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra.)

The proposals relates to construction of office building for Principal District and Session Judge, Ali Bag. After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case No. 3

(Sh. Kiran Dattatray Deshmukh, Kumbha Wada, Tale, Maharashtra)

After examining the application and accompanying documents, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case No. 4

(Sh. Satish Sitaram Bansal, 202/1/5, Nagar Road, Pune)

It was noted that this pertains to a case of construction near Aga Khan Palace, Pune. After examining the proposal, it was felt that height restriction could be applied in this case with the proposed construction not exceeding the lower level of the tower of Aga Khan Palace. However, to specify this, it was felt necessary that the exact height of the monuments should be known and this may be provided to enable final decision in the matter.
Case No. 5

(Shri Kedar Arun Doiphode, 437, Somwar Peth, Karad, Dist. Satara, Maharashtra)

After examining the proposal, it was decided that grant of NOC may be recommend in this case with stipulation with the total height of the proposed construction should not exceed 12.5 m and all (including mumty etc.) and façade of the building should be in character that local architecture.

Case No. 6

(Sh. S.G. Dalvi and Associates, Parel, Mumbai)

This case is deferred.

Case No. 7

(Sh. Civil Judge, Junior Division & Judicial Magistrate First Class Court, Kolhapur, Maharashtra)

After examining the proposal and accompanying documents, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulation that the applicants' should incorporate elements of local architecture and the monument concerned, especially in façade of the building.

Case No. 8

(Shri Rajan Thomas, G.D. Ambedkar Marg, Parel, Distt. Mumbai, Maharashtra)

This case is deferred.

There was a brief discussion about the deferred cases. It was also noted that there are several applications for such high rise constructions located in the vicinity of these two monuments mainly of slum redevelopment involving high rise building. It was decided to consider all such cases after a detailed discussion on this subject which may be held in the next meeting at headquarters.
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MINUTES OF THE 36th MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg,
New Delhi 110001

Time & Date - 3.30 P.M. on 1st May, 2012

The following issues were listed for discussion for today’s meeting.

A. Follow up discussion on Mumbai visit- adoption of Guidelines for NOC application cases for Mumbai city.

B. Finalization of design Guidelines for Kanchipuram and disposal of deferred cases.

C. Discussion on height criteria for constructions relating to institutional buildings in Delhi specially those located in designated institutional areas.

D. Discussions regarding height criteria for constructions in Delhi based on distance factor from the monuments.

E. NOC applications listed for the day.

In addition, Whole Time Member had suggested discussion regarding Heritage bye laws, Heritage Impact Assessment etc.

Regarding follow up action on Mumbai visit, all Members expressed their views that such field visits greatly enhanced understanding of the situation and enabled better decision making. Following the visits to the monuments in Mumbai city, it was agreed that there is a need for taking a quick exercise to prepare Heritage bye laws at least for the 2 or 3 relevant monuments in the city. The guidelines could be prepared through some of the professional, well-known and qualified persons from Bombay itself to do this task. Since Heritage bye laws template is already under preparation this would be provided to such persons who are engaged.

2. The issue of design guidelines was next considered. Presentation was made by Part Time Member (Dr. Basu) on two alternative designs that she had prepared. After discussion it was agreed that both design guidelines should be adopted and while considering NOC applications from Kanchipuram temple town, applicants can be advised to follow any one of these. Dr. Basu would give a final touch to these design guidelines and all pending NOC applications from Kanchipuram would be considered in the next meeting.
3. Member Secretary informed about representation received from applicants undertaking constructions in designated institutional areas in Delhi regarding the height restrictions of 15 meters. Their contention was thought for such institutional cases separate criteria should be adopted where height need not be restricted to 15 meters. This included cases like Delhi University, ICRIER etc. After discussion it was decided that a study may be conducted at the institutional area near 'Satpullah' monument and the matter may be considered based on the findings of this study.

