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

MINUTES OF THE 41st MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 21st May, 2012

The following issues were listed for the discussions today:-

(a) DMRC project of Central Secrtariat – Kashmiri Gate Line.
(b) NBCC project on re-development of east Kidwai Nagar.
(c) Presentation/discussions on height limit for institutional buildings in Delhi.
(d) NOC applications cases.

2. Detailed presentation was made by the team of DMRC officers on the Central Secrtariat-Kashmiri Gate Metro Line, which was first discussed in the 5th meeting, held on 12th December, 2011 of NMA. DMRC highlighted various follow up action taken by them based on the decisions in that meeting, including preparation of a structural Impact Assessment Report. They mentioned that in pursuance of NMA advise, they had tried to get the Impact Assessment done by IIT Delhi or IIT Roorkee but both institutions expressed their inability to do so. It was clarified that the present report had been done by reputed agencies and all relevant aspects had been taken into account. The DMRC officials further mentioned that an early decision was requested as considerable financial implications were involved in the project not getting clearance. NMA members stated that while there was no major issues in so far as the Structural Impact Assessment Report was concerned, other issues were equally relevant such as constructions within 100 mtrs (which is totally prohibited), possibility of finding archealogical remains near the protected monuments in question, Heritage Impact Assessment etc.

3. After detailed discussions, the following decisions were taking:-

(a) A small group of officers would be set up immediately having a representative each from NMA, ASI and DMRC which could go into each segment of the proposed project in detail, particularly those involving the 100 mtrs limit, and suggest specific actions.

(b) Heritage Impact Assessement would be undertaken by DMRC and this could be done through INTACH (it was mentioned that INTACH has recently done HIA for Northern Railways and the same was found to be a very satisfactory report).

(c) Assessement of archaeological remains can be started immediately through the process of trial trenching, which should be done under the supervision of ASI.

4. Thereafter, meeting was held with NBCC officials on their proposed project of re-development of East Kidwai Nagar. This is a project of Ministry of Urban Development, being executed through NBCC, for fresh construction of government residential houses, along with a small commercial complex, at East Kidwai Nagar by demolishing the existing Central Governement housing colony. The proposal envisages keeping the 100 mtrs radius around the protected monument free from any constructions and thereafter, constructing several blocks of residential quarters ranging in high from 30 mtrs to 45 mtrs. A detailed presentation of the proposal was made including the design and other aspects. Following the presentation and detailed discussions, it was explained to the NBCC team that as per NMA's internal guidelines for constructions in the regulated area, a maximum height of 15mtrs was being permitted, which included mumty, parapet, water-storage etc it was suggested to NBCC that they could re-consider the project by restricting the height limit to 15 mtrs up to the regulated area an explore ways of achieving the same covered area by horizontal expansion. This aspect would be examined by NBCC and they would get back to NMA on the same.

5. Subsequant to above discussions, consideration of other items was deferred till the next date, due to paucity of time.

151

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

MINUTES OF THE 42nd MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11.00 A.M. on 22nd May, 2012

The cases which had been listed for the 41st meeting on 21.05.2012 and which have been deferred, were taken up :

DEFERRED CASES

Case no. 1

(KG Marg Car Parking, New Delhi)

The report received from SA, Delhi Circle alongwith the report of CBRI had been circulated to the Members. However, this was not received in time to enable a proper perusal and accordingly it was decided to take up the case after Members had a chance to study same in detail.

Case no. 2 & Case no. 3

(Shri V.K.Dhawan, New Delhi & Smt. Urmila Devi, 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 Sandeep Bansal, Lucknow)

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

Case no. 5

(Shri Pharmaha Khomsaran, Lucknow)

After examining the proposal, Members observed that it relates to two important archeological sites at Ora Jhar and Penahia Jhar and as such any construction activity around the area should be carefully considered. It was decided that Heritage Impact Assessment would be appropriate in this case which the applicant could get done through INTACH. Thereafter, the matter would be examined.

Case no. 6

(M/s Valsa M. V., Kerala)

After examining the proposal and the clarification given, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to have Façade design as per accompanying photographs (photo No. 1, Building No. 14, copy of photos enclosed).

Case no. 7

(Smt. Nirmala Sinha, Varanasi)

This was considered on the lines of fresh cases of Varanasi dealt with later.

FRESH CASES

Case no. 1

(Shri Shrenik Kantilal Shah, Gujarat)

After examining the proposal and observing that it is a low rise housing project, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. ASI may also do a surface archaeology examination and report if any antiquities are found.

Case no. 2

(Shri Pradip Pravinchandra Vaghela, Diu)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to adopt colour scheme for façade in harmony with the protected monument.

Case no. 3 -(Dr. Saim Pech, Varanasi)

Case no. 4 -(Sh. Suryabali Pandey and Smt. Shashikala Pandey, Varanasi)

Case no. 5 - (Smt. Indra Singh W/o Sh. B.P.Singh, Varanasi)

Case no. 6 -(Smt. Madhvi Devi W/o Shri Kaushal Kumar, Varanasi)

Case no. 7- (Sh. Pankaj Kumar and Sh. Rabins Kumar, Varanasi)

Case no. 8 -(Smt. Suryamani Devi w/o Shri Ram Pravesh Kumar, Varanasi)

All these cases as well as deferred case No. 7 above are from Sarnath, Varanasi. Members observed that Sarnath is an important archaeological site and it was informed that a detailed study has been conducted of Sarnath (as mentioned by WTM). It was felt that it would be appropriate to examine these cases with reference to that study. Accordingly all these cases would be taken up in the next meeting of NMA.

Case No. 9

(Smt. Jyoti Pandey w/o Shri Ganesh Dutt Pandey, Lucknow)

After examining the proposal, it was felt that further information about the monument/protected site is necessary, especially as the area presently does not seem to have much construction. Accordingly, ASI (SA, Lucknow) may be requested to send additional information on this site so that a better examination of the case would be possible.

Case No. 10

(Smt. Gyansari Devi w/o Sh. Laxman Nishad, Lucknow)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to adopt facade design in harmony with the protected monument.

Case No. 11

(Sh. Ahmadul Bari, Lucknow)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for ground + one storey only, keeping in view the existing buildings in the vicinity. The applicant may also see if some elements of the local architecture could be incorporated in the design.

Case No. 12

(Shri Arun Dwivedi, Lucknow)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to adopt façade design in harmony with the protected monument.

Case No. 13

(Shri Aniruddhacharya, Agra)

After examining the case and the accompanying documents, it was felt that the property being located at the river front, the drawing needed to be re-designed, keeping in view the protected monument in question. The applicant may be advised accordingly, and it could be re-designed with assistance of INTACH

Case No. 14

(Dr. Reghunathan and Dr. Sujatha Reghunathan, Kerala)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to adopt façade design in harmony with the protected monument.

Case No. 15

(Smt. Lakshmi Devi, Arthuna, Rajasthan)

It was observed that several cases from this area have been received. The area is of rural Rajasthan and there is an opportunity to prepare some design guidelines for such an area. It was decided to get some design guidelines prepared through IGRMS Bhopal, with assistance from SPA Bhopal.

Case No. 16

(Executive Engineer , PWD, New Delhi)

After perusing the application and accompanying documents it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for this case. The CA may also be advised to see that their guidelines and NMA guidelines are adopted by the applicant.

Case No. 17

(Delhi Jal Board/Chief Engineer (Water) Project, New Delhi)

After examining the proposal and observing that it is a Public Utility project. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. ASI should also do a surface archaeology examination, trenching work and report if any antiquities are found.

Case No. 18

(Sh. Mohammad Zahoor and Smt. Kamar Jehan Begum, 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. 19

(Sh Moti Lal Bahri, 70, 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. 20

(Shri Tejasvi Bhargava and others, 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. Sanjeev Batra, 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. Sheela Gehlot, 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

(Smt. Sunjit Sahel, 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. 24

(Smt. Sheela Gehlot, 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

(Smt. Sarla Sharma, Smt. Shakuntala Sharma, 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. 26

(Shri Ramchander Gupta, 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. 27

(Shri Deepak Mehra, 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.28

(Shri Brij Bhushan, 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. 29

(Sh. Manish Newar, New Delhi)

After examining the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 7.2 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc).

Case No. 30

(Sh. Upinder Kapoor, 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. 31

(Ford Foundation, Lodhi Estate, New Delhi)

After examining the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 7.45 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc).

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

MINUTES OF THE 43rd MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11.00 A.M. on 04th June, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration:-

DEFERRED CASES

Case no. 1

(Sh. Bhagwanbhai Manoharbhai Patel, Gujarat)

The clarification sent by SA, Baroda Circle was perused. After re-examining the case in the light of the clarification, members felt that more detailed information about Patan would be helpful since this is an important ancient histrorical city. Accordingly, SA Baroda Circle, may be requested to make a detailed presentation to NMA regarding Patan. A view as the present case would be taken thereafter.

