1

MINUTES OF THE FIRST MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 3 P.M. on 23rd November, 2011

List of Members present is attached.

At the outset, Member Secretary, NMA formally welcomed all the Members to the first meeting of the NMA. He gave a brief background about setting up of NMA, its role and functions and the immediate tasks before it. MS, NMA informed the Members about the status of NOC applications received by the CAs and those forwarded to NMA. He informed that about 1500 applications had been received by different CAs and about 150 had been forwarded for consideration of NMA after verification, enquiry etc. by the respective CAs. He also mentioned that about a dozen or so applications were of the public projects category while the remaining were essentially individual applications. After these introductory remarks, the agenda items were taken up.

MS, NMA invited attention to the provision of Section 20H (2) read with rule 13 of the NMA Rules, 2011 which provide for the procedure to be followed by NMA for its meetings and for the senior most Member to preside over the meetings in the absence of Chairperson. He also mentioned that the cases being considered would be under proviso to Sub Section (7) of Section 20D of AMASR (Amendment) Act, 2010. It was agreed that Ms. Meera Ishwar Dass, Whole Time Member may proceed over the meetings of the NMA in the absence of Chairperson. Thereafter, the NOC applications cases listed for the day were taken up and decisions unanimously taken:

Case No. 1

(Mother superior (Sr. Kochthresia), Mary Matha Adoration Convent, Eyyal (P.O.), Thrissur-680501)

After examining the application and going through the report of the CA as well as other information furnished, this case was recommended for grant of NOC for the proposed

reconstruction with the observation that in the finishing work, local materials like Malabar tiles may be made use of.

Case No. 2

(Shri Vishnupant G. Kothe, Secretary, Dr. Nirmal Kumar Fadkule Prathishathan)

The Authority examined the application and related documents as well as the report of the CA, Mumbai. It was noted that the proposal is for grant of NOC for the finishing work of the Facade of the proposed building which is already under construction. After examining the report and available records, the case was **recommended** for grant of NOC with the following observations:-

(a) In the Facade and finishing material which is compatible/conformity with the protected monument (Solapur Fort) may be used.

(b) While it was noted that glass has been used in the present structure, its further use in the Facade may be limited. Moreover, glass that has been used may be transparent or non-reflective type.

(c) The work would be regularly monitored by office of CA and local ASI to ensure adherence to the above.

(d) Endeavour should also be made to build up a pool of funds to create awareness amongst the local people about the archaeological importance of the site.

Case No. 3

(Shri Arun Babulal Shah)

After examining a proposal in detail, the Authority felt that some additional information was necessary to examine the proposal more properly. Items like, the importance/significance of the protected monument, photographs clearly showing the monument and proposed site of construction, proper delineation of the site with respect to the monument on the map noted to be provided. The CA concerned and ASI official may be requested to provide this information at the earliest to enable examination of this case. The proposal was deferred for

Sl. No.
1.
2.
3.
4.

Case No. 4

(Shri Rakesh Narendra Bhai Dave)

After examining the proposal, the Authority made the same observation as under case no. 3. The proposal was **deferred** for a few days for this propose.

Case No.5

(Manmohan Sharma & Uppal Housing Pvt. Ltd.)

The Authority examined the report of the CA, Delhi and related documents after going to the same; it has been **recommended** to grant NOC in this case. The Authority agreed with the observations made by the CA and suggested that the same may be intimated to the applicant while granting NOC.

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

MINUTES OF THE 2nd MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 3 P.M. on 24th November, 2011

List of Members present is attached.

The Authority considered the following cases and arrived at a unanimous decision in respect of those cases:-

Case No. 1, Case No. 2, Case No. 3

(Shri Ajay N. Shah), (Smt. Satish U. Kapasi), (Shri Sandeep M. Thakkar)

It was observed that these three cases are from the same area in which two cases had been considered in the first meeting and decision deferred in view of asking for some clarifications. It was agreed that the same clarifications may be obtained in these cases as well and besides that a clarification may also be obtained from the CA, Gandhi Nagar, whether these areas, namely, around the Small Stone Mosque and Usman Mosque form part of the proposed heritage city area for Ahmedabad. It was also noted that photographes of the monuments were available in the proposal in consideration today. Accordingly, a decision on the above three cases has been **deferred** for a few days.

Case No. 4

(M/s Gujarat State Road Transport Corporation, Ahmedabad)

This proposal pertains to construction of a public utility building i.e. bus terminal at an existing bus stand location. While it was generally agreed that such nature of public utility may be required, to facilitate proper consideration, certain additional documents/information may be necessary such as:-

(a) Details of the existing structure
(b) Extent of expansion to the existing structure both vertically& horizontally
(c) The traffic into the terminal/additional traffic load expected both human and vehicular.
(d) The visual quality of the proposed facade
(e) An impact assessment report with
    (i) Aesthetic impact
    (ii) Structure impact (vibration to the monuments)
    (iii) Video of existing building/structure
    (iv) 3D simulation of the proposed in relation to the heritage structure

Case No.5

(Vasai-Virar City Municipal Corporation)

After consideration of the proposal and examining relevant documents, this case was recommended for grant of NOC.

Case No. 6

(Messer Neocon Infrastructure Services Pvt. Ltd.)

On perusal of the application and attached documents, it was noted that the proposed construction is in an area which is a densely populated residential

area and already has several high rise buildings in the vicinity. The accompanying maps and photographs were also found to be of good quality and it was felt that this type of documentation could be prescribed for other applications also. After examining the proposal it was observed that it is not clear what exactly was being sought i.e. NOC for construction or height relaxation. The clarification on this issue may be obtained from CA, Mumbai to facilitate a decision. Accordingly, the matter was **deferred** for a few days.

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

MINUTES OF THE 3rd MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.45 A.M. on 25th November, 2011

List of Members present is attached.

The Authority considered the following cases and arrived at a unanimous decision in respect of those cases:-

Case No.1

(Lt. Col. Manjit Singh Paintal)

The case was considered in detail and after examining the report of the CA and accompanying documents and other records this case was **recommended** for grant of NOC. It was also agreed that while communicating the grant of NOC the recommendations made by the CA, Delhi should be included in the NOC approval letter.

Case No. 2

(Maj. Gen. R.K. Khanna)

The case was considered in detail and after examining the report of the CA and accompanying documents and other records this case was **recommended** for grant of NOC. It was also agreed that while communicating the grant of NOC the recommendations made by the CA, Delhi should be included in the NOC approval letter.

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

MINUTES OF THE 4th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 1st December, 2011

List of Members present is attached.

The Authority considered the following cases and arrived at decisions in respect of each after detailed discussions:-

Case No.1

(Smt. Sadhna Singh Chauhan)

It was observed that the proposed construction site is near an important archaeological site i.e. Heliodoras Pillar (Khamba). It was noted that there are some existing structures within the regulated area although their status has not been mentioned in the forwarding report. It was also seen that enclosed maps were not to scale and the google map was not accurate enough. After considering the case it was decided to obtain further clarification in the matter namely:-

(a) A proper map, to scale, showing the location of the mohument and proposed construction site.

(b) Status of existing structures within the 300 mtrs. zone.

(c) A separate report may be obtained from SA, Bhopal Circle, ASI on the archaeological importance and related aspects of the site.

It was felt that such important sites should have the heritage bye-laws in place to consider the case in proper perspective.

Case No. 2

(Sh. Estevan D'Souza)

After going through the report of the CA and enclosed documents it was felt th certain additional clarification may be called for to examine the application proper namely:-

(a) Section plan through the protected site and proposed construction site, t scale.

(b) Clearly labeled photographs showing the protected monument, surrounding buildings, view from the monument towards proposed construction site and vice –versa.