4. The issue suggested by Whole Time Member regarding Heritage bye laws, Heritage Impact Assessment and some related issues was thereafter discussed at some length. It was agreed that a meeting should be held with INTACH HQs in order to chart out a specific plan of action for preparing draft bye laws. The meeting could be held with Member Secretary, INTACH and others. After discussion on Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) it was also agreed that there was a need to have a list of qualified agencies/ institutions/ persons who could undertake preparation of HIA where required in action with NOC applications. An Expression of Interest (EOI) could be invited for the purpose of preparing a panel of such qualified persons.

Consideration of NOC applications could not be taken up due to paucity of time and the items listed were deferred for the next day.
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MINUTES OF THE 37th MEETING OF NMA 

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, 
New Delhi 110001 

Time & Date - 3.30 P.M. on 2nd May, 2012 

The following two deferred cases were taken up first: 

Case no. 1 
(Mr. Da Costa, Goa) 
After going through the clarifications it was felt that the matter could not be decided and the 
issue was deferred again. 

Case no. 2 
(Kerala State Electricity Board, Kerala) 
After perusing the clarifications and the revised design, it was decided to recommend grant 
of NOC in this case. 

(FRESH CASES) 

Case no. 1 
(Smt. Kailashben Amrutlal Shah, Paldi, Ahmadabad, Gujarat) 
The case records were perused and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case 
with the stipulated total height of 11.35 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) 

Case no. 2 
(Smt. Kantaben Navnitlal Gandhi and others, Paldi; Ahmadabad, Gujarat) 
The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Ahmadabad where certain norms 
had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend 
grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, 
water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if 
provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case no. 3

(Shri Pareshbhai B. Dave, Raikhed, Ahmadabad, Gujarat)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Ahmadabad where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 4

(Shri Salim Yusuf Patel, Ahmadabad, Gujarat)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Ahmadabad where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available. Separately, CA may be requested to send some photos of the protected monument.

Case no. 5

(Smt. Parvatiben Ratilal and others, Paldi, Ahmadabad, Gujarat)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Ahmadabad where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 6

(Shri Misbaullakhan Kalyumkhan Pathan, Raikhed-I, Ahmadabad, Gujarat)

The case records were perused and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 11 mtrs (G+2 including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)
Case no. 7

(Shri Ashok P Patel, Paldi, Ahmadabad, Gujarat)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Ahmadabad where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 8

(Shri Rajendra prasad Thakor Lal Patel, Usmanpura, Ahmadabad, Gujarat)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Ahmadabad where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 9

(Shri Bhupendra Chunnilal Shah, Usmanpura, Ahmadabad, Gujarat)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Ahmadabad where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 10

(Smt. Pramilaben Jayantilal Parikh, Maninagar, Ahmadabad, Gujarat)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Ahmadabad where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case no. 11

(Smt. Jyotsnaben Bipin Kumar Patel, Vadnagar, Mehsana, Gujarat)

The case records were perused and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 4.10 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 12

(Shri Milesh Kumar Babu Vassaramo, Diu)

The application was examined in detail and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the suggestion that the colour scheme should be in conformity with the protected monument.

Case no. 13

(Shri Shantilal Devchand, Firangiwada, Gujarat)

The case records were perused and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 11.85 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

The colour scheme should be in conformity with the protected monument.

Case no. 14

(Shri Mansukh Mathuradas Pabari and others, Dwarka, Gujarat)

The application was examined in detail and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with maximum height of 11.5 mts i.e. G+II (including mumty, parapet and water storage tank etc.).

Case no. 15

(Gulben Faramji Pallà and others, Surat, Gujarat)

The application was examined in detail and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with maximum height of 11.5 mts i.e. G+II (including mumty, parapet and water storage tank etc.).
Case no. 16

(Gulben Faramji Palla and others, Surat, Gujarat)

The application was examined in detail and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with maximum height of 11.5 mts i.e. G+II (including mumty, parapet and water storage tank etc).

