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

MINUTES OF THE 81st MEETING (Ist Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.30 A.M on 10th December, 2012

Minutes of the 80th meeting were confirmed.

Thereafter the following cases were taken up for consideration:

Deferred Case

Case no. 1

(Raj Kumar Bapna, Partner, Raj Hotels & Resorts, Rajasthan)

The clarifications submitted by the applicant were perused and it was noted that necessary changes in the designs and layout have been carried out as suggested by the Members. Taking note of the same, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case.

Fresh Case

Case no. 2

(Thiru T.C. Prabhu, Plot No. 20A & B, Door No. 5, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

Case no. 3

(Thiru T.C. Prabhu, Plot No. 4, M.E.S. Road, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

Case no. 4

(Thiru T.C. Murali, Plot No. 2, M.E.S. Road, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

Case no. 5

(Thiru T.C. Murali, Plot No. 6, Amar Nagar, Kadaperi, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

Case no. 6

(Thiru T.C. Giri, Plot No. 3, M.E.S. Road, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

Case no. 7

(Thiru T.C. Giri, No. 3, Door No. 15/8, M.E.S. Road, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

Case no. 8

(Thiru T.C. Sanathkumar, Plot No. 8, Amar Nagar, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

Case no. 9

(Smt. C. Suseela, Plot No. 1, Muthumariamman Koil Street, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

In all these applications, it was not possible to clearly identify the proposed construction site with reference to the protected area. This was felt important since examination of the available documents ~~included~~ indicated that there could be some variation in the distances. It was accordingly decided that the CA should be asked to submit a revenue map (as available in case no. 22 of today's list) which would show the protected area plot no./ boundary and also the property number. All these cases dealt with reference to the boundary of protected area.

Case no. 10

(Thiru V. Dhanraj, Ranga Street, Kadaperi, Tambaram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 9.83 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 11

(Thiru M. Senthilkumar, Vadapalani, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 8.15 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 12

(Smt. A. Babitha, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 9.79 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 13

(Thiru U. Rajagopalan, Purushotham Nagar, Chrompet, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 6.49 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 14

(Thiru S. Jegadeesan, Sembakkam,,Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 6.49 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 14

(Thiru S. Jegadeesan, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with the stipulation that total height including mumty parapet water-storage tank, etc. should be limited to 15 mtrs and all, to keep it in cemetery with the adjoining building on either site.

Case no. 15

(Thiru M. Subbiah, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 9.86 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 16

(Smt. Lourdumary, Mariamman, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 8.16 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 17

(Thiru Leenus Saju Rebello, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 9.86 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction..

Case no. 18

(Thiru R. Dinesh Kumar, Sembakkam, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 9.71 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 19

(Thiru S. Krishnamoorthy, Sembakkam, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 4.84 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 20

(Thiru B. Swaminathan, Sembakkam, Tambaram, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 11.21 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 21

(Smt. S. Jayanthi, Sembakkam, Tambaram, kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 10.08 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 22

(Thiru R. Manimaran, Kilambakkam Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 7.92 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 23

(Thiru O.V. Vijayakumar, Chengalpat, Town, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 7.38 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 24

(Thiru E. Raghavan, Kilambakkam, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 9.67 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 25

(M/s. SML Developers, Chengalpat, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was examined in detail. It was noted that, it is a fairly high construction and before taking a decision on the same, it may be useful to get some information on some of the existing building in the vicinity of the proposed construction site, especially to get an idea about the height of such buildings. The CA may be requested to send this information at the earliest. He may also be asked to do an archaeological impact assessment.

Case no. 26

(Thiru N. Thiyagarajan, Chengalpat, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 4.72 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 27

(Thiru R. Padmanabhan, Kattankulathur, Chengalpat, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 11.27 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 28

(Thiru K. Jayanthi, Vandalur, Chengalpat, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 9.08 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 29

(Thiru A. Vasu & Smt. V. Lalitha, Jeevanandham, Chengalpat, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 7.84 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 30

(Thiru R. Srinivasan, Chengalpat, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 4.98 mtrs including (mumty, Parapet, water-storage tank, etc). The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 31

(Thiru K. Sundaramoorthy, Periyanatham, Chengalpat, Kanchipuram, Chennai)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this Case with total height of 7.84 mtrs including (mumty, Parapet, water-storage tank, etc). The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

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

MINUTES OF THE 81st MEETING (2nd Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.30 A.M on 11th December, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Deferred Case

Case no. 1

(Shri R.D. Shenoy (Ramnani & Associates), Parel, Mumbai)

This application pertains to proposed construction of Parking lot in the regulated area of Baradevi monument at Parel, Mumbai. The applicant has now submitted a revised application in which he has and reduced the proposed height of construction from the original 79.62 mtrs to total of 18.2 mtrs with two basements, ground + four floors. After perusal of the detail of the case, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 18.2 mtrs for the proposed two basements and ground + four floors.

Fresh Case

Case no. 1

(Shri Puthumana Kesavan, Pattambi, Palakkad, Kerala)

The case of the applicant was discussed in the context of the High Court order passed on 2nd August, 2012, that the application should be considered within a period of two months. That period have expired, it was thought necessary to dispose off the application urgently to avoid any legal complication. After examining the proposal in detail, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 13.55 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may try to incorporate a design contextual with the protected monument.

Case no. 2

(The Executive Engineer, PWD, Building Construction Division-I, Chepauk, Chennai)

The proposal was examined in detail. It was noted that this is in the prohibited area and therefore, as per law no permission can be given for any new structure/construction. The applicant may be advised to try and relocate the proposed construction beyond the 100 mtrs.

Case no. 3

(Shri Harneet Singh Sahni, Shri Surinder Singh Anand and Shri Prince Madan, Lajpat Nagar-I New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 16.95 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc.

Case no. 4

(Smt. Raj Rani Diwan, East of Kailash, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for total height of 17 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc and the building should not exceed height of 15 mtrs,to be measured from the road level.

Case no. 5

(Shri Narinder Kumar Chaudhary, East of Kailash, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 13.56 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc.

Case no. 6

(Shri Chander Kishore, Green Park Main, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for total height of 17 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc and the building should not exceed height of 15 mtrs, to be measured from the road level.

Case no. 7

(Smt. Suman Sethi, Rani Pratap Bagh, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 14.99 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc.

Case no. 8

(Smt. Ashima Chopra, Ansal villas, Satbari, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this casewith total height of 15.60 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc.

Case no. 9

(Shri Sumer Mal and Shri Nar Singh Mal, East of Kailash, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for total height of 17 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc and the building should not exceed height of 15 mtrs, to be measured from the road level.

Case no. 10

(Smt. Jasbir Kaur Sawhney, Shri Rajinder Pal Singh, Smt. Surinder Kaur and M/s Jatinder construction, East of Kailash, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for total height of 17 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc and the building should not exceed height of 15 mtrs, to be measured from the road level.

Case no. 11

(Smt. Usha Rani Jolly, 304, Ward No. 4, Mehrauli, New DelhiS)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for total height of 17 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc and the building should not exceed height of 15 mtrs, to be measured from the road level.

Case no. 12

(Sh. Bhupinder Singh S/o Sh. Hari Darshan Singh, Bathinda, Punjab)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 33 feet 3 inches including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 13

345

(Parshotam Lal s/o Sh. Rangat Ram, Bathinda, Punjab)

The application was perused. 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 advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 14

(Smt. Sonia w/o Sh. Sachin Chopra S/o Sh. Vijay Kumar Chopra, Nurmahal, Punjab)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 27 feet 9 inches including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 15

(Sh. Satish Kumar & Surinder Kumar S/o Sohan Lal, Bathinda, Punjab)

The application was perused. 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 advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 16

(Sh. Gian Singh S/o Gurdev Singh, Nurmahal, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for repair and renovation only, being located in prohibited area. The appliacant may be advised to retain the building/elevating foot-print and further, there should be no addition vertically or horizontally.

Case no. 17

(Shri Jatinder Khosla S/o Sh. Sat Prakash Khosla, Nurmahal, Punjab)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 37 feet 6 inches including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 18

(Smt. Shanti Devi w/o Sh. Sukh Ram, Fatehgarh, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 15 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. Further, at the time of digging of foundation ASI should be kept inform, in case of any presence of in archaeological remains.

Case no. 19

(Shri Jaswant Singh, S/o Sh. Balwant Singh, Bathinda, Punjab)

The application was perused. 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 advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 20

(Smt. Darshan Kaur W/o Sh. Avtar Singh, Bathinda, Punjab)

The application was perused. 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 try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 21

(Shri Mukhtiar Singh S/o Sh. Surjit Singh, Fatehgarh, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 24 feet 9 inches including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. Further, at the time of digging of foundation ASI should be kept informed, in case of any presence of archaeological remains.

Case no. 22

(Shri Narinder Kumar S/o Sh. Arjan Lal, Bathinda, Punjab)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 31 feet 9 inches including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 23

(Shri Madhu Soodan S/o Sh. Jagdish Kumar, Bathinda, Punjab)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 38 feet 3 inches including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 24

(Sh. Gurbaksh Singh, Punjab)

The application was perused. It was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 27 feet 9 inches including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

Case no. 25

(Smt. Surinder Kaur w/o Sh. Bant Singh, Ludhiana, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case with total height of 26 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. Further, at the time of digging of foundation ASI should be kept informed, in case of any presence of archaeological remains.

Case no. 26

(Smt. Shakuntala w/o Sh. Satpal Singh, Roop Nagar, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend grant of NOC** in this case for repair and renovation only, being located in prohibited area. The appliacant may be advised to retain the building/elevating foot-print and further, there should be no addition vertically or horizontally.

Case no. 27

(Smt. Indra w/o Lajpatrai, Suman w/o Krishna Kumar, Hissar,Haryana)

The application was perused. 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 to incorporate local/vernacular style in the construction.

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

MINUTES OF THE 81st MEETING (3rd Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11 A.M on 12th December, 2012

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

(Fresh cases)

Case no. 1

(Shri Bimal Garg, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 34'9" including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. the applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular architecture in his construction.

Case no. 2

(Shri Jang Bahadur Kohli B6/56, Nakodar Road, Nurmahal, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 38'3" (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular architecture in his construction.

Case no. 3

(Shri Vinod Kumar Gupta, Punjab)

This proposal relates to repair of an building in the prohibited area. However, in the absence of clear photos and plan of existing building and nature of repairs proposed it was not possible to take a decision. The same may be called for from the CA.

Case no. 4

(Smt. Manju Bala w/o Sh. Rakesh Kumar, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 24'6" including mumty, parapet, water-storage etc.) ASI should be kept informed especially at the time of excavating the foundation in case of any archaeogical remains being found.

Case no. 5

(Thiru R. Natarajan, Kanchipuram, Tamiladu)

After perusal of the application it was noted that construction has already taken place. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 7.46 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) and a penalty of Rs. 25,000 may be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without prior permission and this amount should be utilized through ASI for providing amenities/facilities apt the protected monument.

Case no. 6

(Thiru G. Venkatesan, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.26 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) It should be ensured that at no point the construction crosses the 100 mtr prohibited limit.

Case no. 7

(Thiru G. Sasikaran, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.86 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) It should be ensured that at no point the construction crosses the 100 mtr prohibited limit.

Case no. 8

(Thiru N.V. Devarajan, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and noting that it pertains to Kanchipuram town, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.47 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) and the applicant may be advised to try to adopt the Kanchipuram guidelines circulated in this regard.

Case no. 9

(Thiru S. Mohnakrishnan, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.35 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 10

(Shri Ankur Kothari, Assam)

The application was examined in detail. After perusal of the same it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulation that the building would be restricted to 1 underground level, stilt and 2 floors so that the overall height of the building is in conformity with neighbouring buildings on either side.

Case no. 11

(Shri Sardar Singh s/o Sh. Bhikaram, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.33 mtrs (excluding mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try to incorporate local/vernacular architecture in his construction.

Case no. 12

(District Magistrate, Jehanabad, Bihar)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 5.10" (excluding mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Deferred cases

Case no. 1

(Mrs. Thilothama and Mrs. Sindhu, Kerala)

This case had been referred back to obtain clarification about road level/ ground level. The clarifications given were perused and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 9.94 mtrs to be measured from road level and basement / cellar of 2.55 mtrs. The above height is inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 2

(Smt. Ugamadevi, Karnataka)

The clarifications given by the applicant were perused and it was observed that the applicant is seeking clearance for layout plan at the site. Since there is no provision for giving NOC only for a layout plan, the applicant may be advised to approach CA/NMA only after there is a confirmed proposal for undertaking any construction.

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

The clarifications given by the applicants was noted that these are actually two separate applications and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC to both the applicants for each separate NOC would be issued.

Case no. 5

(Smt. Lakshmi Swaminathan and Shri K.V. Swaminathan, J-29, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

The clarifications regarding proposed repairs/ renovation were perused and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed repairs as per the list provided by the applicant. There should be no new construction or any addition vernacular or horizontal.

Case no. 6

(National Institute of Fashion Techonology, Delhi)

In this case, the applicant has approached NMA for reconsideration of the height limit which was earlier fixed at 15 mtrs and all. Taking note of the fact that this is an institutional body and an Govt. organization, it was decided to consider the height limit of maximum 21 mtrs including (mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.), this being an institutional body.

Case no. 7

(Shri Sumer Bhurmal Kothari, Ahmedabad)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs with height of the building not to exceed 15 mtrs to be measured from road level.

It was also decided to take up a few additional fresh cases as follows:

Case no. 1

(M/s Saigal Holdings Pvt. Ltd., C-26, Nizamuddin West, 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

(Shri Satish Handa, Y-9, Hauz Khas, 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. 3

(Shri Moinul Arafien and others, F-2, Nizamuddin West, 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. 4

(Shri Gangadharan Nair, Kerala)

The application was perused and although it is only for proposed additions/ alteration and located in the prohibited area, it was not clear from the documents as to when the original construction had been done and whether it requires approval from NMA/ ASI. These details alongwith original building plan and plans of alteration and additions may be provided.

Case no. 5

(Thiru M. Mohammad Abubacker Siddique, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the applications it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12.33 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 6

(Shri Mohana Homes, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and keeping in view the existing building in the vicinity which are predominantly ground+1, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with maximum height of 10.5 mtrs (stilt, 2 floors and mumty).

