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

MINUTES OF THE 61st MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11.00 A.M. on 29th August, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Deferred cases

Case no. 1 (Shri Ashfaque Iqbal Hansoti, C.S. No. 4240 (part & 4267, Ward No. 4) Bharuch, Gujarat)

Case no.2 (Smt. Lataben Arvindbhai Kothiwala and others, C.S.No. 5790 to 5798, Ward No. 3, Bharuch, Gujarat)

Both these cases had been listed for the meeting which was held in Daman but consideration had been deferred as Members wanted sometime to go through the details. After examining the case in detail it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in both the two cases further with the stipulation that there would be a restriction of G+3 storeys as followed in other cases of Bharuch. Further, the applicant would be advised to incorporate elements of local architecture and keep the façade and frontage of the building in such a manner so as to maintain the existing streetscape.

Fresh Cases

Case no. 1

(Shri B. B. Naik, Uttar Kannada District, Belguam)

After examining the application it was noted that this pertains to repairs to existing construction within prohibited area. After examining the details, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC only for repair of the building and without any extension to existing limits of the building.

Case no. 2

(Dr. Rehana Begum, Gulbarga Road, Belguam)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to incorporate some elements of the local architecture especially in the façade of the building.

Case no. 3

(Shri Satish Arjun Rao Shinde, Fort Road, Dharwad)

The application was examined and it was noted that the proposal is for addition of Ist floor to the existing ground floor structure. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for the addition of Ist floor to the existing ground floor and the applicant may be advised to retain the existing roof style in the Ist floor also.

Case no. 4

(Shri Sunil Mohan Hongal, Dharwad)

After examining the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed repairs to the existing house which should be carried out in the same style and with the same material as existing. There should be no additions whatsoever.

Case no. 5

(Smt. Mallavva, Hangal, Haveri)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to incorporate some elements of the local architecture especially in the façade of the building.

Case no. 6

(Shri Ningappa Maritimappa Hosalli, Dharwad)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. However, the CA may obtain from the applicant the letter explaining the reasons why NOC was not obtained earlier, as some construction activities has already taken place.

Case no. 7

(Shri Zameer Ahmad, Hangal, Haveri)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to incorporate some elements of the local architecture especially in the façade of the building.

Case no. 8

(Executive Engineer, Minor Irrigations Division, Haliyal, Uttara Kannada)

After perusal of the application and after taking note of the recommendation of the CA who has advised against the proposal, it was decided **not** to grant recommendation in this case.

Case no. 9

(Deputy Commissioner, Siddadevapura, Haveri)

The application was perused and it is noted that this is a proposed construction in a prohibited area. This is not permissible hence the case was **rejected** being in the prohibited area.

Case no. 10

(Assistant Executive Engineer, PWD, Hanagund)

The application was examined and after going through the same it was observed that there is a need to have a detailed plan which should also address the following points:

a) Construction of the pucca concrete road may change the road level and may affect the drainage pattern. This may be examined.

b) A pucca road is likely to result in increase traffic flow. Affects of the same need to be examined.

c) Whether there is any possibility of re-alignment of the road.

Case no. 11

(Shri Jai Kumar Sharma, Gali Baba Ram Dass, Ganja Bagh, Hissar, Haryana)

After perusing the application, Members felt that the proposal is not very clear and some more details are required on the exact nature of the work to enable consideration of the matter.

Case no. 12

(Shri Dharmpal Choudhary, Mohalla Pir Aga, Narnaul, Haryana)

After examination of the application, it was decided that the applicant may be requested to give details of the existing building, the plans for demolition of the same and design for the proposed new construction to enable consideration of the matter.

Case no. 13

(Smt. Vandana Sharma, Thana Road, Hissar, Haryana)

After perusing the application, it was noted that no building plans have been submitted. This should be given alongwith more photographs of the surrounding area of the monument and the construction site.

Case no. 14

(Shri Deepak Aggarwal, Hissar, Haryana)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to incorporate some elements of the local architecture especially in the façade of the building.

Case no. 15

(Smt. Sonia Sharma, Hadwast No. 310, L.C. Road to Sanghol, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant may be advised to incorporate some elements of the local architecture especially in the façade of the building.

The deferred case of Delhi Golf Club was taken up thereafter. Based on the visit of the Members to the Golf Club earlier, the Architect had come with a presentation of the proposal. The matter was discussed in detail and several suggestions were made to the Architect relating to height of the building, development of surrounding area, façade design etc. It was informed to the applicant that while the proposal in itself was acceptable in principle, the modification as suggested may be incorporated by the Architect and shown to the NMA at the earliest for a final decision.

Dr. Sanghamitra Basu Member also brought to the notice of the other Members an issue relating to reported construction activity near Currency Building, Kolkata which is a protected monument. It is not clear whether any construction is proposed and whether it would be within regulated area. It was decided that a reference to ASI Kolkata Circle could be made to ascertain the exact status in this regard.

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

MINUTES OF THE 62nd MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11.30 A.M. on 4th September, 2012

At the outset all Members and Member Secretary, welcomed Prof. Himanshu Prabha Ray who has joined as Chairperson, NMA on 31st August, 2012.

There was a discussion with the team appointed (Ms. Yaaminey Mubayi and Ms. Paromita De Sarkar)for preparation of guidelines for Heritage Impact Assessment. This team had been appointed keeping in view the requirement that has been felt and as is also required, for the preparation of proper guidelines to enable such applicants who have to undertake HIA to follow a uniform set of guidelines and parameters when getting the HIA prepared. The team informed about the progress made so far and suggested that another date may be fixed where they could make a presentation on what has been done alongwith a first draft of the interim guidelines. It was agreed that this presentation may be done during the NMA meeting on 24.9.2012.

2. There was also a brief discussion with representatives of Arthuna Panchayat, Banswara, Rajasthan regarding the next course of action for getting the development plan prepared through consultants for the Shiva and Jain group of temples located in this village. The outline proposal submitted by Ms. Minakshi Jain in this regard was perused and it was decided that NMA may write to State Government of Rajasthan suggesting that preparation of the Development Plan may be got done by the State Government (through the Arthuna Panchayat), by these consultants.

3. Chairperson briefed Members about her meeting with Minister (Culture) held earlier in the day. She mentioned that Minister (Culture) had, inter-alia, emphasized 4 issues that NMA may need to accord some priority to, namely; preparation of a database for all the protected monuments/sites to assist NMA in its functioning; devising means of creating awareness in the public in general about the role and functioning of NMA and the need to involve people in this exercise; undertaking training and capacity building programmes for different officials and stakeholders concerned with NMA and implementation of AMASR Act; and re-examining the issue of appointment of Competent Authorities with a possible shift in the present arrangement from departments of archaeology/culture to that of Urban Development/town and country planning.

Thereafter cases listed for the day were taken up for consideration :-

Case no. 1

(Mr. Ravi Pathak S/o Shri Mohinder Pal, Punjab)

The application was perused and it was noted that it pertains to proposed repair and renovation of a property located in the prohibited area. It was observed that the nature of repairs proposed is not clear and whether there is any re-construction or additional construction. It also needs to be clarified (as observed from the file) whether construction of basement is mandatory as per local building bye-laws. These issues may be clarified.

Case no.2

(Mr. Jatinder Bansal, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for total height of 39ft. 9inchs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to try and follow the traditional form of architecture in the proposed construction.

Case no.3

(Ms. Manju Bala, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for total height of 26 ft. 6inchs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to try and follow the traditional form of architecture in the proposed construction.

Case no.4

(Mr. Rajinder Paul s/o Sh. Girdhri Lal, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for total height of 38 ft. (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to try and follow the traditional form of architecture in the proposed construction.

Case no.5

(Shri Jugal Kishor, Lucknow)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for total height of 13.15 mtr. (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may also be advised to try and incorporate elements of traditional architecture in the proposed construction.

Case no.6

(Wapa Foundation, Tamilnadu)

The application was perused and it was noted that the part construction has already taken place but was stopped after receiving notice from the CA. After examining the documents etc., it was decided that the matter may be regularized and grant of NOC may be recommended subject to the following conditions :

a) Access to the monument/site should not get blocked as a result of the construction and the applicant should make arrangements for such access for people in general.
b) There should be no construction spilling over into the prohibited area.
c) The applicant should not undertake any new development, other than what is contained in the present proposal, in the regulated area, without obtaining prior clearance from NMA.

Case no. 7

(Thiru K.Saravanaprakash, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was noted that it pertains to construction of a hotel. While this in itself is not something that cannot be done, Members felt it would be appropriate that HIA should be got done in this case.

Case no. 8

(Thiru S. Shiva Subramanian, Tamilnadu)

After perusing the application it was observed that this is a big project involving construction of residential housing complex. It was felt that it would be appropriate if the applicant got HIA done in this case.

Case no. 9

(Library officer, District Library,Tamilnadu)

On perusal of the application it was seen that this is a proposal for construction of a new building for District Public Library. It was also noted that construction had already started but was stopped midway after receiving a notice from CA. After perusing the case in detail it was decided that the case may be disposed off by recommending grant of NOC for construction that may be allowed up to the present built up level (i.e., 2 storeys). No additional floors should be constructed beyond that and only finishing work of parapet, water tank etc., may be done.

Case no. 10

(Ms. A. Usha, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.09 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). Further a copy of design guidelines of Kanchipuram may be enclosed with a suggestion to the applicants to try and adopt any one of them.

The cases listed hereafter taken up in the 63rd meeting held on 05.09.2012.

Case no. 11

(Sh. A.K.Santosh, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.95 mtr., (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.), the applicant may also be advised to try and follow the local vernacular architecture.

Case no.12

(Sh. V Devsika Mani, V. Krishnamani and V. Ranganayak, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.15 mtr., (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.), the applicant may also be advised to try and follow the local vernacular architecture.

Case no. 13

(Sh. Muhammad Kutty, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.65 mtr., (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.), the applicant may also be advised to try and follow the local vernacular architecture.

Case no. 14

(Sh. C.V.Kadar, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the proposed construction site is at 105 mtr that is just at the edge of the prohibited limit. In view of this it was felt that only single storey construction may be allowed which should not exceed 5 mtrs in all, (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). Besides this, the applicant may also incorporate sloping roof in the construction.

Case no. 15

(Ms. Syamala, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof for the construction.

Case no. 16

(Sh. K.M.Kumaran, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend NOC in this case with total height of 8.51 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.).

Case no. 17

(Mr. Raphel, Kerala)

After perusing the application it was noted that the proposed construction is for a commercial building which would serve as a outlet for "Consumerfed", an organization of the State Government for retail sales. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). Further, the proposed new construction should be used only for the purpose that has been specified in the case file.

250

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

MINUTES OF THE 63rd MEETING OF NMA

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

The cases listed for 63rd meeting were taken up and the following decisions were taken in respect of these cases:-

Case no. 1

(National Institute of Fashion Technology, Ministry of Textile (Govt. of India) through its Project Engineer Mr. Sanjay Jain, Hauz khas, New Delhi)

The proposal was examined in detail. It relates to additional construction in NIFT (an existing institution of Government of India located at Hauz Khas). Keeping in mind the general guidelines adopted for Delhi and until the framing of heritage bye laws for this area, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for a maximum height of 15 m inclusive mumty, parapet etc. The applicant may apply again for more height when the bye laws are notified for the monument and if so permissible.

Case no. 2

(Shri Ram College of Commerce, Delhi University, Maurice Nagar, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 13.20 m including mumty, parapet etc.

Case no. 3

(Kamla Nehru College, August Kranti Marg, New Delhi)

The proposal for consideration of additional 3rd floor to the existing building at Kamla Nehru College and provision of lift was examined in detail. Keeping in mind the general guidelines pertaining to Delhi it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with height limit of 15mtrs including mumty, parapet etc. The applicant may also install lift within this height limit.