Case no. 17

(Sh. A. Adikala Raj, Thanjavur, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to try and adopt traditional techniques and vernacular style specially in the façade.

Case no. 18

(Shri K. Udaykumar, Valliyantapuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to incorporate a sloping roof (as per NMA design guidelines for Kanchipuram).

Case no. 19

(Mr. M.S. Bashir Ali, Thanjavur, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. However, applicant should retain existing façade/ restore the same, while rest of the building can be as per his design.

Case no. 20

(Sh. K. Ragavendran, Sembakkam, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to try and adopt traditional techniques and vernacular style specially in the façade.
Case no. 21

(Sh. A. Rajavel, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusing the application and accompanying documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulation that the applicant should incorporate design elements of neighboring building (as per photo attached) for sloping roof and corridors etc.

Case no. 22

(The Secretary, Tiruchy Nagarathar Sangam, Tiruchirapalli, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. However, applicant should preserve front portion of existing building; remaining part can be redesigned retaining the existing character of the building.

Case no. 23

(M/s Kidim India Pvt. Ltd., Thanjavur, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the advice that sloping roof may be finished with tiles to blend with existing local structures.

Case no. 24

(Ms. Sudha, Kannagapattu, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to try and adopt traditional techniques and vernacular style separately in the façade.

Case no. 25

(Mr. E. Veeramuthu, Thirupporur, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to try and adopt traditional techniques and vernacular style separately in the façade.
Case no. 26

(Mrs. A. Sujatha, Kannagapattu, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to try and adopt traditional techniques and vernacular style separately in the façade.

Case no. 27

(Mr. S. Chidambaram, Thanjavur, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to try and adopt traditional techniques and vernacular style separately in the façade. Also, some interim design guidelines need to be framed for such cases (in Thanjavur).

Case no. 28

(Mrs. P. Gomathy, Kannagapattu, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to try and adopt traditional techniques and vernacular style separately in the façade.

Case no. 29

(Mr. V. Sekar, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant should follow the NMA design guidelines framed for Kanchipuram.

Case no. 30

(Mr. J. Rajesh, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant should follow the NMA design guidelines framed for Kanchipuram.
Case no. 31
(Mr. S. Dinakaran, Madambakkam, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to try and adopt traditional techniques and vernacular style separately in the façade.

Case no. 32
(Mrs. K. Malarkodi, Mamallapuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to try and adopt traditional techniques and vernacular style separately in the façade.

Case no. 33
(Mr. G. Rajendiran, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant should follow the NMA design guidelines framed for Kanchipuram.

Case no. 34
(Mrs. R. Poonguzhali, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and related documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant should follow the NMA design guidelines framed for Kanchipuram.

Case no. 35
(Shri Vijay Kumar Bassi, A-1/42, Panchsheel Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including muntty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case no. 36

(Smt. Pushpa Taneja and Smt. Kanta Taneja, C-5/16, Rana Pratap Bagh, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 37

(Smt. Pushpa Rani Gupta, D-6/6, Rana Pratap Bagh, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 38

(Northern Railway through Sh. R.K. Pandey, Dy. Chief Engineer, New Delhi)

The case was gone through and the Members desired to examine the proposal in detail and it could be considered in the subsequent meeting.

Case no. 39

(Kalashram Trust, D-2/33, Shahjahan Road, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 14.25 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)
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MINUTES OF THE 38th MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg,
New Delhi 110001

Time & Date - 3.30 P.M. on 7th May, 2012

Before taking up the list of cases of the day, following issues were discussed:

a) Presentation by Northern Railways on new alignment of Railway Track.

b) Consideration of deferred cases of Kanchi Puram, Tamil Nadu.

Prior to this, a meeting was held with several individuals who wanted to make representation about the 15 meter height limit, in respect of NOC applications for Delhi.