Case no. 2

(Sh. Tharun Dath, Kerala)

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

Case no. 3

(Dedicated Freight Corridor India Ltd., Agra)

The clarifications provided were perused by the members. While appreciating the need for such infrastructure development project, it was felt that sensitivity to heritage should also be an important factor particularly for Government/Government Agencies. As such, this corporation (the applicant) should make efforts to find re-alignment of railway track, so, that it could avoid the regulated zone of the protected monument altogether. At the same time, efforts should also be made to ensure appropriate drainage around the protected monument (Budia Ka Taal), which must have been a water body.

FRESH CASES

Case no. 1

(The Executive Engineer (P.W.) (East) Division, Nashik, Maharashtra)

After examining the proposal and noting that this is an application for providing required visitor amenities, including some repair and renovation within prohibited area, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for the proposed constructions and repair/renovation in prohibited area.

L in regulated area

Case no. 2

(Divisional Engineer, Telecom, Nashik, Maharashtra)

After examining the applications, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed repair and alteration of the optical fiber cable subject to the condition that the work would be restricted only to repairs and no new trenches would be dug. Noting the presence of BSNL tower in front of the monument, it was suggested that BSNL may examine re-location of this tower.

Case no. 3

(Deputy Chief (Civil), MOIL Ltd. Nagpur, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application and noting that it falls in the prohibited area, it was decided that NOC cannot be granted in this case. The applicant should examine possibility of re-alignment of the road.

Case no. 4

(Sh. Machindra Bhausahed Dhotre, Ahmadnagar, Maharashtra)

After examining the application, it was noted that the work is reported to have already been completed. In the circumstances, it was decided that the reasons for undertaking the work without NOC may be furnished before further consideration of the matter.

Case no. 5

(Sh. Jigar Jagrutbhai Mehta & Others, Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

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

Case no. 6

(Director General, Civil Defence and Home Guards, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application and noting that the proposed construction falls in an area which has a spread of archaeology and heritage, it was decided that the applicant may inform as to how the proposed new construction would enhance the overall value of the protected monument and also what steps were envisaged to safeguard any archaeological findings that may be located in the area.

Case no. 7

(Gulben Farmji Palia & others, Shahpore, Surat, Gujarat)

After perusal of the applicant, it was noted that the application is not complete has the accompanying photographs do not show surrounding buildings or buildings in the vicinity. The google map may also indicate these details. It would also be useful if the NMA consultant could prepare a brief report on the histrorical significance and growth of Surat city.

Case no. 8

(Sh. Kiranbhai D Sheth, Managing Director, Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

The proposal was examined and after considerations the matter, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC that for the area falling in the regulated zone for which there would be height limit of 15 mtrs, inclusive of mumty, parapet, water tank and etc.

Case no. 9

(Sh. Nasirbhai Ahmedbhai Rasulbhai Sheikh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to keep the façade design as much in conformity with the neighbouring building as feasible.

Case no. 10

(Sh. Bhikaji chimanlal Shah, PoA Holder, Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case, but with height restrictions of 15 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water tank, and etc.

Case no. 11

(Sh. Sheel Kumar Bassi, U-20, Green Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. Akhil Kumar Jain & Smt. Nirmala kochar, R-11, Green Park, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that there is discrepancy in height as per design and as mentioned in the application. Applicant may rectify this discrepancy for the matter to be considered further.s

Case no. 13

(Sh. Ajit Singh, V-27, Green Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. Deepak Singla, Sh. Rupak Singla & others, V-13, Green Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Sh. Ashok Sharma & Smt. Anita Sharma, F-13, Green Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(M/s. All India Heart Foundation, A-1/132, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi-29)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Smt. Kiran Perti & Smt. Shashi Sehgal & others, F-18, Green Park, New Delhi-16)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Smt. Sushila Gupta, B-2/43, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi-49)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 19

(Smt. Indu Rathore, E-60, NDSE-I, New Delhi-49)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Smt. Narinder R.P. Singh, Plot No. 82, Uday Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Smt. Rekha Jain, Smt. Manju Chopra, A-2/18, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Sh. D.K. Sharma, 12/15, Sarvapriya vihar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Sh. P.P. Talwar, and Smt. Asha Arora, B-7/98, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 24

(Sh. Jagat Chaudhary and Smt. Anita Chaudhary, C-48, South Extn.-1, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.)- after the 100mtr limit only. 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

(Smt. Santosh chaudhary, C-2/26, Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 26

(M/s Prestige infracon (P) Ltd., Mori Gate, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 27

(Sh. Jasbir Singh, U-30, Green Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.

43rd minutes remaining

Case no. 28

(The Durga Devi Committee, Aihole, Karnataka)

The proposal was examined. It was decided to request INTACH to examine if the proposed repair work could be modified to make it more harmonious and authentic to the original form.

Case no. 29

(Smt. Haseena Syed w/o Sh. Syed Abdul Rehman Barmawar, Bhatkal, Dist. Uttara Kannada, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that it is not very clear if the repair work has already been completed and this may be clarified with details. If it has not been taken up, it may be permitted with the advise that it should be done in the existing style and material.

Case no. 30

(Smt. Sharamma w/o sh. Shivsharnappa Mudda, Gulbarga, Karnataka)

After the perusal of the application, it was decided to call for details as to how construction was undertaken without seeking NOC earlier. It was observed from the accompanying documents that a wedding Hall has been constructed behind and details of the same may be obtained that is whether it is in regulated area, whether permission had been obtained etc.

Case no. 31

(Smt. Jayshree w/o Sh. Ashok Sawlehwar, Gulbarga, Karnataka)

On perusal of this application, it was observed by members that several case from Gulbarga Fort area have been received and it appears that there are indications of changing sky line and streetscape. It was felt that, in view of this, it may be appropriate to get some design guidelines prepared for this area (Ms. Geetanjanli Rai of INTACH may be consulted for this pupose).

Case no. 32 & 33

(Sh. Govindareddi Hanumappa Yamanur, Soudatti, Belgaum)
(Sh. Husensab Rajesab Nabikhan, Hooli, Tq. Saudatti, Belgaum, Karnataka)

On perusal of both these cases, it was noted that these are for proposed repairs two buildings in the prohibited area. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC for repairs which may be done using the Stone and cement base mortar with roof to be completed in material and design is close as possible to the original.

Case no. 34

(Development Officer, Gram Panchayat, Siddapura, Uttara Kannada)

After perusal of the applications, it was decided to recommend of grant of NOC for the proposed repairs to the roof and building without changing the original style and materials.

Case no. 35

(Sh. Mohiuddin s/o Sayed Abdul Khadar Sab, Gulbarga, Karnataka)

After the perusal of the applications, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for the proposed roof repair, it should be done in the same design and material as original.

Case no. 36

(Sh. Vijay Kumar s/o Sangshetty Patil, Bidar)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that several details have not been funished such as proposed height, number of storyes, floor area etc. All these details may be funished to examine the case further.

Case no. 37

(Sh. Vinod Lal s/o Madanlal Tiwari & Others, Gulbarga)

On perusal of the application, it was noted that no drawing/designs etc have been provided which should be given. Some details of the surrounding streetscape may also be provided.

Case no. 38

(Sh. Bimlendra Pratap, 4 Balmiki Marg, Lucknow)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that this is fairly big project and it would be appropriate to get Heritage Impact Assessment undertaken before the matter is considered further.

Case no. 39

(Sh. Love Kumar Arora, 551 Ka/CC, Bilawa, Alambagh, Lucknow (U.P))

The application was perused along with accompanying of documents etc, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to have some elements of the local architecture in the elevation and design of the façade.

Case no. 40

(Sh. Ram Autar Agarwal, 34-A, Chandralok, Aliganj, Lucknow (U.P))

On perusal of the application, it was noted that construction has already taken place and reasons for not obtaining clearance earlier do not seen to have been mentioned, this should be obtained. Moreover, this seems to be a big project and Heritage Impact Assessment may be undertaken for the same.

Case no. 41

(Sh. Suneel Gomber Through Ahimardan Patalpuri, Hanuman, Sewa Trust (Reg.))

The application was perused and it was decided to obtain the following additional information/clarification:

a) Complete layout plan of proposed project.

b) Prohibited area of protected monument and whether any sort of construction is proposed or has taken place in this area.

c) A copy of High Court orders mentioned in the report.

Case no. 42

(Smt. Savithri Antharjanam & Jithesh Dutt, Mozikunnath Mana, Mele Pattambi. P.O.Pattambi, Palakkad, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to adopt vernacular style in this construction.