Case no. 7

(Thiru P. Shanmugam and P.Selvaraj, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application and noting that it pertains to Kanchipuram town, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.70 mtrs (including mumty,parapet,water-storage tank etc.) and the applicant may be advised to try to adopt the Kanchipuram guidelines circulated in this regard.

Case no. 8

(Thiru S. Palani, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the applications it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.46 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc).

Case no. 9

(Thiru G.Sasikaran, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the applications it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.86 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc).

Case no. 10

(Thiru A. Munisamy, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the applications it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4.20 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). A penalty of Rs 25000/- may also be imposed, as construction was done without prior sanction, to be utilised through MSI to provide facilities/ amenities at the protected site.

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

MINUTES OF THE 81st MEETING (4th Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11 A.M on 13th December, 2012

Case no. 1

(Shri Ramashry Pandey, Dy. Chief Engineer, Northern Railway)

The I[st] case pertained to the application from Northern Railway for construction of driver/guard room near *Nila Gumbad* monument at Nizamuddin. A discussion on this proposal was also held with representatives of Northern Railway and ASI. After going through the details of the case it was decided that the distance should be properly verified, taking the actual distance both from *Nila Gumbad* as well as the protected limit of *Humayun Tomb*. Thereafter the case would be taken up for further consideration.

Thereafter a few cases of Tamilnadu of *Kadaperi Burial site* were taken up (originally listed on 10.12.12) :-

Case no. 2

(Thiru T.C. Prabhu, Sy.no.132/1B, Plot no.20A & B, Kadaperi Villge, Kanchipuram,Tamilnadu)

The application was perused and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.65 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 3

(Thiru T.C. Prabhu, Sy.no. 129/2, Plot no. 4, Kadaperi Villge, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

The application was perused and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 4

(Thiru T.C. Murali, Sy.no. 129/2, Plot no. 2, Kadaperi Villge, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

The application was perused and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 5

(Thiru T.C. Murali, Sy.no. 129/2, Plot no. 6, Kadaperi Villge, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

The application was perused and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.65 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 6

(Thiru T.C. Giri, Sy.no. 129/2, Plot no. 3, Kadaperi Villge, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

The application was perused and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 7

(Thiru T.C. Giri, Sy.no. 132/1B Part, Town Sy.no. 3, Door no. 15/8, Kadaperi Villge, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

The application was perused and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.65 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 8

(Thiru T.C. Sanathkumar,Sy.no.129/2,Plotno.8, Kadaperi Villge, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

The application was perused and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 9

(Thiru C. Suseela, Sy.no.132/1B, Plot no.1, Kadaperi Villge, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

The application was perused and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.65 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

A report submitted by CA Mumbai on building survey near the Parel monument was discussed in some detail with reference to the pending applications for NOC. It was decided that the issue may be taken up on 14.12.2012 morning after Members have some more time to examine the report.

Thereafter the following fresh cases were considered:-

Case no. 1

(Smt. Shubhada Shrikant Paranjape, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for total height of 16.6 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate contextual design in the construction.

Case no. 2

(M/s Gawade Brothers, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with restriction of ground+4 storeys only and additional provision for lift room (the total height may be restricted to 17 mtrs in all).

Case no. 3

(Shri Mohit Shantilal Sethia, Solapur, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for total height of 16.14 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate contextual design in the construction.

Case no. 4

(Shri Rahul Anhaji Kakade, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for total height of 18.10 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate contextual design in the construction.

Case no. 5

(Smt. Yogita Dattatraya Raut, Solapur, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of the building to be limited to 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 6

(Shri Madhukar Kishanlal Pardeshi, Solapur, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for total height of 12.60 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate contextual design in the construction.

Case no. 7 : (Smt. Amrita Puri and other, 18, Nizamuddin East, Delhi)

Case no. 8 : (Shri C.S. Saraf and Shri J.M. Saraf, D-55A, Hauz Khas, Delhi)

Case no. 9 : (Smt. Veena Mathur, D-36, Hauz Khas, Delhi)

Case no. 10 : (Shri Abdul Khalique, 407, Chitla Gate, Chawri Bazar, Delhi)

Case no. 11 : (Smt. Kamal Mohini Dhawan, F-3, Nizamuddin West, Delhi)

All these cases pertaining to Delhi and after the case records were perused it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in these cases with the stipulated total height of 15+2 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicants would be at liberty to apply for greater height limit if provision for the same is there in the heritage bye laws, as and when they are available.

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

MINUTES OF THE 81st MEETING (5th Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11 A.M on 14th December, 2012

The report submitted by CA Mumbai on building height survey of Parel monument was examined in detail. Dr. Meera Ishwar Dass, Member had certain observations especially pertaining to zoning/sub-zoning in this area, which she would be conveying in writing separately. It was also felt that since such a comprehensive survey has been done and similar survey for Jogeshwari Caves is also underway, it may be appropriate to get the heritage bye laws for these two monuments also prepared quickly. CA Mumbai may be asked to look into this, in consultation with CA for western region for the heritage bye laws, INTACH etc. Thereafter, the four cases of Mumbai city listed for the day were taken up.

Case no. 1

(M/s Omkar Realtors and Developers Pvt. Ltd.)

The proposal is for construction of a multi-storey building under Slum Rehabilitation Scheme for rehabilitation of slum dwellers and free sale units. From the documents available in the file, it was seen that there are two blocks, one of 18 floors with total height of 55.60 mtrs + lift room which is for rehabilitation wing and the 2nd block also of 18 floors with three podium and one stilt floor with total height of 69.85 mtrs + lift machine room. After consideration, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for total height of 55.60 mtrs for each block+lift machine room (on the basis of the height given for block 'A').

[Note: - It was subsequently informed that due to oversight the complete details of the case were not available at the time of the meeting. The applicant has infact already got permission from ASI earlier for construction of the buildings up to the height of 69.85 mtrs and has constructed the super structure of the building up to that height. His application now is for increase in the height limit of the sale block, up to 135 mtrs. This being the case, the entire proposal will have to be re-examined and would be brought for reconsideration again later.]

Case no. 2

(M/s Talib Dixit Shaikh Risbud Associates)

On perusal of the application it was seen that this case is a redevelopment scheme where the applicant is constructing five storey building for the State Education Department free of cost and as per the scheme, can construct flats for free sale, under this, he has proposed a tower block complex of 28 floors with a total height of 102 mtrs. After examination of the application in detail along with all relevant maps, documents etc. it was decided as follows:-

a) NOC may be granted for wing 'B' (building for Education Department) for the proposed 5 floors with total height of 26.30 mtrs.

b) For wing 'A', NOC may be granted with restriction on total height of upto 57 mtrs + lift machine room.

Case no. 3

(M/s Samcon Builders)

This proposal is for ~~rehabilitation of slum dwellers under SRA~~ redevelopment of old buildings with 39 tenants to be rehabilitated and some component for free sale. The proposal is for construction of ground+17 floors with total height of 57.80 mtrs and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the same.

Case no. 4

(M/s P.N. Bhobe & Associates)

This application is also for ~~rehabilitation of slum dwellers under SRA~~ redevelopment of old buildings with 28 tenants to be rehabilitated and some components for free sale. The proposal is for construction of ground+17 floors and being similar to case no. 3 above, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 57.8 mtrs for the ground+17 floors + lift machine room.

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

MINUTES OF THE 82nd MEETING (1st Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11 A.M on 7th January, 2013

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Case no. 1

(Shri Prakash Ballal s/o K.B. Muniraj Ballal, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 29 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try & incorporate traditional/vernacular style of architecture in the construction.

Case no. 2

(Shri Ashok Kumar Ballal S/o K.B. Muniraj Ballal)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 29 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try & incorporate traditional/vernacular style of architecture in the construction.

Case no. 3

(Shri Udaya Ballal, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 29 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try & incorporate traditional/vernacular style of architecture in the construction.

Case no. 4

(Shri Anil Kumar Ballal, Udupi, Karnataka)

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 try & incorporate traditional/vernacular style of architecture in the construction.

Case no. 5

(Shri Praveen Devadiga, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try & incorporate traditional/vernacular style of architecture in the construction.

Case no. 6

(Shri Umesh Devadiga, Udupi, karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try & incorporate traditional/vernacular style of architecture in the construction.

Case no. 7

(Shri Kumarayya Hegde, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 35 feet (G+1) (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try & incorporate traditional/vernacular style of architecture in the construction.

Case no. 8

(Chief Engineer/Construction/West, Mandya, Karnataka)

This proposal relates to the re-location of Tipu Sultan's Armoury building, which is a state protected monument, to a site located within the regulated area of a centrally protected monument. This re-location has been rendered necessary due to doubling of the existing Bangalore-Mysore railway track. On the question of any possible re-alignment, Railway Authorities have examined the matter at depth and found that this is not possible because there are centrally protected monuments which would get affected. State Govt. has already given permission for shifting of the monument. After consideration of the matter, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for the re-location of Tipu Sultan's Armoury.

The applicant i.e. Railway Authorities may undertake proper documentation at the time of the re-location process and may install signages, plaques etc. at both the sites i.e. original site and the site where the monument is being re-located. SA, ASI, Bengaluru Circle should be associated during the re-location of Tipu Sultan's Armoury, as also a representative to be nominated by NMA.

Case no. 9

(Smt. Aruna Patil, Bidar, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the construction to be limited to ground+ 2 floors only, this being suggested keeping the surrounding ambience and the height of buildings in the vicinity.

Case no. 10

(Shri V.K. Vasudevan, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was noted that most of the proposed construction has already been undertaken by the applicant. After perusal of the case, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case and a penalty of Rs. 20,000 may be imposed on the applicant for having undertaken construction without permission. This amount should be utilized for providing amenities/facilities around the protected monument under the guidance of ASI. Also, no further construction should be undertaken by the applicant beyond what has already been done.

Case no. 11

(Shri A.K. Abdul Rahim, Wayanad, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for the total height of 8.20 mtrs (incuding mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) Further, the construction should not be used for any production activities or for storage/godown purpose, to maintain a proper ambience around the protected monument.

Case no. 12

(Smt. U.A. Haleema, Wayanad, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.2 mtrs including (mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 13

(Shri P. Surendran, Kerala)

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.). ASI may be associated at the time of digging of foundation in case of any archaeological findings.

Case no. 14

(Shri Sathyan & Smt. Boby, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.85 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant should incorporate sloping roof and coloumns along passage on the first floor.

Case no. 15

(Shri Abdul Latheef, Kerala)

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

Case no. 16

(Shri E.V. Francis, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.95 mtrs including (mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 17

(Smt. Shashirai, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground + 1 floor with total height not exceeding 9 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture.

Case no. 18

(Shri L.R. Bairwa, Varanasi, U.P)

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 incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture.

Case no. 19

(Smt. Archana Shrivastava, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground + 1 floor with total height of 9.20 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture.

Case no. 20

(Shri Damri Rai, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+2 floors with total height of 5.94 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture.

Case no. 21

(Smt. Baby Gupta, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 with total height of 9.19 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture.

Case no. 22

(Shri Ravindra Nath Tripathi, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+2 floors with total height of 12.46 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture. The protected monument in question is *Chaukhandi Stupa.*

Case no. 23

(Shri Saligram Tiwari, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+2 floors with total height of 12.28 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture.

Case no. 24

(Smt. Shanti Tiwari, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 floor with total height of 9.10 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture.

Case no. 25

(Shri Ratnesh Kumar Singh, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 floor with total height of 9.29 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture.

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

MINUTES OF THE 82nd MEETING (2nd Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11 A.M on 8th January, 2013

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

(Deferred cases)

Case no. 1

(The Jamshri Rajitsingh Ji Spg. and Wvg. Mills Co. Ltd., Mumbai)

The application had been sent back for clarifications regarding the costruction that appeared to have already been undertaken on the 2nd and 3rd floors. The clarifications sent by the CA/ applicant was perused and it was noted that the applicant had constructed basement to 3rd floor during the period 2000-04 on the basis of permission given by the Municipal Corporation. However, the applicant would still have required for NOC from ASI since the property is located in regulated area. This issue needs to be clarified and if ASI permission was there, copy of the same may be provided.

Case no. 2

(Ms. Meena P. Jain and Sachin S. Katariya, Aurangabad)

The case was referred back to obtain clarification as to why construction had taken place without permission. After perusal of the application and noting that the construction has already been done without NOC, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.4 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) and a penalty of Rs. 50,000 may be imposed on the applicant for the construction without prior sanction. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 3

(Shri Shirishbhai Shantilal Shah, Gujarat)

The matter had been deferred keeping in view the likelihood of site management plan being prepared, it being a World Heritage Site. However, it would seem that this will take more time and the applicant has requested for consideration of this case. After due perusal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in his case for the items of work as proposed in the application and as per conditions suggested by the CA.

(Fresh cases)

Case no. 1 (Sh. Dinesh Mestry Ellora Project Consultants, Mumbai)

Case no. 2 (M/s Khushi Developers, Mumbai)

Both the cases related to Jogeshwari Caves for which CA, Mumbai is preparing a detailed building survey map; it is expected to be submitted shortly. In view of that, it was decided to **defer** consideration of both the cases till after receipt and examination of this survey report.

Case no. 3

(Shri Prabhakar G.Dabholkar (Architect), Mumbai)

After detailed perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of stilt+7 upper floors with total height of 28.5 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 4

(Chief Executive Officer, Maharashtra Maritime Board, Home Department)

The proposal relates to provision of a Jetty and approach for a public utility service at the protected monument. After due consideration and considering it as a provision of facilities for the public, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. Attempt should be made to use stone or other similar material for cladding and also use stone for construction of the railings along the Jetty walls.

Case no. 5

(Deputy Chief Engineer, Deputy Municipal Architect, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18.65 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc).

Case no. 6

(Shri Purushottam Anant Kawali, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the case and taking into consideration existing buildings in the vicinity, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with ground+ 3 floors only and total height of 15 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The construction may be harmonious with the protected monument and use of stone cladding may also be considered by the applicant.

Case no. 7

(Shri K.H. Jivarajanji, Pune)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the limitation of 15 mtrs of total height (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate vernacular/ traditional style in the construction.