2. Thereafter, detailed presentation was made by Northern Railways on the Cultural/Heritage Impact Assessment, which was done for their proposed construction of new alignment of Railway Track from old Delhi Railway Station. The Cultural Impact Assessment was conducted by INTACH, who also made the presentation. All Members appreciated the detailed report for its thoroughness and clarity and for having addressed key issues. It was also noted with satisfaction that the Heritage Impact Assessment had actually taken into account Archaeological mitigation which actually resulted in the railways re-aligning their original proposal, so that any construction nears the protected monument of Saleem Garh Fort was avoided and actually taken beyond the 100 meter limit. It was felt that such Archeological mitigation should be a standard component of any HIA.

After the detailed presentation and having carefully considered the matter, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. It was also decided to advice Northern Railway to take required measures to retain the old Yamuna Bridge and develop it as an Industrial Heritage/Museum.

3. The cases of Kanchipuram Temple Town were taken up next, where design guidelines have already been framed. It was decided that the Kanchipuram NOC applications would be recommend grant of NOC for constructions of ground + one storey, with the construction to be as per one of the design guidelines of NMA. These recommendations will cover the following cases:-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>According to Synopsis</th>
<th>New Cases No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Monuments</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 2</td>
<td>Case No. 1</td>
<td>Thiru B. Kuganandhi</td>
<td>Megalithic Cists and Cairns</td>
<td>Ind Street, Abimi Nagar, Kunnakapattu, Thiruppur, Kanchipuram district, pin: 603110, Tamilnadu</td>
<td>Should be of G+1 with height restriction not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 3</td>
<td>Case No. 2</td>
<td>Thiru A. Ramachandran</td>
<td>Semnakkam</td>
<td>Pl.No:18, Sakti Nagar, Sembakkam, Tambaram Taluk, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 7</td>
<td>Case No. 3</td>
<td>Thiru T. S. Ganesh</td>
<td>Megalithic Cists and Cairns</td>
<td>Gowrivakkam Village, Tammaram Taluk, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 10</td>
<td>Case No. 4</td>
<td>Thiru G. Mani</td>
<td>Megalithic Cists and Cairns</td>
<td>Plot.No:3, Sakhthi Nagar, Sembakkam, Taluk, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 8</td>
<td>Case No. 5</td>
<td>Thiru M. E. Ramesh</td>
<td>Megalithic Cists and Cairns</td>
<td>D.No:5, Pl. No: 198 III, Kakkan street, Mahasakthi colony, Sembakkam, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 4</td>
<td>Case No. 6</td>
<td>Thiru G. Nagasundram</td>
<td>Sri JVARAHARESWAR A Temple</td>
<td>No. 108-A/1, Westraja Street, Big Kanchipuram-2 Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 6</td>
<td>Case No. 7</td>
<td>Thiru J. Sengamala Selvi</td>
<td>Sri JVARAHARESWAR A Temple</td>
<td>104. A/1 Samgeetha Vidwan Naina Street, Kanchipuram 631502, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 22</td>
<td>Case No. 8</td>
<td>Thiru K. Ramalingam</td>
<td>Sri JVARAHARESWAR A Temple</td>
<td>No. 17, Anni Illam, O.P. Kulam New Street, Kanchipuram, Pin-631502</td>
<td>As per NMA guideline, should be of G+1 with height restriction not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 23</td>
<td>Case No. 9</td>
<td>Ms. J. Prema</td>
<td>Sri JVARAHARESWAR A Temple</td>
<td>No.20, Ubbhalaiivaram Paramasivam Street, Big Kanchipuram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 5</td>
<td>Case No. 10</td>
<td>Thiru V. Srinivasam</td>
<td>Sri MukthiSwar Temple</td>
<td>No. 70, Kanthadai Street, Sripilliputhur-626165, Virudunagar District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 11</td>
<td>Case No. 11</td>
<td>Thiru S. Baskaran</td>
<td>Sri MukthiSwar Temple</td>