1 69

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

MINUTES OF THE 44th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11.00 A.M. on 5th June, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration :-

Case no. 1

(Mr. D.Mallikarjuna Rao)

After examining the proposal it was observed that this is a fairly big project and it would be appropriate to get Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed project.

Case no. 2

Divisional Engineer (Highways)

After perusal to the application it was noted that the proposed project falls within prohibited area of the protected monument and consequently NOC cannot be granted in this case.

Case no. 3

(Shri Parshuram Doddamani, Goa)

After examining the proposal it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to undertake the construction in vernacular style.

Case no. 4

Shri Swapnil M Naik, Director (Tourism) (Parking and Interpretation Centre)

The application was perused and it was noted that this is a proposal for providing visitor amenities/interpretation centre. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 5

Shri Swapnil M Naik, Director (Tourism) (Pilgrimage Centre)

After perusal of the application and noting that it relates to provision of visitor amenities, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 6 - (Dr. Saim Pech, Varanasi)

Case no. 7 - (Shri Suryabali Pandey and Smt. Shashi Kala Pandey, Varanasi)

Case no. 8 - (Smt. Indira Singh W/o Sh. B.P.Singh, Varanasi)

Case no. 9- (Smt.Madhvi Devi W/o Sh. Kaushal Kumar, Varanasi)

Case no. 10 - (Shri Pankaj Kumar and Sh. Rabins Kumar, Varanasi)

Case no. 11 - (Smt. Suryamani Devi W/o Sh.Rampravesh Kumar, Varanasi)

These cases pertain to Varanasi. Members of NMA are scheduled to visit Varanasi this week and it was decided to take up all these cases thereafter.

Case no. 12

(Smt. Roshni Gupta and others, D-6/14 RP 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 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

(Shri D.S.Sahni, A-4 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. 14

(Smt. Sheela Gahlot, E-4 Hauz Khas Market, 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. Sheela Gahlot, E-3 Hauz Khas Market, 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

(Shri Badrul Hasan and other E-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 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

(M/s Sangam Overseas Pvt Ltd, 9, K.G.Marg, New Delhi)

After examining the proposal, it was felt that the existing building represents a certain architectural design and it would appropriate, if this original design is incorporated in the proposed new project. The applicant may be advised to re-submit the proposal with this modification.

Case no. 18

(Shri Ramchander Gupta, 5048-B, Roshanara Road,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. 19

(Reserve Bank of India, Colony August Kranti Marg, New Delhi)

This project is a major project and it would be appropriate for Heritage Impact Assessment to be done. The applicant may approach INTACH for this purpose.

Case no. 20

(Smt. Gulu Adwani and Smt. Indira Adwani, B-24, Mayfair Garden, 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. 21

(Smt. Sunita Pawar, 362-Shah Pur Jat Vilage, 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 Vijay Israni and others, F-49, 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. 23

(Shri Ravi Sood, U-5a, 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. 24

(MCD Executive Engineer Project, Under Bhism Pitamah Flyover, 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

(M/s Harbans Lal Malhotra and Sons Pvt. Ltd., 14-Hailey Road, New Delhi)

This case was not taken up as it had been withdrawn for some modifications by the applicant.

Case no. 26

(S2 Property Pvt. Ltd., N-2, 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. 27

(Radhey Shyam Tiwani and Smt. Veena Tiwani, C-20, Shivalik, 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. 28

(Shri Devashish Ghosh and Smt. Nilanjan Ghosh, D-16/D, 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. 29

(Shri Om Prakash Aggrawal and others, C-12, CC Colony, 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. 30

(Shri Dhanraj Singh, D-28, 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. 31

(Shri Kulbhushan Uppal, 18-Uday 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. 32

(Shri Jaswant Singh Kanwar, B-75 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. 33

(Shri M.L. Mehta, G-41, 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. 34

(M/s Sabh Infrastructure Ltd., C-65, East of Kailash, 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. 35

(M/s Uppal Housing Pvt. Ltd., S-253, 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. 36

(Shr M.S Chawla, A-65A, Nizamudding 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. 37

(Shri Darshan Kumar Jain and Smt. Trishla Jain, 98-Jain Colony,Delhi-7)

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

(Smt. Sheela Malkani, F-1/7, 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. 39

(Smt. Rama Chopra, S-194, 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. 40

(Smt. Rupali Uppal, N-65, 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. 41

(Shri Rajinder Pal Singh and others, H-65, 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 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. 42

(Shri Shyam Sunder Khimani, C-9, Shivalik, New Delhi)

After Perusal of the case, it was noted that the property is located at exactly 100 mtrs and it was decided that ASI, Delhi Circle may be requested to re-verify the distance.

Case no. 43

Executive Engineer (Wroks), MCD, Delhi

After examination of the proposal, it was seen that this is for construction of protective boundary wall of park adjoining the protected monument and located at Zero mtr distance. Being in the prohibited area any construction can only be taken up by ASI. Therefore, the matter may be referred to ASI and the applicant informed accordingly.

179

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

MINUTES OF THE 45th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 11th June, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration :-

Deferred Cases

Case no. 1

(Sh. Kennath Ansel, Kerala)

After perusal of the clarification submitted by the applicant, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 2

(Sh. C.K. Davidson, Kerala)

After perusing the clarifications submitted and noting that this pertained to a burial cave site, it was decided that while grant of NOC may be recommended, ASI may be requested to first conduct an archaeology survey to assess the extent of archaeological spread of this site.

Case no. 3

(ICRIER, 16 and 17 Pushp Vihar Institutional Area, Delhi)

In this case the applicant has submitted a representation requsting for grant of more height (up to 28 meters as in the application) rather than the 15 mtrs that was recommended. It was noted that this case of an institutional building which is also located in institutional area. In Delhi, if a few case of institutional building have been permitted height up to 21 mtrs and after due consideration, it was decided to agree for increase in height limit up to 21 mtrs in this case, being an insititutional building located in an institutional area.

Fresh cases

Case no. 1

(Sh. P.R. Khanna, No.70, sunder Nagar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Col. Daman Seigell and Smt. Geeta Seigell, C-21, Nizamuddin West, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Satya Pal, J-1, Green Park (Main), New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height up to ~~13.67~~ 13.26 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 4

(M/s. Tara Palace Hotel through Director Sh. Sushil Kumar Goyal, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Lalit Kumar Bassi, Sh. Balbir Kumar Bassi, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Arvind Sethi, Sarvapriya vihar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Sh. Kishan Kumar Gupta, B-6, C.C. Colony, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. Vijay Kumar Jain, B-31, C.C. Colony, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. R.N. Gupta & Sh. Mohit Gupta, B-57, C.C. Colony, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. Kewal Kohli, B-81, C.C. Colony, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Sh. Arun Sehgal, Sh. Subhash Aggarwal, Sh. Raj Kumar Gupta, C-4, C.C. colony , New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(M/s. Pratik construction Pvt. Ltd, Panchsheel Vihar, New Delhi, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(M/s. Pink city Aprartments Pvt. Ltd. Jor Bagh, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Smt. Sushma, C-4, Shivalik, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. Anshul Bajaj, B-7, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Delhi Radhasoami Satsang Association, Soami Nagar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. Bhupinder Chaturvedi, Director, Grotech, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Sh. Yuvraj M Desai, Hunagund, District, Bagalkot)

After perusal of the application and noting that it pertains to Aihole, it was felt appropriate that a presentation could be made regarding this monument/site (by Ms. Shikha Jain/Geetanjali and ASI).

Case no. 19

(Sh. Manohar Hanumantappa, Bammanahall, Taluk, Haveri, Halekote)

After perusal of the application and noting that the inspection report is not favourable, it was decided not to **recommend** grant of NOC.

Case no. 20

(Sh. Dattatrya H. Hedge, Tirupati Nivas, Hangal, Haveri,)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advise to use vernacular style in construction.

Case no. 21

(Sh. Shivayougi shivappa chikkajjanavar, Taluk, Haveri)

On perusal of the application an accompanying documents, it appears that the area is earmarked for some sort of planned development. This being a relatively construction free area, it was felt necessary to ascertain relevant facts regarding proposed development if any in this area.

Case no. 22

(Sh. Vishweshwarayya S. Hiremath, Shastri chawl, Dharwad)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advise to use vernacular style in construction.

Case no. 23

(Sh. Namchandrappa. B. Devakki, Chavadi Oni, Amargol, Hubli, Dharwad)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that the construction site is located practically at the limit of 100 mtrs and moreover, the construction already seems to have taken place. Reasons for the applicant not having applied for NOC have not been mentioned and the same should be obtained. Moreover, it needs to be examined whether some interim guildline could be quickly framed for this area (perhaps by Sh. Satya Prakash/INTACH).

Case no. 24

(Sh. Ramjik Patel, Renuka Nivas, Dharwad)

On perusal the application, it was noted that although this is not a big enough construction for HIA to be conducted, nevertheless, a quick Impact Assessment may be done seeing that it is measure commercial construction in a relatively small area (School of Archaelogy, Goa could be requested for this).