(c) Background of the protected monument, its historical and archaeological importance.

Case No. 3

(Thiru A.R. Ravichandran)

It is observed that this is a fairly large scale commercial project (extension of an existing tourist resort). Moreover, this is also a World Heritage Site. After considering the proposal, in this matter it was decided as follows:-

(a) An archaeological impact study should be got conducted (by the applicant) which should cover aspects like increased tourist in flow, increase in vehicular traffic and its management, environmental issues, as a consequence of such increase in volume of tourist traffic.

(b) Since this is a world heritage site, ASI should also send its views taking into account UNESCO guidelines on management of world heritage site.

It was also observed that this is not a case which could be classified into exceptional category.

Case No. 4

(Er. Augustine Thomas, Kerala)

This proposal relates to reconstruction of ... Electricity Board ...

with the proposal it was seen that the proposed building appears to be a modern, block type structure of the Government offices. Members were of the opinion that while such constructions for public utilities are necessary at the same time Government should take the lead in demonstrating its sensitivity towards protection and promotion of local heritage and heritage conservation in its buildings and constructions. While the internal structures need not be gone into, Members felt that the building Façade should be of such design so that it is in character with the protected monument in whose vicinity it is located, the scale, use of material, roof line and other such details should be broadly in conformity with the local architecture. It was accordingly decided that the applicant may make suitable modification as suggested above and thereafter a presentation can be made before the Authority on an appropriate date for further consideration of the proposal.

Case No.5

(Smt. Ugama Devi)

It is observed that this is a project on the larger side both for residential and commercial purpose. It is located near Hospet town, which is a base for Hampi world heritage site. It was further observed that the enclosed documents, reports and other material are quite sketchy and did not explain the proposal in requisite detail. It was decided that the Competent Authority may be requested to make a PowerPoint presentation on this application to explain the proposal in full detail which should have amongst their things proper photographs, scale maps etc.

11

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

MINUTES OF THE 5th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 3.00 P.M. on 12th December, 2011

List of Members present is attached.

The following NOC applications were taken up for consideration by the Authority:-

Case No.1 & 2

(Shri Arun Babulal Shah) and (Shri Rakesh Narendra Bhai Dave)

These two cases were the **deferred** cases from the 1st meeting held on 23.11.2011. The clarifications sent by CA, Ahemdabad were examined by the Members. After considerable discussions it was observed that the requisite clarity on various issues was still not there even with the clarifications sent by CA, Ahemdabad. Issues like intervening buildings and structures, existence of or proposed heritage status for the city or any proposed heritage zones, use of local materials and adherence to local archaeological and architectural norms were some areas which needed to be examined. Since thereafter the number of cases from Gujarat and Ahemdabad in particular it was large, it was felt that a site visit by the Authority to Ahmedabad would be appropriate which would also enable discussions with CA, SA and other local Authorities. It was accordingly decided that meeting of the Authority will be held in Ahmedabad on 2nd and 3rd January, 2012 to consider these cases.

Case No. 3

(Manager, City Montessori School, lucknow)

After examining the proposal and looking at all the documents submitted it was decided to recommend the case for grant of NOC. It was also agreed that while conveying that recommendation, the applicant could be advised to take affirmative action, especially being an educational institution, to create awareness amongst its students about the importance of the protected monument and also to inculcate a feeling of heritage appreciation and take some steps like getting installed a plaque at the site and other

Case No. 4

(Junior Engineer (Work) West Central Railway, Railway Station, Bhopal)

It was observed that this proposal pertaining to repairing and relaying of pipe lines was within the **protected** monument i.e. Kamlapati Mahal, Bhopal. Since it is within the protected area, the ASI has to take an appropriate decision. However, Members highlighted the importance of this monument and suggested that ASI should take more measures for the protection and preservation of this site.

Case No. 5

(Shri R.K. Mishra, Chief Project Manager, DMRC, New Delhi)

The Members had gone through the report of CA, Delhi, pertaining to this project. Being such a large scale project and running close to a number of protected monuments, it was felt that certain investigations are a pre-requisite, such as archaeological impact assessment, seismic status, vibration studi

es etc. which should be got done from independent agencies. On the aspect of interpretation of the 100 mtrs direction it was decided that a specific clarification should be obtained on this from the Ministry of Law.

It is also decided that DMRC may be asked to make a formal detailed presentation on its project to the Authority on 14.12.2011 at 3.30 P.M.

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

MINUTES OF THE 6th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - **3.00 P.M. on 13th December, 2011**

List of Members present is attached.

The following NOC applications were taken up for consideration by the Authority:-

Case No.1

(Managing Director, Chennai Metro Rail)

After examining the application, it was noted that the proposal is for construction of a Chennai Metro station building which would be partly underground and partly over ground. However, it was also noted that the proposed construction is at 50 meters distance from the protected monument and therefore falls in the prohibited area where no new construction is permissible. It has been mentioned in the forwarding report of CA, Chennai that this construction, which is for a public project should be treated as a case for the creation of a public utility and therefore should be considered under the exemption clause of AMASR Act. After discussions on this point, Members felt that some clarification needs to be obtained on the definition of "Public Utility" including any court rulings on this definition or any definition laid down by Government. This may be obtained to consider the plea made by

CA, Chennai. It was also ... Metro rail line should ... know whether underground tunnel etc. would be running near the protected monument.

Case No.2

(Chief Officer, Panhala Hill Station Municipal, Mumbai)

This case pertains to laying of garden near the protected monument i.e. Panhala Fort. After perusing the case, Members expressed their appreciation of this type of initiative which has been taken by the Municipal Authority in order to beautify the surroundings and vicinity of this historic place. While landing the objective, Members felt that it would be a more worthwhile project through creation of additional detailing in the laying of the garden, (which could be suggested by the Authority) and for which certain additional information is felt required namely:-

(a) What is the historicity of the garden and what was the original use of the area

(b) Are there any indicators of what was the relation between the main fort and the area where the proposed garden is to come up?

(c) While laying out the garden it would be a good idea to put up interpretative signs including cultural and information signages.

(d) Consultation could also be held with local horticulture experts including Horticulture wing of ASI in designing the garden.

Once this information is received the proposal can be considered again.

Case No.5 and Case No.6

(Shri K.K. Ibrahim Mohammadbhai), (Shri Misbullakhan Kaiyumkhan)

Both these cases are from Ahemdabad and as decided in the 5th meeting of the Authority, these cases would also be taken up for consideration in the meeting of the Authority at Ahemdabad on 2nd and 3rd January, 2012.

Case No.7

(M/s Charan Plaza Pvt. Ltd.)

The application was examined in detail and it was observed by the Members that there are certain discrepancies in the application pertaining to purpose of the construction, height, exact location etc. Specifically, the following clarifications are necessary to examine the proposal properly:-

(a) The nature of the proposed construction, whether it is for residential or commercial purpose.

(b) Details of existing buildings in the vicinity including height of the same.

(c) Provision of scale map showing the location of the monument and proposed construction site.

(d) If it is a building for commercial purpose, a heritage impact assessment may also be got done by the applicant.

After receiving of these clarifications the matter would be taken up again.

Case No. 3

(Assistant Project Administrator Baihar, M.P.)

It was noted that this project for construction of a tribal students hostel is required developmental project and located in a backward, tribal area where there are reportedly extremist activities. At the same time it was also observed by the Members that the protected monument is an important one historically and adequate steps need to be taken for its preservation. Taking into account these factors, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the following advisory:-

(a) In completing the hostel building, especially in the façade and finishing, it would be useful to associate someone who is familiar with the local, vernacular architecture and historic area development.
(b) Local INTACH (at Jabalpur) could also be consulted.
(c) Some affirmative action for heritage awareness can be undertaken by the school authority, such as erection of a plaque at the site, heritage education amongst the children etc.