<td>Old. No.8/New. No. 17, Kuppu Street, Big Kanchipuram 631501, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 1</td>
<td>Case No. 12</td>
<td>Thiru S. Jayachandran</td>
<td>Sivaganga little Fort</td>
<td>Post Box. No. 307, No. 1762, Manojappa Street, Thanjavur-9, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl.No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Monuments</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 1</td>
<td>Thiru B. Kuganndhi</td>
<td>Megalithic Cists and Cairns</td>
<td>IInd Street, Abirami Nagar, Kannagapattu, Thirupporur, Kanchipuram district, pin: 603110, Tamilnadu</td>
<td>Should be of G+1 with height restriction as specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 2</td>
<td>Thiru A. Ramachandran</td>
<td>Semnakkam</td>
<td>Plot No: 18, Sakti Nagar, Sembakkam, Tambaram Taluk, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 3</td>
<td>Thiru T. S. Ganesh</td>
<td>Megalithic Cists and Cairns</td>
<td>Gowrivakkam Village, Tamaram Taluk, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 4</td>
<td>Thiru G. Mani</td>
<td>Megalithic Cists and Cairns</td>
<td>Plot No: 3, Sakti Nagar, Sembakkam, Taluk, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 5</td>
<td>Thiru M. E. Ramesh</td>
<td>Megalithic Cists and Cairns</td>
<td>D.No: 5, Pl. No: 198 III, Kakkan street, Mahasakthi colony, Sembakkam, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 6</td>
<td>Thiru G. Nagasundaram</td>
<td>Sri Jvarahareswara Temple</td>
<td>No. 108-A/1, West raja Street, Big Kanchipuram-2 Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 7</td>
<td>Thiru J. Sengamala Selvi</td>
<td>Sri Jvarahareswara Temple</td>
<td>104. A/1 Samgeetha Vidwan Naina Street, Kanchipuram 631502, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 8</td>
<td>Thiru K. Ramalingam</td>
<td>Sri Jvarahareswara Temple</td>
<td>No. 17, Anni Illam, O.P. Kulam New Street, Kanchipuram, Pin-631502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 9</td>
<td>Ms. J. Prema</td>
<td>Sri Jvarahareswara Temple</td>
<td>No. 20, Ubthalaivar Paramasivam Street, Big Kanchipuram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 10</td>
<td>Thiru V. Srinivasam</td>
<td>Sri Mukthiswara Temple</td>
<td>No. 70, Kanthadal Street, Srvilliputhur-626165, Virudunagar District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 11</td>
<td>Thiru S. Baskaran</td>
<td>Sri Mukthiswara Temple</td>
<td>Old No. 8/New. No. 17, Kuppu Street, Big Kanchipuram – 631501, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 12</td>
<td>Thiru S. Jayachandran</td>
<td>Sivaganga little Fort</td>
<td>Post Box. No. 307, No. 1762, Manojapppa Street, Thanjavur-9, Tamilnadu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. It was thereafter, decided to take up remaining NOC cases on the next day. Following this, Whole Time Member gave detailed briefing about the meeting which was held earlier in the day with INTACH on the issue of preparation of Heritage Bye-laws. It was explained that as the first target Delhi chapter of INTACH would take up Bye-laws for all Delhi monuments (174), a task which would be facilitated since the detailed survey for all the monuments was already available.

5. Tentatively, this may be completed within six months of being commissioned. It was also informed that a methodology for preparing Bye-laws had been sent by INTACH to NMA, this would be circulated amongst of Members.
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MINUTES OF THE 39\textsuperscript{th} MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001

Time & Date - 11.30 A.M. on 8\textsuperscript{th} May, 2012

The following cases were taken up:

\textbf{Case no. 1}

(Smt. Sudesh Rani, 5026-A, Afeem wali Gali, Bathinda, Punjab)

After considering the application and accompanying documents it was decided to \textbf{recommend} grant of NOC in this case and the applicant may be advised to undertake the construction keeping the local/ vernacular architecture in view.