Case no. 25

(Sh. Pradeep Madanlal Tiwari, Fort Road, Asif Gunj, Gulbarga)

On perusal the application, it was noted that although this is not a big enough construction for HIA to be conducted, nevertheless, a quick Impact Assessment may be done seeing that it is major commercial construction in a relatively small area (School of Archaelogy, Goa could be requested for this).

Case no. 26

(Sh. Illiyas S/o Kazha Mainudhin, Muktampura, Gulbarga)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground floor construction with total area of 676 sq. feet and the construction may have sloping roof and otla in the front.

Case no. 27

(Dr. Anil Kumar S/o sh. Pandurang Rao Sapare, Pansal Taleem, Bidar, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advise to follow the vernacular architectutre and material and try to incorporate some elements of the protected monument.

Case no. 28

(Sh. Ali Adil Noor Muhammed Sheik, Bizapur, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of ground floor only.

Case no. 29

(Smt. Shankuntala W/o Dayanand Naik, Uttar Kannada, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for construction of ground floor only. The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and vernacular design.

Case no. 30

(Sh. Subhashahappa s/o Basappa Pujar, Galaganath Tal, Karnataka)

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

Case no. 31

(Sh. Premlal Madanlal Tiwari, Gulbarga, Karnataka)

On perusal the application, it was noted that although this is not a big enough construction for HIA to be conducted, nevertheless, a quick Impact Assessment may be done seeing that it is measure commercial construction in a relatively small area (School of Archaelogy, Goa could be requested for this).

The remaining cases listed for the day could not be taken up due to paucity of time and would be taken up in the next meeting.

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

MINUTES OF THE 46th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 12th June, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration :-

Case no. 1

(Smt. Y.Vimalamma, A.P)

Case no. 3

(Smt. J.N. Malathi, A.P)

Both these applications are from Penukonda, Andhara Pradesh which appeared to be important from archaeological point of view having a large fort with many protected structures. It would be appropriate if bye-laws are quickly made for this area and cases could be considered thereafter. Accordingly these two cases were deferred.

Case no. 2

(E.O., Sri Kumararama Bhineswara Swamy Temple, A.P)

After going through the application, it was observed by Members that this site indicates a possibility of archaeological remains in the surrounding area. As such, ASI may be requested to conduct a quick archaeology survey to access possibility of any archaeological remains. As far as the proposal itself was concerned, it was agreed that such amenities were required to be provided and decision would be taken after the above mentioned report.

Case no. 4

(Sh. P.Chinna Tirupalliaiah, A.P)

After perusing the application it was noted that the construction has already taken place, though it is a small building. After due consideration it was decided to regularise the matter by recommending grant of NOC but the applicant should be cautioned not to undertake any further construction in future without necessary NOC.

Case no. 5

(Secretary, YAT&C Department, Govt. of A.P) .

The proposal was examined and it is seen that it is a proposal for providing amenities for tourists and visitors. It was accordingly decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for the purpose of repair of existing structure and for the new structures as proposed.

Case no. 6

(Sh. Bhagubhai Thakor Bhai Patel, Gujarat)

The proposal was examined in detail and it was observed that a complete picture of protected monuments in Daman was necessary to consider NOC cases. The matter was accordingly deferred.

Case no. 7

(Sh. Krishna Dinesh Kahar, Gujarat)

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

Case no. 8

(Haji Mohammadbhai Haji Musaji Gheewala, Gujarat)

On perusal of the application it was seen that two small plots are being merged and a new construction is proposed. After seeing layout of existing constructions in the area it was felt that the proposed new construction, for which grant of NOC is recommended, might change this streetscape and accordingly the applicant should be advised to provide suitable design in the facade to maintain the existing frontage and also have a sloping roof and retain the eaves design as in the existing building.

Case no. 9

(Sh. Shirishbhai Shantilal Shah, Gujarat)

On perusal of the application and noting that it pertains to Champaner-Pavagadh, World Heritage Site for which site management plan is under preparation, it was decided to defer the matter for the time being.

Case no. 10

(Sh. Rajesh Kumar Pravin Chandra Shah, Gujarat).

On perusal of the application it was seen that the construction has already been undertaken by the applicant. After due consideration it was decided to recommend grant of NOC to regularize the construction with caution to the applicant t not to undertake any work without obtaining prior NOC.

Case no. 11

(Sh. Amirmiya Rahimbhai Sheikh and others, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application Members felt that the existing structure which is proposed to be demolished was representative of a particular architectural style and design and efforts could be made to try to preserve and restore the building. For this purpose CA, Gujarat should consult INTACH to explore this possibility.

Case no. 12

(Sh. Gulam Kadar Kalubhai Amod Wala, Gujarat)

Perusal of the case, it was decided to defer the matter for present.

Case no. 13

(Sh. Abbas Abdul Karim and others, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for the proposed construction with total height of 11.26 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank).

Case no. 14

(Sh. Rajinder Singh, C-31, Shivalik, ND)

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. Kamal Aneja, C-2/34, SDA, ND)

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. Om Prakash Gulaya, 20, Begumpur Village, ND)

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. Rajinder Kumar and Smt. Parwati, C-4J, NDSE-I, ND)

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

(Smt. Aruna Shaiva, G-27, Nizamuddin West, ND)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for the proposed construction with total height of 15 mtr (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank).

Case no.19

(Sh. Naresh Kumar Goela and Sh. Arun Kumar Goela, A-2/3, Safdarjung Enclave, ND)

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

(Golf Club Ltd., ND)

The application was examined in detail. It was noted that it pertains to construction for providing sport facilities at Delhi Golf Club. In order to understand the proposal in a proper prospective, it was decided that the applicant may arrange for an onsite visit for the Members whereafter, the matter would be considered.

Case no.21

(Smt. Surender Kumari and Sr. Charanjit Chanana, L-1/11, 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

(Sh. Sudershasn Kumar Malik and Smt. Veera Malik, K-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.

Case no.23

(Sh. M.S. Khurana Smt. Harjit Adi Homji, F-12, 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.24

(Sh. Sunil Sehgal and Sh. Govind Sehgal and Meenu Sehgel, E-48, 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.25

(Sh. Anil Kumar Mangla and Sh. Dinesh Kumar Mangla, A-68, 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.26

(Dang Con. Pvt. Ltd.,C-16, Shivalik, 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.27

(Smt. Sheela Gehlot, S-372, 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.

The remaining cases could not be considered due to paucity of time and would be taken up in the next meeting.

193

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

Delhi
2012

MINUTES OF THE 47th MEETING OF NMA

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

Lel

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 18th June, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration:-

Case no. 1

(Sh. Bhaskaran Nair, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to follow vernacular style of construction.

Case no. 2

(Mrs. Premalatha Sreedharan, Poonkattu House, Chowannur. P.O. Thrissure, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. However, ASI may be requested to do survey of the area to assess presence of any archaeology.

Case no. 3

(Mr. Antony E.O. Edakkalathoor House, Eyyal. P.O, Thrissure, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. However, ASI may be requested to do survey of the area to assess presence of any archaeology.

Case no. 4

(Smt. P. Rajeshwary, Puliath House, Pallimanna, Kumbalangad, Kanjirakode, Thrissure, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to follow vernacular style of construction.

Case no. 5

(Sh. Vijay Oswal, 70, Veer Nagar, Jain Colony, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. Chawla Construction Company, M/s Sabh Infrastructure Ltd, 180, Kailash Hills, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(M/s Luxury Consumer Products (India) Pvt. Ltd, M/s Tegh Exports Pvt. Ltd. Through their Common and Authorized Director Sh.I Naveen Singh Khanna, E-20, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Madan Mohan Nangia, C-17, East of Kailash, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(M/s Gold Line Exim Pvt. Ltd./ 27, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. Bimla Devi, X-54, Green Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Sh. Ranbir Singh Chopra, Sh. Guneet Singh Chopra and Sh. Inderjeet Singh Chopra, B-9, Nizamuddin West, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Dr. Kailash Chander Gupta & Smt. Gita Gupta, D-16, Geetanjali Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. Gyanendra Verma & Sh. Raj Verma, A-61, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi)

After perusal the case which is for repairs to existing building, it was noted that the details of proposed repair have not been indicated, which should be done by showing it in the building plan along with photos of the damage portions of the house requiring repair.

Case no. 14

(Sh. Madan Lal Taneja, A-93, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(All India Institute of Medical Sciences through its Executive Engineer Sh. M. Rastogi)

This application pertains to construction of a new ward at AIIMS. It was noted that this is a very large construction for adding additional hospital facility and for a better understanding of project a presentation and site visit may be done initially. The project would also require Heritage Impact Assessment.