Case no. 4 - (Miranda House, Patel Chest Marg, Delhi)

and

Case no. 5 - (Miranda House, Patel Chest Marg, Delhi)

Both these cases pertains to Miranda House College. It was observed that construction had already taken place when the site was inspected by CA Delhi in December, 2011. The reasons for taking up the work without permission have not been indicated and there are no details as to when the construction work actually started etc. It was decided that the College Authorities may be ask to come for a discussion during the meeting of NMA proposed on 24.09.2012 to obtain clarifications and have discussions on the above.

Case no. 6

(Shri Ramashray Pandey, Campus of Hazrat Nizamuddin Railway Station of Northern Railway, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **defer** the case for the time being as it was felt necessary to have discussions with ASI and Railway Authorities on certain aspects of the project.

Case no. 7

(Shri A.K. Gupta (Chief Engineer, DMRC) Jantar Mantar Road, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and noting that it was a fairly big project, it was decided that the applicant may be asked to get Heritage Impact Assessment conducted for the project.

Case no. 8

(Shri Ranajit Mukherjee and others, D-234, 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. 9

(Shri S. Jethwani, Chief Engineer/PD DMRC, Malviya Nagar Metro Station, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and noting that it was a fairly big project, it was decided that the applicant may be asked to get Heritage Impact Assessment conducted for the project.

Case no. 10

(Shri Guru Dutt Rallan and Shri Guru Baksh Rallan, A-2/172, 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. 11

(Shri Suman Kumar Berry and others, N-42, 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.

Case no. 12

(Shri Rakesh Kumar and M/s S.N. Buildtech Pvt. Ltd., through its Director Sh. Gurinder Singh Narula, C-5/7, 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. 13

(Shri M.P. Sharma, B/73, 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.) 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

(Smt. Sarojini Kapoor, 2/1, 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. 15

(Smt. Manju Biswas and others, B-1/69, 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. 16

(Smt. Shalini Sharma and others, B-1/22, 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. 17

(Smt. Kiran Rathi, 11/13A, 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. 18

(Shri Amit Bansal and Smt. Shikha Bansal through her GPA Sh. Amit Bansal, A-22, Hauz Khas 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. 19

(Shri M.P. Jaipuria, Plot No. 52, Janpath, 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. 20

(Urban Heritage Foundation, DDA through Senior Architect (WZ and D), Anglo Arabic Sr. Sec. School, Ajmeri Gate, Delhi)

After perusing the application it was observed that this is a proposal for undertaking repair and restoration of an existing Auditorium, library building and associated structures in the prohibited area of the protected monument. After perusing the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC only for repair and renovation as per CA's recommendation. The applicant may be advised to engage a conservation architect to assist in the execution of the work.

Case no. 21

(Smt. Sarla Bhatnagar, C-7, Shivalik, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12.90 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case no. 22

(North Delhi Municipal Corporation through Executive Engineer (Projects), City Zone, Parade Ground, Subhash Marg, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **defer** the case as it was felt necessary by the Members to get specific views of ASI in this case before taking any decision.

Case no. 23

(Smt. Promila Rawla and others, C-3/3, 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. 24

(Shri Munish Nagpal, B-1/4, Hauz Khas Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted, 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. 25

(Smt. Babita Tripathi and others, 18, NDSE-I, Co-operative House Building Society Ltd. 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. 26

(Shri Surinder Singh and Smt. Sarabjeet Kaur, A-2/140, 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. 27

(Shri Gurnam Singh and others, 1/4, 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.

Case no. 28

(Smt. Kusum Lekhi, A-15, 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.) 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. 29

(Shri Ashok Kumar Gupta, 7, Jantar Mantar Road, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 3 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case no. 30

(Smt. Rajni Gupta, B-7/35, 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. 31

(Smt. Rekha and others, H-2, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

This proposal relates to construction, repair and renovation work in a residential building located within the prohibited area of the protected monument. It was decided to call CA for more details of the case to consider the case further.

Case no. 32 and case no. 33

(M/s Nahata Traders and Builders (P) Ltd., D-46-B, Khasra No.-86, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

After perusal of both the cases which are linked, it was observed that they appear to have some limitation in the matter, the current status of which is not reflected. This may be clarified so as to facilitate decisions in the matter.

Case no. 34

(CPWD through its Executive Engineer Shri Arunanshu Mallick, Bank of Baroda Building, 16, Parliament Street, New Delhi)

After perusing the application it was noted that this is regarding repair and renovation work in the prohibited area of the protected monument and after examining the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case only for repairs. There should be is no additional construction whatsoever.

Case no. 35

(M/s M.N. Buildcon Pvt. Ltd. through its Director Shri Shailendra Nigam, Plot No. 15, Jaipur Estate, 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.) 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. 36

(Shri Ravinder Kapoor, G-2, 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 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. 37

(Hindustan Steelworks Construction Ltd. through its General Manger, Handloom Complex, Janpath, New Delhi)

The case was examined in detail and noted that it is for construction of lift machine room and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but the construction work (installation of lift) should be done within total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) from road level.

Case no. 38

(Shri Vijay Kumar Gupta, 49, Uday Park, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **defer** the case.

Case no. 39

(Lt. Col Chitranjan Prabhakar, B-2, NDSE-II, 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. 40

(Shri Ravi Gupta, 105, Masjid Moth Village, New Delhi)

After perusal of the case and going through all the records in detail it was noted that this is a proposal for repair and renovation of an old building constructed in haveli style and is located within the prohibited area. It was decided to **recommend** grant of permission to undertake repairs and renovation of the building and it was also felt that it could be useful if the applicant were to engage a conservation architect who could prepare detailed documentation of the damaged areas and provide assistance on what and how the repair work/renovation work may be carried out. It is also clearly stipulated that there should be no additional construction (or reconstruction) or any horizontal or vertical additions.

Case no.41

(Shri Navneet Bhutani and Shri Ramesh Bhutani, B-30, NDSE-II, 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.

Case no. 42

(Shri Mohd. Usman and Smt. Shehnaz Usman, C-28, 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.) 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. 43

(M/s Swati Realcon Private Limited, Z-1/A, Hauz Khas 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.

260

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

MINUTES OF THE 64th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Room, Hotel Ambassador, V.N. Road, Church Gate, Mumbai.
Time & Date	-	11.00 A.M. on 10th September, 2012

A seminar had been scheduled on the first day of the NMA meeting to hold consultations with invited experts and professionals as well as State Govt. officials regarding interim guidelines for Mumbai in the context of several applications that have been received for constructions and have been kept pending. The objective of the consultative seminar was to seek views and opinions from the invitees based on their experience and work that they would have done in Mumbai for similar areas. The meeting lasted throughout the day and record of discussions of the seminar is being issued separately.

261

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

MINUTES OF THE 65th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Room, Hotel Ambassador, V.N. Road, Church Gate, Mumbai.
Time & Date	-	11.00 A.M. on 11th September, 2012

Several cases pertaining to Mumbai city as well as from other parts of Maharashtra under CA Mumbai had been listed for consideration. Prior to taking up the cases, Chairperson and Members had an intensive discussion regarding the proposed interim guidelines and the suggestions that had been put forward by some of the invitees at the consultative seminar.

Therafter discussions were held with invited applicants (who had requested for the same) about their respective project and various issues that were relevant in the framing of their proposals and their designs.

Following the presentations made by the invited applicants, there were further detailed discussions amongst the Chairperson and Members on what could be included in the interim guidelines for the Mumbai city cases particularly on height related aspect. After these detailed discussions and in view of the fact that it was not possible to arrive at an conclusive decisions about the nature of the interim guidelines it was decided to adopt the follow:-

a) For the present, no decision on high rise structures being possible, a general limit of 15 mtrs height may be followed, this height limit being taken from the National Building Code which specifies high rise buildings as those constructions of over 15 mtrs in height.

b) A study may be undertaken on the buildings existing around the Parel monuments and Jogeshwari Caves. This may assist in the formation of some guidelines at least for height aspect.

(c) The above is a purely transitory arrangement and the actual permissible height limits may be decided once either the study undertaken of existing buildings in the vicinity of the monuments concerned could give certain or as may be contained in the heritage bye laws for these monuments.

(d) A plan of action will be taken in hand to prepare and notify the heritage bye laws, atleast for the Parel monument and Jogeshwari Caves, within a period of 6 months.

(e) Pending the above, applicants may be advised that their cases can be granted NOC with the height stipulation of 15 mtrs subject to modification in terms of what may be prescribed in the heritage bye laws or in the study relating to height of the building.

The following cases are accordingly disposed off:-

i) Omkar Realtors & Developers Pvt. Ltd.
ii) Samcon Builders
iii) M/s P.N. Bhobe and Associates
iv) Shri R.D. Shenoy, M/s Ramnani and Associates
v) Shri S.G. Dalvi
vi) M/s Talib Dixit Shaikh Risbud Associates
vii) Sri Parag Mungle
viii) Sahana Properties

A brief discussion was also held with Executive Engineer, PWD, Kolhapur who had came to Mumbai to meet with the Authority regarding a few pending cases of Panhala municipality. These cases will be taken up shortly.

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

MINUTES OF THE 66th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Ahmadabad
Time & Date	-	11.00 AM on 17th September, 2012

A two day meeting of NMA was scheduled at Ahmedabad on 17th and 18th September, 2012. On the first day, i.e. 17.9.2012, visit to protected monuments/site in connection with the project of BRTS and re-development of Bhadra Fort as well as visit to Sarkhej Rauza was undertaken.

2. At first, a brief presentation about the 2 Projects i.e. Bhadra Fort and BRTS was made by AMC. Thereafter, the entire team proceeded on visit to Bhadra Fort area and thereafter along the proposed route of the elevated BRTS corridor which had several protected monuments. After the visits, a more detailed presentation was made by the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation on both the projects. The discussion on the Bhadra Fort redevelopment also continued in the afternoon of the next day, i.e. 18.9.2012 also. The following decisions were taken in respect of these 2 projects:-

(a) **BRTS Project:**

It was noted that AMC has attempted to incorporate the suggestions of NMA regarding this project and has also ensured that the proposed alignment would now fall outside the prohibited limits. While explaining the new alignment, it was pointed out that near the BricK Minar monument (Kalupur) this would involve acquisition of some properties, one or two of which appear to be heritage buildings whose preservation needed to be explored. This point was discussed and the AMC authorities informed that they are themselves looking at this aspect and if further re-alignment is possible and after examining the matter thoroughly, they would revert to NMA with a final view.

(b) Regarding re-development of Bhadra Fort area, the proposed design was discussed in detail. Certain issues like the pattern of the paving (including circular patterns), tree plantation, raised platforms for hawkers etc. were discussed.

It was informed that new construction such as raised platforms could be done provided these could be categorized as public amenities. It was also noted that the proposed project has not been formally sent to NMA for NOC. It was accordingly decided that the proposal along with the final designs, drawings etc. as approved by AMC would be sent by AMC to NMA at the earliest so that the matter could be formally considered.

3. A Presentation was also made by INTACH Ahmedabad Chapter on the draft Heritage Bye-laws prepared for Sarkhej Rouza monument. The detailed background and research that has gone into preparation of the Heritage bye-laws was appreciated. It was informed that these bye-laws have been submitted to INTACH headquarters in Delhi. It was also informed that the draft Heritage bye-laws for Dwarkadeesh monument have also been prepared.

4. This was followed by on-site visit to the Sarkhej Rouza monument in the evening.

Government of India
Ministry of Culture
National Monuments Authority
24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001

MINUTES OF THE 67th MEETING OF NMA

Venue - St. Laurn Towers, Ahmedabad

Time & Date - 11 A.M on 18th September, 2012

The following NOC application cases were taken up for consideration :-

Fresh cases

Case no. 1

(Principal, Industrial Training Institute, Dist Panchmahals, Gujarat)

After perusal of the proposal it was seen that this is for construction of a training shed located behind an existing building. It is a single storey construction with total height of 3.8 mtrs. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 2

(Sh. Bhisma P.Parikh, Depot In charge (Gujarat))

This proposal pertains to construction of a milk booth and it was noted that the construction has already been done. After perusing the details of the case, it was decided to recommend that the construction undertaken may be regularized by way of grant of NOC but the applicant should be cautioned that in future he must obtain required clearances if any construction related work is to be undertaken.