\textbf{Case no. 2}

(Shri Bikkar Singh, 4094, Near Singh Sabha Gurudwara, Bathinda, Punjab)

This proposal is for repair of wall and change of roofs for residential purpose of the building located within the prohibited area. After examining the proposal it was decided to \textbf{recommend} grant of NOC for the proposed repair and change of roof but without any addition or alteration to that. It has been advised that proposed repair should be done in a traditional pattern and material.

\textbf{Case No. 3}

(Shri Hem Raj Setia, Gall Arjan Dass, Bathinda, Punjab)

After examining the application it was decided to \textbf{recommend} grant of NOC for repair. The applicant is advised to keep the repair work as much to the original as feasible and to use existing material.
Case no. 4
(Smt. Usha Rani, Bathinda, Punjab)

After examining the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for repair. The applicant is advised to keep the repair work as much to the original as feasible and to use existing material.

Case no. 5
(Shri Baldev Raj, 5182, Sirki Bazar, Bathinda, Punjab)

After examining the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for repair. The applicant is advised to keep the repair work as much to the original as feasible and to use existing material.

Case no. 6
(Smt. Krishna Rani, 5219, Sirki Bazar, Bathinda, Punjab)

After examining the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for repair. The applicant is advised to keep the repair work as much to the original as feasible and to use existing material.

Case no. 7
(Shri Mittar Saini, Bank Bazar, Bathinda, Punjab)

After examining the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for repair. The applicant is advised to keep the repair work as much to the original as feasible and to use existing material.

Case no. 8
(Shri Parveen Kumar, Mohalla Kochharam, Jalandhar, Punjab)

After considering the proposal it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for repair/renovation as per following:

a) Increase in plinth and roof as per proposal of applicant.
b) The arches should be retained and remain the same along with external features.
c) Applicant should make use of traditional technique and materials in the proposed repair and renovation.
Case no. 9

(Smt. Karamjit Kaur, Roparm, Punjab)

After going through the application and accompanying documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the clear stipulation that the repair work should be limited only to boundary wall and no excavation is allowed.

Case no. 10

(Smt. Shanti Devi, Qila Road, Bathinda, Punjab)

After perusing the application Members noted that this proposal is for repair work within the prohibited area and after examining the proposal it was decided to recommend grant of NOC only for repair of roof and there should not be any change in traditional and original material/technique.

Case no. 11

(Shri Madan Lal, Mohalla Sudan, Numahal, Punjab)

After going through the application and accompanying documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 12

(Smt. Pushpa Devi, Bathinda, Punjab)

After going through the application and accompanying documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC only for repair of roof and it has been advised to use original material.

Case no. 13

(Shri Saajan Sharma, 4523, Gali Middu Mal, Bathinda, Punjab)

After perusal of the case it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for repairs which should be kept only to the minimum require and keeping the original/ traditional material in view. There should be no addition or alteration whatsoever.
Case no. 14

(Shri Mandeep Singh and others, Sata Bazar, Bathinda, Punjab)

After perusing the application and accompanying documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. Design should try to incorporate features of the protected monument.

Case no. 15

(Shri Santokh Singh, Mohalla Mata Rani Chowk, Ropar, Punjab)

This case is also for repair within the prohibited area and after perusing the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC only for repair of roofs as per existing and traditional material and technique. Also wall may be replaced without any excavation.

Case no. 16

(Shri Pritpal Thapar, Phool Chakkar, Ropar, Punjab)

This case is also for repair within the prohibited area and after perusing the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC. No excavation/digging is to be allowed. Separately it is advised to obtain drawings of the proposed repair from the CA.

Case no. 17

(Shri Kailash Chand, Phool Chakar, Ropar, Punjab)

This case is also for repair of roof within the prohibited area and after perusing the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for repair of walls and roof without carrying out any excavation. It has been advised to use the same material for repair.