Case no. 8

(M/s Adorn Realtors, Pune)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the limitation of 15 mtrs of total height (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate vernacular/ traditional style in the construction. Basement should be restricted only to 1 basement.

Case no. 9

(Shri Vishwanath Hari Pore, Pune)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the limitation of 15 mtrs of total height (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate vernacular/ traditional style in the construction. One basement to be allowed.

Case no. 10

(Shri Mohan Bandopant Kashid, Kolhapur, Maharasthra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.9 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture.

Case no. 11

(Shri Shivanand Baburao Bandivadekar, Kolhapur, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4.83 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture.

Case no. 12

(Shri Ratnakar Gajanan Kulkarni, M/s Supercraft Foundary Partnership Firm, Kolhapur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.02 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture.

Case no. 13

(Smt. Sudhatai Pandit Bandivadekar, Kolhapur, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.41 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/vernacular architecture.

Case no. 14

(Shri Ashok P. Bhosale & Smt. Geeta T. Bhosale, Kolhapur, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.9 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/vernacular architecture.

Case no. 15

(Shri Manoj Bhalchandra Nakhare, Kolhapur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.40 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture.

Case no. 16

(Smt. Shubhalaxmi Balasaheb Patil, Kolhapur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.75 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture.

Case no. 17

(Shri Asifiqbal Rafiqahmed Mokashi, Kolhapur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 5.45 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate traditional/ vernacular architecture. The applicant may try to utilize local stone material in the construction.

Case no. 18

(City Engineer, Solapur Municipal Corporation, Solapur)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the applicant has asked for permission for construction of *Ashok Stambh* with total height of 8.34 mtrs. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in the same, as applied by the applicant.

Case no. 19

(Shri Prashant Govind Joshi Partner M/s Girija Kunal Sorabh)

After perusal of the application and taking into consideration existing buildings in the vicinity it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with height limitation of 15 mtrs in all (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 20

(Shri Anil Pandharinath Kulkarni, Solapur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 13.09 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate local/vernacular style of construction.

Case no. 21

(Shri Shekhar Sheshmal Gandhi, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.00 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate local/vernacular style of construction.

Case no. 22

(Shri Kulkarni Purushottam Shantaram & Kulkarni Vivek Shantaram, Ahmednagar)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12.45 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate local/vernacular style of construction.

Case no. 23

(Shri Keshav Tulsiram Koli, Jalgaon, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4.45 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate local/vernacular style of construction.

Case no. 24

(Shri Shravan Dhondu Koshti, Jalgaon, Maharashtra)

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.) The applicant may be advised to try and incorporate local/vernacular style of construction.

Case no. 25

(Shri Executive Engineer, Ahmedabad City (R&B) Division, Gujarat)

This application pertains to construction of Court building near '*Bhadra Fort*' in Ahmedabad. The applicant had also presented their case before NMA in the meetings held at Ahmedabad on 17.09.2012. During this discussion, NMA had suggested retention to block 'A' of the Court complex being an outstanding example of colonial architecture. This suggestion has been accepted by the applicant and the propoed construction would now be only at the site of block 'B'. To compensate for the area of block 'A', the proposed new building at block 'B' would be of ground+9 floors.

After detailed consideration it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulation of ground+7 floors in all. The existing block 'A' will be retained by the applicant, as already agreed.

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

MINUTES OF THE 82nd MEETING (3rd Day) OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24,Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11 A.M on 9th January, 2013

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

(Deferred cases)

Case no. 1

(Omkar Realtors Pvt. Ltd, Mumbai)

This case had been erroneously been recommended NOC for 57 mtrs and it was later noted that the applicant had already get NOC from ASI earlier for building height of 70 mtrs and his present application was for NOC for increase in height to 135 mtrs for the sale block. After perusal of the case, it was observed that there is no letter from the applicant giving the detailed reason as to why increase in height is being sought by him over and above the NOC which he had already got from ASI. This point should be clarified for further consideration of the matter.

Case no. 2

(S.G. Dalvi & Associates, Mumbai)

This case had earlier been recommended NOC for 15 mtrs and the applicant had submitted a representation seeking increase in height as per his application for 102 mtrs. On perusal of the file it was noted the applicant had got the NOC from ASI earlier but the same was not available in the file nor was there any indication of the height which had been allowed earlier. There was also no detailed justification from the applicant asking for increase in the height limit. These clarifications may be provided by the applicant to consider the case further.

In the context of the above two cases and other cases from Mumbai relating to Parel, it was observed that in the last meetings in December, 2012 Dr. Meera Dass and Dr. Sanghamitra Basu, Members had undertaken to prepare some draft guidelines (which would possibly included zoning, sub-zoning etc) on the basis of the building survey report submitted by CA, Mumbai. The issue was reviewed and it was agreed that Dr. Dass and Dr. Basu would prepare these draft guidelines at earliest.

Case no. 3

(Shri Narsingha Bhanu, Andhra Pradesh)

The application pertains to erection of transmission towers near an archaeological site. It was referred back for some details about the assessment of the site and its architecture potential etc. The clarifications sent by the CA were perused wherein it has been mentioned that the original alignment of the transmission line has already been shifted away from the protected area at a distance of 123 and 175 mtrs from the boundary. Erection of the two towers would not have any impact on the archaeological site and would in no way impact any further excavations etc. After perusal of the clarifications, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the erection of the two power transmission towers as per location plan submitted by the applicant.

(Review Cases)

Case no. 1

(Shri Devendra B. Kadikar, Ahmedabad)

This case pertains to Ahmedabad which had been granted NOC for construction of the building as per modified guidelines allowing 15 mtrs for the building+additional 2mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. The applicant has represented that his proposal may be re-considered in the light of GDCR regulations which require a 2.8 mtrs hollow plinth and allow height of 5 mtrs for stair cabin+machine room. In view of this, the applicant has requested to allow total height 23.4 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc). After due consideration of the matter it was decided that while the height of the building may be retained at 15 mtrs, additional height of 2.80 mtrs for the hollow plinth and 5.0 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water tank and machine room may be allowed over and above so that the total height of the building including everything should not exceed 22.80 mtrs. The other conditions stipulated in NMA guidelines would continue to be followed as also other conditions mentioned by CA Gujarat. The interim guidelines for Ahmedabad/Gujarat would be modified to the above extent and applications seeking modification of height within the above limits would be disposed off accordingly.

(Fresh Cases)

Case no. 1

(Smt. Parvatiben Jogibhai Tandel, Daman & Diu)

The application was perused and the matter discussed in detail. There was a general opinion that Daman town had certain special historical and architectural features and it would be quite appropriate if attempts could be made to preserve these especially in the growth and development as manifest in the new constructions. Members had also done some documentation during the previous visit to Daman town which could be used. Keeping all these factors in mind, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the following conditions:

a) The existing building on the proposed site (which is to be demolished) is a single storey structure with sloping roof. The applicant should retain this architectural feature in the new construction with sloping roof and sloping chajjas over balconies.

b) The applicant may also try to incorporate certain design features from some of the existing buildings for example the Police Station building which has arched windows, colonnades, verandah etc.

c) Provision of balconies with sloped chajjas may also be considered.

d) The overall mass of the building may be broken up visually by use of different colour schemes etc.

e) The height of building would be restricted to 15 mtrs (i.e. ground+4 floors) excluding provision for mumty, water-tank and machine room etc.

A note will also be provided to the applicant (& the CA also) on certain suggestions/guidelines on the above which can be referred to for guidance.

Case no. 2

(Medical Superintendent, Class-I, Rural Hospital, Kolhapur)

After perusal of the application it was noted that the applicant has not provided any building design for the proposed construction. This should be made available to consider the matter further.

Case no. 3

(Sh. H. Fasulutheen, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 29'-1" (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to follow one of the options given in the guidelines for Kanchipuram which have already been circulated.

Case no. 4

(M/s BSCPL Infrastructure Ltd., Chennai)

The application was perused and the matter examined in detail. After due consideration it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the condition that for the buildings which are proposed to be constructed within regulated area, the overall height of the building (excluding provision for mumty, parapet, water-tank, machine room etc.), should not exceed 20 mtrs (i.e. stilt+4 floors) and overall height of the building should not exceed 25 mtrs.

Case no. 5

(Thiru R. Karmegam, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.74 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.).

Case no. 6

(Smt. Chitrakala, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.56 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.).

Case no. 7

(Thiru A. Anbazhagan, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.67 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 8

(Smt. Jayam Natarajan and others, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.67 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 9

(Thiru S.K. Sundararajan, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.26 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 10

(Thiru S. Srinivasan, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 13.27 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 11

(Smt. N. Dhanalakshmi, Kanchipuram)

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-tank etc).

Case no. 12

(Thiru K. Purushothaman, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4.35 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to follow one of the options given in the guidelines for Kanchipuram which have already been circulated.

Case no. 13

(Thiru E. Dayalan, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.23 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to follow one of the options given in the guidelines for Kanchipuram which have already been circulated.

Case no. 14

(Thiru S. Venkatesan & Smt. V. Mala, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.54 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to follow one of the options given in the guidelines for Kanchipuram which have already been circulated.

Case no. 15

(Thiru M. Kuppusamy, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.69 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to follow one of the options given in the guidelines for Kanchipuram which have already been circulated.

Case no. 16

(M/s G.R. Thangamalligai Jewellers Pvt. Ltd., Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 14.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to follow one of the options given in the guidelines for Kanchipuram which have already been circulated.

Case no. 17

(Thiru M. Mani, Smt. M. Indiramani, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.22 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to follow one of the options given in the guidelines for Kanchipuram which have already been circulated.

Case no. 18

(Thiru V. Shobankumar, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.90 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to follow one of the options given in the guidelines for Kanchipuram which have already been circulated.

Case no. 19

(Thiru M. Mani & Smt. M. Indiramani, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.90 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to follow one of the options given in the guidelines for Kanchipuram which have already been circulated.

Case no. 20

(Smt. A. Saraswathi, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.70 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to follow one of the options given in the guidelines for Kanchipuram which have already been circulated.

Case no. 21

(Thiru R. Sarathy, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.47 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to follow one of the options given in the guidelines for Kanchipuram which have already been circulated.

Case no. 22

(Thiru P.R. Gajapathy, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.47 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to follow one of the options given in the guidelines for Kanchipuram which have already been circulated.

Case no. 23

(Thiru P.K. Anandhan, Kanchipuram)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.15 (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to follow one of the options given in the guidelines for Kanchipuram which have already been circulated.

Case no. 24

(Shri V. Koteswara Rao, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.75 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 25

(Shri Shaik Abdul Rub, Guntur, A.P)

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-tank etc).

Case no. 26

(Shri Kommuri Venkata Ramana, Guntur, A.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 13.96 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 27

(Shri N.V.V. Pavan Kumar, Guntur, A.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.82 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 28

(Shri Pulakanam Narayana Rao, Guntur, A.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.65 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 29

(Smt. N. Krishna Veni, Guntur, A.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.8 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 30

(Smt. Nannapaneni Prameela, Guntur, A.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.4 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 31

(Shri N. Umamaheswari, Guntur, A.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.32 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 32

(Shri Pulakanam Narayana Rao, Guntur, A.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.4 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 33

(Shri G. Padmanabha Rao, Guntur, A.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.6 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 34

(Shri B. Krishna Murthy, Guntur, A.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.87 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 35

(Shri Bommisetty Rambabu, Guntur, A.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.8 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 36

(Shri TSV Suresh Kumar, Guntur, A.P)

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-tank etc).

Case no. 37

(Shri Khaja Ziauddin Shaik, Warangal, A.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.5 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 38

(Smt. Vemuri Ratnakumari, Krishna Distt. A.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Government of India 381
Ministry of Culture
National Monuments Authority
24, Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001

MINUTES OF THE 82nd MEETING (4th Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.30 A.M on 10th January, 2013

The following cases were taken up for consideration

(Deferred cases)

Case no. 1

(M/s. Sangam Overseas Pvt. Ltd., 9, Kasturba Gandhi Marg, New Delhi)

This case had been taken up twice in the past and had been deferred, first to ask the applicant to modify the design and on the second occasion as there was a likelihood of bye-laws for 'Ugarsen Ki Baoli' getting ready. However, as the bye-laws are going to take some time, and it has been requested by the applicant, the matter was reconsidered. After going through the application and the revised designs, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total building height of 21 mtrs to be measured from road level (and 2.4 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc. as indicated in the application).

Case no. 2

(Sh. Ramashray Pandey, Deputy Chief Engineer/Construction State, Northern Railway, New Delhi)

This proposal had been deferred for confirmation of the exact distance of the construction site from the boundary of the protected monument. This has been confirmed by SA Delhi Circle, to be 100.94 mtrs. In view of this, the matter having been considered earlier, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case. The applicant should ensure that the 100 mtr limited is not crossed in the construction and façade of the building may be kept harmonious with the protected monument in question.