Case No.4

(Shri Tharum Dath. M.J., Kerala)

After going through the available documents and papers of this application, it was observed that the information furnished was quite incomplete, without proper photographs, details of surrounding areas and buildings, absence of maps and so on. The CA, concerned may be requested to furnish these details for proper examination of the application.

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

MINUTES OF THE 7th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 15th December, 2011

List of Members present is attached.

The following NOC applications were taken up for consideration by the Authority:-

Case No. 1

(Director (Mono Rail), Mumbai)

It was noted by the Members that although this is a public utility infrastructure project and involved only construction of elevated rail track, certain aspects needed to be kept in mind both in view of the importance of the protected site and the fact that this is a public infrastructure project. Some additional details such as effects of sounds and vibration as a result of the proposed construction as well as the subsequents operation of the mono rail need to be studied and provided. This may be provided to enable the Authority to consider the case further. It was also seen that there are no photographs of the monument or of the proposed construction site and surrounding area available. This may be provided.

Case No.2

(Shri Shekhar Patil, Mumbai)

The case was examined in detail by the Members. While it was appreciated that it is a slum improvement project but certain other considerations need to be carefully examined. It was seen that the area around the protected monument, including the proposed site, is mostly single storey plus one structure, mainly being slum clusters. The proposed slum rehabilitation project will involve raising of a 10 storey structure and it is quite likely to have an impact on the character of future construction in the area.

CA, C
metro
under
monu

Case I

(Chief

This c
i.e. Pa
apprec
Munici
of this
would
detailin
Authori
namely:

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

Once thi
again.

The areas involves an important monument and, it was felt that some information the available master plan for this area, details of some existing buildings includ height etc. could be provided for better examination of the case.

It was also noted that this was a case/area which required heritage bye-laws prepa urgently to deal with such applications.

Case NO.3

(Shri Wajahat Habibullah, Lucknow)

After examining the case it is observed that this is an application only for carrying repairs to the existing building. The grant of such permission is within the competa of the CA concerned as per delegated powers and as such the Authority has objection to the proposal. However, while conveying the permission, the CA ensure that no additions or fresh construction is taken up.

Case No.4

(Shri Chandrakant Natwarlal Thakkar, Gujarat)

This pertains to the case from Ahmedabad and as already decided such cases been kept together for consideration during the meeting of the Authority in Ahmed on 2nd and 3rd January, 2012.

Case No.5

(Shri K.M. Palani, Chennai)

After the detailed perusal of the application and accompanying documents, i decided to **recommend** the case for grant of NOC. It was observed by the Me that the protected site appears to be an important one whether heritage by needed to be prepared quickly so as to regulate land use pattern in the buffe (prohibited and regulated area) of the protected site.

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

MINUTES OF THE 8th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	3.30 P.M. on 19th December, 2011

List of Members present is attached.

The following NOC applications were taken up for consideration by the Authority:-

Case No. 1

(Hemkunt Sahib Infrastructure Developers ltd. New Delhi Municipal Council, Delhi)

The proposal for construction of multi storey parking-cum-Commercial Complex for NDMC was considered by the Authority. It was observed that this is a project for providing a public service facility, besides developing commercial space. The proposed project is located in an already highly developed commercial area with several high rise buildings and structures though there are traditional buildings and bungalows also which reflect the architectural practice of that period. While taking into account the need of provide such public facilities particularly in highly developed commercial areas, the Members also took note of the fact that aspects of conservation and preservation of the protected monuments in whose vicinity it is located needed to be kept in mind. For further examination of the proposal by the Authority, additional information was felt necessary:-

(a) Specific comments from ASI on the proposed project, especially with regard to the depth of the proposed construction in relation to the water level in Baoli, water retention etc. and also on the aspect of large number of vehicles in the proposed parking.
(b) There was some doubt about the final design of the building, especially the façade, this may be clarified.
(c) While clearances have been obtained from environmental, DUAC etc., clarification on their validity may also be indicated.

Case No.2

(Sulabh International Social Services Organization, Delhi)

After examining the proposal in detail and going through the attached documents etc., it was decided to **recommend** the case for grant of NOC.

Case No.3

(Shri Om Prakash Gupta through GP A Shri Amteshwar Singh, Delhi)

The proposal was examined in detail. From further examination of the attached maps and documents it was noted that the proposed reconstruction is located on an inside road and not in the direct line of site of the protected monument. Other buildings of similar height have already come up or are under construction. After examination of all aspects, it was decided to **recommend** the case of grant of NOC.

Case No.4

(BMB Developers Pvt. Ltd., Delhi)

The case was examined with reference to the accompanying documents, maps etc. It was noted that while this case is located in the same area as considered in case No. 3 above, there are certain differences which need to be kept in mind. The proposed site of reconstruction is located on the main road and just across from the protected monument although at the distance of 178 metres. Members felt that as this building, in fact as well as other buildings situated in this row, front the protected monument, therefore there is a difference from other buildings which are located in the rows behind this. As such Members felt that some of the aspects relating to façade, colour, building material etc (as also specified by CA, Delhi) may be incorporated and the designs submitted to enable final decision. Accordingly, CA, Delhi may ask the applicant to submit the façade design etc. and this case is deferred for further consideration.

Case No.5

(Secretary, Baby Welfare Association, Aurangabad)

This application pertains to demolition and reconstruction of school building located in Ahmednagar, Maharashtra. The protected monument in question is gate near Niyamat

Khan's Palace. While the purpose of the proposed construction itself is laudable, it is observed that the site of proposed construction and the surrounding areas including existing building indicated local character of the architecture and design. In fact the school building is almost a century old. It is also felt that the design of the proposed new building was not compatible with the existing local character of the buildings. A design more sensitive to this aspect would perhaps be more appropriate. Members also felt that this was a monument where availability of the heritage bye-laws would be very useful in considering NOC cases. In view of this, it was decided to request the CA concerned to get necessary modification carried out as suggested above and at the same time preparing of heritage bye-laws may also be taken up on immediate basis for this monument. The case would be considered thereafter.

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

MINUTES OF THE 9th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	3.00 P.M. on 26th December, 2011

List of Members present is attached.

The following NOC applications were taken up for consideration by the Authority:-

Case No. 1

(Usha Kampani, Seema Kumar, Madhulika Marwaha and Asha Gulaty, Delhi)

The Members examined the case with reference to the documents and other material. It was observed that the proposed construction site is located near the Begumpuri Mosque protected monument. It was further observed that though 1 or 2 other cases near this monument have been recommended for NOC, this case is slightly different as the proposed construction falls in the first line of buildings fronting the protected monument. In view of this, Members felt that this building and others in this line needed to have a slightly different approach so that their outer structures and designs were in character with and compatible with the nearby protected monument. It was accordingly decided that the facade etc. may be redesigned keeping in view the above suggestions and thereafter the case may be resubmitted for consideration. It was also noted that this is not a "reconstruction" but actually fresh construction after demolition of the existing building.

Case No.2

(Brig. Arjan Singh Narula, Delhi)

After examining all the papers and documents and noting the fact that the proposed construction site is well away from the protected monument and there are number of intervening rows of built up constructions in between, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

Case No.3

(Veena Dhingra, Delhi)

This case was not taken up for consideration, the case being withdrawn due to some discrepancies in the application.

Case No.4

(Director, National Institute of Siddha, Chennai)

The Members examined this case with respect to the documents and other papers submitted. It was noted that the proposed construction / addition to the existing building, is located at a distance of 21 mtrs from the protected site. As this is within the prohibited area of the protected site, no construction can be taken up as per the provisions of the AMASR Amendment Act.