Case no. 18

(Mr. R. Ramachandran, Valikantapuram, Chennai)

After perusing the application and accompanying documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may advise to use vernacular or local traditional architecture in the construction.
Case no. 19 - (Shri A.P. Suresh, 153/5, Mamallapuram, Tamilnadu)
Case no. 20 - (Shri P. Balachandran, 171/19, Mamallapuram, Tamilnadu)

To have a better understanding in relation to monuments which is World Heritage Site, ASI may be requested to give a power point presentation on site management plans for Mahabalipuram.

Case no. 21

(Shri M. Malarkodi, Valikandapuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusing the application and accompanying documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for this case. The applicant may be advised to use vernacular or local traditional architecture for the construction. The CA may also advised to suggest NMA guidelines for Kanchipuram to the applicant for reference.

Case no. 22 - (Shri G. Victor Jesudoss, Tamilnadu)
Case no. 23 - (Ms. Jennifer Ann Macedo, Mamallapuram, Tamilnadu)

To have a better understanding in relation to monuments which is World Heritage Site, ASI may be requested to give a power point presentation on site management plans for Mahabalipuram.

Decisions on NOC cases whose power point presentations and synopsis were ready:

Case no. 1 (in synopsis Case no. 3)

(Smt. Rekha Rathi, 29, Sadhna Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms have been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including muni, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case no. 2 (in synopsis Case no.4)

(Sh. Arvind Thirani, 31, Sadhna Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 3 (in synopsis Case no.5)

(Sh. Amitabh Aggarwal, B-6, Green Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 4 (in synopsis Case no.6)

(Smt. Gayatri Vaish, S-19, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case no. 5 (in synopsis Case no. 7)

(Shri H.R. Khan Suhel, D-9, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 6 (in synopsis Case no. 8)

(Shri Shadab Ali Hashmi, D-7, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi)

After examining the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 14.35 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc).

Case no. 7 (in synopsis Case no. 9)

(Smt. Anju Malhan, B-8, Green Park Main, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case no. 8 (in synopsis Case no. 10)

(Shri Ashok Kumar Chawla, No. 180 to 182, Gali Bandook Wali, Ajmeri Gate, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including munt, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Remaining cases could not be considered due to paucity of time.
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MINUTES OF THE 40TH MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg,
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At the beginning meeting was held with Director, WHS, ASI and Ms. Shikha Jain
conservation consultant regarding site management plans for World Heritage Sites and
Mahabalipuram in particular. A separate record of discussion is being issued for this.

Thereafter the cases listed for the day were taken up:

DEFERRED CASES

Case no. 1
(National Institute of Siddha, Chennai)

This case was put up for a decision on whether a reference should be made to Ministry of Culture
as to whether this should be treated as public utility project and consider under
"Exempted Category", this being located in the prohibited area. After consideration of the matter,
it was felt that the applicant should further examine and explore any possibility to re-locate the
proposed construction outside the prohibited area. A clear demarcation of 100m/300m may also
be shown on his site plan.

Case no. 2
(Balaram Govindoss, Chennai)

After examining the clarifications given, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case
for construction of ground+ 2 storeys. The applicant may also be advised to try to maintain the
footprint of the existing building.
Case no. 3 and Case no. 4

(Mohd. Haneef and Mohd. Ikram, Agra)

The clarifications were examined but required clarity was still not there. No designs/drawings of the proposed new constructions were found in the file. This should be provided by the applicant to understand the case properly.

Case no. 5

(Captain James, Goa)

The clarifications were perused. It was also noted that the application pertains to proposed construction in the vicinity of World Heritage Site. It was decided that views of Goa Heritage Action group may be obtained in this case.

Case no. 6

(Shri Harbhajan Singh, Punjab)

After perusal of the clarifications it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant should maintain the character of the local architecture and incorporate the elements of the protected monument in the façade of the proposed new building.