(Fresh cases)

Case no. 1 (Sh. Atul Kumar Gupta, Kashipur, Udhamsingh Nagar, Uttrakhand)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.34 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 2 (Smt. Urvarshi Rawat, Kashipur, U.S. Nagar, Uttrakhand)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 3.1 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 3 (Sh. Neeraj Puri, Raipur Road, Dehradun, Uttarakhand)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.40 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 4 (Sh. Anand Singh Negi, Bajpur Road, Kashipur, Uttrakhand)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4.87 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 5 (Sh. Satya Pal, Director, Khadi & Village Industries, Uttrakhand)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total G+2 floors and mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 6 (Smt. Bimla Devi, C.C. Colony, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 7 (Sh. Harcharan singh Kohli, Sh. Tejender Singh Kohli, Sh. Harjeet Singh & Sh. Harminder Pal Singh, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and having noted that it pertains to Delhi for each interim guidelines are being followed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total building height of 15 mtrs to be measured from road level and additional 2 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 8 (Sh. Arun Kumar & Sh. Anil Kumar, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and having noted that it pertains to Delhi for each interim guidelines are being followed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total building height of 15 mtrs to be measured from road level and additional 2 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 9 (M/s. Govindam Traders Pvt. Ltd. Through its Director Sh. Aman Gehlot, Green Park, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and having noted that it pertains to Delhi for each interim guidelines are being followed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total building height of 15 mtrs to be measured from road level and additional 2 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 10 (Sh. Ved Prakash (Karta of HUF), Sh. Rajiv Kamal & Sh. Davender Kumar, Soami Nagar, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 11 (Sh. Pran Khanna, Hauz Khas, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and having noted that it pertains to Delhi for each interim guidelines are being followed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total building height of 15 mtrs to be measured from road level and additional 2 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 12 (Sh. Bharat Tondon, Geetanjali Enclave, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 13 (Smt. Archana Mahajan, Sarvapriya vihar, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 14 (Sh. Sudhir Batra, Shivalik, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 15 (Sh. Sagar Batra & Smt. Poonam, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and having noted that it pertains to Delhi for each interim guidelines are being followed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total building height of 15 mtrs to be measured from road level and additional 2 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 16 (Sh. Bharat Tondon, F-2, Geetanjali Enclave, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 17 (Smt. Promila Suri, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and having noted that it pertains to Delhi for each interim guidelines are being followed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total building height of 15 mtrs to be measured from road level and additional 2 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 18 (M/s. United Air Products Pvt. Ltd. Through its Director Sh. Bharat Tondon, F-3, Geetanjali, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and having noted that it pertains to Delhi for each interim guidelines are being followed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total building height of 15 mtrs to be measured from road level and additional 2 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 19 (Sh. Mohd. Akram, Kalyanpura, Turkman Gate, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.48 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 20 (Smt. Janki Mishra, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 21 (M/s. Delhi Cold Storage Pvt. Ltd. Through its Director Sh. Ravi Mittal, Roshanara Bag Road, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 22 (Raj Sethi & Smt. Dipika Sethi, NDSE-II, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and having noted that it pertains to Delhi for each interim guidelines are being followed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total building height of 15 mtrs to be measured from road level and additional 2 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 23 (M/s. Jain Marbles (Partnership Firm) through Sh. Prakash Chand Jain, Partner, Green Park, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.51 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 24 (Sh. Chand Jain and Sh. Prakash Chand Jain, Green Park Ext., New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.51 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 25 (Sh. Kammal Akhtar, Sh. Jamal Akhtar & Sh. Bilal Akhtar, Nizamuddin West, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 26 (Sh. N.M. Thapar & Sh. J.M. Thapar, Pushpanjali, Vikas Marg Extenstion, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 16.93 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 27 (Smt. Pushpa Kapoor, Uday Park, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 28 (M/s. Pure Earth India Pvt. Ltd through its Director Sh. Surjeet Singh, NDSE, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and having noted that it pertains to Delhi for each interim guidelines are being followed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total building height of 15 mtrs to be measured from road level and additional 2 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 29 (Smt. Shashi Agrawal & Dr. Kamlesh Mittal, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 30 (Smt. Priti Saluja, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 31 (Smt. Kanak Jain through its GPA Sh. Kailash Chand Jain, Green Park, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12.20 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 32 (Sh. Deepak Gupta, Smt. Neena Vyas & Smt. Rajni Mohiuddin, Gulmohar Park, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 33 (M/s. C.I. Car Internatilonal through its Partner and Director Sh. Mohd. Shahid, Nizamuddin West, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and having noted that it pertains to Delhi for each interim guidelines are being followed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total building height of 15 mtrs to be measured from road level and additional 2 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 34 (Smt. Shabnam Haroon, Naya Mohalla, Azad Market, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 35 (Smt. Vinay Kumari Kundalia & Sh. Mahendra Kumar Kundalia, C.C. Colony, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and having noted that it pertains to Delhi for each interim guidelines are being followed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total building height of 15 mtrs to be measured from road level and additional 2 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 36 (Sh. Kharaiti Lal, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 37 (Sh. J.S. Chaney, Sh. A.S. Chaney & others, Greater Kailash Part-I, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and having noted that it pertains to Delhi for each interim guidelines are being followed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total building height of 15 mtrs to be measured from road level and additional 2 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 38 (Sh. Arjun Dass, Smt. Vanti Devi and Sh. Atam Prakash Dudeja, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

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

MINUTES OF THE 82nd MEETING (5th Day) OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24,Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11 A.M on 11th January, 2013

The minutes of the 81st meeting which were circulated on the first day of the 82nd meeting have been confirmed, there being no comments from any of the Members.

The following cases were taken up for consideration.

(Deferred cases)

Case no. 1

(Delhi Metro Rail Corporation, New Delhi)

The DMRC case was first taken up for consideration in December, 2011, the proposal actually having been received from the CA Delhi in NMA in June, 2011. Thereafter, the matter was taken up in several subsequent meetings of the NMA and also in discussions with DMRC, ASI and other officials on a few occasions. Various aspects of the entire project were considered in detail including issues like potential structural threat to the monuments, potential archaeology along the proposed alignment, need for impact assessment, structural impact assessment etc. The CA Delhi while examining the application had also gone into these matters and made several suggestions such as conducting GPR Survey, re-alignment especially of the stations and overhead entry-exit, conducting stakeholder meetings and so on. The applicant (DMRC) on its part has complied with various requirements and suggestions, GPR Survey has been done, impact assessment carried out by SPA etc. After a comprehensive examination of the project agencies like SPA, CA Delhi etc. have highlighted long term benefits of this public utility project and the various measures that DMRC would be taking to ensure that any likely damage and threat to the monuments enroute is minimized.

All these issues have been considered at length in NMA. A detailed background note was prepared for the meeting today and circulated amongst Members. A copy of the same is attached with these minutes. After detailed discussions and considering all aspects, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for this project of construction of DMRC Metro line, as per details in the application, from Central Secretariat to Kashmiri Gate with detailed observations of the NMA which are attached with these minutes and which shall be incorporated in the NOC and final permission that would be given.

Case no. 2 Shri Sanjeev Shankar, N-159, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi

Case no. 3 Shri Sanjeev Shanker, N-161, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi

After perusal of the clarifications relating to the proposed repairs, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in both the above cases for the proposed repair and renovations as per list given by the applicant.

Case no. 4

(M/s Charan Plaza Pvt. Ltd., Lucknow)

The applicant has clarified the clearance regarding the nature and type of construction and given other details as asked for. After perusal of the same, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12.45 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.).

Case no. 5

(Pharmaha Khomsaram, Joint Secy, Mulnidhi Wat Thai Kusinara, U.P)

The application has been re-submitted after the clarifications which was basically to ask for an archaeological assessment report in view of the fact that the protected site is an important historical and archaeological site. The applicant has got an impact assessment done by some consultants, which after perusal by Members was not felt to be either comprehensive enough or addressing the relevant issues properly. Reiterating that the importance of the archaeological site cannot be over emphasized, Members felt that a detailed archaeological site survey should be done by ASI and after the detailed report is received the matter could be considered again.

Case no. 6

(Chief Medical Superintendent, Balrampur Hospital, Lucknow)

The clarifications furnished by the applicant were perused and it was noted that the State PWD agencies have certified that neither the existing building has structural strength for additional constructions on it nor is there any scope to retain any of the existing buildings/incorporate them in the proposed new construction. After perusal of these clarifications it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.80 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The proposed new construction should be ~~complying~~ in consonance with the protected monument in question and compatible colours should be used in the façade.

Case no. 7

(Shri Ram Avtar Aggarwal, Lucknow)

The clarifications of the applicant were perused wherein it has been stated that the construction had started without prior NOC due to lack of knowledge about the same and the work had been stopped as soon as notice from the CA/SA was received. After perusal of the application it was observed by Members that the distance of the protected monument at 283 mtrs is from one end of the boundary of the construction site. From an examination of the layout plan, it would appear that the construction activity could actually begin at a point inside the construction site which is physically beyond 300 mtrs. This point should be specifically examined/clarified by the CA.

Case no. 8

(Thiru S. Shiva Subramaniam, Chennai)

After perusal of the application and noting that an impact assessment has been got done by the applicant, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for total height of 20.22 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to follow traditional/vernacular style in the new construction.

(Fresh Cases)

Case no. 1

(Dr. Meera Ramachan, Gargi College, New Delhi)

After examination of the proposal and noting that it pertains to an institutional building (Gargi College), it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for total height of 17.3 mtrs including (mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) and one basement.

Case no. 2

(Shri Satish Chander Goel, K-44, Green Park Main, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for the proposed repair and renovation. There would be no new construction or any addition horizontally/vertically to the existing building.

Case no. 3

(Smt. Geeta Luthra, N-5, Panchsheel Park, New 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 K.C. Bhalla, 2/23, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi-16)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 5

(Smt. Premila Patidar, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+1 floor and maximum building height of 8 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to follow traditional/vernacular style in the new construction.

Case no. 6

(Shri Dalji S/o Shri Nagarji Patidar, Banswara, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+1 floor and maximum building height of 8 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to follow traditional/vernacular style in the new construction.

Case no. 7

(Smt. Anju Singh, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor with maximum height of 5.5 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to follow traditional/vernacular style in the new construction.

Case no. 8

(Smt. Saraswati Shukla, Ajmer, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11 ft (excluding mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may be advised to follow traditional/vernacular style in the new construction.

Case no.9

(Principal, Secondary School, Alwar, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+1 floor and maximum building height of 8 feet 10 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to follow traditional/vernacular style in the new construction.

Case no. 10

(Shri Munshi Lal Mali, Tonk, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the clarifications relating to the proposed repairs, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for the proposed repair and renovations as per details given by the applicant.

Case no. 11

(Shri Ramjl Lal S/o Shri Dev Karan, Haryana)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+1 floor and maximum building height of 10.36 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to follow traditional/vernacular style in the new construction.

Case no. 12

(Shri Lajpat Rai Krishan Kumar, Hissar, Haryana)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+ 2 floors with total height of 11 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to follow traditional/vernacular style in the new construction.

Case no. 13

(NHPC Limited, Faridabad, Haryana)

After examination of the application it was decided that this may be treated as an institutional building and a maximum height of 21 mtrs may be provided with 3 mtrs for mumty, parapet etc. The applicant being a large public undertaking should contribute towards heritage promotion and they may consider setting up an interpretation centre near the proposed new construction explaining the historic background and also, in association with ASI, take up beautification and maintenance of the monument, providing information signages etc.

Case no. 14

(Shri Ram Kumar S/o Gordhan Dass, Haryana)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+II floors and maximum building height of 11 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to follow traditional/vernacular style in the new construction.

Case no. 15

(Shri T.C. Aggarwal S/o Shri Govind Ram, Haryana)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+II floors and maximum building height of 11 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 16

(Shri Krishna Madan S/o Shri Thakar Dass, Haryana)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+II floors and maximum building height of 11 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to follow traditional/vernacular style in the new construction.

Case no. 17

(Smt. Shanti Soni w/o Shri R.K. Soni, Gwalior, M.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulated total height of 24 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) The applicant may be advised to follow traditional/vernacular style in the new construction.

Case no. 18

(Shri Ram Kumar Yadav S/o Shri Pancham Singh, Jhansi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with height of 6.3 mtrs for the building and additional 1 mtr for the water tank. The applicant may be advised to follow traditional/vernacular style in the new construction.

Case no. 19

(Smt. Devmuni Devi, Rohtas, Bihar)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with height of the building restricted to 20 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may be advised to follow traditional/vernacular style in the new construction.

Case no. 20

(Shri Dinesh Kumar, Regional Tourist Officer, Agra)

This proposal is for certain repairs/renovations/construction for providing better infrastructure facilities near Taj Mahal, Agra. A detailed presentation on the project was made by Secretary, Tourism, Govt. of U.P and officials of Regional Tourist office, Agra. After perusal of the application/ presentation and observing that the proposed facilities are quite necessary for visitors to the monument and also in the nature of essential public services, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC to the extent that the proposals fall within the prohibited area/ regulated area.

ANNEXURE - I

Detailed conditions relating to NOC recommended for DMRC proposal for Central Secretariat-Kashmiri Gate, Metro Line

The following detailed conditions have been stipulated by NMA while considering and recommending the above NOC:

a) The proposed alignment, especially the stretch between ITO and Red Fort is a potentially rich area in archaeology, especially medieval archaeology. This section would need careful monitoring. As indicated in the DMRC proposal, the average depth of the tunnel in this stretch is about 17m: this being the area which may have the potential archaeology, DMRC should establish a mechanism involving ASI and other stakeholders for regular monitoring during the stage of works being carried out.

b) Even prior to any work being taken up, the area/stretch needs to be quickly assessed by a joint team from ASI & DMRC to identify areas that might be indicative of potential archaeology. Use of any existing database or historic records of the area, especially the Shahjahanabad area, should be made use of. This would assist in the monitoring process mentioned above.

c) A condition assessment of the protected monuments falling along the Metro route may be carried out covering both conservation requirements and assessments of current structural position of the monument. Such a condition status of the monument would enable preventive conservation and structural work to be taken up prior to start of any construction activities. This would also assist in identifying the type of monitoring requirements and equipments needed.

d) Threat to the historic monuments during various stages of construction/post construction is a concern expressed repeatedly as also the need to monitor this effectively on real time basis. For this purpose, DMRC should install monitoring equipment on all protected monuments along the proposed route capable of measuring vibrations/structural impacts when construction activities are on and during the metro operations. This should be done in association with ASI.

e) DMRC should set up a separate fund for the purpose of heritage promotion and campaigning for the cause of Delhi's heritage: this should be used for Interpretation centers, establishing small museums or display units for any salvaged/rescued archaeology, developing facilities or amenities around the protected monuments concerned and so on. The size and nature of such a fund may be suggested by a committee, consisting of officers from DMRC, ASI, SPA, NMA and other stake holders, which team could also suggest the works to be taken up and monitor the same. This committee will be formed immediately, to be headed by the representative from ASI; the officers to be nominated shall be senior officers of the level of at least Director and the committee can also examine best practices followed at other places for drawing up their plans.

395

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

MINUTES OF THE 83rd MEETING (1st Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11 A.M on 18th February, 2013

At the beginning of the meeting, Member Secretary elaborated on the procedure being followed for the NMA in taking decisions for the NOC applications. It was mentioned that cases listed for the consideration are taken up one by one with a synopsis being available with each Member. Presentation is made on each case and relevant files referred to and each case discussed. Thereafter a decision is taken to which all Members present would have agreed to. Minutes of the meeting are prepared subsequently based on the discussions and decisions and these minutes are approved by the Chairperson. It was also clarified that minutes are circulated at the next meeting for confirmation and comments/observations on the minutes would have relate to any factual errors or any observation made by a Member which may not have been fully recorded but it could not be on the decision in respect of that case.