Case no. 16

(Sh. Bharat Bholanath Solanki, Dwarka, Gujarat)

After examining the application, it was decided to accept the recommendations of CA Gujarat for imposition of fine for violation. Thereafter, the case may be sent back to NMA for consideration of NOC.

Case no. 17

(Authorized Signatory of Khemani Distillerules Pvt. Ltd., Ranganwada, Daman)

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

Case no. 18

(Sh. Nileshbhai Narotamdas Bathiya & others, Dwarka, Gujarat)

After examining the application, it was decided to accept the recommendations of CA Gujarat for imposition of fine for violation. Thereafter, the case may be sent back to NMA for consideration of NOC.

Case no. 19

(Sh. Arifkhan Basirkhan Pathan & others, Bharuch, Gujarat)

After examining the application, it was decided to accept the recommendations of CA Gujarat for imposition of fine for violation. Thereafter, the case may be sent back to NMA for consideration of NOC.

Case no. 20

(M/s Ganesh Caplease Service Pvt. Ltd., Jogeshwari, Mumbai)

The perusal was examined in detail and after going through the application and attached documents etc, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of ground + 4 storeys.

Case no. 21

(Sh. Kamlesh S Limbachiya, Director, M/s Keshavi Developers Pvt. Ltd., Jogeshwari, Mumbai)

The perusal was examined in detail and after going through the application and attached documents etc, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of ground + 4 storeys, for the construction falling within the ~~referred~~ regulated area.

basement,

Case no. 22

(Sh. Vinod Suresh Nayak, Director, Hotel Bahawa Pvt. Ltd. Pune,)

After the perusal of the application and going through accompanying documents etc, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with stipulation that height of the building would be restricted to 15 mtrs excluding mumty and lift room (which may be constructed as per enclosed drawing).

198

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

MINUTES OF THE 48th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11.00 A.M. on 19th June, 2012

The following cases were taken up from the list carried over from the 47th meeting :-

Case no. 23

(Mr. Rajaram R Masane of M/s Samcon Builders, Mumbai)

It was decided that this case may be taken up once the proposed Heritage study at Parel is complete.

Case no. 24

(Shri Naresh Pratap Singh, Agra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to incorporate elements of the local monument in elevation and design.

Case no. 25

(Smt. Suryakali w/o Late Dayaram Pandey, Luknow)

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

Case no. 26

(Shri Narayan Rao Khamitkar, Belgaum)

On perusal of the application it was noted that the applicant has already constructed addition of first floor. A notice should be issued as to how the construction was taken up without obtaining NOC.

Case no. 27

(Shri Laxman Prasad S/o Shankar Prashad, Belgaum)

On perusal of the application it was noted that the applicant has already constructed addition of first floor. A notice should be issued as to how the construction was taken up without obtaining NOC.

Case no. 28

(Shri Abdul Shakur Miyajan Pala, Belgaum)

This case was deferred.

Case no. 29

(Shri Abdul Kareem, Belgaum)

On perusal of the application it was noted that the applicant has already constructed addition of first floor. A notice should be issued as to how the construction was taken up without obtaining NOC.

Case no. 30

(Chairman & Deputy Commissioner, Sub Regional Science Center, Belgaum)

This case was deferred.

Case no. 31

(The Principal, Government Independent Pre-University College, Belgaum)

On perusal of the application it was observed that this is a new construction which would fall in the prohibited area and this is not permissible.

Case no. 32

(The Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Belgaum)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The construction should be done in vernacular style.

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

MINUTES OF THE 51st MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11.00 A.M. on 27th June, 2012

A discussion was held with Ms. Paromita De Sarkar and Ms. Yaaminey, who are proposed to be engaged to prepare draft guidelines for Heritage Impact Assessment. Record of discussions of this meeting is being issued separately. Thereafter, cases listed for the day were taken up.

Deferred Cases

Case no. 1

(KG Marg Parking, New Delhi)

The case was examined with reference to the clarifications sent by ASI including the High Court order and report of CBRI. After careful examination of the proposal, it was felt that it could not be considered without a Heritage Impact Assessment. The applicant should accordingly get the HIA done preferably by INTACH (or by CBRI or IIT Delhi).

Case no. 2

(M/s BSCPL Infrasturcture Ltd., Tamilnadu)

In this case the applicant had been asked to get HIA done and this was accordingly under taken and the HIA report had been circulated amongst Members. After examination of the proposal with reference to the HIA, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant would also abide with the recommendations made in the HIA study while executing the project.

Case no. 3

(Qamruddin and Nasruddin, Lucknow)

After perusal of the clarifications given by the applicant, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

201

Fresh cases

Case no. 1

(Mr. Raman Namboothiri P.M., Kadavallur, P.O. Kunnamkulam, Thrissur)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof.

Case no. 2

(Mr. Hari N.R., Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof.

Case no. 3

(Sh. K. Moideen Kutty Hajl, Kerala)

On perusal of the application, it was noted that this is a proposed construction in **prohibited area** which can not be taken up and therefore, NOC cannot be recommended.

Case no. 4

(K.C. Abraham, Thrissur, Kerala)

The application was examined and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 5

(Sh. Sadashivappa Veerappa holalad, Hangal, Haveri, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant should incorporate sloping roof and Otla and also ensure proper ventilation and lighting internally.

Case no. 6

(Smt. Vanita V. Ravadigar, Hangal, Haveri, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant should incorporate sloping roof and Otla and also ensure proper ventilation and lighting internally.

Case no. 7

(Smt. Ayesha Bhanu. Iqbal Ahmed Naik, Hangal, Haveri, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant should incorporate sloping roof and Otla and also ensure proper ventilation and lighting internally.

Case no. 8

(Mohd. Abdul Shakur Miyajan Pala, TMC, Hangal, Haveri, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant should incorporate sloping roof and Otla and also ensure proper ventilation and lighting internally.

Case no. 9

(Chairman & Deputy Commissioner, Sub Regional Science Centre, Bidar, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the proposed project is located in a relatively construction free area. No drawings/designs/plans of the proposed construction have been sent which are required for a proper examination. It would also be appropriate if the applicant gets HIA conducted for the project.

Case no. 10

(M/s Sabh Infrastructure Ltd., through its Director Sh. Gautam Sabharwal, 59, Uday Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. Deepti Gupta, S-58, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. Sandeep Sethi, 84, Uday Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. Vikram Anand and Smt. Rani Anand, 116, Uday Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Smt. Kamlesh Suri & Smt. Neelu Khandpur, B-32, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. Latika Dutt Abbot, C-11, Geetanjali Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(M/s Laxmi Buildtech Pvt. Ltd., 36, Jor Bagh, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(M/s Heritage and Art Creations, Hindu Rao House, Hindu Rao Hospital Complex, New Delhi)

After examination of the proposal, it was decided that the applicant may be requested to make a presentation, wherein, details of the proposed work of restoration, conservation etc may be explained as also indicating what was the original structure.

Case no. 18

(Sh. Abhijit Basu & Sh. Surajit Basu, 229, Jor Bagh, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 19

(Smt. Promila Wadhwa, C-60, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Sh. Rajinder Kumar Batra and Sh. Kharati Lal Batra, C-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, 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

(Smt. Sita Devi, A-19, South Extn. Part-I, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 14.83 mts including mumty, parapet and etc.

Case no. 22

(Sh. Neeraj Kumar & Smt. Yashodha Devi, A-15, South Extn. Part-I, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Smt Saroj Kappor, C-1/19, Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 24

(Smt. Santosh Rani Jain, Darya Ganj, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Smt. Indira Wadera, 10/13, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 26

(M/s Waghishwari Estates (P) Ltd., 24, Jor Bagh, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.65 mts including mumty, parapet and etc.

Case no. 27

(Smt. Poonam Goswami, 95, Uday Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 28

(Sh. Dil Mohan Rai Bahl, E-62, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 14.94 mts including mumty, parapet and etc.

Case no. 29

(Sh. Naresh Kumar and Raj Kumar, 105, Uday park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 30

(Sh. Masroor Elahi, B-29A, Nizamuddin West, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 31

(Delhi Police through Joint commissioner of Police, ITO, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but with height restrictions of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, machine room etc.) for both block of constructions, that is, Police post and residential quarters.

Case no. 32

(Smt. Vimal Mithal, 109, Anand Lok, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 33

(Major General Surender Kumar Talwar and others, BP-9, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for undertaking the internal repairs in this case which should be carried out strictly as shown in the accompanying drawings. No additions should be made what so ever.

Case no. 34

(Smt Subhalakshmi Khan, 3, Sadhna Enclave, New Delhi)

This case was **deferred** for the next meeting.