Case No. 5

(Vijay Mangla, Delhi)

This case was examined in detail with reference to the application and accompanying papers and documents, it was decided to carry over discussions/decisions on this case to the next meeting of the Authority i.e. 10th meeting scheduled on 27.12.2011.

24

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

MINUTES OF THE 10th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.00 P.M. on 27th December, 2011

List of Members present is attached.

The following NOC applications were taken up for consideration by the Authority:-

Case No.1

(Vijay Mangla, Delhi)

The case of Shri Vijay Mangla, carried over from the last meeting, was taken up again. It w felt that this being the first case of fresh construction in this particular locality .followi revision of FAR norms by MCD/DDA may set the benchmark for further new construction the area, surrounding the protected monument therefore, in order to assess the ca properly, Members felt it would be appropriate to obtain a section drawing from the propos construction site to the monument showing a profile of the existing buildings intervening between. Some details pertaining to the protected monument may also be provided. soon as this information is received the case would be taken up again.

It was also observed that this is a case of fresh construction and not reconstruction mentioned in the application and that correction should be reflected accordingly.

Case No. 2.

(M/s Omaxe Ltd., Amritsar)

It was observed by the Members that in this case NOC had already been granted by AS 2007 and construction had already started and frame work structure is already compl Thereafter the applicant had submitted an application to ASI for extension of validity increase in building height upto 30 mtrs. and was advised to apply to the CA/NMA as revised provisions of the amended Act It was also noted that this extension in height

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

MINUTES OF THE 11th MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Ahmedabad, Gujarat

Time & Date - 3rd January, 2012

List of Members present is attached.

The meeting was continued from Monday 2nd January, 2012.

2. A brief presentation was made by Shri Y.S. Rawat, Competent Authority, Gujarat and also Director (Archaeology), Government of Gujarat on the status of NOC applications received, processed etc as well as the central monuments in Gujarat and other details.

3. While the first case was put up for consideration, Members of the Authority had certain general observations to make about the NOC cases in general and about Ahmedabad/Gujarat in particular. It was noted that site inspection to the centrally protected monument had been undertaken the previous day which had been very informative and useful in understating the ground situation. Members observed that while certain activities/constructions may have been allowed in the past it need not be the benchmark and the effort of the NMA should be in adopting a long term approach which, on the one hand preserves and protects the central monuments in question and on the other addresses the genuine needs of individuals and others in development which in this matter is manifest through construction of residential and commercial buildings. At the same time Members noted that a certain amount of uniformity needs to be followed while considering NOC application cases, particularly till such time as heritage bye laws for each monument are in place. It was also observed that a view taken by the Authority in prescribing certain height limits wherever NOC applications are recommended on the basis of such uniformity would not preclude persons from seeking amendments to their NOC permissions in the future if the bye laws, as the when framed, permitted. After discussion on the above issues in depth, Members unanimously agreed that from the stand point of this uniformity and as guiding principle, wherever it was being considered for **recommendation** to grant

NOC, it may be granted, for construction of ground + 3 floors. If there were applications seeking higher number of floors/more height, they would be advised to await the final status on building heights etc. once the heritage bye laws were in place. It was also felt appropriate that wherever NOC cases were being recommended with ground+3 limit, a short advisory note broadly explaining the reasons as to why the recommendations were being granted to ground+3 level may be appended along with the permission letter which would finally go to the applicant.

4. It was also felt by the Members that in order to further the cause of heritage and for general preservation of the monuments in question the following measures may be adopted by the applicants:-

(i) The colour, material texture and detailing of the building facade should be such so as to maintain the character of the protected monument in whose vicinity it is located.

(ii) The applicant, particularly if it is a builder/developer may consider setting up a fund or creating a trust or a donation to the cause of waste management and environmental development around the centrally protected monument in question.

(iii) Applicant should consider erecting an appropriate plaque of about 3'x3' at their construction site giving a brief background about the monument in question.

5. Based on the above general principles adopted by the Member it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for construction of ground+3 storeys in the following cases:-

Case No. 1. Shri Arun Babulal Shah (22-B, Vishvakunj Society, Narayan Nagar Road, Paldi Ahmedabad)

Case No. 2. Sandeepbhai Mahasukhbhai Thakkar (POAH) (TPS No. 3 (CKP Section), Ellis Bridge, Paldi, Ahmedabad)

Case No. 3. Shri Chandrakant N Maniyar (City Survey No.198& 491, Paldi Ahmedabad)

Case No. 4. Shri Ajay N Shah (F.P. 920/2/P. T.P.3, Paldi, Ahmedabad)

Case No. 5. Shri Satishbhai U Kapasi and Miniaxi Kapasi (TPS No., F.P. No.90, 91, Sub Plot no. 14, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad)

Case No. 6. Shri Narendra Bhai B Dave and Others (SP-2, Usmanpura, Ahmedabad)

Case No.10. Shri Misbullakhan Kayumkhan Pathan (CST No. 862, Moje Raikhad-1, Ahmedabad)

Case No.11. Shri Jatinbhai Gunvantbhai Patel (Final Plot No. 289, TPS no. 22, Moje Paldi, Ahmedabad)

Case No.12. Dr. Sanjay P Pardeshi (Vibhag B Tika No. 12/3, 85 P 145, Vadodara)

Case No.13. Shri Devengbhai C. Patel (Tika No. B-101/1, CS No. 211/1 to 211/4, Fatni Mohalla, Rao Pura, Vadodara)

Case No. 14. Shri Pradeep Manohar Vednekar and others (CS No. 87 and 88, Vibhag B, Tika No. 12/4, Dandia Bazar, Vadodara)

In respect of the remaining 5 cases, the decisions were as follows:-

Case No. 7

(Shri K.K. Ibrahim Mohammad Bhai- Survey No. 107/A/1/2 and 107/A/2/1/P, Village Makarba, TP Scheme No. 92, Sharkhej, Ahmedabad)

On examining the case records it was seen that the proposed construction is in an area which appears to be pre-dominantly single storey or ground + 1 construction. Keeping that in mind and the general ambience of the protected monument in question, Members were of the opinion that at present **recommendation** could be made for grant of NOC for ground+2 storey only (against ground + 4 storeys in the application). Once the heritage bye laws are in position the applicant could, if he so desired, approach the CA for increase in height.

Case No.8

(Shri Inayatkhan Misrab Miyan Pathan-City Survey No. 1797/1, 1797/2, F.P. no. 101/1, TSP no. 85, Vatva, Ahmedabad)

It is observed that this is a major construction of commercial buildings and residential flats going up to 11 floors. Members observed that following the general principle adopted

in the regard, in this case **recommendation** for grant of NOC for construction of ground+ 3 storey could be made and if the applicant wants to go up to a greater height he may be required to undertake a Archaeological Impact Assessment and thereafter apply again to the CA.

Case No.9

(M/s Albina Estate Ltd.- F.P. No. 113, 114, 121 and 123 TPS no. 14, Dariapur, Kazipur, Ahmedabad)

The proposed construction is in a vacant area where there was earlier a textile mill of National Textile Corporation which has been shut down and perhaps all buildings etc. have been demolished or removed. This is a major construction of residential/commercial nature of four different blocks, the buildings ranging in height from ground + 3 storey to ground + 6 storey. In this case Members felt that it would be appropriate to have a proper presentation from the developers on the proposed construction. It was also felt that National Textile Corporation, on whose power of attorney the developer the undertaking is construction, may also be requested to remain present at the presentation so as to get their perspective on the project.