Case no.3

(Sh. Mukesh Kumar Motilal Patel, Gujarat)

On perusal of this case it has been observed that the construction has been completed for which permission was not obtained. After examining the case in detail it was decided the construction may be regularized by way of granting NOC; however the applicant by way penalty should contribute towards providing some facilities/amenities near the protected monument such as signage, benches etc., under the overall guidance of ASI, such provision being limited to a financial amount of Rs. 10000/-.

Case no.4

(Sh. Bharatbhai Ukabhai Vaghri (Patni), Gujarat)

The proposal was examined in detail and it is observed that it is a low rise construction proposal of ground + one storey units with total height of 7.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.). It was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case and the applicant may be requested to undertake the construction, especially the facade, keeping it harmonious with local architecture. Also, during digging work for the construction ASI may remain present/applicant would inform the ASI if any archaeological remains appear to be there.

(Sh. Patel Manishkumar Vadilal, Vadnagar, Gujarat)

On perusal of this case it has been observed that the construction has been completed for which permission was not obtained. After examining the case in detail it was decided the construction may be regularized by granting NOC; however the applicant by way of penalty should contribute towards providing some facilities/amenities near the protected monument such as signage, benches etc., under the overall guidance of ASI, such provision being limited to a financial amount of Rs. 25,000/-.

Case no. 6

(Smt. Laxmiben Bachubhai Jani, Dist. Bhavnagar, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the construction has already been started though it was stopped after receiving notice. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC for completion of the project in this case and the applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof with column and brackets. Further, by way of penalty for having started the work without permission, the applicant may contribute towards providing proper path way with protective railings of the caves, this work being done under the overall guidance of ASI.

Case no.7

(Shri Ishwarbhai Kakubhai Vithalani)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc).

Case no. 8

(Smt. Geetaben Radheshyam Shah, Vadodara, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.22 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc).

Case no. 9

(Smt. Lilavatibai Chunilal & Upendra Chunilal, Daman and Diu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.45 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc). Applicant may be advised to incorporate color of facade in the local vernacular style.

Case no. 10

(Sh. Dayabhai Vasrambhai Ghaghda, Trustee, Soni Samast Vadi, Dwarka, Gujarat)

On perusal of the case it was noted that the construction has already been undertaken without permission and up to a height of 17.05 mtrs. Keeping this in mind it was decided that this case may be kept pending till the Heritage Bye-Laws for this monument are ready.

(Sh. Netaji Nirbhayram Thaker, Jamnagar, Gujarat)

On perusal of this case it has been observed that the construction has been completed for which permission was not obtained. After examining the case in detail it was decided the construction may be regularized by granting NOC; however the applicant by way/penalty should contribute towards providing some facilities/amenities near the protected monument such as signage, benches etc., under the overall guidance of ASI, such provision being limited to a financial amount of Rs. 20000/-.

Case no.12

(Sh. Manilal Laxmidas Bhatiya & others,Jamnagar, Gujarat)

On perusal of this case it has been observed that the construction has been completed for which permission was not obtained. After examining the case in detail it was decided the construction may be regularized by granting NOC; however the applicant by way/penalty should contribute towards providing some facilities/amenities near the protected monument such as signage, benches etc., under the overall guidance of ASI, such provision being limited to a financial amount of Rs. 20000/-.

Case no.13

(Sh. Pareshbhai (Babubhai) Arvindbhai Joshi & Others, Jamnagar, Gujarat)

On perusal of this case it has been observed that the construction has been completed for which permission was not obtained. After examining the case in detail it was decided the construction may be regularized by granting NOC; however the applicant by way/penalty should contribute towards providing some facilities/amenities near the protected monument such as signage, benches etc., under the overall guidance of ASI, such provision being limited to a financial amount of Rs. 25000/-.

Case no.14

(Sh. Sharadchandra G. Punekar, Vadodara, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 13 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc).

Case no.15

(Sh.Shailesh Bhagvanji Ghaghda, Gujarat)

On perusal of this case it has been observed that the construction has been completed for which permission was not obtained. After examining the case in detail it was decided the construction may be regularized by granting NOC; however the applicant by way penalty should contribute towards providing some facilities/amenities near the protected monument such as signage, benches etc., under the overall guidance of ASI, such provision being limited to a financial amount of Rs. ~~20000~~/one lakh, as this is a commercial building.

Case no.16

(Amir Mohammed Gyasudin Shaikh, Partner of Sahil Buildcon, Mirzapur, Gujarat)

After perusal of the case pertaining to Ahmadabad where certain interim guidelines have been adopted by NMA. AS per provision of these interim guidelines of NOC, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc) with the provision that the applicant would be at a liberty to apply for greater height if the Heritage Bye-Laws would prepared for this monument so permit or any further modifications in the guidelines.

Case no .17

(Sh. Rameshbhai Naranbhai Parekh, Paldi, Gujarat)

On perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 14.88 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc).

Case no. 18

(Gulben Faramji Palia & others, Surat, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application and keeping in mind the decision on earlier cases relating to this area/monument it was decided to recommend NOC for construction limited roof, ground + 3 storeys.

Case no. 19

(Sh. Hamidabanu Khadim Husain Momim, Jamalpur, Gujarat)

After perusal of the case pertaining to Ahmadabad where certain interim guidelines have been adopted by NMA. AS per provision of these interim guidelines of NOC, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc) with the provision that the applicant would be at a liberty to apply for greater height if the Heritage Bye-Laws would prepared for this monument so permit or any further modifications in the guidelines.

Case no. 20

(Sh. Manubhai Ranchhodlal Patel and others, Naranpura, Ahmedabad)

After perusal of the case pertaining to Ahmadabad where certain interim guidelines have been adopted by NMA. AS per provision of these interim guidelines of NOC, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc) with the provision that the applicant would be at a liberty to apply for greater height if the Heritage Bye-Laws would prepared for this monument so permit or any further modifications in the guidelines.

Case no. 21

(Smt. Subhadraben Maneklal Patel and others, Ahmedabad)

The proposal was examined in detail and it was noted that the construction is located at beyond the 300 mtrs limit. This was also confirmed by CA, Gujarat. Keeping that in mind it was clarified that NOC is not required in this case provided the construction is beyond 300 mtrs limit and it may be taken up as per the AMC guidelines.

Case no. 22

(Sh. Nitinbhai Ramjibhai Katar, Jamnagar, Gujarat)

On perusal of the case it was noted that the construction has already been undertaken without permission and up to a height of 18.60 mtrs. Keeping this in mind it was decided that this case may be kept pending till the Heritage Bye-Laws for this monument are ready.

Case no. 23

(Sh. Dhananjay Kunvarji Vayeda, Jamnagar, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend the grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.85 mtr (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc).

Case no. 24

(Addl. City Engineer (BRTS), Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

This proposal relates to construction of single level bus shelters for BRTS, Ahmedabad at 4 locations. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the suggestion that the Bus shelters may be constructed incorporating local architectural features, arches etc.

Case no. 25

(The Sarpanch, Khandosan Gram Panchayat, Khandosan, Mehsana, Gujarat)

The case was examined and it was noted that it is a proposal for construction of a village entrance gate. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.3 mtrs and with the advise to the applicant to modify the design of the top portion of the gate (head of the gate) to make it more traditional.

Deferred cases

Case no. 1

(Sh. Roshanbhai Husanbhai Palanpurwala, Bharuch, Gujarat)

This case had been deferred with the suggestion that the applicant may explore the possibility of preserving and restoring the existing building. It was clarified by CA, Gujarat that the existing building had already been demolished much earlier. In view of this it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for the proposed new construction with total height of 11.43 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc). The applicant may try to incorporate some part of the design of the earlier building.

Case no. 2

(Sh. Amirmiya Rahimbhai Sheikh and others, Bharuch, Gujarat)

This case had been deferred with the suggestion that the applicant may explore the possibility of preserving and restoring the existing building. It was clarified by CA, Gujarat that the existing building have already been demolished much earlier. In view of this it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for the proposed new construction with total height of 10.5 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc). The applicant may try to incorporate some part of the design of the earlier building.

Case no. 3

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

This case had been deferred since construction was undertaken without permission and CA had recommended a fine. After clarification on this issue it was decided to regularize the case by recommending grant of NOC but the applicant by the way of penalty would contribute towards development of some facilities near a monument, under the overall guidance of ASI, within a financial limit of Rs. 10000/-

Case no. 4

(Sh. Nileshbhai Narotamdas Bhatiya & others, Jamnagar, Gujarat)

This case was deferred since construction was undertaken without permission and CA had recommended a fine. After clarification on this issue it was decided to regularise the case by recommending grant of NOC with a total height of 15 mtrs., but the applicant by the way of penalty would contribute towards development of some facilities near the monument, under the overall guidance of ASI, within a financial limit of Rs. 50000/-

Case no. 5

(Sh. Bharat Bholanath Solanki, Dwarka, Gujarat)

This case had been deferred since construction was undertaken without permission and CA had recommended a fine. After clarification on this issue it was decided to regularize the case by recommending grant of NOC with total height of 15 mtrs., but the applicant by the way of penalty would contribute towards development of some facilities near the monument, under the overall guidance of ASI, within a financial limit of Rs. 50000/-

Case no. 6

(Sh. Sh. Bhagubhai Thakor bhai Patel, Daman and Diu)

This case was deferred in order to understand better the monuments in Daman. This having been seen it was now decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with height restriction up to 12 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc) and with the suggestion to incorporate elements of local architecture in the proposed construction.

Case no. 7

(The Director General, Civil Defence and Home Guards, Lal Darwaja, Ahmedabad)

The clarifications submitted by the applicant in this deferred case were perused and it was thereafter decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 13.93 mtrs. (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc).

Case no. 8

(Sh. Nazmuddin Abbasi Kachwla, Bharuch, Ahmedabad)

After perusal of this deferred case and the clarification of CA, Gujarat that the structure was not a heritage one, rather a recent construction, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 13.93 mtrs. (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc).

Case no. 9

(Mrs. Vohara Jamuna, Shabbirbhai, Bharuch, Ahmedabad)

After perusal of this deferred case it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 13.93 mtrs. (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc).

Note:-

The applicant would also put up notice on his property acknowledging that violation of the Act has taken place and that he has contributed towards the up keep/provision of amenities near the monument on this account.

The above would be applicable in fresh cases No. 11, 12, 13, 15 and deferred cases No. 3, 4, 5.

279

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

MINUTES OF THE 68th MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Room

Time & Date - 03:00 PM on 24th September, 2012

The cases listed for 68th meeting were taken up and the following decisions were taken in respect of these cases:

Deferred Cases:

Case no. 1

(M/s. Delhi Golf Club through Secretary Shri Rajiv Hora, New Delhi)

This case relating to the Delhi Golf Club was taken up and a presentation was made by the architect of the applicant. The designs and drawing had been revised on the basis of discussions held on the last occassion. It was noted by members that necessary modifications have been carried out by the applicant. After going through the revised designs in detail, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case, as per the revised drawing and designs for the proposed new constructions, with overall height limit of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 2

(Sh. Gyanender Verma & Sh. Raj Verma, A-61, Nizamuddin, New Delhi)

The case had been referred back to obtain details of proposed repairs. This has been furnished by the applicant, and was examined. After perusal of this case, it was decided to **recommended grant of NOC** in this case for the proposed repair work as specified in the application. There should be no additional construction or any horizontal or vertical addition. Boundary wall repair only is permissible and no new boundary wall can be constructed.