Case no. 35

(Sh. H.R. Khan Suhel and Sh. Harjit Singh Sahni, C-46, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 36

(Sh. Rajiv Rastogi and Sh. Vikas Rastogi, D-48, Gulmohar Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Sh. K.B. Mehra, Y-74, Hauz Khas, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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

(Sh. Suresh Dutt and Sh. Bhuvnesh Dutt, 7/13, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 39

(Sh. Tarun Kumar and others, C-7/6, Rana Pratap Bagh, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 40

(Sh. Arun Sehgal and others, B-3/22, Rana Pratap Bagh, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 41

(Sh. Sandeep Gupta, 96, Anand Lok, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA 210
MINISTRY OF CULTURE
NATIONAL MONUMENTS AUTHORITY
24, TILAK MARG, NEW DELHI 110001

MINUTES OF THE 52nd MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	3.30 P.M. on 16th July, 2012

The following cases (Deferred Cases) were taken up for consideration.

Case no. 1

(Shri Akhil Kumar Jain and Smt. Nirmala Kochar, Delhi)

After perusal of the clarifications given by the applicant, in response to the discrepancy relating to height of the building in the application and as per drawing, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for 15 m in all (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

(M/s Total Waterproofing, Goa)

The clarifications given by the applicant were perused, as also the presentation sent. It was noted by the Members, after going through the case in detail, that the CA in his inspection report, has not recommended this type of construction and has rather mentioned that the land use recommended for such an area is farm house. In view of the comments of the CA it was decided that this case could not be recommended for grant of NOC.

Case no. 3

(Sh. Bimlendra Pratap, Lucknow)

After perusal of the clarifications given by the applicant and after noting that this is a somewhat big project (though not qualifying for HIA in terms of likely cost) nevertheless it was felt that a quick Impact Assessment report may be got done by the applicant perhaps through local INTACH.

Case no. 4

(Shri Amarji, Rajasthan)

After perusing the design sent by the applicant in response to earlier clarifications and after re-examining the case, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with ground floor and a total height of 14 feet in all.

Case no. 5 and Case no. 6

(Shri Mohd. Hanif and Shri Mohd. Ikram, Agra)

After perusing the clarifications, in terms of land ownership as well as the design of the building, and noting that the proposal was for construction of one additional floor on an existing building, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicants may be advised to incorporate elements of the local archaeology in their building.

Case no. 7

(Shri A.R. Ravichandran, Tamilnadu)

The clarifications submitted were examined and it was noted that views of ASI have not been received. This being an important World Heritage Site, it was felt that views of ASI are necessary before taking a final decision in the case and accordingly the same may be expedited.

Case no. 8

(Shri K.R. Divakaran, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided that the proposal may be recommended for grant of NOC subject to the conditions that the applicant would incorporate traditional design and use traditional materials in the construction. The applicant would also re-submit the final design incorporating the above suggestions.

Case no. 9

(Shri Satish Sitaram Bansal, Mumbai)

After perusal of the clarifications regarding height of Aga Khan Palace and after going through the application in detail, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case subject to total height of 15 m (including mumty, parapet etc.

A meeting with DMRC was held from 5 pm onwards, which was also attended by SA, Delhi Circle, regarding the developments near Sunehri Masjid at which location it has been reported that elements of an old wall perhaps of Mughal period have been excavated. Record of discussion of this meeting is being issued separately.

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

MINUTES OF THE 53rd MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11.00 A.M. on 17th July, 2012

The cases listed as fresh cases for 16.07.2012 and could not be taken up due to shortage of time, were taken up for consideration today.

Case no. 10

(Smt. Uma Gupta, Lucknow)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with a total height of 12 m including mumty, parapet etc.

Case no. 11

(Mr. V.P. Ali, Kerala)

The case was examined in detail. It was observed that the height of the protected monument is about 7 m and consequently any new construction should not exceed this level. Accordingly, while it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case, the total height should be restricted to 2 storeys and 7 m including mumty etc. The building may also have sloping roof.

Case no. 12

(Mrs. Sumathy P., Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof with verandah/ sit out with columns on the ground floor. The construction may be in conformity with the traditional archaeology.

Case no. 13

(Mrs. Nandini P., Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof with verandah/ sit out with columns on the ground floor. The construction may be in conformity with the traditional archaeology.

Case no. 14

(Mrs. Nandini C., Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to go in for sloping roof.

Case no. 15

(Mrs. Suseela and Mrs. Radha, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for total height of 6.85 m including mumty, parapet etc.

Case no. 16

(Mr. A.A. Porinchu, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof with verandah/ sit out with columns on the ground floor. The construction may be in conformity with the traditional architecture.

Case no. 17

(Mr. Ashraf and others, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but total height should be restricted to 7 m including mumty, parapet etc. The applicant may also be advised to go in for sloping roof and verandah with columns.

Case no. 18

(Mr. C. Rajeev, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but total height should be restricted to 7 m including mumty, parapet etc. The applicant may also be advised to go in for sloping roof and verandah with columns.

Case no. 19

(Shri Joseph Nixon, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.77 m including mumty, parapet etc. During construction the applicant should also be advised not to cross the 100 m limit as the proposed construction is at 101 m.

Case no. 20

(The Sub Judge, Kerala)

The application was examined and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 21

(Mr. Ayoob Khan and others, Kerala)

The case was examined. It was noted that structure of the building has already been constructed. After perusal of the details, it was decided that grant of NOC may be recommended in this case but restricted to total height of 7 m. The remaining portion should be demolished. Additionally, the applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and a verandah on the ground floor.

Case no. 22

(Mrs. Suma Krishnakumar, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but total height of the building should be restricted to 7 m including mumty, parapet etc. It may also be suggested to the applicant to try and retain the "mukham" and also the traditional architecture.

Case no. 23

(Smt. Suseela Menon, Kerala)

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

Case no. 24

(Shri Raj Kumar Bapna, Rajasthan)

After going through the application in detail it was noted that the proposed construction is in an area which has a natural setting, tree and forest cover etc. therefore the proposed design of the building may be re-worked to blend with the natural surroundings, have a "heritage" look. It may also be clarified that the land design fall in protected area reserves forest area.

Case no. 25

(Shri Ajay Kumar and Shri Ajit Kumar, Bihar)

The application was examined in detail. This relates to Kumharar, which is reported to be the ancient palace of Mauryas and was partially excavated. It was felt that the case needs a detailed assessment particularly with reference to effects of digging/ excavation in construction as well as archaeological study alongwith a local ASI.

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

MINUTES OF THE 54th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	3.00 P.M. on 30th July, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Case no. 1

(Delhi Public School through Sh. M. I. Hussain (Principal), Mathura Road, New Delhi)

The proposal relates to consideration of some additional buildings and addition to existing buildings of DPS Mathura Road which is an educational institute. The proposal was examined in detail with reference to design and drawings etc. and after due consideration it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but with the condition that there would be a limitation of height of maximum 15 mtrs including mumty, water tank etc. in respect of each block/ building.

Case no. 2

(Smt. Sheela Gehlot, C-2/13, Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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. Sheela Gehlot, C-1/39, Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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

(Smt. Nita Sharma and Shri Rajendra Sharma, A-2A, Green Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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

(Shri Subhash Chand Gupta and Smt. Sudha Gupta, E-74, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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 Raj Kumar Gupta and others, C-3/4, Rana Pratap Bagh, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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

(Shri Chadrashekhar Pratap Singh and others, Z-20, Hauz Khas Market, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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

(Dr. Dinesh Das through his General Attorney Smt. Krishna Mohanty, 8/1, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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. Geeta Singh and others, A-33, Hauz Khas, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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. Pushpa Kumari and others, Y-34, Hauz Khas Market, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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. Raghbir Kaur, Y-1, Green Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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

(M/s H.S. Investment (P) Ltd., M/s Sawhney Investment (P) Ltd., M/s Baba Properties (P) Ltd., 51, Hanuman Road, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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

(Shri Ajay Khanna and Smt. Diya Vig, B-5/61, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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 Abhinav Singal and Smt. Shruti Singal, X-10, Hauz Khas, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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

(Shri S.L. Goel, D-259, Sarvodaya Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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

(Shri Shashi Anand and others, BP-11, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi)

The case pertains to repair and renovation to the property which is located in the prohibited area. After examining the proposal in detail it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for only repairs and renovation with the following conditions:-

1. There would be no change to the exterior limits of the existing structure. Both vertically and horizontally.

2. There would be no new construction or addition of any new room.

3. Alterations to interiors only are permissible.

4. Repairs to exterior are permissible.

Case no. 17

(Smt. Apjit Kaur, C-10, Nizamuddin West, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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

(Awadh Public Charitable Trust, FC-31, Sheikh Sarai Phase-2, Institutional Area, Press Enclave Road, New Delhi)

After examining the proposal, it was seem that there is some discrepancy in the information namely what is the existing height of the building and what would be the final proposed height after the addition of the two floors. These clarifications may be furnished.