2. Whole Time Member raised an issue relating to the procedure for examination of draft heritage bye laws with the request that individual members should be allowed to undertake visits to the monument/ sites in question for a better understanding of the proposed heritage bye laws. It was clarified that examination of such matters would ideally be done by the NMA as a whole so that all the members then had a chance to study the draft heritage bye laws from an on site inspection point of view. Whole Time Member also raised an issue regarding quorum for NMA meetings to which it was mentioned that the Act and Rules provided for the NMA to itself decide on these matters.

The minutes of the 82nd meeting which were circulated on the first day of the 83rd meeting have been confirmed, there being no comments from any of the Members.

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

Case no. 1

(Sh. Mohammad Siddiq Hajinoor Mohd. Campwala, Vadodara)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.80 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may be advised to use traditional style of architecture in façade.

Case no. 2

(Shri Shashikant Ramanbhai Patel & others, Vadodara)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.60 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may be advised to use traditional style of architecture in the construction.

Case no. 3

(Shri Varma Vinay Dhaneshbhai P.O.A.H. & others, Vadodara)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 16.40 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may be advised to use traditional style of architecture in the construction.

Case no. 4

(Smt. Geetaben Ashokbhai Agrawal, Vadodara)

After perusal of the application it was noted that construction has already taken place. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 12 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) and a penalty of Rs. 50,000 may be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without prior permission and this amount should be utilized through ASI for providing amenities/facilities at the protected monument. Also, no further construction should be undertaken by the applicant beyond what has already been done.

Case no. 5

(Shri Jayraj A. Thakwani, Vadodara)

After perusal of the application it was noted that construction will take place on an existing building. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 12.18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

Case no. 6

(Shri Ashok Rawatmal Nahar, Vadodara)

After perusal of the application it was noted that construction has already taken place. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 12 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) and a penalty of Rs. 50,000 may be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without prior permission and this amount should be utilized through ASI for providing amenities/facilities at the protected monument. Also, no further construction should be undertaken by the applicant beyond what has already been done.

Case no. 7

(Shri Babuji Ratanji Thakor, Patan, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that construction has already taken place. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 4 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) without any further construction/ addition in the proposed building. Keeping the nature of the application in view it was decided that the applicant should be warned not to undertake any further construction beyond what has already been done and any proposed construction activity would need prior sanction.

Case no. 8

(Shri Revaji Ratanji Thakor, Patan, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that construction has already taken place. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 4 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) without any further construction/ addition in the proposed building. Keeping the nature of the application in view it was decided that the applicant should be warned not to undertake any further construction beyond what has already been done and any proposed construction activity would need prior sanction.

Case no. 9

(Shri Badsangji Ratanji Thakor, Patan, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that construction has already taken place. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 4 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) without any further construction/ addition in the proposed building. Keeping the nature of the application in view it was decided that the applicant should be warned not to undertake any further construction beyond what has already been done and any proposed construction activity would need prior sanction.

Case no. 10

(Shri Mohammadbhai Musabhai Kapadiya, Bharuch)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 13.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc).

Case no. 11

(Shri Salim Akbarbhai Lokhandwala, Bharuch)

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

Case no. 12

(Shri Yunushusen Abdulrazzak Gandhi & others, Bharuch)

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

Case no. 13

(Shri Mahendrakumar Hiralal Patel & others, Patan)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that this proposal is for construction which falls partially in prohibited area as well as in regulated area. So, it was decided that no construction should take place in prohibited area and entry gate may also be shifted but NOC is granted for regulated area only with the condition that upto 100 mtrs should be maintained as green area.

Case no. 14

(Shri Mahendrakumar Chimanlal Shah, Godhra, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that construction has already taken place. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 9.08 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) and a penalty of Rs. 25,000 may be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without prior permission and this amount should be utilized through ASI for providing amenities/facilities at the protected monument. Also, no further construction should be undertaken by the applicant beyond what has already been done.

Case no. 15

(Shri Ramanbhai Gandabhai Panchal & others)

After perusal of the case it was noted that the applicant has already constructed super structure up to 4 floors. After detailed examination, keeping in mind the surrounding structures in the vicinity, the fact that the construction has been undertaken without obtaining prior permission etc. it was decided that NOC would be recommended only for ground (hollow plinth)+2 floors for which total height should not exceed 9 mtrs+another 2 mtrs for mumty, water-tank etc). The remaining 2 floors which have been constructed by the applicant must be demolished. CA, Gujarat may ensure that the demolition is first carried out before the permission as above is granted. Further penalty of Rs. 50,000 may be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without prior permission and this amount should be utilized through ASI for providing amenities/facilities at the protected monument. Also, no further construction should be undertaken by the applicant beyond what has already been done.

Case no. 16

(The Principal Galteshwer Primary School, Kheda, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 1.82 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.)

Case no. 17

(Smt. Kamlaben Natwarlal Thakkar, Paldi, Ahmedabad)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 22.39 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) During construction the applicant should also be advised not to cross the 100 m limit as the proposed construction is just beyond 101 m.

Case no. 18

(Shri Abdulrahim Pirbhai Marghawala & others, Vadodara)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 12.75 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc).

Case no. 19

(Shri Mohmed Hanif Ismailbhai Kokniwala, Vadodara)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that construction has already taken place. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 10.77 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) and a penalty of Rs. 25,000 may be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without prior permission and this amount should be utilized through ASI for providing amenities/facilities at the protected monument.

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

MINUTES OF THE 83rd MEETING (2nd Day) OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24,Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11 A.M on 19th February, 2013

First, balance cases listed for 1st day (case no. 20-28) were taken up:-

Case no. 20

(The Executive Engineer, T.C.G.L, Gandhinagar, Gujarat)

After perusal of the case and noting that it was a project to provide visitor amenities it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for the various facilities proposed total height of which would range 2.53 to 5.40. The material to be used should be of appropriate type for example: - on fibre roof tiles could be put. Road paving should be in brick or pre-cast RCC tiles. Care should also be taken with natural drainage pattern is not disrupted.

Case no. 21

(Shri Imran Nazir Kureshi & Samir Nasir Shaikh, Surat)

After perusal of the case, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 19.80 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc) and the balconies may be incorporated in front side of building.

Case no. 22

(The Administrator, Dwarkadhish Temple, Jamnagar, Gujarat)

After perusal of the case, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the ropeway bridge of 17.50 mtrs from river bed level and the conditions which imposed by ASI earlier will also apply.

Case no. 23

(Director, Annapurna Polymers Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

After examining the application it was noted that the purpose of the proposed construction is not specified. It needs to be specified first, then the matter could be consider again.

Case no. 24

(Shri Mansukhbhai Jivrajbhai Vaja, Bhavnagar, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has undertaken the construction without permission and has actually completed the construction inspite of being served notice by CA/SA. Keeping the circumstances in mind, it was decided that this unauthorized construction should get demolished.

Case no. 25

(Shri Prahladbhai B. Patel and others, Ahmedabad)

After perusal of the case, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 16.45 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc) and the applicant is advised to keep the façade in harmony with local character.

Case no. 26

(Executive Engineer, Ahmedabad City (R&B) Division, Bhadra Fort, Ahmedabad)

After perusal of the case, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the proposed redevelopment plan and subject to the conditions as mentioned in the NOC letter.

Case no. 27

(Shri Ratilal B. Raninga and Smt. Niruben B. Kambaliya, Junagarh, Gujarat)

After perusal of the case, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+2 only in view of prevailing nature of structures. Basement is not agreed to.

Case no. 28

(Shri Kasambhai Aadambhai Hamdani, Porbandar, Gujarat)

After perusal of the case, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 7.26 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Deferred cases

Case no. 1

(Shri Bhagwanbhai Manoharbhai Patel, Patan, Gujarat)

After perusal of the case, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for ground floor construction as per plan. ASI should be associated during excavation of foundation in case of any archaeological remains.

Case no. 2

(Shri Harish B. Dhumal, Baroda, Gujarat)

After perusal of the case, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 13.80 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 3

(Shri Kirtikumar Chimanlal Shah & others, Baroda, Gujarat)

After perusal of the case, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 12.30 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 4

(Sh. Nilesh Ramanlal Chunawala P.O.A.H. of Sh. V.P.Govindan & others, Baroda, Gujarat)

After perusal of the case, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 14.70 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Thereafter, the cases listed for the second day were taken up.

Member Secretary had circulated a communication from NDMC regarding maximum permissible height for super structures above roof level such as mumty, water-tank, lift room etc. NDMC had requested that as their bye laws allowed for a maximum of 3 mtrs for roof structures, NMA may consider allowing same height limits. After consideration of the matter, it was decided that the maximum permissible height for super structures above the roof such as mumty, water-tank etc. may now be fixed at 3 mtrs; thereby total height of a structure could be a maximum of 18 mtrs (the building height not to exceed 15 mtrs measured from road level to roof level). It was also decided that there would be no further reconsideration especially of the height permissible for roof top structures. Thereafter the cases were taken up for consideration.

Case no. 1

(Shri Ajay Wahi, B-2/30, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but the total height restricted to 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs.

Case no. 2

(Shri Shantanu Bhattacharya, B-2/28, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) with building height not to exceed 15m.

Case no. 3

(Shri Inder Sain Jasuja, B-2/53, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 4

(Smt. Asha Mital, B-2/62, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 5

(Smt. Sarla Saini, B-2/83, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but the total height restricted to 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs.

Case no. 6

(Smt. Kumud Mittal, G-118/7, Krishna Nagar, Safdarjung Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but the total height restricted to 17/18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs.

Case no. 7

(Smt. Indra Gupta, S-318A, Panchsheel Park, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but the total height restricted to 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs.

Case no. 8

(Smt. Rama Kapoor & others, N-31, Panchsheel Park, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 9

(Smt. Sita Devinder Singh, N-102, Panchsheel Park, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17.90 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 10

(M/s Sanskar Homes Pvt. Ltd., D-3, Commercial Centre, Vasant Vihar, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 11

(Shri Devender Verma, 8, Begumpur, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 12

(M/s Uppal Housing Pvt. Ltd. C-3/13, Safdarjung Development Area, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 13

(Shri Ram Kumar Goel, C-2/60, Safdarjung Development Area, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but the total height restricted to 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs.

Case no. 14

(Smt. Sudha Agarwal and others, C-1/18, Safdarjung Development Area, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but the total height restricted to 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs.

Case no. 15

(Shri Aashish Agarwal & M/s Grovy Exports and Marketing Ltd., Y-44, Hauz Khas, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 16

(Shri Sukhdev Blaggana and others, Y-40, Hauz Khas, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but the total height restricted to 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs.

Case no. 17

(Shri Rakesh Gupta and others, 332/8, Main Market, Mehrauli, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 18

(Capitol Art House Pvt. Ltd. Through Director Sanjeev Batra, The Hazel, A-1/4, Ward no. 1, Style Mile, Kalka Das Marg, Mehrauli, Delhi)

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 addition horizontally or vertically to the existing structure.

Case no. 19

(Sundrydge India Heritage Pvt. Ltd. Through Director Sanjeev Batra, Kutub Sarai, One Style Mile, 6-8 Kalka Das Marg, Mehrauli, Delhi)

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 addition horizontally or vertically to the existing structure.

Case no. 20

(Sundrydge Kila Resorts Pvt. Ltd. Through Director P.J. Thareja, The Kila, Seven Style Mile, 4A Kalka Das Marg, Mehrauli, Delhi)

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 addition horizontally or vertically to the existing structure.

Case no. 21

(M/s Red Rose Estates Pvt. Ltd through its signatory Sh. Parvinder Singh Kohli, 48, Block-172, Jorbagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but the total height restricted to 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs.

Case no. 22

(Shri Kapil Gupta, C-29, Geetanjali Enclave, Delhi)

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

Case no. 23

(Shri Raj Khanna & Smt. Madhu Khanna, 8/8, Sarvapriya Vihar, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 17 mtrs as proposed (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 24

(Shri Amrit Lal Giroti, B-94, Malviya Nagar, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 17 mtrs as proposed (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 25

(Shri Ved Mehra, D-206, Saket, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but the total height should not exceed 15.84 as proposed (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 26

(Shri Madan Lal Jain, B-7/104, Safdarjung Enclave Ext., Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17.90 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 27

(Shri Anil Narang, A-61, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 28

(Shri Loku Ram Adlakha, Shop No. 39, opp. Civil Hospital, Hisar, Haryana)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.97 mtrs+ 2 mtrs for mumty.

Case no. 29

(Shri Tarachand Bagri, Khokrakot, Rohtak, Haryana)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 17 ft. (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 30

(Smt. Anita Gulia W/o Shri Hansraj Gulia, Ward No. 11, Farooknagar, Jhajjar, Haryana)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 19'6" feet inches (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

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

MINUTES OF THE 83RD MEETING (3th Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.30 A.M on 20th February, 2013

At first, the left over cases from the list of the 2nd Day were taken up for consideration (case no. 31st to 34th and deferred cases)

(Fresh Cases)

Case no. 31

(The Pujaries of Sri Sri Ram-Janaki Thakurbari, Sivadoul Complex, P.O., Sivasagar, Assam)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that there are insufficient detail about proposed repair work and there is no site plan, details of existing building etc, these may be provided to examine the case properly.

Case no. 32

(Sh. Jatindra Lahkar, Deputy Commissioner Sivasagar cum Chairman Sivasagar Development Authority, Sivasagar, Assam)

After examined of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC, for the proposed maintenance work around the protected sites. It was also felt that the issue of protection of the Sivasagar tank should be examined and the reference may be made to the Government in this regard. The matter has also referred to by the CA in his report.

Case no. 33

(Smt. Chandrakala Bhatia, Talria Pada, Jaisalmer, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application, it was seen that the construction had already started without obtaining permission. Further, it is not clear whether any notice was issued by the CA/SA, whether the work was stopped or has since been completed etc. These details may be provided for further examination of the case.

Case no. 34

(Sh. Dharmesh S/o Sh. Subhash Chand Mehta, Banswara, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for the construction as per drawing submitted. The total height of building should not exceed 20 feet.