Case no. 3

(Aditya Raj, Kiran Auto Mobiles, Patna)

This case had been referred back to obtain a report from ASI Patna Circle, regarding the archaeological site. A detailed report has been received from ASI Patna Circle, which mentions that the site itself is well protected with boundary wall etc and surrounding area is already considerably built up. In view of this, ASI has no plan to take up any further excavation in the surrounding area. Keeping in view, the report, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case. The applicant may ensure that during digging of foundation local ASI may be associated, in case any archaeological remains being found or if some digging has already been done, the debris may be examined by ASI.

Case no. 4

(M/s. Sumit Woods Pvt. Ltd., Goa)

The clarification given by the applicant relating to size of the project was gone through and it was noted that the estimated cost of the project is about Rs. 7 crores, which is well below the threshold limit for Impact Assessment. After examining the proposal in detail, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case.

Case no. 5

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

After examining the proposal in detail, the drawings and decisions submitted and recommendation of INTACH/CA, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case. For future development in the area, the advice of INTACH contained in the inspection report may be followed.

Case no. 6

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

The case had been referred back for submission of drawing/designs/ of the proposed building, which have now been submitted and these were examined in detail. After careful consideration, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with the following conditions:

a) On the side facing the Fort Gate, height of the building should be restricted to ground+1 storey only.

b) Façade of the building should incorporate elements of architecture and material of the protected monument.

Case no. 7

(Sh. A.R. Ravichandran, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

The clarification submitted by the applicant as well as ASI Chennai Circle, were perused. The application was also gone through in detail and it was noted that the proposal is for addition / expansion of the existing resort complex. After careful consideration, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case.

Fresh Cases

Case no. 1

(Smt. Leelavati Prabhakar Madiwal (Through Deputy Commissioner, Karwar), Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 5 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc).

Case no. 2

(Smt. Sumanbai w/o Nagappa Tandoorkal, karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 7 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc)

Case no. 3

(Sh. Jagadevappa, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 4 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc)

Case no. 4

(Sh. Mahadevi w/o Mallikarjun, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 6 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc)

Case no. 5

(Sh. Mallinath s/o Guralingappa Kolsur, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 7 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc)

Case no. 6

(Sh. Anantrao Srinivasrao Banknal, Bazar Road, Hangal Taluk, District Haveri)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case, for the purpose of reconstruction of side wall/compound wall.

Case no. 7

(Secretary, School Development & Managemet, High School, Muttalli, karnataka)

After examining the proposal in detail and noting that it pertains to construction of class rooms, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case, with the total height of 4 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate design of the existing building in the new constructions, especially, the sloping tiled roof.

Case no. 8

(Smt. Lalita w/o Annappa Shet, Uttara Kannada, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 23 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc)

Case no. 9

(Smt. Kasturavva Shivaputrappa Kachatti, Anand Nagar, 1st Cross, Badami, District, Bagalkot, Karnataka)

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

Case no. 10

(Dr. Rajendra Y Marakumbi, Anand Nagar, 1st Cross, Badami, District, Bagalkot, Karnataka)

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

Government of India
Ministry of Culture
National Monuments Authority
24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001

MINUTES OF THE 69th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11 A.M on 25th September, 2012

At first, the cases left over from the 68th meeting of 24th September, 2012 were taken up for consideration.

Case no. 1

(Dr. Sanjay Chandaa)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.80 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. 2

(Sh. Subaschandra Basappa Karennavar)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 5 meters including parapet, mumty, water sotrage tank etc.

Case No. 3

(Smt. Tahera Begum)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 13 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. 4

(Sri Shivayougi G. Savadatti)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that construction had been started by the applicant without permission. After examining the case in detail, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8 meters (including mumty water tank etc). The applicant should be cautioned not to take up any construction related activity in future without obtaining permission .

Case No. 5

(Smt. Somanthevva Rajappa Katti)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 5 meters with mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping tiled roof with otla.

Case No. 6

(Sh. Shivanandappa Hullappa Ambiger)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 5 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. 7

(Sh. Shantappa s/o Basavanappa Mulge)

The application was examined and it was noted that although construction had been started without permission (only columns were built). The work was stopped on getting notice from the CA. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for addition of first floor to the existing building.

Case No. 8

(Sh. Laxmiputra s/o Shantmalappa Patil)

After perusal of the application it was decied to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 23 feet including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. 9

(Sh. Mohammad Shabbeer s/o Abdulsab Kalludi)

The application was examined in detail. Comments of the CA were also taken note of and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of ground plus one floor only, as also recommended by the CA.

Case No. 10

(Shri Chandrakant Tippana Reddy)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. 11

(Shri Vishwanath Baovappa Dandin)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 23 feet.

The applicant may try to incorporate sloping roof in the construction.

Case No. 12

(Smt. Lalitha w/of Laxmikanth Tadakal)

The application was examined in detail. Comments of the CA were also taken note of and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of ground plus one floor only as also recommended by the CA.

Case No. 13

(Sh. N. Balamurugan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9 meters including parapet, mumty and water storage tank etc.

The applicant may be advised to go in for tiled roof.

Case No. 14, 15, 16, 17 & 18

Thiru T.C. Prabhu, Thiru T.C. Prabhu, Thiru T.C. Murali,Thiru T.C. Murali, Thiru N. Thiyagarajan

These 5 cases pertain to property which is located near Group of Cains archaeological site at Tambaram. It seems from these applications that new constructions are coming up on existing plot which has a building which would be demolished. After detailed examination it was decided that a status note may be obtained from ASI, Chennai which may contain information on the extent of the burial site (as per protection notification); whether there are more burial mounds within this area; the point from which measurement of prohibited/regulated area is to be taken; and a clear site plan. These cases may be considered after the status note is received.

After disposal of the above cases, cases listed for the day were taken up.

Deferred Case:-

Case No. 1

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

This case had been referred back for certain clarifications which have now been provided by the applicant. It has been clarified that realignment of the proposed railway track is not feasible given the locational constraints and it has also been clarified for necessary arrangements for proper drainage would be made and that necessary measures would be taken to ensure safety of the monument. After perusal of the clarifications, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the following conditions:-

(a) Necessary arrangements would be made to install appropriate equipment at the protected monuments to monitor whether there is any structural threat on account of the railway operations.

(b) It may be examined if trains can run at reduced speed on the stretch passing through the regulated area as a means to mitigate the vibration that may be caused by passing trains.

(c) Necessary measures may be put in place for proper drainage along the raised embankment which will have the railway track.

(d) Cultural sign boards may be placed near the protected monuments to highlight its importance etc.

Fresh Cases:

Case No. 1

(The Jamshri Rajitsinghji Spg. & Wvg Mills Co. Ltd., Fatechand Damani Nagar, Station Road, Solapur-413001)

The application was perused. It was noted that the proposal is for addition of 5th floor to an existing building. Perusal of the photographs etc. indicated that perhaps the 2nd and 3rd floors have been recently added. It needs to be clarified by the applicant whether these 2 floors have been added only in the recent past and if so whether with requisite permission. The need for the additional floor should also be clearly brought out in the application.

Case No. 2

(Sh. Sanjay Ambusa Mengji, Sh. Manesh Ambusa Mengji,"Bhagyarekha", 152, Goldfinch Peth, Near Datta Chowlk, Solapur-413007)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 14.17 meters including parapet, mumty and water storage tank etc.

Case No. 3

(Sh. Mukund Bhagvant Chavan, 501, Shivaji Nagar, Joshi Ali, Gaothan, Pune-5)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case, but the total height of building should be restricted to 15 meters inclusive of parapet, mumty and water storage tank etc.

Case No. 4

(Sh. Mohammedsaheb Kadersaheb Momim, 99/B, Murarji Peth, Solapur-413001)

After perusal of the application it was observed that construction had already been started by the applicant without permission. The reasons for this have not been furnished and the applicant should clarify this point as well as when the construction began.

Case No. 5

(Sh. Narayan Krishnaji Degaonkar, 114/12, Radhakrishna Colony, Murarji Peth Solapur-413001)

The application was perused and it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for total height of 11.95 meters inclusive of parapet, mumty and water storage tank etc. It is also suggested to the applicant to try to retain the façade of the existing building in the new construction.

Case No. 6

(Sh. Shekhar Tukaram Bahirat, 324, Shivajinagar, Gavthan, Pune-5)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case but the total height of the building should be restricted to 15 meters inclusive of parapet, mumty and water storage tank etc.

Case No. 7

(Mrs. Ujwala Balu Dhore, Panchayat Samiti (Vikas Colony), Unnar, Tal-Junnar, Dist. Pune-410502)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4 meters inclusive of parapet, mumty and water storage tank etc.

Case No. 8

(Chairman Shivner Shikshan Prasarak Mandal C/o Navgire and Navgire Architects, Bodke Nagar, Junner, Dist. Pune-410502)

This application pertains to construction of college building/associated buildings. From perusal of the photographs etc. it seems that construction has already started and this needs to be clarified. CA may, therefore, submit a report regarding the actual status of the constructions as on ground indicating whether work has already started, when and whether with or without permission.

Case No. 9

(Sh. Sachin Manikchand Shah, 105/1, Gold Finch Peth, Solapur-413007)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case but the total height of the building should be restricted to 15 meters inclusive of parapet, mumty and water storage tank etc.

Case No. 10

(Sh. Eknath Bapuji Kulkarni, 619, South Kasaba, Solapur-413007)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11 meters inclusive of parapet, mumty and water storage tank etc.

Case No. 11

(Sh. Youvraj Sudhakar Chumbalkar 1, Sourabh Apartments, Lower Ground Floor, Hotg Road, Solapur-413003)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case but the total height of the building should be restricted to 15 meters inclusive of parapet, mumty and water storage tank etc.

Case No. 12

(Sh. Prakash Vasant Undale, Sh. Arvind Gajanan Rasane, 268, 269, Kasaba Petha, Near Manik Chowk, Pune-411011)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case but the total height of the building should be restricted to 15 meters inclusive of parapet, mumty and water storage tank etc.

Case No. 13

(Sh. Sandeep Namdev Ghojage, CTS No. 556+557, Narayan Peth, Pune-411030)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case but the total height of the building should be restricted to 15 meters inclusive of parapet, mumty and water storage tank etc.

Case No. 14

(Chaiman, Solapur D.C.C. Bank Staff Co Op. Credit Society Ltd., 105 Navi Peth, Plot No. 8648/2A/1, Dist – Solapur-413007)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case but the total height of the building should be restricted to 15 meters inclusive of parapet, mumty and water storage tank etc.

Case No. 15

(Sh. Shankar Balbhim Karmalkar, 75, Navi Peth, Waskar Waba, Solapur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case but with total height of 25 feet inclusive of parapet, mumty and water storage tank etc.

Government of India
Ministry of Culture
National Monuments Authority
24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001

MINUTES OF THE 70th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24,Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	3 P.M on 3rd October, 2012

When the cases listed for the day were taken up for consideration it was noted that there are several cases from Chennai relating to burial sites/cairns/cists located in Sembakkam Tambaram region. Some cases from these sites had been considered in the last meeting wherein a decision had been taken to get a detailed presentation regarding such burial sites from CA Chennai/ SA Chennai especially to understand the nature and extent of these sites, the exact protection notifications and the current status, whether any fencing etc. has been done, a point from which decisions, measurement are taken etc. It was accordingly decided that the cases listed for today of these sites may also be taken up after the detailed presentation/clarifications as above which may be tentatively scheduled in the 3rd week of October, 2012. The following cases were accordingly deferred:

Case no. 1: Thiru M. Senthilkumar
Case no. 2: Thiru T.C. Giri (survey no. 132/1B)
Case no. 3: Thiru T.C. Giri (survey no. 129/2)
Case no. 4: Smt. A.Babitha
Case no. 6: Thiru T.C. Sanathkumar
Case no. 7: Smt. C. Suseela
Case no. 8: Thiru V. Dhanraj
Case no. 9: Thiru U. Rajagopalan
Case no. 11: Thiru S. Jegadeesan
Case no. 13: Thiru R. Padmanabhan
Case no. 14: Smt. S Jayanthi

Case no. 15: Smt. K. Jayanthi

Case no. 16: Thiru A. Vasu and Smt. V. Lalitha

Case no. 17: Thiru R. Srinivasan

Case no. 18: O.V. Vijaykumar

Case no. 19: Thiru E. Raghavan

Case no. 20: R. Manimaran

Case no. 21: K. Sundarmoorthy

Case no. 22: M/S SML Developers SSM Corporate House

Case no. 5

(Smt. S. Rajalakshmi, Madambakkam Village, Tambaram Taluk, Kanchipuram)

The application was perused and it was noted that there is some discrepancy in the distance as it mentions 102 mtrs from protected area/ 197 mtrs from protected monument. This points needs clarification and the case would be taken up thereafter.