Case no. 19

(Shri Narender Anand, Janpath lane, New Delhi)

After examining the case it was observed that there are several issues in this case and it would be appropriate to call officers from ASI hdqr. to explain the issues involved properly before decision is taken.

Case no. 20

(Shri Inderjeet Singh, N-81, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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.) from road level. 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 a presentation was made by NBCC, on the proposed East Kidwai Nagar redevelopment scheme. This presentation was made following certain observations made by Members when the proposal had first been put up. It was noted that apart from minor changes, the issue of proposed heights of the buildings and greater ground coverage had not been addressed by the applicants. Members felt that those needed to be addressed. Also this being a Government project there was good scope to make this a model development scheme incorporating the concerns of Heritage conservation and mangagement.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA 224
MINISTRY OF CULTURE
NATIONAL MONUMENTS AUTHORITY
24, TILAK MARG, NEW DELHI 110001

MINUTES OF THE 55th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11.00 A.M. on 31st July, 2012

The cases which could not be completed on 30.07.2012 were taken up for consideration (case no. 21-38) as per case list but re-numbered from case no. 1 onwards in the minutes below).

Case no. 1

(Smt. Nirmala Devi, 2116, Neeli Chatri Mandir, Yamuna Bazar, Delhi)

The application pertains to repair and renovation of a temple located in the prohinited area of Salimgarh Fort. The applicant has not provided a clear site plan or details of the site, nature of damage, photos of the damaged portions etc. It was also noted that applicant has stated that the damage was caused due to earthquake, the relevant details may be provided.

Case no. 2

(Shri Salman Haider and others, A-3, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi)

This case pertains to repair and renovation of property located in the prohibited area of Humayun Tomb. After going through the the application in detail it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for undertaking the proposed repairs and renovations subject to the following:-

1. There would be no change to the exterior limits of the existing structure. Both vertically and horizontally.
2. There would be no new construction or addition of any new room.
3. Alterations to interiors only are permissible.
4. No reconstruction of exterior wall is permissible.

5. No construction of RCC floor slab.

Case no. 3

(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan and Shri K.V. Swaminathan, J-21, NDSE-I, Delhi)

This case also pertains to repair and renovation of property located in the prohibited area. However, there were no details of the proposed repairs or renovation or photos of the damaged portions. The applicant may be requested to furnish the same.

Case no. 4

(Smt. Praveena Duggal, N-177, Panchshila Park, New Delhi)

This is also pertains to repair and renovation of property located in prohibited area. After examining the proposal it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed repairs and renovation as per list contained in the application form and subject to the condition that there would be no new construction or addition to the existing structure.

Case no. 5

(Shri Vatsala Kumar, A-I, Khasra no. 487/439/53/1/2, Sarai Kabiruddin, Sheikh Sarai, Mehrauli, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed construction with stipulated height 13.63 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 6

(Bindu Saxena, B-I, Khasra no. 487/439/53/1/2, Sarai Kabiruddin, Sheikh Sarai, Mehrauli, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed construction with stipulated height 13.63 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 7

(Shri Shailendra Swarup, C-I, Khasra no. 487/439/53/1/2, Sarai Kabiruddin, Sheikh Sarai, Mehrauli, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed construction with stipulated height 13.63 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 8

(Thiru B. Solomen Charles, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed construction with total height 11.34 mtrs (including mumty, parapet etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof for balcony and varandah and have an otla/ sitting platform on the ground floor.

Case no. 9

(Thiru H Vasanth Kumar, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed construction with total height 12 mtrs (including mumty, parapet etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof for balcony and varandah and have an otla/ sitting platform on the ground floor.

Case no. 10

(Thiru Anto Selvaraj and Smt. Rosalind Kasthuri, Kanchipuram, Tamilndu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed construction with total height 11.09 mtrs (including mumty, parapet etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof for balcony and varandah and have an otla/ sitting platform on the ground floor.

Case no. 11

(Thiru D. Charles Jeyasingh, Kanchipuram, Tamilndu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed construction with total height 12 mtrs (including mumty, parapet etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof for balcony and varandah and have an otla/ sitting platform on the ground floor.

Case no. 12

(Smt. V. Meera, Kanchipuram, Tamilndu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed construction with total height 11.06 mtrs (including mumty, parapet etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof for balcony and varandah and have an otla/ sitting platform on the ground floor.

Case no. 13

(Thiru G. Sainathan, Smt. V. Meera, Kanchipuram, Tamilndu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed construction with total height 6.36 mtrs (including mumty, parapet etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof for balcony and varandah and have an otla/ sitting platform on the ground floor.

Case no. 14

(Smt. C. Suseela, Kanchipuram, Tamilndu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed construction with total height 7.24 mtrs (including mumty, parapet etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof for balcony and varandah and have an otla/ sitting platform on the ground floor.

Case no. 15

(Smt. J. Kantammal,Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed construction with total height 7.94 mtrs (including mumty, parapet etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof for balcony and varandah and have an otla/ sitting platform on the ground floor.

Case no. 16

(Smt. V. Devikarumari,Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed construction with total height of 7.5mtrs (including mumty, parapet etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof for balcony and varandah and have an otla/ sitting platform on the ground floor.

Case no. 17

(Thiru U. Parthasarathy, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was observed that this pertains to Kanchipuram town for which NMA has suggested certain design guidelines. The case was **recommended** for grant of NOC and the applicant been advised to follow the stipulated design guidelines.

Case no. 18

(Smt. M. Valarmuthi, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed construction with total height of 12 mtrs (including mumty, parapet etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof for balcony and varandah and have an otla/ sitting platform on the ground floor.

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

MINUTES OF THE 56th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	3.00 P.M. on 6th August, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Deferred cases:

Case no. 1

(Sh. Bimlendra Mohan Pratap Mishra, Lucknow)

In this case, the applicant had been advised to get HIA done as the project appeared to be a large one. The applicant has subsequently modified his proposal, reducing the height and the number of units, and requested that the proposal may be decided without insisting on HIA. After persuing the proposal as re-submitted by the applicant and examining the accompanying documents etc, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case as per the revised proposal of the applicant and with a total height of 14.8 mts including mumty, water tank, parapet and etc. The applicant may also be advised to follow local architectural style and material.

Case no. 2

(Shri Om Prakash, Hissar)

After perusal of the clarifications submitted and noting that this was a residential construction, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 3

(M/s. Devansh Realty, Mumbai)

This case pertains to NOC for constructions at Parel in Mumbai. The applicant had been advised to get HIA undertaken report for consideration of the project which was accordingly got done by the applicant. Members desired to have some more time to examine the HIA in detail. Besides this, it was also felt that a consultation process for Mumbai related projects may be appropriate where professionals and experts could be

invited so that decisions making could be facilitated. This consultation may be held sometime in early September in Mumbai.

Case no. 4 & Case no. 5

(M/s P.N. Bhobe & Associate, Mumbai) & (M/s Samcon Builders, Mumbai)

In these two cases, both from Mumbai, the applicant had been advised to get HIA done. The applicant have submitted a representations that their projects are not of very large nature (well below the Rs. 20 crores threshold limit) and their HIA was not required.

Various aspects of the proposal were examined in considerable detail by the members but a decision could not be arrived due to paucity of time. It was accordingly decided to consider these cases in the next meeting.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF CULTURE
NATIONAL MONUMENTS AUTHORITY
24, TILAK MARG, NEW DELHI 110 001

MINUTES OF THE 57th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11.00 A.M. on 07th August, 2012

As per schedule fixed earlier, a meeting and presentation was to take place at Delhi Golf Club, which has applied for NOC for proposed constructions. The case had been considered in the 46th meeting (12th June) and it had been decided to request the applicant to arrange for on-site presentation.

As per discussion, following points to be conveyed to the Golf Club officials:-

1. The texture of the proposed building can be same as the surrounding.
2. Height of the proposed building should be lower unlike what has been asked for.
3. It is advised to add/create Mughal period gardens to the construction site/surroundings.

From all these observations, it is decided to have a meeting on coming week with the Architect of Golf Club to whom members of NMA will describe the required changes in proposed architecture in detail.