Case No. 15 and 16

(Mr. Nazmuddin Abbasi Kachwala- CS no. 4294, 4295 (part) and 4296, Ward No. 4, Bharuch)

(Mrs. Vohara Jumana Shabbirbhai- CS No. 3869, 3870, Municipal No. B 1935/1936, Vaharawad, Bharuch 4294, 4295 (part) and 4296, Ward No. 4, Bharuch)

These cases pertain to Bharuch City in Gujarat and on a presentation of the cases, Members observed that even though it was basically reconstruction of the 2 properties, the nature of construction pointed to a particular architectural pattern which perhaps defined the character of the local architecture in that part of Bharuch City and it would be quite appropriate from a heritage preservation point of view if the buildings could be restored in their present form. However, it is also noted that the applications relate to needy section of society and reconstruction of their buildings was perhaps a necessity. After taking into consideration all relevant aspects, it was decided that these 2 cases may be **deferred** for 30 days during which time CA may ascertain in consultation with local INTACH on the possibility of bye laws being framed for this area quickly or whether the applicant could consider restoration of the buildings. Based on this impact, the cases would be taken up again one month from now.

Case No. 17

(Gujarat State Road Transport Corporation-TPS No. 2, FP no. 6_8A, B,7, 910, 41+42A, B,43, Near Astodia Gate, Ahmedabad)

A presentation on this case had been made by GSRTC on the previous day i.e. 2nd January. After considering the matter, Members desired that the following aspects may be addressed:-

(a) As mentioned by GSRTC, the heritage impact assessment report may be submitted in 15 days.

(b) The design of the proposed construction of bus terminal requires to be re-visited, it should be in character with the Astodia Gate protected monument.

(c) It may be examined where a properly designed viewing platform can be constructed which could afford visitors and users of the bus terminal a view of Astodia Gate and perhaps the other nearby protected monuments as well.

Case No.18

(Additional City Engineer (BRTS), Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation, Ahmedabad)

A presentation had been made by AMC on the proposed elevated corridor the previous day i.e. 2nd January. After going through the application and other material, Members desired that the following aspects may be addressed:-

(a) An archaeological impact assessment may be got done and AMC may involve ASI for this purpose.

(b) Designs of the columns and pillars need to be re-visited to keep them in character with the protected monuments concerned.

(c) The visual impact that the elevated corridor may have on the protected monument (as many as 7 en route needs to be properly examined and assessed.

(d) The issue of rerouting of the elevated corridor may also be examined afresh.

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

MINUTES OF THE 12th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	2.30 P.M. on 16th January, 2012

List of Members present is attached.

The list of the day was perused and Members had made the following observations:-

Most of the cases related to Delhi and in this context the following was noted:

(a) As per approved master plan for Delhi 2021, the FAR has been increased for MCD/DDA approved colonies.

(b) As a result of these many persons are approaching the Authorities for increasing heights of their properties to the new permissible levels.

(c) The new FAR levels allow height up to 5 floors (15 mtrs excluding Mumty, Water-Storage tank etc.) and this indicates alteration of the skyline in the city with large number of persons seeking to avail of higher height limit.

(d) Heritage bye laws for the protected monuments are not yet available and in their absence it would be appropriate to follow as a general principle some uniform guidelines while considering such NOC applications.

(e) As and when the relevant heritage bye laws are in place and if those bye laws so permit, the applicant would be at liberty to apply again for higher height limit.

With these observations the cases were taken up for consideration and the following decisions were arrived at:-

Case No.1

(Mr. Kshitij Kulkarni, R/o A-803, Varsha Co-op-Society, Building No. 55, Tilaknagar, Chembur, Mumbai at C.S.No. 102 At post - Teh.- Panhala, Dist. Kolapur- 416 201, Maharshtra)

After examining the proposal it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant should also be advised to take up some steps to demonstrate the importance of the nearby protected monument such as in design of the facade to maintain character of the local monument, install of small plaque of 2'x2' regarding the monument etc.

It was decided that separately the Panhala Municipality may be approached to obtain a copy of municipality bye laws if available.

Case NO.2

(Mr. Mago, Property No. E-7, Nizamuddin West, New Delhi-49)

In the light of the observations made at the beginning of this meeting and after examining the proposal and relevant documents, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of ground floor + 12 mtrs (15 mtrs in all, including Mumty, Water Storage Tank etc).

It is also made clear that the applicant may approach the CA again, after the heritage bye laws have been notified and if such bye laws allow, for higher height limits.

Case No. 3

(Mrs. Usha Kampani, Property No. D- 230A, Sarvodaya Enclave, New Delhi -17)

This case was taken up as a deferred case from the 9th meeting held on 26.12.2011. As per the decisions taken in the 9th meeting regarding this case, the clarifications were provided by the applicant. After having gone through the same and having noted that the proposed site of construction is not in the direct line of sight of the protected monument, it was decided to recommend grai NOC in this case. (15 mtr in all, including Mumty, Storage etc) plz check this.

Case No. 4

(BMB Developers, A-6, Geetanjali Enclave, New Delhi)

This case was a deferred case from the 8th meeting of NMA held on 19th December, 2011. The required clarifications namely incorporation of suggestions regarding facade in the design, had been made by the applicant and the same was submitted to the NMA. After having gone through the

clarifications/revised designs, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for ground + 3 floors with height limit of 14.85 mtrs. (excluding Mumty, Water-Storage Tank etc.)

Case No. 5

(Mrs. Poonam Verma, Property No. 103 Jor Bagh, New Delhi)

The proposal was examined by the Members and the accompanying maps, documents etc were gone through. Following the general observations made in this matter, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for total height of construction of 15 mtrs (including Mumty, Water – Storage Tank etc.)

Case No. 6

(Mrs. Veena Dhingra, Delhi)

This case was placed before the NMA Members in the 9th meeting held on 26.12.2011 but was withdrawn due to some discrepancies. These discrepancies having been removed, the matter was been put up again and after examining the proposal and accompanying documents in detail it was decided to recommend grant of NOC with a total construction height limit of 13.63 mtrs (including Mumty, Water-Storage tank etc.)

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

MINUTES OF THE 13th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	3.00 P.M. on 17th January, 2012

List of Members present is attached.

On perusal of the list of cases and taking note of the cases pertaining to Delhi, Members reiterated the observations made in the meeting held on 16th January, 2012 regarding height restriction. Thereafter, having examined individual case the following decisions were arrived at:-

Case No.1

(Shri R.V. Subramanian, New T.S. No. 126/4 block 27, Ward-A, D No. 6 (old T.S No. 79 block -4, Ward-5) D. No. 7B, Nandikoil Street, Tiruchirapali,Tamilnadu)

The application was examined in detail and it was noted that the proposed construction site is located in the buffer zone of three different protected monuments. It was seen that there were no details of existing buildings nearby, in the vicinity of the proposed construction which was felt necessary to be protected. It is also observed that availability of any municipal bye laws needed to be checked and if in existence those should be made available. These clarifications/additional information may be made available for after examination of the case.

Case No. 2

(Procurator/Treasurer, St. Joseph's College at Tiruchirapalli & T.S. no. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31Pt., 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43Pt., 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52 7 53,, Tamilnadu)

After examining the application in detail along with accompanying documents it was noted that having visuals of the monument were not available, which was felt necessary. Applicant may be requested to provide the same. There was

some discrepancy also noted regarding the distance of one of the plots (plot No. 50) which as per CA's report is mentioned at 45.9 mtrs and this needed to be clarified. Members also felt it appropriate that heritage impact assessment may be prepared for this project. Also, municipal bye laws if framed may be made available. On receipt of the above clarifications/additional information the matter would be further examined.