Case no. 10

Shri G. Sekar, Madambakkam Village, Tambaram Taluk, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of this application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The design guidelines which were framed for Kanchipuram may be suggested to the applicant.

Case no. 12

(Thiru K. Balasubramaniam and Thiru B. Shanmugam, Tambaram Taluk, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of this application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The design guidelines which were framed for Kanchipuram may be suggested to the applicant.

(Deferred Case)

Case no. 1

(M/s Heritage Arts and Creations, Hindu Rao Hospital Complex, Delhi)

This application pertains to repair and restoration work of building (Hindu Rao House) located within the prohibited limit of the monument. Members had desired that a presentation of the nature of the repair work etc. may be made by the applicant before the matter was considered. Accordingly, the Architect of the applicant made a detailed presentation of their proposal about the nature of repair and restoration work. After going through the presentation, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the repair and restoration work as per plans submitted in the application including the proposed usages. There should be no new construction and no vertical/horizontal additions. Also, if any change in the usages is proposed, the applicant would have to approach NMA again.

286

Government of India
Ministry of Culture
National Monuments Authority
24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001

MINUTES OF THE 71st MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11 A.M on 4th October, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Deferred Case

Case no. 1

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

After perusal of the clarifications regarding the distance and the clarifications given by ASI was perused and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for total height of 14.98 mtrs with the specific stipulation that the construction should begin only after 100 mtr limit.

Fresh Cases

Case no. 1

(Mrs. Rajani C.G, Kottikkal, Azhikode, Thrissur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4.05 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and otla.

Case no. 2

(Smt. Sathi Amma, Thrissur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.15 mtrs including mumty, parapet and water storage tank etc.

Case no. 3

Smt. P.Geetha Menon, Thrissur

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4.15 mtrs including mumty, parapet and water storage tank etc.

Case no. 4

(Shri P.S. Gopinathan, Thrissur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.90 mtrs including mumty, parapet and water storage tank etc.

Case no. 5

(Smt. Usha Balakrishnan, Kochi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9 mtrs including mumty, parapet and water storage tank etc.

Case no. 6

(Smt. Thilothama and Smt. Sindhu, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was felt that, since there are two levels, a clearer cross section of the land showing the levels may be provided. Also, it may be suggested to the applicant to see if the design of the proposed construction could be more contextual, keeping in mind the monument.

Case no. 7

(Mrs Sunitha K.K, Thrissur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 3.45 mtrs including mumty, parapet and water storage tank etc.

Case no. 8

(Mr. Anil P. Mathew, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.35 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and otla/ verandah.

Case no. 9

(Shri Wilson T.V., Thrissur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4.15 mtrs including mumty, parapet and water storage tank etc.

Case no. 10

(Shri Abdul Razak, Pattambi, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 10.35 mtrs. Regarding designs, the applicant may be advised to try and incorporate the design as in a few earliar cases to this area for which NOC has been recommended.

Case no. 11

(Mr. Gangadharan and Mrs. Sobhana, Wayanad, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.73 mtrs including mumty, parapet and water storage tank etc. from the lower ground level.

Case no. 12

(Mr. Jayaraj P., Thrissur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.30 mtrs including mumty, parapet and water storage tank etc.

Case no. 13

(Shri. Santhiandran A.N., Thrissur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 5.70 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case no. 14

(Shri Carmo James CRDS Rodrigues and Mrs Ana Alvisa Praxedes Barreto, Goa)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.50 mtrs including mumty, parapet and water storage tank etc. as per CAs recommendation.

Case no. 15

(Shri Aghilesh Parayil, Goa)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 5.6 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case no. 16

(Shri Ashok Kumar Sarawagi, Guwahati)

After perusal of the application Members felt necessary to get more information on nature of buildings in vicinity, heights etc. and the case may be discussed threrafter.

Case no. 17

(Smt Anwari Begum and Sri Mazhar Ali, Jhansi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 6.10 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. It may be suggested to the applicant to see if the design of the proposed construction could be more contextual.

Case no. 18

(Shri Sayed Afsar Ali, Jhansi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 3.93 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case no. 19

(Shri Bhup Singh, Rohtak, Haryana)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4.79 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case no. 20

(Smt Rani Devi, Hissar, Haryana)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.80 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

291

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

MINUTES OF THE 72nd MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	3.00 P.M. on 15th October, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Fresh Cases

Case no. 1

(Chief Medical Superintendent, Lucknow)

This proposal is for construction of a new hospital building by demolishing the existing structure. It was observed that the existing building is perhaps of colonial period having certain characteristic architectural features which could ideally be preserved if feasible. It was accordingly decided that the applicant may have the matter re-examined to see if the existing structure/building can be retained and the additional requirement of space to build either on the existing structure or by keeping the structure intact. It would also be necessary to examine the existing foundation to see if it has tackle load bearing capacity for this purpose. The proposal may be considered again after this clarification.

Case no. 2

(Shri Sumer Bhurmal Kothari, Ahmedabad)

This case pertains to Ahmadabad. It was informed by Member Secretary that during the visit to Ahmadabad in September, 2012 several representations had been received and several applicants had met the Members regarding the height restrictions being followed for Ahmedabad. It was decided to examine the matter by getting a report from CA Gujarat. The report has now been prepared by CA Gujarat after consulting INTACH, SA Baroda and others. This may be examined for taking a decision.

regarding the height limits in Gujarat. It was accordingly decided to defer this case till such time.

Case no. 3 & 4 (Shri Santosh Kumar, Bihar) (Smt. Malti Devi, Bihar)

When these two cases were considered, it was observed that both these cases relate to the same property i.e. Company Sarai with same design and so on. It is however not clear as to why there are two separate applications for the same construction. This point may be clarified by the CA.

Case no. 5

(Shri Jang Bahadur Kohli, Punjab)

After perusal of the case certain discrepancies were noted regarding the covered area of the proposed construction and the height of the building between what the applicant has mentioned and what has been mentioned by the CA in his forwarding. This issue may be clarified by CA first.

Case no. 6

(Shri Santokh Singh, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 37.3 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may try to incorporate the local architecture in his construction.

Case no. 7

(Shri Dwarkesh Kalra, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 23 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may try to incorporate the local architecture in his construction.

Case no. 8

(Executive Engineer, PHED, District Rural Division, Chittorgarh)

The proposal relates to construction of public utility i.e. ground level water reservoir. After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the suggestion to use local material like stone in the finishing of construction.

Case no. 9

(Commissioner Municipal Board, Jaisalmer)

On perusal of the application it was observed that this is a project proposed by the Municipal Corporation for a fairly large construction of town hall (an auditorium) in a large vacant area close to the Jaisalmer Fort. After perusing the application, the enclosed drawings etc. it was felt that the construction at the proposed location is likely to be obstrusive and adversely affect the ambience in the vicinity of Jaisalmer Fort. The Municipal Corporation should try to identify an alternate location which is at some distance from the Fort for this purpose.

Case no. 10

(Commissioner Nagar Palika, Chittorgarh)

After perusal of the application which is for construction of the fire station it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 11

(Smt. Gamiri, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 27 feet including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc) the applicant may be advised to incorporate the local architecture in his construction.

294

Deferred Case

Case no. 9

(Miranda House, Delhi University)

The Principal, Miranda House College had been requested to come for clarifications regarding the case which had been considered earlier and where it was noted that construction have taken place without obtaining permission. After hearing Principal Miranda House and Architect it was decided that the following details may be submitted by the applicant:

a) Copies of letters from DUAC, MCD and affidavit submitted by Miranda House.
b) A written submission as to why the construction had been taken up without obtaining NOC from ASI or NMA.

It was also observed that there is a discrepancy regarding the proposal for construction of a new teacher block: while the College Authorities have stated that construction has not started and they have applied for permission, the CAs report had mentioned that construction has already take place. This point needs to be clarified by CA. Another issue which needs to be clarified by CA Delhi is the exact distance of the new hostel block from the protected monument.

Case no. 12

(Smt. Yasmin Biwi, Rajasthan)

The proposal relates to repair of residential building in the prohibited area. However, on perusal of the application it was observed that there are elements of construction also which is not permissible in the prohibited area. The applicant may be advised to resubmit the application limiting it only to repair and renovation.

Case no. 13

(Sh. Vishal Ishwar Ramtake, Bhandara, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4.95 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate the local architecture in his construction.

Case no. 14

(Sh. Nitin and Sachin Namdeo Kawale, Bhandara, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.40 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate the local architecture in his construction.

Case no. 15

(Sh. Pitale Shantilal Motilal, Ahmednagar, Aurangabad)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.40 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc). It may be suggested to the applicant to try to adopt façade design of one of the building which is indicated in the enclosed photograph, which is of buildings in the vicinity.

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

MINUTES OF THE 73rd MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11.00 A.M. on 16th October, 2012

Prior to taking up the carry over cases from the list of 15th Oct, 2012, a matter was raised by Dr. Sanghamitra Basu, Member regarding the matter of Delhi High Court on which a note had earlier been circulated by Member Secretary. This relates to the suggestion from Delhi High Court to consider increasing height limit in bye laws for Shershah Gate up to 30 mtrs in that particular sub-zone. It was informed by Member Secretary that INTACH has submitted a fresh draft heritage bye laws for Shershah Gate suggesting the height limit of 30 mtrs as mentioned above. On this issue, after discussion, it was decided that these draft heritage bye laws may circulated within NMA for views and comments and then the draft bye laws would be put up in the public domain. In this context, the procedure to be adopted for arriving at an agreed draft was discussed in detail and a note on the same has been circulated within NMA separately.

Thereafter the cases were taken up:

Case no. 16

(Sh. Mahant Rajhans Shevlikar, Aurangabad)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC which will be limited only to the proposed repairs. There should be no new construction and no vertical and horizontal addition to the existing structures.

Case no. 17

(Sh. Meena P.Jain, Aurangabad)

After perusal of the application it was observed that construction has already taken place and it was not clear whether as to why the construction was started without obtaining permission. It is also not clear whether any notice was issued by CA and whether work has stopped. These points may be clarified by the CA in the first instance.

Case no. 18

(Shri Dinkar Pandit Patil, Aurangabad)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 9 mtrs including mumty parapet, water storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof.

Case no. 19

(Sh. Rama Zipru Koshti, Aurangabad)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 4.15 mtrs including mumty parapet, water storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate the local architecture in his construction.

Case no. 20

(Sh. Trimbak Baburao Jadhav, Aurangabad)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. Keeping in view the existing builidings in the vicinity, it was decided to limit the height to G+1 storey with maximum height of 7 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.)

Case no. 32

(Shri Sanjeev Shankar, New Delhi)

On perusal of the application it was observed that this pertains to repairs/renovation as the property is located in the prohibited area. Further details of the same could not be found in the application which may be submitted in the first instance.

Case no. 33

(Shri Sanjeev Shanker, New Delhi)

On perusal of the application it was observed that this pertains to repairs/renovation as the property is located in the prohibited area. Further details of the same could not be found in the application which may be submitted in the first instance.

Case no. 34

(Shri S.L. Bhatia, 143, 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.) 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. 35

(Delhi Transport Corporation, DTC-headquarters, New Delhi)

This proposal is from DTC for repair and renovation of a bus terminal at Mehrauli. After perusal of the details it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed repairs and renovation with the suggestion that the applicant may consult a conservation architect to advise on specific issues like material for road surfacing, high mast lighting, façade of toilet and footpath etc.