(Deferred Cases)

Case no. 01

(Reserve Bank Of India, RBI Colony, August Kranti Marg, Hauz Khas, New Delhi)

The proposal is for construction of residential colony for RBI officers. This had been deferred earlier and the clarifications provided by the applicant were gone through. After examination of the same, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with height limitation of 21 mtrs. This case is considered as a Group Housing Project in the government sector.

Case no. 02

(Miranda House (Teaching Extension), University of Delhi)

This proposal of Miranda House for construction of new academic block was examined with reference to the clarification provided by CA, especially, in respect of, whether the construction has started or not. After examining the report of the CA, 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. 03

(Miranda House (Girls Hostel), University of Delhi, Delhi)

This case pertains to construction of new Hostel Block for girls which has already been completed. The report of CA, in this context, was examined and after taking into account various factors, it was felt that the college authorities should first prepare an action plan for heritage permission and awareness within the college and campus in general. They should include component of workshops, seminars, heritage walks, heritage week etc with active involvement of the students. This plan may be prepared and should be submitted to NMA for consideration of grant of NOC/regularisation of the case.

Case no. 04

(Smt. Vandana Sharma D/o Sh. Harish Chander Sharma, Hissar, Haryana)

After perusal of clarification relating to submission of building plan, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.50 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 05

(Sh. Ashok Kumar Sarawgi, Guwahati, Assam)

The clarification provided by the CA, i.e. photographs of buildings in the vicinity and heights were examined and after taking into account the prevelance of existing construction in the area, it was decided that NOC may be accorded in this case with the stipulation that total height of the building would not exceed 12 mtrs inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc.

The cases relating to Jogeshwari Caves had been deferred in anticipation of a building survey report that was expected from CA Mumbai. This was supposed to be submitted in December 2012 but it would seem that this is likely to take even more time as on date. Keeping that in mind, it was felt that cases which have been pending since very long need to be considered. Accordingly following cases were taken up:-

Deferred cases

Case no. 1

(M/s Khushi Developers, Jogeshwari, Mumbai)

This is a proposal in SRA category and located at 218.8 mtrs from the protected limit of Jogeshwari Caves. After perusal of the site map and other details it was observed that the proposed construction site is across a major six lane road (western express way) and therefore quite delinked from the protected area. Taking these considerations in view it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 60.17 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc (comprising stilt and 1-19 floors).

Case no. 2

(Shri Dinesh Mestry Ellora Project Consultants, Mumbai)

This proposal is also under SRA category located at 103 mtrs from the protected limit. After consideration of relevant aspects in detail, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 36.85 mtrs including mumty, water-tank etc. (comprising ground+10 floors).

(There was a detailed discussion regarding cases of Mumbai especially of SRA category located near Parel and Jogeshwari Caves. A detailed record of that discussion is being issued specially and looked from a part of the record of the minutes)

Review Cases

Case no. 1

(St. Joseph College, The Procurator, Tamilnadu)

In this case, the applicant has already been granted NOC but has requested a review for allowing a second basement as applied earlier. After examination of the case it was decided to reiterate the decision of NMA to permit only one basement, this having been done not on any structural feasible condition but on account of the fact that the entire area is archaeologically rich area and therefore deep foundations are not recommended in view of disrupting/ damaging any archaeological remains. It was also decided to ask the applicant to confirm that necessary changes in the façade design have been incorporated.

Case no. 2

(Neocon Infrastructure Services Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai)

This case was earlier granted NOC for the total height of 24 mtrs. The applicant has now requested to permit height of up to 35.9 mtrs to accommodate mandatory requirements that have now to be provided in terms of parking and open space which would require to be compensated by more height. After consideration of the case it was decided to **recommend** appropriate modification in the earlier NOC and allow total height of 35.9 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. (comprising basement+ground and 9 floors)

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

MINUTES OF THE 83RD MEETING (4th Day) OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24,Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	11.30 A.M on 21st February, 2013

The following cases were taken for consideration:

(Fresh Cases)

Case no. 01

(Dr. Somshekhar Bhalke & Dr. Suman Bhalke, Railway Station Gate, Hyderabad, Bidar)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that the applicant has already constructed the nursing home before taking approval. Hence, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the condition that applicant has to contribute towards the development of the garden/open area around the monument. However, SA may be asked to inform the status of open area around the monument also whether there is a garden around it and suggest the required development.

Case no. 02

(Sh. Pavit Singh s/o Sh. Balbir Singh, Guru Nagar, Bidar)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that the application belongs to plot no. 31 of survey no. 53, 54 & 58, Guru Nagar, Bidar. In this case, clarification is required on the status of the construction and whether it is already completed.

Case no. 03

(Sh. Punit Singh S/o Sh. Balbir Singh, Guru Nagar, Bidar)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for plot no. 19 of survey no. 53, 54 & 58, Guru Nagar, Bidar.

Case no. 04

(Sh. Parmeshwar Manjunath Shet, Durgakeri Honnavar, Uttara Kannada)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case provided the nature of work should only be repair and it is advisable to keep the roof material same as previous.

Case no. 05

(Smt. Lakshmi Neelkantha Muger, (Through Deputy Commissioner, Karwar) Ankola, Uttara Kannada)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 3.5 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 06

(Shri Dhulappa Hanmanthappa Hosale, Guru Nagar, Bidar)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.40 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 07

(Shri Chandrakanth Gangaram Tandle, Near Govt. Girls High School, Main Road, Bidar)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9 mtr + 1 mtr for including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Thereafter, discussion on the draft heritage bye-laws for Sher Shah Gate and Farukh Nagar were taken up for which a separate record of discussion is being issued.

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

MINUTES OF THE 83RD MEETING (5th Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 11.30 A.M on 22nd February, 2013

The following cases were taken for consideration:

(Deferred Cases)

Case no. 01

(Shri Shekhar Bala Patil, Mumbai, Maharashtra)

This case pertains to Jogeshwari Caves and is a S.R.A. Scheme, which had been deferred earlier as a building survey report was expected for this monument. Since, a few case of Jogeshwari have been considered during this round of meeting, this case was also examined and after consideration, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 45 mtrs (number of floors of each block as per building plan submitted) inclusive of mumty, water-storage tank, parapet, lift room etc.

Case no. 02

(M/s Nahata Traders & Builders (P) Ltd., Nahata Chambers, 231, Masjid Moth, NDSE-II, New Delhi)

And

Case no. 03

(M/s. Nahata Group of Builders & Financers (P) Ltd., Nahata Chambers, 231, Masjid Moth, NDSE-II, New Delhi)

Both the cases had been referred back to obtain views of ASI as some legal issues were involved. After examining the clarifications, sent by ASI and noting that both the cases falls within the prohibited area, it was decided **not to recommend** NOC, as the construction area falls in the prohibited zone.

Case no. 04

(Hemkunt Sahib Infrastructures Developers Ltd., New Delhi Municipal Council, K.G. Marg, Connaught Place, New Delhi)

This case pertains to Multi Level Car Parking with commercial block at K.G. Marg. The case was gone through in detail and the building plans, site map etc were considered. It was noted that the primary aim of this project is to provide parking in this commercial area with the objective of reducing congestion and thereby helping in improving the environment in this area. Keeping that in mind and after examing all relevant aspects of the case, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the following conditions:

a) The height of the block which will have parking would be 40 mtrs inclusive of mumty, water-storage tank, parapet, lift room etc, this being considered on the special consideration of the stated purpose of providing vehicular parking, which will decongent the area and through the likely positive impact on the environment also help towards overall preservation of the protected monument.
b) The block which will be used for commercial purpose would be limited to 21 mtrs (plus 3 mtrs for roof top, lift room etc), this being given the same consideration as institutional building for which 21 mtrs height is being allowed.
c) The applicant should also take appropriate steps to ensure maximizing rain-water harvesting, run off systems and efforts to recharge ground water in the area.

(Review Cases)

Case no. 01

(Shri Devang Verma (Omkar Realtors), Mumbai)

This case relates to Parel monument and the applicant has already got NOC from ASI for a building up to 70 mtrs in height. He has now asked for an increase in height limit up to 135 mtrs. After perusal of clarification of given by the applicant the following issues were still not clear:

a) Cogent reasons for seeking increase in the height limit, especially in terms of increase in the number of slum dwellers as now claimed by the applicant.
b) How the applicant purposes to add the extra height prayed for, which is almost double for which he has got NOC, in terms of existing foundation, construction methodology etc., this needs to be clearly explained etc.

It has also been decided that a detailed excersise for Parel area would be undertaken considering the building survey report, the high rise definition of buildings in Mumbai etc to work out some interim guidelines by NMA and the case may be considered thereafter.

Case no. 02

(S.G. Dalvi, Mumbai)

This case is also similar to case no. 1. and apart from the applicant being advised to submit a proper justification for seeking increase in the height limit, the other observations regarding preparation of interim guidelines of Parel would also hold good in this case.

Case no. 03

(Shri Talib Dixit (Devansh Reality), Mumbai)

In this case, the applicant was recommended NOC with height limit of 57 mtrs and he has sought an increase in height limit to what had been originally applied for i.e., 102 mtrs. This case may also be taken up again after interim guildelines are finalized.

Case no. 04

(Shri Satish Sitaram Bansal, Mumbai)

The clarification regarding the height of the lower limit of the tower at Aga Khan Palace was examined and after taking note of the same, it was decided that earlier NOC may be revised and the applicant may be allowed a maximum height of 20 mtrs, inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

(Fresh Cases)

Case no. 01

(Sh. Atul Kumar Kaniyalal Shah, Dandiya Bazar, Vadodara, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 16.52 mtr including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 02

(Sh. Pravin Manubhai Mistry, Raj Mahal Road, Vadodara, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 14.35 mtr including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 03

(Partner of Golden Theater, Vatva, Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of the building limited to 15 mtrs from road level to roof top and additional 5 mtrs for roof top structure like lift room, mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc (as per the permissible height limit adopted by NMA based on DCRG regulations for roof top structures.

Case no. 04

(Smt. Mumtazunnisa Begum w/o Sh. Mohd. Abbas, Muslimm Chowk, Gulbarga, Karnataka)

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.

Case no. 05

(Sh. Mhalappa Baba Pai, Uttara Kannada, Karnataka)

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

Case no. 06

(Sh. Satish Arjun Rao Shinde, Dharwad, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.67 mtr including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc, as per revised design.

Case no. 07

(Shri Ummer & Smt. Risna, Sulthan Bathery, Wayanad, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground + 1 floor only, total height including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc not to exceed 8.2 mtrs based on neighbouring building and façade may be maintained in the local character.

Case no. 08

(Sh. V. Devasika Mani, Sh. V. Krishnammal and Sh. V. Ranganayaki, Mattanchery Ernakulam, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that there is some doubt over the ownership and this require clarification. The matter was accordingly deferred.

Case no. 09

(Shri T. S. Shallappan, Mandya, Bangalore, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, and keeping in view the buildings in the vicinity, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for Ground + 1 floor with total height of 9 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.

There being paucity of time, the remaining cases listed for the day could not be taken up and would be considered in the next meeting.

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

MINUTES OF THE 84th MEETING (1st Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 18th March, 2013

The minutes of the 83rd meeting which were circulated on the first day of the 84th meeting have been confirmed, there being no comments from any of the Members.

Therafter following cases were taken up for consideration:

Case no. 10

(M/s Pearl Printers & Publishers Ltd., Chennai, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was noted that there were some shortcomings in the proposal i.e site map, location of the proposed construction is not clear and the purpose of this institution is not mentioned in the proposal. These discrepancies needs to be clarified first then the matter could be consider again in the next meeting of NMA.

Case no. 11

(Shri Mahindra Ramniwas Panchariya, Satara, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 16.72 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 12

(Shri Adhikrao Ramchandra Mane, Satara, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.75 mtrs (excluding mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 13

(Shri Balkrishna Narayan Gargate, Satara, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 14

(Shri Rakesh P. Salunkhe, Satara, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 14.63 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 15

(Shri Milind Shivajirao Shinde, Satara, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12.15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 16

(Smt. Surekha Shivanand Dubal & Smt. Kalindi Deepak Dubal, Satara, Maharashtra)

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

Case no. 17

(Shri Sandeep N. Jani Kalyaniee Vilas, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 18

(Shri Chandrakant Kantilal Shah & Shri Mahendra Kantilal Shah, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case but with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 19

(Technical Director, Pune Municipal Corporation, Pune)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the proposed construction of grade separator and storm water drain is located within the prohibited area. It also appears that no attempt has been made to find out any alternative alignment for the road/ storm water drain. This should be examined by the applicant. In any case, since the proposed construction falls within the prohibited area NOC cannot be recommended.

Case no. 20

(Director, Society of St. Francis Industrial Training Institute, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 52.60 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 21

(Brother Dominic Polaprayil Trustee Society of the Congregation of Franciscan Brothers, Thane, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for additional two floors with the total height of 24.35 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 22

(Executive Engineer, Raigad Irrigation Division, Raigad, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was observed that there is no clear recommendation from the CA in this case. Given the nature of the proposed project, it needs to be more carefully examined, also taking into account hydrological factors, likely capillary action on account of water storage in the dam etc. The CA may re-examine from these points and submit the case again.

Case no. 23

(Shri Anant Ramrao Shinde & Shri Shivaji Ramrao Shinde, Sangli, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 8 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) and the applicant is advised to use local basalt stone for cladding.

Case no. 24

(Chief Officer, Panhala Hill Station Municipal Council, Panhala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 10.18 mtrs for the *Shiv Smarak* structure as well as for the garden beautification.

Case no. 25

(Sarpanch, (Manager, Vitthal Mandir), Grampanchayat Ghodeshwar, (Begumpur)

After perual of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12 feet for construction of Sabha Mandap. It was also observed that there is an adjoining wall which seems to be made of local stone which should not be demolished.