Case No. 3

(M/s Talib Dixit Shaikh Risbud Associates, at Plot Bearing C.S. No. 429 & 3/429 situate a G.D. Ambekar Marg, Parel, Mumbai-400 013)

On examining the application it was observed that the proposed construction is located in the vicinity of a historically very important monument namely Monolithic Bas Relief Depicting Shiva. Even though this is a highly urbanized area of Mumbai, considering that the proposed project is a major one, it would be appropriate to have a Heritage Impact Assessment. Also CA, Mumbai may ascertain if there are any bye laws or master plan for this area which may have some guidelines regarding such constructions.

Case No. 4

(Shri Devang Verma, Director, Omkar Realtors & Developers Pvt. Ltd., Plot Bearing C.S. no. 1/431 & 432 of Parel, Mumbai)

On detailed perusal of the application it was noted by the Members that the proposed construction is for a laudable project namely rehabilitation of Slum Clusters. However, it is again located under the vicinity of the same monument as in case No.3 above and keeping in mind that this would be a major project, it would appropriate that Heritage Impact Assessment may conducted to enable a more holistic assessment of the proposed application. Also CA, Mumbai may ascertain if there are any bye laws or master plan for this area which may have some guidelines regarding such constructions.

Case No. 5

(Shri Shushant Behl, property No. B-18, East of Kailash, New Delhi -110065)

The application was examined in detail and after consideration of the same and taking note of the observations made in this regard, it was decided to recommend a grant of NOC for a total construction of ground+12 mtrs (i.e. a total height 15 mtrs in all, including Mumty, Water Storage Tank etc.)

Case No. 6

(Shri Rajiv Malhotra, Property No. D-130, Panchsheel Enclave, New Delhi - 110017)

The application was examined in detail and after consideration of the same and taking note of the observations made in this regard, it was decided to **recommend** a grant of NOC for a total construction of ground+12 mtrs (i.e. a total height 15 mtrs in all, including Mumty, Water Storage Tank etc.)

Case No. 7

(Shri Joginder Singh Dang, Property No. D-129, Panchsheel Enclave, New Delhi - 110017)

The application was examined in detail and after consideration of the same and taking note of the observations made in this regard, it was decided to **recommend** a grant of NOC for a total construction of ground+12 mtrs (i.e. a total height 15 mtrs in all, including Mumty, Water Storage Tank etc.)

Case No. 8

(Shri Vijay Mangla, Property No. C-50, Soami Nagar, New Delhi)

The application was examined in detail and after consideration of the same and taking note of the observations made in this regard, it was decided to **recommend** a grant of NOC for a total construction of ground+12 mtrs (i.e. a total height 15 mtrs in all, including Mumty, Water Storage Tank etc.)

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

MINUTES OF THE 14th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 3.00 P.M. on 23rd January, 2012

List of Members present is attached.

The below mentioned cases were taken up for consideration in this meeting and aft deliberation the following decisions were arrived at:-

Case No. 1

(O.P. Jindal Global University, Sonepat, Haryana)

The NOC application was examined in detail along with the relevant documents, propc design etc after going through these, the Members had following observations to make:-

(a) The proposed construction is located near, a "Kos Minar" which has l described as a "milestone" which had been erected along the old imp route at regular intervals, in early 18th century. In isolation a "Kos M in itself may not appear very important but taken together, they are part larger historical landscape.

(b) Keeping that in mind it may be relevant to find out if there are othe Minars in the vicinity (i.e. at the supposed intervals that they had erected) and what was their alignment with reference to this of Kos Min this can be ascertained, it would indicate the alignment of the old in route.

(c) From a perusal of the designs as submitted, it was seen that the pr construction would block the view of the Kos Minar from within the can this institution. One block has already been constructed but for the block for which the application has been made, it could be considere align it so that an open line of sight towards the monument is availab designing the layout accordingly may be considered.

(d) Members noted that the proposal is from an educational institutior would only be appropriate that such institution take proactive an measures in heritage promotion.

On receipt of the above clarifications, the matter would be considered again.

Case No. 2

(Ms. S. Rajyashree & B. Ravikumar, A1, Ananthi Apartment, New No.1, Old No. 11, Sundareswarar Street, Mylapore, Chennai-4)

The proposal was considered and it was noted that it is an application for construction on ground floor + first floor with a total height of 26 feet. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

Case No. 3

(Mrs. P. Meenakshi, 7, Ambu Nagar, Pookkara Vilar Road, Thanjavur, Tamil Nadu)

The proposal was examined in detail. After going through the attached documents etc., it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

It was also observed that additional details could have been provided and CA may be requested to ensure that in future.

Case No. 4

(Mrs. M. Lakshmi, 14-5, Abrirami Nagar, Kannagapattu, Thirupporur, Kanchipuram District, Tamil Nadu)

The proposal was examined in detail. After going through the attached documents etc., it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

Case No. 5

(M/s Nikitasha Realtors Pvt. Ltd., 4th Floor, Mathias Plaza, 18th June Road, Panaji, Goa)

The proposal was examined and relevant documents as well as design gone through. Members noted that the proposed design of the construction reflected the local architectural patterns and designs. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

Case No. 6

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

After examining the application and accompanying documents, Members noted that around the proposed construction site are existing buildings which reflect the traditional architecture of that area. It would have been more appropriate if reconstruction was proposed rather than new construction in this case. Certain discrepancies regarding the distance was noticed and it was felt that re-verification of the distance with relation to the existing protected limit/boundary of the monument be provided. Details of nearby buildings in the vicinity may also be provided. On receipt of these clarifications the case would be taken up again.

Case No.7

(Shri Dhanraj Singh, D-73, 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.8

(Ms. Radhika Khanna, A-55, Hauz Khas, New Delhi)

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

Case No. 9

(Smt. Iqbal Rajinder Kaur, Master Sumeet Singh and Ms. Jasleena, C-34, Hauz Khas, Ne Delhi)

The proposal was examined and it was noted that the application is for construction of st ground floor+ 2 floors with total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, wat storage tank etc.). It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

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

MINUTES OF THE 15th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 24th January, 2012

List of Members present is attached.

Item No.1

The draft heritage bye laws for Shershah Gate and Khairul Manzil Mosque which had been prepared by INTACH and forwarded by CA were discussed. Members appreciated the exercise undertaken by Prof. AGK Menon in preparing the draft heritage bye laws especially in the context of the limited time available in the light of the hearing of Delhi High Court in this matter. The various provisions in the draft bye laws were discussed in depth. While appreciating that time constraint was a factor in the preparing of the bye laws, Members observed that they have some suggestions/comments to make which would be given within a day or two. Members also felt that a visit to the monument/site would facilitate their understanding of how the heritage bye laws may be finalized. On receipt of suggestions from Members and after the proposed site visit the matter would be finalized.

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

Case No. 1

(Smt. Sheela, Shri Anup Wahal and Smt. Madhu Sikri, C-113, East of Kailash, New Delhi-110065)

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 greate height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they ar available.

Case No.2

(Datavision Pvt. Ltd., 204, Pragati House, New Delhi)

On perusal of the application it was observed that the property is located at 74.97 mtrs from the monument within the prohibited area. This case is only for renovation and not any construction. After examining the designs and other details submitted with the application for renovation, it was decided to **recommend** grant of permission to undertake renovation of the property as proposed without any additions to the proposed structure.

Case No.3

(Shri Subhash Verma, 204, New Rajinder Nagar, New Delhi-110060)

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.

LIST OF MEMBERS ATTENDED THE 15th MEETING OF THE NATIONAL

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

MINUTES OF THE 16th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 3.00 P.M. on 30th January, 2012

List of Members present is attached.

The list of the cases for the day was taken up for consideration. After discussions on the deliberations, the following decisions were arrived at in respect of the cases.