The remaining cases from the list could not be taken up due to paucity of time.

Minutes of Meeting for 74th Meeting of NMA

Agenda: Strategy for preparation of Heritage Bye Laws in the light of notification of Regional Directors of ASI as Competent Authorities for Heritage Bye Laws.

Date and Schedule: Tuesday 30th October 2012

Meeting place: 11.00 am at National Museum, New Delhi.

Participants:

1. Chairperson, NMA
2. Member Secretary, NMA
3. Whole Time Member, NMA
4. Part Time Members, NMA
5. Shri Divay Gupta, INTACH
6. Ms Nayantara Ray, INTACH
7. Prof AGK Menon, INTACH
8. Dr Priyaleen Singh, INTACH
9. Ms. A. Vijaya, INTACH

Discussions made on Heritage Bye-laws for Gwalior fort Melkote, Farukhnagar, Baoli etc.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA 360
MINISTRY OF CULTURE
NATIONAL MONUMENTS AUTHORITY
24, TILAK MARG, NEW DELHI 110001

MINUTES OF THE 75th MEETING OF NMA

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

Minutes of the 72nd and 73rd meeting were circulated and gone through by Members persent. The same were confirmed with the minor change suggested by Dr. Meera Dass, Member as follows:-

In case No. 1 of 72nd meeting, the worlds "in consultation with Conservation Architect" may be added.

The next issue that was taken up for discussion was the matter relating to draft heritage bye laws for Sher Shah Gate Monument and in that context, the Delhi High Court case for expansion plans of the High Court.

The draft heritage bye laws as received from the Competent Authority had been circulated amongst all Members for comments, as per decision taken on this issue earlier. The comments/views received basically state:-

a) The earlier bye laws provided for maximum height of 21 mtrs buildings in RZ2 while the bye laws now submitted have a provision for a maximum height limit of 30 mtrs. If the latter is to be considered, there may be a provision for sub zoning within RZ2 with one sub zone covering block 'C' of existing High Court building which may permit construction up to 30 mtr while the second sub zone may limit the building heights to 21 mtrs. This view was expressed by Dr. Sanghamitra Basu and Dr. Rima Hooja.
b) The requirement of additional space for High Court Judges, the reason for which expansion is being sought, might be possible if the height of existing block 'A' and block 'C' is raised equally, perhaps up to 21 mtr and there may be no need to consider height limit of 30 mtr only for block 'C'. If there are any restrictions imposed on raising the height of block 'A' on account of any other regulation, (as informed by Member Secretary), this could be negotiated with the High Court Authorities. This view was expressed by Dr. Meera Ishwar Dass, Member. In the discussions, Dr. Basu also experessed her views in favour of this approval. approach.

It was decided that in order to consider the second suggestion, Dr. Meera Dass and Dr. Sanghamitra Basu may meet the Hight Court Authorities to explain this position. Member Secretary would try to arrange for this meeting preferably on 8th/9th November, 2012 when the next NMA meetings are scheduled. If this option or the meeting is not feasible, then the draft heritage bye laws with first option mentioned above would be put in the public domain for comments. Specific height limitations for RZ4 covering Sundar Nagar area may also be incorporated/which can be kept at 15 mtrs maximum height of building + additional 2 mtr height for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Thereafter the cases listed for the day were taken up :-

Fresh Cases

Case no. 1

(Shri Abhijit Ashitkumar Gandhi, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with restriction on total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no. 2

(Shri Vidhyadhar Vishwanath Deshpande, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with restriction on total height of 12.6 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no. 3

(Shri Gurupaddappa Channappa Ashtagi, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with restriction on total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to retain facade of the existing building in the new construction.

Case no. 4

(Shri Manohar Ganpat Sapate, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the applicant had already undertaken construction without obtaining permission. After going through the documents and recommendations of CA it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with height limitation of total 15 mtrs in all (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). A penalty of Rs. 1,00,000/- may also be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without prior sanction which would be incurred by the applicant for providing amenities/facilities at the protected monument under guidance and supervision of ASI.

Case no.5

(Shri Dattatray Shriram Baraskar, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the applicant had already undertaken construction without obtaining permission. After going through the documents and recommendations of CA it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with height limitation of total 14.64 mtrs in all (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). A penalty of Rs.1,00,000/- may also be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without prior sanction which would be incurred by the applicant for providing amenities/facilities at the protected monument under guidance and supervision of ASI.

Case no.6

(Shri Vitthal Yemaji Dahihande, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with restriction on total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no.7

(Shri Kalidas Bhikoba Shiras Subhadra Bhikoba Shiras, Mumbai)
After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with restriction on total height of 11.7 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no.8

(Shri Chandraprabha V.Koditkar, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with restriction on total height of 12 (ft) (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no.9

(Shri Sunil Shivaji Shinde and Shri Sanjay Shivaji Shinde, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with restriction on total height of 3 mtr (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no.10

(Shri Vilas D. Indrapurkar & Others, Mumbai)

The application was examined in detail. It was observed that part of the property of the applicant falls within prohibited limit. The applicant has proposed to demolish existing two buildings and take up new constructions, beyond 100 mtr limit. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC in the case with the following conditions :-

a) Total height of the proposed new building in the regulated area would not exceed 15 mtr in all (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.).
b) No basement to be constructed either in prohibited or regulated area.
c) There would be no construction whatsoever within the 100 mtr prohibited limit.
d) The applicant can retain the existing building located in the prohibited area if he so desires and could undertake repair and renovation of the same for which permission should be obtained separtely.

Case no.11

(Tehsildar, Panhala, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12.8 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no.12

(Chief Officer, Panhala-C.S no 431,459, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.32 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no.13

(Chief Officer, Panhala-C.S no. 635 (R.S 5/A), Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.32 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no.14

(Chief Officer, Panhala-C.S no. 634/S.No. 109, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no.15

(Chief Officer, Panhala-C.S no. 458 (R.S.No. 60), Mumbai

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no.16

(Chief Officer, Panhala-C.S no. 541, 57, 572, 573 & 574, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for the surface development of public garden, as per details in the application.

Case no.17

(Chief Officer, Panhala-C.S no. 494, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.41 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no.18

(Chief Officer, Panhala-C.S no. 500 (R.S.113) Mumbai)

On perusal of the application it was observed that this construction is located at72 mtr i.e., within prohibited area. However, it is construction of public toilets which is permissible as per Section 2 [(dc)] of the AMASR amendment Act and as such NOC may be recommended for the same.

Case no.19

(Shri Ajit Singh, C-80 Malviya Nagar, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application 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 Naresh Agarwal and Shru R.P Saluja (F-44 Green Park), New Delhi)

After perusal of the application 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

(Shri Suchin Gupta and Sushama, 53 Anand Lok, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application 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 Rama Arora, A 1/74 Panchsheel Enclave,New Delhi)

After perusal of the application 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 Krishna Gupta,Hisar)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with height limit of 11 mtr in all (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may also try to incorporate some elements of local/vernacular architecture in his construction.

Case no. 24

(Shri Manpreet Kaur,Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with height limit of 27 feet in all (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may also try to incorporate some elements of local/vernacular architecture in his construction.

Case no. 25

(Dr. Avinash Gupta, Agra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with height limit of 28 feet in all (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may also try to incorporate some elements of local/vernacular architecture in his construction.

306

Government of India
Ministry of Culture
National Monuments Authority
24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001

MINUTES OF THE 76th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11 A.M on 1st November, 2012

At first, matter pertaining to modifications of height limit for buildings in Ahmadabad/Gujarat was taken up for discussion. MS, NMA explained the background of the matter and that a number of representations had been received from individuals asking a review of the 15 mtrs limit being followed for grant of NOC. He also mentioned that several persons had met the Members during the visit to Ahmadabad on 17-18th September, 2012 and it had been decided to call for a report from CA Gujarat. This report, prepared after consultations with INTACH Ahmadabad and SA, ASI had been received and was circulated amongst everyone. After the matter was discussed in detail it was decided to modify the interim guidelines for Ahmadabad/Gujarat and to permit an additional 2 mtrs for roof level constructions such as mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. The height of the building would not exceed 15 mtrs at roof level, this is being measured from the road level. The similar issue of Delhi was also discussed and it was decided that the interim guidelines for Delhi may also be modified as above. Necessary instructions would go to CA Gujarat and CA Delhi to intimate individual persons about this decision and to obtain applications from the desirous persons for modifications in the NOC granted earlier.

Thereafter cases carried over from 75th meeting were taken up for consideration.

Fresh cases

Case no. 26

(Poonam Yadav, Agra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12.49 mtrs. It may be suggested to the applicant to try and incorporate some elements of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no. 27

(Prakash Goyal, Agra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.74 mtrs. It may be suggested to the applicant to try and incorporate some elements of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no. 28

(Keshav Pratap Singh, Agra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.4 mtrs. It may be suggested to the applicant to try and incorporate some elements of local/vernacular architecture.

Case no. 29

(Villlage Girdhari Lal, Lucknow)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 3.93 mtrs.

Case no. 30

(M/s Shrikar Hotels Pvt. Ltd, Lucknow)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with stipulation that total height of the building would be restricted to 15 mtrs inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Deferred cases

Case no. 1

(M/s Neocon Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai)

This case had been referred back to ascertain the exact nature of the application i.e whether for extension of validity of NOC or fresh permission. After perusal of the application it was noted that this is for new construction. After considering the application in detail and taking note of the buildings in the vicinity it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulation that total height of the building would not exceed 24 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc, to be measured from road level.

Case no. 2

(Veena Yadav, Bihar)

After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of the building to be restricted to 15 mtrs inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. Further no basement shall be permissible.

Case no. 3

(Shri Ajay Kumar, Bihar)

After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of the building to be restricted to 15 mtrs inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. Further no basement shall be permissible.

Case no. 4

(Laxmi, Rajasthan)

The case was reviewed in the context of the earlier observations of Members and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 14 feet inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local/ vernacular architecture.

Case no. 5

(Shri Prakash Chand, Rajasthan)

The case was reviewed in the context of the earlier observations of Members and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 14 feet inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. The applicant may try to incorporate some features of local and vernacular architecture.

Case no. 6

(M.Ravinder, Andhra Pradesh)

The clarifications submitted in this case were noted, this was a case where construction had been started without obtaining permission. After perusal of the details, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulation that the applicant would, by way of penalty, contribute the amount of Rs. 50,000 towards development of facilities and amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 7

(The Medical Superintendent, Hospital Road, Chennai)

After perusal of the clarifications relating to change in proposed design, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.14 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. CA Tamilnadu may be requested to monitor the construction work from time to time and local INTACH may also give a final report after construction is over.

Case no. 8

(Shri Dharam Pal Chaudhary, Haryana)

After perusal of the clarifications it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. The applicant may be advised to try and use local/traditional material in the construction.

Case no. 9

(T.R. Aravindan, Kancheepuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the clarifications it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.38 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate traditional/vernacular architecture in the construction.

Deferred cases (from case list of 01.11.2012)

Case no. 1

(S.Rajalakshmi w/o J.Venkatesh, Chennai)

The clarifications regarding distance of the construction site from the monument was noted. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.38 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate traditional/vernacular architecture in the construction.

Case no. 2

(Sarvana Prakash, Chennai)

The case had been referred back asking for Impact Assessment to be conducted in this case. The same has now been submitted and after going through the Impact Assessment report in detail, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 19.95 mtrs inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-storage etc. It was also recommended that, apart from following the recommendations contained in the Impact Assessment report, the applicant should facilitate construction of boundary fencing around the protected site under supervision of ASI.

Case no. 3 and Case no. 4 : (Shri Santosh Kumar, Patna) (Malti Devi, Patna)

The clarifications regarding ownership of land were perused. It is still not clear as to whether there are two owners of the same property or whether it is joint ownership etc. and why there are two separate applications. This needs to be clearly explained.