Case no. 26

(Shri Ramesh Chand Jain and others, 115, Veer Nagar, Jain Colony, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 27

(Smt. Raj Bala Jain and Shri Rajesh Kumar Jain, C-4/15 Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17.60 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 28

(Smt. Kusum Lata Jain, C-4/16, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17.60 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 29

(Shri Shiv Chander Lal Batra, D-12, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.53 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 30

(Smt. Shanta Jain, 139, Veer Nagar, Jain Colony, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 31

(Shri A.L. Batra, N-90, Panchsheel Park, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.84 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) and penalty of Rs. 1 lakh may be imposed on the applicant for the construction without prior sanction. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 32

(Smt. Usha Badhwar and others, A-2/145, Safdarjung Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 33

(M/s Mehrauli Realty & Consultants Ltd., H-5/12, Ward No. 1, Mehrauli, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was observed that a more detailed examination is needed in this case since there are a number of monuments existing in the vicinity. Also clear demarcation of the 100 mtr limit within the plot boundary with reference to the protected boundary of the monument as notified needs to be done.

Case no. 34

(Shri Sarbjeet Singh, C-1/2, Safdarjung Development Area, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 35

(Shri Atri Mukherjee, E-56, NDSE-I, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 36

(M/s Prestige Infracon (P) Ltd. Through Director Sanjay Seth, 3631-3632,Mori Gate, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 37

(Thiru G. Varadarajan, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.40 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 38

(Thiru A Sabiullah, President, Thippusultan Masjid Muslim Jamath Committee, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with maximum height of 7.69 mtrs inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.

Case no. 39

(Smt. P. Ilahijan, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

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-tank etc).

Case no. 40

(Thiru K. Sivasubramaniam & Thiru K. Murugesan, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

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-tank etc).

Case no. 41

(Thiru P. Sathiyanarayanan, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case if no construction has already started/ taken place. This may be confirmed by the CA before granting permission.

Case no. 42

(Thiru M. Venkatachalam, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.02 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant is advised to have sloping roof.

Case no. 43

(Thiru M. Balasubramaniam & Smt. B. Uma, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case if no construction has already started/ taken place. This may be confirmed by the CA before granting permission.

Case no. 44

(Smt. S. Selvi, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.93 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) and penalty of Rs. 2500 may be imposed on the applicant for the construction without prior sanction. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 45

(Thiru S. Badhrie, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.71 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc)

Case no. 46

(Thiru G. Muruganantham, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.24 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) and penalty of Rs. 2500 may be imposed on the applicant for the construction without prior sanction. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 47

(Thiru S. Srinivasan, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.31 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) and the applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof.

Case no. 48

(Thiru C. Lingasamy, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case if no construction has already started/ taken place. This may be confirmed by the CA before granting permission.

Case no. 49

(Thiru K. Ramasamy, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.91 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) and the applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and penalty of Rs. 50,000 may be imposed on the applicant for the construction without prior sanction. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 50

(Thiru N. Murugesan, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.31 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) and the applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof.

Case no. 51

(Smt. S. Gandhimathi, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) and the applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and penalty of Rs. 50,000 may be imposed on the applicant for the construction without prior sanction. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 52

(Smt. S. Susila & Thiru S. Matheshwaran, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) and penalty of Rs. 25000/- may be imposed on the applicant for the construction without prior sanction. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 53

(Thiru K.C. Jafer Ali, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

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-tank etc) and the applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof or if any other archeology.

Case no. 54

(Thiru K.R. Thennarasu, Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 55

(Thiru N. Murugesan, town sy. No. 58, 57/1A, Ward-A, Block-8,Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.95 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) and the applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof.

Case no. 56

(Thiru N. Murugesan, town sy. No. 227,228(Part), Ward-A, Block-11,Namakkal, Tamilnadu)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.95 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

430

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

MINUTES OF THE 84th MEETING (2nd Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 19th March, 2013

The following cases were taken for consideration:

Case no. 01

(Shri Bishwanath Sinha (Additional Resident Commissioner) Kerala, 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 11.6 mtr. including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. It is also advisable to retain the basic character of the building and to reuse old material for new construction.

Case no. 02

(National Zoological Park thourgh its Director Sh. Amitabh Agnihotri, Mathura road, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that there are no designs and building plans. Hence, it was decided to ask the applicant to make a PowerPoint presentation before the Members regarding the work plan.

Case no. 03

(Harbans lal Malhotra & Sons (P) Ltd, Jhandewalan Ext, New Delhi)

Deferred (Some discrepancy has been noticed in the distance measurement based on DSSDI site plan and CA Delhi has been asked to quickly verified it. Once clarified decision taken in today's meeting would be confirmed). The decision is to allow one basement and a height of 21m.)

Case no. 04

(Sh. Sudarshan Kumar jain, Veer Nagar, Jain Colony, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17.46 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 05

(Smt. Ekta Satija and Sh. Raj Satija, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 06

(Sh. Surinder Kumar Gupta and Sh. Prem Kumar Mittal, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 07

(Sh. Satish Kapoor, Sh. Ashok Kapoor, Sh. Shiv Kapoor and Smt. Manju Kapoor, Rana Pratap Bagh, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 08

(Shri Rajesh Singh, Green Park Main, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 09

(Smt. Vidyawati, Smt. Shobha Gupta and Smt. Anita Gupta, Rana Pratap Bagh, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 14.99 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 10

(Smt. Shanti Devi Kapoor, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 11

(Shri Chandrakantha Bhat, Lakshmi Kripa House, Nallur Villagar, Bajagoli Post, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

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

Case no. 12

(Shri Mruthyunjaya, Xerox, Opp Mariyamma Temple, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground+ 1 floor with the total height of 30 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 13

(Shri Mahesh K, Bhahubali Pravachan mandir, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the designs/plans enclosed indicate contruction of Ground floor only. Hence, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the maximum height of 5 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 14

(Smt. Prabha Niranjan, Mangalore Road, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground+ 1 floor with the total height of 28 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 15

(Dr. C. Prabhakar Athikari, Jayanthinagar, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground+ 1 floor with the total height of 23 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 16

(Shri Hemanth Kumar S/o Sh. Harishchandra Achar, Dhanashale, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 40 feet (as per enclosed building design) including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 17

(Shri Rajendra S/o Sh. Palani Swamy, Hiriyangadi, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Single storey with the total height of 17 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 18

(Shri Ronald D' Silva, Dhanashale, Karkala Kasaba, Udupi, Karnataka)

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

Case no. 19

(Shri K. Kamalaksh Kamath, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

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

Case no. 20

(Shri Sateesh Bhandari S/o Sh. Gopal Bhandari, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground+ 1 floor with the total height of 28 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 21

(Shri Gopalkrishana Ramakrishan Bhat alias G.R. Bhat, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground floor with the total height of 25 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 22

(Shri T. Brahmananda, Anavatti, Shimoga, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground+ 1 floor with the total height of 7.55 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 23

(Shri Shankargowda Shidralli, address missing ???)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground+ 1 floor with the total height of 8.01 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 24

(Shri Murali N. S. S/o Sh. Late Srikantaiah N.V., Nanjangud, Mysore, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground+ 1 floor with total height of 6.90 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 25

(Smt. B. Uma Chiplunkar C/o Sh. Umesh Bhat, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for with the total height of 17 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 26

(Shri Dayananda N., Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground+ 1 floor with the total height of 26.5 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 27

(Smt. N. Varija S. Shetty W/o Sh. Shamprasad, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 20 feet 8 inches (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 28

(Shri K. Sudesh Kamath, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground+ 1 floor with total the height of 8 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.) within the limit of 300 mtrs.

Case no. 29

(Shri Naveed S/o Sh. Abdul Jabbar, Nuggehalli, Hassan, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground floor with the total height of 15 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.) and the applicant may be advised to incorporate a sloping roof.

Case no. 30

(Smt. Farhana Banu W/o Sh. Late Illiyas Pasha, Nuggehalli, Channarayapatna, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground floor with the total height of 15 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.) and the applicant may be advised to incorporate a sloping roof.

Case no. 31

(Smt. Raksha, Hiriyanadi, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground floor with the total height of 22 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 32

(Shri Prabhakara S. Acharaya S/o Sesappa Acharya, Hiriyangadi, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground floor with the total height of 12 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 33

(Shri Hemachandra Acharya C/o K Sridhar Acharya, Moodabidri, Dakshina Kannada, Karnataka)

After examining the application and going through the CA report, it was noted that the proposed area is a low built area and it is the first line of construction. Hence, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground + 1 floor with the total height of 8 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.). The applicant may be advised to incorporate a sloping roof.

Case no. 34

(Chief Officer, Town Panchayath, Channagiri, Davangagere, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Single storey with the total height of 3.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.). The applicant may be advised to incorporate a sloping roof and okhla to the preposed construction.

Case no. 35

(Dr. Krishanaiah Shetty M. V. & Dr. Vandana C., Kote, Kolar, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 14.90 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

437

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

MINUTES OF THE 84th MEETING (3rd Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 20th March, 2013

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

(Deferred Cases)

Case no. 1

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

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for repairs of building with total height of 24 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) as per the drawings and photos submitted by the applicant.

Case no. 2

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

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for repairs for repairs of building as proposed with total height of 36 feet 9 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant is advised to follow traditional style and materials in repair work.

Case no. 3

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

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for repairs of roof-slabs and walls as proposed with total height of 26 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant is advised to follow traditional style and materials in repair work.

Case no. 4

(Shri Mohammedsaheb Kadersaheb Momin, Solapur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for UGF+3 floors and any construction which had already been done beyond this should be demolished and penalty of Rs. 1 lakh may be imposed on the applicant for the construction without prior sanction. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 5

(The Jamshri Rajitsinghji Spg. & Wvg Mills Co. Ltd., Solapur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case only upto G+3 floors and anyconstruction which had already been done beyond this should be demolished and penalty of Rs. 1 lakh may be imposed on the applicant for the construction without prior sanction. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 6

(Chairman, Shivner Shikshan Prasarak Mandal C/o Navgire & Navgire Architects, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was noted that the drawings submitted by the applicant do not indicate 3rd floor and sports hall plan. After consideration, the case is **recommended** only for presently built up of 16.35 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). No penalty has been imposed as it is an educational institution.

(Review Cases)

Case no. 1

(Kamla Nehru College through Principal Dr. Minoti Chatterjee, Delhi)

This case was discussed earlier in the 63rd meeting of NMA and was approved with total 15 mtrs height limit, now the applicant is seeking permission to construct a lecture hall block in the regulated area of a centrally protected monument. After going through the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the lecture hall as proposed with the total height of 11 mtrs in addition.

Case no. 2

(Shri Ankur Kothari, Assam)

After going through the clarifications submitted by the applicant it was decided to modify the NOC granted earlier and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for basement+stilt+3 floors (14.7 mtrs for building upto roof level) and 4 mtrs for roof top mumty/ lift room.

Case no. 3

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

The case was re-examined with reference to the clarifications given by the applicant. After noting that part of the plot falls within the regulated limit, it was felt that the applicant can have a building with stagger heights, with a limit of 15 mtrs for the portion falling within the regulated area and beyond that it may be as per their plan. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC accordingly.

Case no. 4

(Smt. Parvatiben Jogibhai Tandel, Daman)

The request of the applicant to reconsider the height allowed as per earlier NOC was examined in detail. After due consideration it was decided that the applicant would follow staggered approach in the overall construction by having 3 blocks as follows – 15 mtrs for 1st block (G+3 including parapet), 18 mtrs for 2nd block (G+4 including parapet) and 24 mtrs for 3rd block (G+5 including mumty, lift room etc.)

(Fresh cases)

Case no. 1

Academic Welfare Society, Mathura, U.P)

After carefully examining the proposal it was found that the distance of the proposed location from the protected monument is not clearly mentioned which should be done and the site plan enclosed could be certified by the CA.

Case no. 2

(Sant Shri Asaramji Ashram, Kashipur, Uttarakhand)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case of two single-storey structures upto 4.1 & 5.3 mtrs (including parapet and mumty).

Case no. 3

(Dr. S. Kalbe Sadiq, Secretary, Tauheedul Muslimeen Trust Foundation Society, Lucknow)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 20 feet (6.096 mtrs) including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.

Case no. 4

(Shri Rajendra Kumar Nanda and others, Directors of Nanda Infra Tech (P) Ltd., Odisha)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 13.5 mtrs (excluding mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) as recommended by CA.

Case no. 5

(Shri Kanhaiya Lal s/o Shri Prahalad Mali, Tonk, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for repairs only to the existing building. There should not be any new construction or any addition vertically or horizontally.

Case no. 6

(Shri Shyam Sunder s/o Shri Giriraj Soni, Tonk, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application and noting that the proposed site is located within prohibited area it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case only for repairs of building with the height of 10 feet (excluding mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) as proposed. There should be no new construction is permissible.

Case no. 7

(Shri Jatinder Roy Khatter and others, Bathinda, 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-tank etc.)

Case no. 8

(Shri Rohit Bansal & Sh. Sunil Kumar, Bathinda, Punjab)

This proposal relates to prohibited area and after perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for repairs for building with total height of 24 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The applicant is advised to use traditional style and material in repairs.

Case no. 9

(Smt. Kalawanti, 3744B/8119 Mohalla Molvia Wala, Bathinda, Punjab)

This proposal also relates to prohibited area and after perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for repairs of building with total height of 24 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The applicant is advised to use traditional style and material in repairs.

Case no. 10

(Smt. Vipan Lata w/o Sh. Bhupinder Kumar, Bathinda, Punjab)

This proposal also relates to prohibited area and after perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for repairs of building with total height of 27 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The applicant is advised to use traditional style and material in repairs.

Case no. 11

(Shri Surinder Kumar Sharma s/o Sh. Parkash Chand Sharma, Bathinda, Punjab)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for new construction with total height of 26 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 12

(Shri A.S. Nawaz, ACS, Director, Dairy Development, Assam)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 3.30 mtrs (excluding mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) as proposed by the applicant.

Case no. 13

(Shri Dhiresh Dutta, Assam)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of one storey (Assam type house with tin).

Case no. 14

(Shri Parimal Kumar Das, Assam)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.80 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.).

Case no. 15

(Smt. Meera Dutta, Assam)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 19 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) as per drawings submitted by the applicant. The applicant is advised to follow construction in Assam type style, if possible.