Case NO. 1

(City Montessori School, Lucknow)

Member Secretary gave a background of the case. Briefly, the applicant had been allotted land by Lucknow Development Authority (LDA) in 1987 for the purpose of construction of school building. After receiving the possession of the land in 1987, the applicant started construction soon thereafter. Subsequently after the notification of 1992 whereby limits of prohibited and regulated area were notified, the S.A., Lucknow in 2004 issued a show cause notice to the applicant on the ground that NOC had not been taken by them as required by the 1992 notification. This was followed by a demolition order issued by ASI. The applicant moved the Allahabad High Court in the matter where when the issue came up for consideration in 2009, the High Court directed ASI to consider the application of CMS. However, this could be done and subsequent to the 2010 Amendment ASI has informed the applicant and the court that NMA is the relevant authority to decide on the matter. The High Court has accordingly, directed that the matter may be considered by NMA.

In this context it was noted that the applicant had started construction soon after allotment of the land in 1987 i.e. well before the issue of the 1992 notification. The ASI also issued show cause notice only in 2004, well after 1992 and only after the buildings had been completed by CMS, Lucknow. After consideration of all aspects as well as the fact that the construction had started well before 1992, it was decided to regularize the construction of the building by CMS, Lucknow. However, no further addition to the building should be undertaken by the applicant and the applicant may undertake certain steps like appropriate changes in the facade to be in harmony with and reflect the local architecture of the monument and install a 3'X3' plaque highlighting the importance of the monument in question.

Case No.2

(Shri Qamruddin and Nasruddin, R/o Village Birdpur No.1, Tola-Piprahwa, Thana-Kapilvastu, Dist.-Siddarth Nagar, U.P.)

It was noted that this is a proposed construction in a predominantly rural area which has typical constructions of mud wall and thatch roofs. It was also noted that no photographs of the monument/site are available which was felt necessary to allow better understating of the matter. This may accordingly be provided and the matter would be taken up thereafter.

Case NO.3

(Shri Omprakash, R/o No. 06, Block B-1,2 Shankar Niwas, Thana Road, Hisar)

This was a deferred case from the meeting on 19.12.2011. After going through the additional information furnished (mainly photographs) it was felt that there is still insufficient clarity, particularly in terms of the existing area of the monument and the distance from the proposed construction. It was also felt that this was an important monument and a proper understanding of the monument and its surrounding may be necessary to examine the case properly. It was therefore decided that SA, Chandigarh Circle may be requested to make a brief presentation before the NMA on suitable date. The case would be considered thereafter.

Due to paucity of time remaining cases could not be taken up and were attend to the meeting tomorrow i.e. 31.01.2012.

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

MINUTES OF THE 17th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 31st January, 2012

List of Members present is attached.

The following NOC applications were taken up for consideration by the Authority:-

Case No.1

(Albina Real Estates Ltd., P.O.A. holder of National Textiles Corp/ Ltd., Ahmedabad)

The first case that was taken up is Albina Real Estates Ltd., Ahmedabad for which the applicant had been called for a presentation.

A detailed presentation was made by the applicants highlighting various aspects of their project including details of the monuments, proposed design and details of the construction, measures for environmental and pollution control, measures for promoting heritage etc. After the presentation the matter was discussed in detail in the presence of representatives of the applicant and the following suggestions were made by the Members:-

(a) The proposed commercial blocks face the monument and it would be appropriate if the facade designs is reflective of the local architecture of the monument.

(b) It may be considered to provide suitable viewing areas/ platforms which would afford views of the monument as well as the city areas.

(c) The present design of the residential block do not allow for line of vision towards the monuments. Some changes in the layout may be considered so that visual link with the monument could be brought in.

(d) Keeping in view the large nature of the proposed project, it would be appropriate to have a heritage impact assessment done (Guidelines for the same would also be provided by NMA to the applicant).

After receipt of the above clarifications/information the matter would be taken up again.

Thereafter the pending cases from 30.01.2012 meeting as well as those listed for today i.e. 31.01.2012 were taken for consideration.

Case No.2

(Smt. Anjeleena Kumar Gupta, R/o C-2/5, 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.3

(Shri H.S. Bedi, R/o N-97, 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 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 S.L. Watwani, B-2/145, 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.5

(Mr. Santosh M.V., Panthayil House, Chittanjoor, P.O. Kunnamkulam, Thrissur, Kerala)

After examining the application and attached documents, it was observed that the information furnished was incomplete and google map, photographs of the protected site and distance were needed. This may be provided where after the case would be taken up again.

Case No.6

(Dedicated Freight Corridor Corporation India Ltd. under Ministry of Railways, Kanpur)

After examining the proposal Members felt that while this is an important infrastructure development project certain clarifications were necessary to examine the same properly. Details of the monument, clarifications on the distance (whether 40 mtrs or 140 mtrs) and a section drawing from the monument to the proposed railway track an elevated embankment may be provided to enable a better understanding of the project.

Case No.7

(Shri Tajinder Pal Singh Gill, C-56, East of Kailash, New Delhi-110065)

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

(Shri Vishvavir Arya, S-288, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi-110048)

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

(Ashwani Kumar Macker, D-105, Panchsheel Enclave, New Delhi-110017)

The application was examined along with accompanying documents and it was noted that the proposed construction is for total height of 13.16 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

Case No.10

(Shri Ramesh Aggarwal, A-202, Shivalik, 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.11

(Dr. Baldev Raj, 60, Krishna Square I, Amritsar, Punjab)

The application was examined in detail and it was noted that pertains to proposed construction in the regulated area of Summer Palace protected monument in Amritsar. While examining the attached documents, particularly the photographs of surrounding areas of the proposed construction site, it was noted that most of the buildings in the surrounding area are of ground +2 storey. After considering all aspects, it was decided, in this context of existing buildings in the vicinity, to **recommend** grant of NOC for construction of ground + 2 floors (with maximum height of 12 mtrs). The applicant may also consider brick furnish to the building and may install a 2'X2' plaque height allotted the importance of the monument in question.

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

MINUTES OF THE 18th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 6th February, 2012

List of Members present is attached.

Before taking up the list of cases for the day, Member Secretary made a presentation on the following matters:-

(a) Status of disposal of cases by NMA till date. It was noted that about 18% cases have been considered so far and the pace of disposal needs to be expedited. In this context, it was felt that it would be useful to have meetings of the NMA at those places from where large numbers of cases have come such as Gujarat, Maharashtra, Punjab, Tamil Nadu etc.

(b) Formalization of internal guidelines for issue of NOC for Delhi and Gujarat, particularly in respect of height restrictions. Members would go through the draft circulated which may be finalized in the next few days.

(c) It was noted that MCD has made it mandatory for construction of stilt for all new constructions/reconstructions in Delhi. This point was noted with reference to the height restrictions that are being stipulated while recommending cases of Delhi. In this context, the application of one Mrs Poonam Verma, 103 Jor Bagh, New Delhi was also noted where the applicant has requested for grant of an additional 2.5 mtrs height for construction of mumty, parapet etc.

(d) Member Secretary also informed about the decision /orders passed by Delhi High Court today (06.02.2012) regarding the heritage bye laws for SherShah Gate. He informed that the High Court has set 21st February, 2012 as the final date for approval of the heritage bye laws for this monument.

Thereafter the cases listed for the day were taken up and the following decision arrived at.

Case No. 1

(Mrs. Poonam Verma, Property No. 103, Jor Bagh, New Delhi)

The request for additional 2.5 mtrs for mumty and parapet was noted by the Memt Decision on the same has been deferred.