Case no. 7

(Smt. Nirmala Sinha, Varanasi)

It was decided to list this case for 21.05.2012.
FRESH CASES

Case no. 1 - Shri Harish B Dhumal, Vadodara, (Gujarat)
Case no. 2 - Shri Kirit Kumar Chimanlal Shah and others, Vadodara (Gujarat)
Case no. 3 - Shri Nilesh Ramanlal Chunawala, Vadodara (Gujarat)

All the above cases were in the same area and pertains to ‘Rao Tambekar ni Haveli’ in Baroda which is an important heritage building and located in an area which has a certain archaeological character. It was decided that a quick survey of the area may be undertaken which can lead to some basic design guidelines which NMA would prepare. Survey/photograph of this area should be done a team of surveyor and photographer of NMA.

Case no. 4

(Shri Roshanbhai Husanbhai Palanpurwala, C.S. No. 4027, Bharuch City, Gujarat)

After examining the case and accompanying documents it was unanimously decided that the existing building deserves to be observed and conserve in its existing form. The applicant may be advised accordingly and assistance of INTACH may be taken in this purpose.

Case no. 5

(Executive Engineer, Panchayat (R & B) Division, Anad, Gujarat)

After examining the case, certain discrepancies were noted such as purpose of construction (residential or office), lack of legible map, clearly labeled photos etc. these should be provided to enable a proper consideration of the case.

Case no. 6 - (Shri Shrenik Kantilal Shah Ahmadabad)
Case no. 7 - (Shri Pradip Pravinchandra Vaghela, Diu)

It was decided to list these cases on 21.05.2012.
**Case no. 8** – (Dr. Saim Pech, Mauza Ganj, Sarnath, Varanasi)
**Case no. 9** – (Shri Suryabali Pandey, Sarnath, Varanasi)
**Case no. 10** – (Smt. Indra Singh, Sarnath, Varanasi)
**Case no. 11** – (Smt. Madhvi Devi, Sarnath, Varanasi)
**Case no. 12** – (Shri Pankaj Kumar, Sarnath, Varanasi)
**Case no. 13** – (Smt. Suryamani Devi, Sarnath, Varanasi)

All the above cases pertaining to Chaukhandi Stupa/ Sarnath. It was suggested that cases from this area could be examine with respect to a study that was conducted on Sarnath. Accordingly, these would be listed for 21.05.2012.

**Case no. 14** – (The Executive Engineer, P.W. (East) Division, Nasik, Maharashtra)
**Case no. 15** – (Machindra Bhasaheb Dhotre, Savedi, Ahmadnagar, Maharashtra)
**Case no. 16** – (Divisional Engineer Telecom, Sherul Phata, Nasik)
**Case no. 17** – (Deputy Chief (Civil) MOIL Ltd., Nagpur)
**Case no. 18** – (Shri Ram Autar Agarwal, Sitapur Road, Lucknow)
**Case no. 19** – (Dr. Raghunathan, Thiruvanchikkulam)
**Case no. 20** – (Mr. D. Mallikarjuna Rao, Perumbakkam, Chennai)

It was decided to list these cases to 21.05.2012.

**Case no. 21**

(Sh. Balbir Singh Malhotra, D-16/1, Hauz Khas, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.
Case no. 22

(Smt. Ritu Kothari, B-261, Asian Games Village, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 11 mtrs i.e. G+2 (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 23

(Shri Tejasvi Bhargava, Plot No. 33, Hanuman Road, New Delhi)

Drawing needs to be re-examine.

Case no. 24

(M/s BDR Real Estate (P) Ltd., B-31, Nizamuddin West, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 25

(Ford Foundation, 55, Lodhi Estate, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was felt that it needs to be checked from height point of view of the lift/toilet.
**Case no. 26**

(Smt. Krishna Shroff, BP-20, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including muntly, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

**Case no. 27**

(Smt. Sheela Gahlot, S-374, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15 mtrs (including muntly, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.