Case no. 5

(M/s Sangam Overseas Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi)

While noting that certain designs modifications had been carried out by the applicant as suggested earlier, Members noted that heritage bye laws for the protected monument (Ugarsen ki Baoli) are under preparation and likely to be submitted soon. In view of that the case may be deferred till the bye laws are finalized.

Case no. 6 and Case no. 7 (M/s Nahata Traders (P) Ltd., New Delhi)

Both these cases had been referred back for clarifications on the current status of the litigation. After going through the same, Members felt that the detailed report from ASI on the legal issues may be obtained and legal advice from NMA's council may also be taken to understand overall position better.

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

MINUTES OF THE 77th MEETING OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11.00 A.M. on 8th November, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration :-

Deferred cases

Case no. 1

(Shri K.Anandan, Chennai)

After going through the clarifications provided, it was observed that there seems to be another protected monument in the vicinity namely "Pidari Amman" Temple and it needs to be checked up whether the proposed construction site falls outside the prohibited limit of this monument also.

Case no. 2

(Shri V. Madhavan, Chennai)

After perusal of the clarifications it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with advise to the applicant to incorporate sloping roof and otla/verandah.

Case no.3

(Shri T. Swaminathan, Chennai)

After perusal of the clarifications and noting that the existing building has already been demolished, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for proposed ground + 3 floors with total height of 15.37 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). In this case dissenting note of Dr. Meera Dass, WTM is taken on record as the Member was of the opinion that in this case only ground + 2 floors should be allowed and construction could have been made incorporating the vernacular/traditional architecture.

Case no.4

(Shri G.Victor Jesudoss, Chennai)

After perusal of the case it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 14 feet.

Fresh Cases

Case no.1

(Thiru Divakara Vasudevan, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8 mtr (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.2

(Thiru G.J Chinnasamy, Smt. M.A. Vanitha Auxilla, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.63 mtr (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.3

(Smt. M Saraswathy, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.24 mtr (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.4

(M/s Key 2 Home, Represented by its Partner Thiru G. Chandramouli, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.08 mtr (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.5

(Thiru T. Chanrasekaran, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12.35 mtr (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.6

(Thiru R. Balakrishnan, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.67 mtr (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.7

(Shri V.Ayuenu, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the construction has already taken place without obtaining permission. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the height of 15 mtr but the applicant by way penalty should contribute towards providing some facilities/amenities near the protected monument such as signage, benches etc., under the overall guidance of ASI, such provision being limited to a financial amount of Rs. 20000/-.

Case no.8

(Shri T. Rajeswari, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the construction has already taken place without obtaining permission. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the height of 35 feet but the applicant by way penalty should contribute towards providing some facilities/amenities near the protected monument such as signage, benches etc., under the overall guidance of ASI, such provision being limited to a financial amount of Rs. 20000/-.

Case no.9

(Shri J. Anitha, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the construction has already taken place without obtaining permission. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the height of 8.15 mtr but the applicant by way penalty should contribute towards providing some facilities/amenities near the protected monument such as signage, benches etc., under the overall guidance of ASI, such provision being limited to a financial amount of Rs. 20000/-.

Case no.10

(Shri S. Vengappan, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the construction has already taken place without obtaining permission. It was decided to recommend grant of NOC with the height of 4.50 mtr but the applicant by way penalty should contribute towards providing some facilities/amenities near the protected monument such as signage, benches etc., under the overall guidance of ASI, such provision being limited to a financial amount of Rs. 20000/-.

Case no.11

(Smt. Sunita Rani, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 26 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.12

(M/s Madan Lal Bansal & Company, Contractor Pvt. Ltd., Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 38 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.13

(Shri Sachin Kumar S/o Shri Uttam Chand and Smt. Raj Rani W/o Sh. Uttam Chand, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 26 feet 6 inches. Further, the applicant may be adivised to try and retain the existing entrance gate in the new construction also.

Case no.14

(Shri Ajay Kumar Goya S/o Shri Keshav Dev, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 35 feet 9 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.15

(Shri Giyan Chand, S/o Shri Dhanu Ram, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 26 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.16

(Smt. Pushpa Devi, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 28 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.17

(Shri Chander Shekhar S/o Late Sh. Prakash Chand, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 27 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.18

(Smt. Krishna Devi & Sh. Vishav Bhushan, Punjab)

On perusal of the application it was seen that it is for proposed repairs to a property located in the prohibited area. However, details of the proposed repairs were not provided and the same should be given alongwith photos, clearly indicating the type of repairs to be undertaken.

Case no.19

(Sh. Surinder Kumar S/o Sh. Nagin Chand, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 26 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.20

(Sh. Sukhjit Kaur w/o Sh. Suba Singh, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15 feet 9 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.21

(Sh. Vinod Kumar & Sh. Surinder Kumar S/o Sh. Satpal, Punjab)

On perusal of the application it was seen that it is for proposed repairs to a property located in the prohibited area. However, details of the proposed repairs were not provided and the same should be given alongwith photos, clearly indicating the type of repairs to be undertaken.

Case no.22

(Sh. Shashi Parbha W/o Shri Shittal Parshad, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 27 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.23

(Smt. Anju Gupta w/o Sh.Avinash Gupta, Smt Parveen W/o Sh Vinay Kumar Gupta, Punjab)

On perusal of the application it was seen that it is for proposed repairs to a property located in the prohibited area. However, details of the proposed repairs were not provided and the same should be given alongwith photos, clearly indicating the type of repairs to be undertaken.

Case no.24

(Sh. Shittal Parshad S/o Sh Hukum Chand, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 27 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.25

(Sh. Amrit Lal Bansal s/o Sh. Bala Ram, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 26 feet. Further, the applicant may be adivised to try and retain the facade of the existing balcony in the new building.

Case no.26

(Smt. Sharda Chopra w/o Sh. Chandermohan Chopra, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 25 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.27

(Sh. Bhushan Kumar & Sangeeta Rani, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 38 feet 3 inches. Further, the applicant may be adivised to try and retain the facade of the existing building.

Case no.28

(Sh. Harbinder Singh S/o Sh. Raghbir Singh, Punjab)

On perusal of the application it was seen that it is for proposed repairs to a property located in the prohibited area. However, details of the proposed repairs were not provided and the same should be given alongwith photos, clearly indicating the type of repairs to be undertaken.

Case no.29

(Smt. Aruna Rani W/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar and Smt. Saroj Devi W/o Sh. Pawan Kumar, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 26 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.30

(Smt. Gurbax Kaur w/o Sh. Baldish Singh, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 30 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.31

(Smt. Usha Rani w/o Sh Purshotam Lal, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 30 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.32

(Sh. Santokh Singh S/o Shri Jagat Singh, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 30 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.33

(Sh. Sital Singh, S/o Sh. Gurdev Singh, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 27 feet 3 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.34

(Smt. Jasbir Kaur w/o Sh. Gian Singh, Punjab)

On perusal of the application it was seen that it is for proposed repairs to a property located in the prohibited area. However, details of the proposed repairs were not provided and the same should be given alongwith photos, clearly indicating the type of repairs to be undertaken.

Case no.35

(Smt. Surjit Kaur W/o Sh. Mohinder Singh, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 26 feet 3 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Case no.36

(Smt. Sunita Rani w/o Sh. Pawan Kumar, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 26 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be requested to incorporate vernacular/traditional architecture in the construction.

Government of India
Ministry of Culture
National Monuments Authority
24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001

MINUTES OF THE 78th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11 A.M on 9th November, 2012

Minutes of the 75th, and 76th and 77th meetings which were circulated amongst Members were confirmed.

Thereafter the following cases were taken up for consideration:

Case no. 1

(AIIMS, New Delhi)

The background note on the NOC application case of AIIMS was considered by Members. After going through the details of the case and considering the discussions held with AIIMS authorities as well as the background note now circulated, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with the following stipulation:

a) The maximum permissible height of buildings would not exceed 21 mtrs inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

b) There are some proposed buildings height of which is less than this limit. It would not be permissible to increase the height of those buildings without prior sanction.

c) A committee has ~~held~~ been setup to plan and implement the scheme for the development in and around the protected monument, including preservation and conservation of the monument if required. The action plan may be prepared by this committee within a period of four weeks and may also be submitted before the authority for its perusal.

Fresh cases

Case no. 1

(Shri Baljeet Singh, New Delhi)

After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.30 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 2

(Shri Satish Chand Khosla, D-25, Hauz Khas, Delhi)

After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.60 mtrs including mumty,parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 3

(Shri Sanjiv Kumar and others, 30, Chirag Delhi, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for total height of 17 mtrs with the stipulation that total height of the building upto roof level would not exceed 15 mtrs and the remaining 2 mtrs would be permissible for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 4

(Shri Yogesh Talwar, D-2/6, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for total height of 17 mtrs with the stipulation that total height of the building upto roof level would not exceed 15 mtrs and the remaining 2 mtrs would be permissible for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 5

(Shri Amit Gupta, 583, Chirag Delhi, Delhi)

After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12.5 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 6

(Dr. S.K. Nagrath, C-81, East of Kailash, Delhi)

After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 7

(Dr. Suresh Gupta, S-357, Panchsheel Park, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for total height of 17 mtrs with the stipulation that total height of the building upto roof level would not exceed 15 mtrs and the remaining 2 mtrs would be permissible for mumty, parapet,water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 8

(Shri Ramkaran Saini, Tonk, Rajasthan)

On perusal of the application it was noted that this pertains to repair of building within prohibited area. After examining the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for plastering and repair works only. There should be no new roof/wall/any new construction.

Case no. 9

(Shri Satyanarayan Saini, Tonk, Rajasthan)

On perusal of the application it was noted that this pertains to repair of building within prohibited area. After examining the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for plastering and repair works only. There should be no new roof/wall/any new construction.

Case no. 10

(Shri Bhawar Lal Mali, Tonk, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to keep pillared verandah and make use of traditional material.

Case no. 11

(Shri Gopal Lal Mali, Tonk, Rajasthan)

On perusal of the application it was noted that this pertains to repair of building within prohibited area. After examining the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for plastering and repair works only. There should be no new roof/wall/any new construction.

Case no. 12

(Shri Bhagchand Mali, Rajasthan)

On perusal of the application it was noted that this pertains to repair of building within prohibited area. After examining the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for plastering and repair works only. There should be no new roof/wall/any new construction.

Case no. 13

(Shri Ramnarayan Jaat, Tonk, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height being limited to 10 feet+3 feet for mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.

Case no. 14

(Shri Ram Prasad Sharma, Tonk, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height being limited to 10 feet+3 feet for mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.

Case no. 15

(Smt. Sushila Devi Sharma, Tonk, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of the building being restricted to 10 feet+ additional 3 feet for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 16

(Shri Ramakrishan A.Manglore, Karnataka)

After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 6.4 mtrs inclusive mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. The applicant may be advised to have sloping roof and verandah.

Case no. 17

(Smt. Padmavati, Karnataka)

After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 4 mtrs inclusive mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. The applicant may be advised to have sloping roof and verandah.

Case no. 18

(Shri Irappa Timmayya Naik, Karnataka)

After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 4 mtrs inclusive mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. The applicant may be advised to have sloping roof and verandah.

Case no. 19

(Shri Taufeeq Ahmed, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+3 floors with total height of 12.5 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

3-124

Government of India
Ministry of Culture
National Monuments Authority
24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001

MINUTES OF THE 79th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 03.00 P.M on 19th November, 2012

The Minutes of the 78th meeting were confirmed.

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Deferred Cases

Case no. 1

(Capt. James Braganza, Captain of Ports Department, Goa)

After perusal of the clarification received, which were comments from Goa Heritage Action Group (GHAG), it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with the following stipulation:

a) During construction of the new jetty, recommendation of GHAG may be followed.
b) ASI Goa circle should document the existing structure and building both from architectural and structural point of view.