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

MINUTES OF THE 58th MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Daman

Date - 11th August, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration:-

Deferred Cases

Case no. 1

(M/s P. N. Bhobe & Associate, Mumbai)

Case no. 2

(M/s Samcon Buildings, Mumbai)

The above two cases had been considered earlier but had been deferred, the applicants having been asked to get HIA undertaken. In response, the applicants have submitted a representation, duly supported by a certificate from the Architects, that the cost of their respective projects is in the range of Rs. 12-13 crores each, which is well below the thresh-hold of Rs. 20 crores for which HIA is required to be undertaken. Both the cases were examined in considerable detail by the Members with specific reference to area of the plots, the FSI available (including incentive FSI) as per guidelines of Maharashtra Government, details of the rehabilitation scheme and incentive component, proposed designs and other related matters. It was agreed that being much less than the thresh-hold limit HIA was not required in these two cases. However, while examining the aspect of total FSI/ built up area that was proposed in relation to the proposed heights of the building, Members felt that there was scope for the applicants to achieve the same level of FSI/built up area with lesser number of floors by increasing ground coverage at each level. Therefore, while Members agreed that both these cases could be considered for recommending grant of NOC especially as HIA was not required, the applicants may rework the design on the above parameters, wherein it should be possible to undertake the project within ground+10 floors/ ground+5 floors respectively.

Case no. 3

(Omkar Realtors, Mumbai)

The applicant had been asked to get HIA undertaken and the same had been prepared by the applicant and copies were circulated to all Members. This case was deferred on the grounds that some similar cases of high rise buildings in Mumbai have been deferred; it is proposed to hold intensive consultations with experts and professionals (especially of Mumbai) to elicit views and suggestions on the type of development that would be appropriate around the protected monuments in Mumbai city, such a consultative process facilitating decision making by the NMA.

In this context of NOC application cases from Mumbai, it has been decided to hold a consultative process through a one day Workshop, which would be held in Mumbai. Experts and professionals from conservation, architecture, heritage background, town planning and related fields as officials from related departments of Maharashtra Government would be invited to this Workshop. Discussions would focus around aspects like heritage management, Municipal building bye-laws, slum rehabilitation guidelines etc. These discussions would be held on the 1st day and on the 2nd day of the meeting, NMA would take up all pending cases related to Mumbai for dicisions.

Fresh cases

Case no. 1

(Smt. Lataben Arvindbhai Kothiwala and others, Bharuch)

After perusal of the application, Members decided to **defer** this case to enable more in depth examination of the same.

Case no. 2

(Shri Ashfaque Iqbal Hansoti, Bharuch)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The height of the building shall be restricted to ground+2 storeys, total height not to exceed 12 meters including parapet, water storage tank etc. The applicant would be advised to maintain the streetscape in his construction and some design guidelines for this purpose would be provided by NMA.

234

Case no. 3

(Shri Ashfaque Iqbal Hansoti, Bharuch)

After perusal of the application, Members decided to **defer** this case to enable more in-depth examination of the same.

Case no. 4

(Shri Samir Shahabuddin Multani, Bharuch)

After perusal of the application it was decid ... case. The height of the building shall be restricted t ... eed 12 meters including mumty, parapet, water stor ... ised to maintain the streetscape in his construction a ... would be provided by NMA.

Cases of Bharuch considered with a general guideline of G+2 storeys, with max. height of 12 mts including mumty, water tank etc. (as discussed in Daman meeting).

Case no. 5

(Smt. Alimunnisabanu Safiyuddin Shaikh, Bharuch)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height as proposed in the application at 10.5 meters. The applicant may be advised to retain the façade of the existing building in the new construction.

Case no. 6

(Smt. Mumtaz Iqbal Guruji, Bharuch)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height as proposed in the application at 10.5 meters. The applicant may be advised to retain the façade of the existing building in the new construction.

Case no. 7

(Smt. Javidhusen Haji Abdulrahim Chakkiwala, Bharuch)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height as proposed in the application at 10.5 meters. The applicant may be advised to retain the façade of the existing building in the new construction.

Case no. 8

(Shri Dattatray Bhalchandra, Bharuch)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. However, the total height of the building shall be restricted to 39 feet in all (12.04 meters including parapet, water storage tank etc.) The applicant may also be advised to maintain the overall streetscape while undertaking construction.

Case no. 9

(Shri Babubhai Ambalal Patwa and others, Bharuch)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The height of the building shall be restricted to ground+2 storeys, total height not to exceed 12 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. The applicant would be advised to maintain the streetscape in his construction and some design guidelines for this purpose would be provided by NMA.

Case no. 10

(Shri Phiroz S. Patel, Vadodara)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The total height of the building should be restricted to Ground+3 storeys with total height 12.50 meter including mumty, parapet etc. The applicant may also follow the design guildelines which will be suggested by NMA.

Case no. 11

(Shri Pravinbhai Babubhai, Vadodara)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for total height of 12.3 meters (including mumty, parapet etc.) The applicant may also be advised to follow the design guidelines to be provided by NMA.

Case no. 12

(Smt. Rekhaben Shankarbhai Kaher, Vadodara)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The total height of the building should be restricted to 12.25 meters including mumty, parapet etc. as per application. The applicant may also follow the design guidelines which will be suggested by NMA.

Case no. 13

(Shri Vinay Narendralal, Diu)

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

Case no. 14

(Shri Mukesh kumar Meghji Solanki, Diu)

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

Case no. 15

(Shri Devendrabhai Bapalal Kadikar and Smt. Kamlaben Bapalal Kadikar, Ahmedabad)

After perusal of the application and noting that it pertains to Ahmedabad for which certain interim guidelines have been adopted by NMA, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 15 meters. The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height if the same is permissible in the heritage bye-laws as and when they are notified.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF CULTURE
NATIONAL MONUMENTS AUTHORITY
24, TILAK MARG, NEW DELHI 110 001

MINUTES OF THE 59th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.00 A.M. on 13th August, 2012

This meeting of NMA was being held to especially discuss the draft template of heritage bye laws.

The draft template of heritage bye laws which had been prepared by a team appointed for this purpose, which earlier been circulated amongst a few professionals and experts (Dr. Narayani Gupta, Sh. Pradip Krishen and Sh. Aman Nath). One round of discussions had also been held with them earlier. The draft template was then discussed section-wise and chapter-wise along with the comments received from the experts and appropriate modifications were made based on the discussions of the Members. While the considerable progress was made in this regard, the entire draft template could not be gone through due to paucity of time and it was decided to fix another date in the near future to exclusively discuss and finalize this template.

A copy of the template as modified in this meeting will be circulated to all the Members separately.

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

MINUTES OF THE 60th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	3.30 P.M. on 28th August, 2012

Before taking up the list of cases a presentation was made to the Members by Ms. Pooja Saxena, Consultant on behalf of NMA on " Rehabilitation proposal for Bhoj Temple"

This work had been assigned to Ms. Saxena subsequent to visit of the Authority to Bhopal in January, 2012 and after discussions with the local people. Several families are staying within the protected area and there is a proposal to rehabilitate them to a different location within regulated area of the monument. Ms. Saxena has conducted a detailed study of the site and a comprehensive documentation of the families who are to be rehabilitated. All Members appreciated the high quality of the work done by the Consultant and their team and took note of the various issues raised in the report. One critical point which needs to be examined is regarding the actual location of each family on the new plot which has been identified for the rehabilitation. The Consultant was requested to discuss this with the local authorities first. It was also agreed that in principle this project may be steered by NMA as a model project combining the elements of detailed site survey, documentation, preparation of Heritage Bye-laws and the rehabilitation package.

Thereafter, some of the cases listed for the day were taken up :-

DEFERRED CASES

Case no. 1

(Sh. Awadh Charitable Trust, Delhi)

Clarification regarding some discrepancy in the height has been called for and the information submitted was perused. After consideration, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of an additional 4th floor, 5th floor and Terrace subject to overall height limitation of 21 mtrs (inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no.2

(Sh. Raj Kumar Bapna, Rajasthan)

The applicant had been requested to re-work the design of the proposed construction and also to clarify whether the land falls in reserve forest area etc. The applicant has clarified that the land does not fall in any forest area and also submitted a revised design. Then same was examined in detail. Members were of the opinion that the project may be considered but the following changes in the design need to be carried out :-

(i) Remove Domes/Chattaries and should avoid imitation of old architecture.
(ii) The building should follow terraced development along the contours of the hill.
(iii) The present structure has a very large mass ; it should not be monolithic and may be broken up into smaller units so that overall it is less obstrusive
(iv) There may be greater use of screens/jaalis
(v) The color and material in the facade can be in harmony with the local architecture, inspired by it, rather than imitated.

The applicant may incorporate the above suggestions so that the matter can be considered for final disposal.

FRESH CASES

Case no. 1 & **Case no. 3**

(Sh. Veena Yadav, Patna) (Sh. Aditya Raj, Kiran Automobiles, Patna)

Both these cases relate to construction near Kumharar, Patna an archaeological site dating to Ashokan period. Before considering any case from this area, Members desired to have a status report on the archaeological potential of this site from ASI. Thereafter, the cases would be taken up for consideration.

Case no.2

(Sh. Jeetendra Nath, Patna)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to keep the character of the local architecture in his proposed construction.

Further cases could not be taken up due to paucity of time.