Case No.2

(Mrs. Meena Sachhar and Others, D-17, Nizamuddin (West), New Delhi)

While examining this application and the accompanying documents Members noted was not clear whether the distance from the monument as recorded in the applicat from the boundary of the monument or from the monument itself. This needs clarified and it would also be required to clarify what is the protected limit for monument. This information may be provided along with a copy of notification of this monument for further consideration of the case.

Case No.3

(Shri Avtar nath Sachar, D-18, Nizamuddin West, New Delhi)

This is a similar case as case no.2, and is the adjoining property. Same comments as case no. 2 are applicable here also.

Case No.4

(Maharani Swarupa Kumari, 78, Block, 172, Jor 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.5

(Sh. Pradeep Krishna Nayyar & Sh. Praveen Rattan Nayyar, R/o B-1/76, 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.

view. There

Case No.6

(Sh. Joginer Khanna, R/o E-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.7

(Mohd. Ikram, R/o 74, Khandari Colony, Agra)

The application/accompanying documents were examined and it was observed that the enclosed site map/google map is not very clear and does not show the distance of the construction site from the monument. It was also not clear why there are two different sets of applications (as contained in case no.8 following) for the same construction proposal. There are also some discrepancies in the floor area for each floor. These clarifications may be provided for further construction of the case.

Case NO.8

(Mohd. Haneef, R/o 74, Khandari Colony, Agra)

The same comments as for case No. 7 are applicable in this case.

Case No.9

(Shri R. Rajamanickam, 98, Rock Fort North Street, Trichy, Tamil Nadu)

After perusing the application and documents, it was noted that a few cases of the same monument had been considered earlier. The documents do not clearly indicate the building/site for the proposed reconstruction and sufficient details of the protected site are also not available. It was suggested that SA, Chennai may be requested to have a presentation prepared on the Trichy monuments clarity and send it to NMA for perusal. The matter would be taken up thereafter.

Case No.10

(S.R.K. Srinivasan, 70, Kanthadai Street, Srivilliputhur, District Virudhnagar, Tamil Nadu-626165)

After perusing the case/documents it was decided to **recommend** the case for grant of NOC with the condition that the façade of the proposed new building should be reflective of the vernacular architecture.

50

Case No.11

(Sh. Amit Kumar Rohit Kumar Jayaswal & others, Vibhag-B, Tika No. 11/1
Dandia Bazar, Vadodara (Gujarat)

After examining the application/accompanying documents in details, it wa
recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may however be a
undertaking the new construction to maintain the character of the surrounc
buildings and the lane in which it is situated having features such as wooden
colour etc.

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

MINUTES OF THE 19th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 7th 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

(Sh. Sikandar Lal Yadav, 93, 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. 2

(Sh. Digambar Sen Sawhney, C-1/4, 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. 3

(Sh. Anwar Ahmad Khan, C-69, East Nizamuddin, 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. Kanwal Malhotra, A-20, Gulmohar 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

(Smt. Monisha Kapoor Dhawan, 115 A, Jor 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. 6

(M/s BSCPL Infrastructure Ltd, Perambukkam, Chennai)

After examining the application it was noted that this seems to be a major project with a large number of multi storey blocks being proposed for construction. It was felt that Heritage impact assessment study needs to be done for this project before it is examined further. Accordingly, this may be undertake and a report provided to NMA for further examination.

Case No. 7

(Sh. K. Ramachandran, Konnangath House, Thayamkullangara, Cherpu, Thrissur)

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

Case No. 8

(Sh. Balaram Govindass, No. 124, Nethaji Road, Madurai, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application Members observed that this case was also from Trichy, from where a few cases have already been put up. In those, it had been decided that SA, Chennai may be asked to submit a presentation on Trichy monuments and accordingly this case may also be considered after that.

Case No. 9

(Mrs. Mohinder Kaur, #4028, Neeta Street, Arya Samaj Chowk, Bathinda, Punjab)

The application was examined and it was noted that the application is for construction on the first floor of an existing building. After examining the proposal it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with maximum height of 27 feet including mumty parapet etc.

Case No. 10

(Sh. K. Balaji, No. 7, 3rd Cross Street, Anna Nagar West, Vellore-632001 (Tamilnadu)

The application was examined and after seeing the accompanying photographs of the existing building, which is proposed to be demolished and a new construction made thereon, the following observations were made;

(a) The existing building has a certain Architectural character and it may be perhaps more appropriate to try and preserve this structure.

(b) From the building plans it seems that the applicant would be getting far less covered area than what he presently has. It may therefore be perhaps beneficial to him if the existing building is restored and he can then make use of the already available space.

CA, Chennai may therefore have this matter examined from that point of view and send a further report to NMA, after due consultations with the applicant.

54

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

MINUTES OF THE 20th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	3.00 A.M. on 13th 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

(Sh. Mohit Sarobar, G-7,NDSE II, New Delhi-110049).

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. Deepak Sarin, Smt. Rekha Sarin and M/s Aarone Buildtech Pvt. Ltd., C-220, Sarvodaya 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. 3

(Sh. Mohammad Shakil and Smt. Aulia Begum, R/o D-16, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi-110049)

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. Joginder Pal and Sh. Desh Raj and others, H-37, NDSE-I, 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 th there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 5

(Smt. Draupadi Trikha, R/o Plot No. 1/1074, Mehrauli, 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-st etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for t there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case No. 6

(Smt. Manjeet Kaur, M.C. No. 6239/1179, Heera Chowk, Bathinda (Punjab)

The application was examined and it was noted that the application is for construction floor of an existing building. After examining the proposal it was decided to **recommen** NOC with maximum height of 27 feet including mumty parapet etc.

Case No. 7

(Sh. Rohit Kumar M Sanghvi, No. 87/1, Vellal Street, Purasaavakkam, Chennai-600084 (Ta

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

Case No. 8

(Capt. James Braganza, Captain of Ports Department, Government of Goa, Dayanand Road, Panaji, Goa)

After examining the application and attached documents, it was observed that the furnished was incomplete and photographs of the protected site and details of the mon needed. This may be provided where after the case would be taken up again.

Case No. 9

(Kenneth Ansel & Ansel F., Christ Villa, Thangaserry, P.O. Kollan, Kerala)

After going through the application and attached documents, it was observed that the furnished was incomplete and google map, photographs of the protected site and di needed. This may be provided where after the case would be taken up again, perhaps of the proposed NMA meeting in Chennai.

Case No. 10

(Sh. Paras Kumar Mandhyan & others, F-III/2, Indralok Colony, Kanpur Road, Lucknow (U.P)

After examining the application and accompanying documents, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. CA, Lucknow may also be requested to provide more information regarding the protected monument, separately.

Case No. 11

(Smt. Savitra Bansal and Sh. Sandeep Bansal, 9/2 Sarvodaya Nagar Colony, Rana Pratap Marg, Lucknow-226001 (U.P)

After going through the application and accompanying documents members felt necessary to ask the applicant to clarify the height limit which is 7.50 mtrs is correct as site inspection report of ASI mentions a different height. Members also noted the site inspection report accompanying this case was quite comprehensive and well written. This could serve as a model for how site inspection reports may be prepared. This may be provided where after the case would be considered again.

Case No. 12

(Sh. Sunil Laxmanrao Gandevikar, CS No. 126, Vibhag-B, Tika No. 12/4, Dandia Bazar, Vadodara (Gujarat)

After examining the application and attached documents, it was decided that the case may be **deferred** for the time being on the possibility of bye laws being framed for this area quickly. Based on this, the case would be taken up again.

Case No. 13

(Smt. Nirmala Sinha, 133/2, Mauza Ganj Pargana Shivpur, Sarnath, Varanasi)

After examining the application and attached documents, it was observed that the information furnished was incomplete and google map, photographs of the protected site were needed.