Case no. 2

(Jaoquim F. Brass Remedios and Domnic T. Remedios, Goa)

After perusal of the clarification, it was observed that comments from ASI which had been called for have not been received as yet. These are required to examine the case properly. Moreover, INTACH has already prepared the draft Heritage Bye-laws for this monument and perhaps the matter can be processed in the light of bye-laws.

Case no. 3

(Madhavi Devi, Varanasi)

The application was examined and after consideration, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this with total height of 12.20 mtrs including mumty parapet, water storage tank etc. It may be suggested to the applicant to provide for 'Chajjas' and 'verandah' with columns and the constructions may be kept harmonious/contextual with the local character and architecture.

Case no. 4

(Saim Pech, Varanasi)

The application was examined and after consideration, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this with total height of 9.3 mtrs including mumty parapet, water storage tank etc. It may be suggested to the applicant to provide for 'Chajjas' and 'verandah' with columns and the constructions may be kept harmonious/contextual with the local character and architecture

Case no. 5

(Indra Singh, Varanasi)

The application was examined and after consideration, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this with total height of 9.65 mtrs including mumty parapet, water storage tank etc. It may be suggested to the applicant to provide for 'Chajjas' and 'verandah' with columns and the constructions may be kept harmonious/contextual with the local character and architecture

Case no. 6

(Pankaj Kumar and Rabins Kumar, Varanasi)

The application was examined and after consideration, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this with total height of 9.2 mtrs including mumty parapet, water storage tank etc. It may be suggested to the applicant to provide for 'Chajjas' and 'verandah' with columns and the constructions may be kept harmonious/contextual with the local character and architecture

Case no. 7

(Nirmala Sinha, Varanasi)

The application was examined and after consideration, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this with total height of 9.68 mtrs including mumty parapet, water storage tank etc. It may be suggested to the applicant to provide for 'Chajjas' and 'verandah' with columns and the constructions may be kept harmonious/contextual with the local character and architecture

Case no. 8

(Dev Narayan Pujari, Varanasi)

The application was examined and after consideration, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this with total height of 12.52 mtrs including mumty parapet, water storage tank etc. It may be suggested to the applicant to provide for 'Chajjas' and 'verandah' with columns and the constructions may be kept harmonious/contextual with the local character and architecture

Case no. 9

(Suryamani Devi, Varanasi)

The application was examined and after consideration, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this with total height of 9.36 mtrs including mumty parapet, water storage tank etc. It may be suggested to the applicant to provide for 'Chajjas' and 'verandah' with columns and the constructions may be kept harmonious/contextual with the local character and architecture.

Case no. 10

(Suryabali Pandey and Shashikala Pandey, Varanasi)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that this proposal relates to construction near 'Dhamek Stupa' site, which is World Heritage Site. It was also observed that existing construction in the vicinity are predominantly single storey or Ground+I. Keeping these factors in view, while **recommending grant of NOC** in this case, it was decided to limit the height of the building to Ground + I floor with total height not to exceed 9 mtrs including mumty parapet, water storage tank etc.

Fresh Cases

Case no. 1

(Sh. Ved Prakash, Village Kotla Mubarakpur, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for total height of 17 mtrs with the stipulation that total height of the building upto roof level would not exceed 15 mtrs and the remaining 2 mtrs would be permissible for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no.2

(Smt. Lakshima Agnihotri alias, Lakshima Chadha, 144, Uday Park, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for total height of 17 mtrs with the stipulation that total height of the building upto roof level would not exceed 15 mtrs and the remaining 2 mtrs would be permissible for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 3

(Sh. Sohan Lal Kalra, Hauz Khas, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 15.9 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 4

(Sh. Virender Kumar Gupta, Sh. Ashok Kumar Gupta, Sh. Chandra Shekhar & Sh. Amitabh Gupta, B-1/43A, Hauz Khas, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for total height of 17 mtrs with the stipulation that total height of the building upto roof level would not exceed 15 mtrs and the remaining 2 mtrs would be permissible for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 5

(Sh. Kirti Mehta, D-128, Panchsheel Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for total height of ~~17~~ 7.41 mtrs with the stipulation that total height of the building upto roof level would not exceed ~~15~~ 7.47 mtrs and the remaining 2.5 mtrs would be permissible for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 6

(Sh. Sahil Hasan, D-64, Panchsheel Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for total height of 17 mtrs with the stipulation that total height of the building upto roof level would not exceed 15 mtrs and the remaining 2 mtrs would be permissible for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 7

(Sh. Harbans Lal Kapoor, N-39, Panchsheel Park, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for total height of 17 mtrs with the stipulation that total height of the building upto roof level would not exceed 15 mtrs and the remaining 2 mtrs would be permissible for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 8

(Sh. Ramesh Chandra Kathuria, C-2/12, Rana Pratap Bagh, Hauz Khas, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for total height of 17 mtrs with the stipulation that total height of the building upto roof level would not exceed 15 mtrs and the remaining 2 mtrs would be permissible for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 9

(Sh. Chalti Devi, Sh. Prem Kumar Goel & Sh. Sat Narayan Aggarwal, D-6/2A Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

After Perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 15.99 mts including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 10

(Sh. Rajinder Sahni & Sh. Kuldeep Sahni, D-5/8A, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

After Perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 16 mts including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 11

(Deputy Chief (Civil) MOIL Limited, Nagpur)

The case was examined in detail. Considering the fact that this is an important ancient Buddist site and the applicant is mining company, it was felt necessary that ASI should examine the matter and access the site particularly, all the excavated remains and future potential etc. On receipt of the report the matter would be examined further.

receipt

Case no. 12

(Sh. Gulam Kadar Kalubhai Amodwala & Others, Bharuch (Gujarat))

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 10 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. The applicant may be requested to incorporate some elements of local/vernacular architecture in his construction

Case no. 13

(Sh. Avinash Chandrakant Naik, Goa)

The application was examined and it was noted that the case pertains to prohibited area. It is mentioned in the report of CA that the construction had been completed long ago and applicant wants to regularize the same. In order to, examine the matter properly some additional information was felt necessary such as, when was the construction done when was it demolished and when has the renovation or reconstruction been done.

Case no. 14

(Vice Chairman, Jhansi Development Authority, Jhansi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided that the grant of NOC in this case may be **recommend** with the stipulation that the proposal may be re-designed by shifing the haat building towards the existing mela area, away from the 100 mtrs limit while the mela area could be located where the present haat is proposed.

Case no. 15

(Chief Engineer, PWD (ARIASP & RIDF) Assam)

After perusal of the application and noted that the alignment of the highway has been shifted futher away from the protected monument, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case.

Case no. 16

(Sh. Manoj Kumar Khandella, Assam)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 2.93 mtrs.

Case no. 17

(Sh. Suren Sharma, Jaysagar, Dist. Sivasagar, Assam)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case. The total height would be restricted to 3.30 in all as recommend by the CA.

Case no. 18

(Sh. Raju Bangarya Naik, Karnataka)

On perusal of the application, it was observed that the construction has already taken place. While it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case, it was also decided to impose a penalty of Rs. 20,000 for the construction without permission and this fine would be utilized by the way of providing amenties/facilities at the protected monument under the guidance of ASI.

Case no. 19

(Sh. Mohammed Kazim Imamsaab Hariapur, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 3.5 mts including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. The applicant may also incorporate sloping roof and Otla.

Case no. 20

(Smt. Anasuyya Kariyappa Madiwal, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 7 mts including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. The applicant may also incorporate sloping roof and Otla

330

Government of India
Ministry of Culture
National Monuments Authority
24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001

MINUTES OF THE 80th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11 A.M on 20th November, 2012

1. Minutes of the 79th meeting were confirmed.

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

(Deferred case)

Case no. 1

(Procurator/Treasurer, St. Joseph's College, Trichy)

The clarifications relating to distance of the construction site from the monument was noted, it has been certified by the CA that the distance is 115 mtrs. After examining the relevant details, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the following conditions:

a) Only one basement would be permissible.
b) The proposed glass façade of the building may be modified to have less glass and use stone material façade in between.

(Fresh cases)

Case no. 1

(Shri Lalit Kumar Idnani, D-272, Sarvodaya Enclave, New Delhi)

The case records were perused and noting that it pertains to Delhi where certain norms had been adopted (in the 12th Meeting held on 16.01.2012) it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 15+2 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

Case no. 2

(Smt. Jamsheeda, Nisha Manzil, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.9 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and verandah with pillars/ columns.

Case no. 3

(Smt. Zeenath P.K., Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was noted that the applicant has completed the extension work on the first floor. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case and impose a penalty of Rs. 25,000 which would be utilized for the provision of some amenities/facilities at protected monument which would be done under supervision of ASI.

Case no. 4

(Shri Gangadharan and Smt. Sobhana, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.7 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof.

Case no. 5

(Shri Stanly Varghese, 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 and verandah with pillars/ columns. The total height will not exceed 10.35m (quarters) and 11.45m (Residence).

Case no. 6

(Shri E.K. Moideen, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.94 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and verandah with pillars/ columns.

Case no. 7

(Shri M.T. Basil, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and verandah with pillars/ columns.

Case no. 8

(Shri N.S. Mani, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.8 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and verandah with pillars/ columns.

Case no. 9

(Shri M.M. Ummer, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.95 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and verandah with pillars/ columns.

Case no. 10

(Shri M.M Ummer, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.85 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and verandah with pillars/ columns.

Case no. 11

(Shri P.K. Jithesh, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.75 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and verandah with pillars/ columns.

Case no. 12

(Shri P.K. Jithesh, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and verandah with pillars/ columns.

Case no. 13

(Smt. Saffia Usman and Smt. Nadeera Usman, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and verandah with pillars/ columns. The applicant may also ensure use of the building only for the specified purpose as mentioned in the application. Use of glass in the façade may also be reduced.

Case no. 14

(Shri Ganeshan, 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 and verandah with pillars/ columns.

Case no. 15

(Shri M.J. Alaxander, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.05 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and verandah with pillars/ columns.

Case no. 16

(Shri Akbar and Nine others, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.85 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and verandah with pillars/ columns.

Case no. 17

(Commissioner of Tourism, Govt. of Rajasthan)

The applicant pertaining to improvement of infrastructure within *Jaisalmer Fort* was examined and after perusal it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the condition that the work should be implemented under the guidance and supervision of ASI.

Case no. 18

(Shri Dayalal, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for construction of additional Ist floor only. The applicant may be advised for sloping roof and the total height of the Ist floor should not exceed 15 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) and over-all height of the building should not exceed 25 ft. in all.

Case no. 19

(Shri Birdi Chand Jain, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed repair of kitchen, bathroom etc. The applicant would not undertake any additional construction outside the limits of the existing building and there should be not additions whatsoever horizontally or vertically.

Case no. 20 (Thiru M. Subbiah, Tamilnadu)

Case no. 21 (Smt. Lourdumary, Tamilnadu)

Case no. 22 (Thiru B. Swaminathan, Tamilnadu)

Case no. 23 (Thiru R. Dinesh Kumar, Tamilnadu)

Case no. 24 (Thiru Leenus Saju Rebello, Tamilnadu)

Case no. 25 (Thiru S. Krishnamoorthy, Tamilnadu)

All these cases relate to burial sites near Chennai. While considering cases from these areas earlier it had been decided to call for a report from CA/SA Chennai on the burial sites. The present cases and those deferred earlier may therefore be clubbed together to be considered as soon as this report is received and examined.

Case no. 26

(M/s Kanchipuram District Private Bus Owner's Association, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.62 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may also be advised to try and adopt one of the suggested options in the Kanchipuram guidelines.

Case no. 27

(Shri Ch. Narsinga Bhanu, Superintending Engineer, Andhra Pradesh)

The case was examined in detail. Considering the fact that this is an important ancient Buddhist site and the applicant is a mining company, it was felt necessary that ASI should examine the matter and assess the site particularly all the excavated remains and future potential etc. On receipt of the report the matter would be examined further.