Case no. 16

(Shri Mrityunjay Singh and others, Varanasi, U.P)

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

Case no. 17

(Shri Badrinath Dixit, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.19 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 18

(Smt. Bina Shrivastava w/o Sh. Shashi Kant Shrivastava, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.30 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 19

(Smt. Nisha Jaiswal w/o Sh. Jawahar Ram, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.10 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 20

(Shri Manoj Kumar Sonkar, DFO, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 3.80 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 21

(Smt. Vimla Devi w/o Sh. Ram Awadh, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height not to exceed 9.36 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 22

(Smt. Vimla Jha w/o Sh. Vijay Kumar Jha, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.05 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 23

(Shri Navdeep Chhabra, GPA of Smt. Kamala Chawla, K-9, NDSE-II, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 24

(Shri Sibeswar Mukherjee & Smt. Chandana Mukherjee, B-3/9, Safdarjung Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height not to exceed 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 25

(Shri Vijay Batra, E-37, NDSE-I, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17.42 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 26

(Shri Praveen Kumar and others, 232, Block-172, Jorbagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height not to exceed 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 27

(Shri Purnendu Bhattacharya and others, B-2/68, Safdarjung Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height not to exceed 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 28

(Shri Kawaljit Singh & others, E-29, Panchsheel Park, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height not to exceed 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. The construction should be done beyond 100 mtrs limit only.

Case no. 29

(Smt. Indu Jain, G-16, Green Park Main, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height not to exceed 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 30

(Shri Sharad Khanna & others, G-18, Green Park Main, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height not to exceed 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

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

MINUTES OF THE 84th MEETING (4th Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 21st March, 2013

The following cases were taken for consideration:

Case no. 01

(Smt. Asha & Smt. Latha, Chullickal, Kochi, Mattancherry, Ernakulam, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.20 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 02

(Smt. V.K. Sathidevi, Cherpu, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.74 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 03

(Shri Davis, Cherppu, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 3.10 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 04

(Shri Joseph, Cherppu, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.26 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 05

(Shri M.C. Joseph & Smt. Thresiamma, Wayanad, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.9 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 06

(Shri Suresh Kumar, Thiruvallam, Trivandrum, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4.25 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 07

(Shri Vicent Joseph and Ivy, Thangaserry, Kollam, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.25 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 08

(Smt. Sughatha Kumari K.K, Triprayar, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.25 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 09

(Smt. Reetha U. Shanwad and Sh. U.K. Shanwad, Dharwad, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.64 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 10

(Shri Manoj Vishwanath Chandgude, Dharwad, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for Ground +2 in this case with total height of 11 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.), as most of the buildings in the area are G+1

Case no. 11

(Shri Allabakash Gaffarsab Lohar, Dharwad, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.97 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 12

(Shri Kiran A. Shinde, Dharwad, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.47 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 13

(Shri Vinay M. Mahindrakar, Dharwad, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.21 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no-14 to Case no- 17:

a) (Smt. Annapurna Veerupakshi Reddy, Gulbarga, Karnataka)
b) (Shri Omprakash Jayanthraj Anchaliya, Gulbarga, Karnataka)
c) (Smt. Sonubhai Shankarao Jirolli, Gulbarga, Karnataka)
d) (Shri Inderchand Chainaj Anchaliya, Gulbarga, Karnataka)

After perusal of these above listed following applications, it was noted that in the CA reports, the provided distances from the protected limits were not verified by CA, Belgaum. In this regard, CA is requested to verify the distances for each case as per his survey. Also, the type of development happening around the monument should be provided for further consideration of these applications.

Case no. 18

(Chairman, Kanara Education Society, Kumta, Uttara Kannada, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 39 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 19

(Sh. Prashanth Kumar Subhash Siraji, Bidar, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.20 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 20

(Executive Engineer, Panchayat Raj Engineering Division, Bagalkot, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.21 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 21

(Thiru M. Shanmugam, Namakkal, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for Ground + 2 in this case with total height of 11 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.), as the surrounding buildings are generally G + 2.

Case no. 22

(Thiru V. Palaniappan, Namakkal, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.90 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 23

(Thiru G. Selvakrishan, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for Ground floor in this case with total height of 4 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.). However, the applicant should not use the proposed site for storing of hazardous materials.

Case no. 24

(Pastorate Chairan CSI Christ Church Parsonage, Tirunelveli Town, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.54 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 25

(Thiru A.R. Mohammed Moinuddin, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for Ground + 1 in this case with total height of 8 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 26

(Thiru S. Mani, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground floor with the total height of 4.15 mtr (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.) and the applicant may be advised to incorporate a sloping roof.

Case no. 27

(Thiru Syed Moin Ahaed Saqqaf, Thanjavur, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.51 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 28

(Smt. Mahmudunnisa Bibi, Thanjavur, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.51 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 29

(Sh. Samirbhai Rajnikant Parikh, Panchmahals, Tamil Nadu)

On perusal of the application, it was observed that the construction has already taken place. While it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+2 in this case with total height of 11 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.), it was also decided to impose a penalty of Rs. 50,000 for the construction without permission. This fine would be utilized by the way of providing amenties/facilities at the protected monument under the guidance of ASI.

Case no. 30

(Sh. Akbari Saifuddin Kanchwala and others, Bharuch, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.60 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.). However, it is advisable to retain the outer façade of the present building.

Case no. 31

(Sh. Nizamuddin Gilamakbar Fiter and others, Bharuch, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.60 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 32

(Sh. Chandulal Mathuradas Barai, Dwarka, Jamnagar, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of ~~12.15~~ 9.60 and 12.15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc). Also the applicant can be advised to have the balcony with brackets and pillars as per the existing building.

Case no. 33

(Sh. Dinesh Gordhandas Ghaghda, Dwarka, Jamnagar, Gujarat)

After examining the application, it was decided to accept the recommendations of CA Gujarat for imposition of fine of Rs. 1 lakh for violation. This fine would be utilized by the way of provided amenities/facilities at the protected monument under the guidance of ASI. Also, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 8.56 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 34

(Smt. Diwaliben Ramdas Samani, Dwarka, Jamnagar, Gujarat)

After examining the application, it was decided to accept the recommendations of CA Gujarat for imposition of fine of Rs. 1 lakh for violation. This fine would be utilized by the way of providing amenities/facilities at the protected monument under the guidance of ASI. Also it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.21 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.).

the way of providing amenities/facilities at the protected monument under the guidance of ASI. Also it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.21 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.).

Case no. 35

(Sh. Mohammedzaid Moinuddin Rafai POAH of Sh. Makbulhusain Saiyed, Vadodara, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for Ground + 3 in this case with total height of 14 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 36

(Sh. Rajesh Narharilal Bhatt and Others, Vadodara, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for Ground + 3 in this case with total height of 14 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 37

(Sh. Babulal Dhanraj Jain and others, Usmanpura, Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 20.10 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 38

(Sh. Dhanjibhai Madhavajibhai Patel, Toran Vadnagar, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.74 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 39

(Sh. Shinde Santosh Sopan, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8.0 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 40

(Sh. Eage Mallesham Anjayya, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case only for repair of commercial building.

Case no. 41

(Sh. Shaikh Irfan Ishakbhai & 9 others, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for limited to Ground + 2 in this case with total height of 11 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 42

(Sh. Shaikh Liyakat Mohammed & 2 others i.e. Shaikh Sameer Mohammed & Smt. Shaikh Najama Mohammed, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.98 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 43

(Sh. Umakant Bhawanrao Deshmukh, Aurangabad, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

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

MINUTES OF THE 85th MEETING (1st & 2nd Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 25th April, 2013

The minutes of 84th meeting which were circulated on the first day of the 85th meeting have been confirmed, there being no comments from any of the Members.

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

(Deferred cases)

Case no. 1

(Shri Ramji K. Patel, Belgaum)

After perusal of the case and re-consideration it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the stipulation that total height would not exceed 11mtrs in all for ground + 2 floors.

(Review cases)

Case no. 1

(Shri Devang Verma, Omkar Realtors, Mumbai)

The case pertains to request by the applicant for grant of additional height beyond what he has got through NOC issued by ASI earlier for 70 mtrs. The clarifications sought from the applicant have been provided in detail which addresses all the issues raised. The applicant has admitted that the foundation of the existing building had been constructed so as to permit increase in height at a later stage. It has been stated that the initial application was only for 70 mtrs as that was the height limit up to which clearance from High Rise Committee of State Govt. was not required. The applicant has mentioned that he would be able to accommodate the rehabilitation compound in 1 block of 70 mtrs but for the 2nd block, which is the sale block, he requires to go up to higher height in order to utilize the FSI available. It has also been mentioned that clearance has now been obtained from High Rise Committee for a height of 125 mtrs and from the Civil Aviation Authority for height up to 155 mtrs. Discussions on this application remained inconclusive and it was decided to consider the matter again the next day.

Case no. 2

(Shri Parag Mungale, Architect, S.P. Associates, Architects & Engineers, Mumbai)

The applicant been granted NOC for 15 mtrs in all and submitted an application seeking increase in the height up to 45 mtrs. After perusal of the application it was noted that the construction site seemed to be within the prohibited area. It was therefore decided to re-examine the details from that point of view and consider the case accordingly.

Case no. 3

(Shri Prakash Vasant Undale, Shri Arvind Gajanan Rasane, Pune, Maharashtra)

In this case the applicant who was granted height of 15 mtrs in all has requested for review of the height up to 27 mtrs. On this issue, the Pune Municipal Building bye laws were examined. It was noted that there are provisions regarding height of buildings that related to the road width. Relevant provisions of the byelaws (at page 47-48) were examined and on that basis it was decided to revise the height of the proposed construction up to 18 mtrs at roof level and an additional 3 mtrs for roof top structures. The NOC issued earlier may be modified accordingly.

(Fresh Cases)

Case no. 1

(Shri Mukund S. Naik, Goa)

This application falls within prohibited area. The proposed extension of the building is therefore not permissible. For proposed repairs, details including the drawings may be provided to examine the matter further.

Case no.2

(Shri Vishwas Tukaram Chavan, Aurangabad, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12.2 mtrs (including mumty, parapet etc). The applicant may be advised to use local/traditional material in construction.

Case no. 3

(Shri Londhe Sandip Baban & Shelke Nitin Ramdas, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra)

On perusal of the application it was observed that the construction has not only taken place but that the applicant continued the construction in spite of ASI issuing notice for the unauthorized construction. It was therefore decided that the applicant should explain as to why construction started without permission and why he did not stop the work even after receiving notice in the matter.

Case no. 4

(The Range Forest Officer, Forest Department, Daman)

The proposal is from the State Forest Department for reconstruction of an existing building. After perusal of the details it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground + 1st floor with total height of 7.7 mtrs (inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The building should incorporate sloping roof.

Case no. 5

(Shri Anil Babanrao Thorve, Pune, Maharashtra)

This case was also examined in terms of the details as mentioned in the review case no. 3 i.e. with reference to the relevant provision of Pune Municipal building bye-laws. Based on that it was decided that NOC may be granted in this case but total height should not exceed 6 mtrs in all, this being calculated as per provisions of the relevant bye laws.

Case no. 6

(Shri Prakash Kundar, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was noted that the proposed construction is just at the prohibited area limit. It was also observed that there is preponderance of buildings with ground + 1 or ground + 2 and keeping that in view it was decided that while grant of NOC may be recommended, it should be limited to ground + 2, with total height of 12 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. The applicant should incorporate sloping roof and care must be taking to ensure construction line is beyond the 100 mtr prohibited limit.

Case no. 7

(Smt. Minakshi Baban Gund, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water tank etc.) and with sloping roof. The applicant may also be advised to use local material in construction.

Case no. 8

(Smt. Lata Raosaheb Shinde, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 8 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water tank etc.) and with sloping roof. The applicant may also be advised to use local material in construction.

Case no. 9

(Shri Bharat Kushaba Muthe, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.16 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water tank etc.) and with sloping roof. The applicant may also be advised to use local material in construction.

Case no. 10

(Shri Vijay Dilip Modhve, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the case it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.16 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water tank etc.) and with sloping roof. The applicant may also be advised to use local material in construction.

Case no. 11

(Shri Chaya Kamlakar Chapekar, Solapur, Maharashtra)

On perusal of application and after taking note of the fact that in earlier cases a maximum of 17 mtrs height in all had been allowed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height being restricted to 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water tank etc).

Case no. 12

(Shri Shahaji Yashwant Salgar, Solapur, Maharashtra)

On perusal of application and after taking note of the fact that in earlier cases a maximum of 17 mtrs height in all had been allowed, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height being restricted to 17 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water tank etc.

Case no. 13

(M/s Manthan Builders & Developers Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai)

This application pertains to construction of building on SRA project at Parel, near the *Shiva Sculpture.* The detailed discussions on the issue of considering applications from Mumbai, particularly the SRA related projects which tended to have high rise structures which took place while discussing review case no. 2 were recalled. It was observed that even interim guidelines could not be finalized for such Mumbai cases while at the same time individual applications were pending for decisions since such applications had been made almost 2 years back. While discussions were taking place on the issue, it was noted that in Mumbai buildings which do not exceed 70 mtrs in height are not required to be put up before the High Rise Committee for clearance. It was felt that till such time as NMA could evolve its own guidelines on the matter, it may be appropriate to adopt this yardstick, namely, that the criteria of buildings, up to a height not requiring clearance from the State High Rise Committee (which being 70 mtrs as of now excluding roof top structures) could be adopted by the NMA in the interim. This was agreed to.

In view of the above the present case was accordingly considered and it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 74.40 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, machine-room etc).

Case no. 14

(Chief Engineer, Water Supply Project, Maharashtra)

This proposal from the Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai pertains to construction of underground tunnel for water supply and vertical access shaft for drinking water supply in Mumbai, located near *Kondivates Caves* protected monument. While the utility of the project was appreciated, it being a project to augment water supply, some concerns were expressed about any adverse effects especially of the controlled blasting for this project.

(5) contd..

In order to ensure that there was no adverse impact, it was decided that while grant of NOC for the project may be recommended, the construction work should be closely monitored by the CA Mumbai in association with SA Mumbai Circle in order to keep a watch on the stability of the protected structure.

Case no. 15

(Shri R. Mohanavelu, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu)

On perusal of the application it was noted that the construction work has already taken place although it is a small construction. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case and a penalty of Rs. 20, 000 may be imposed on the applicant for having undertaken the work without permission and this amount should be utilized for providing facilities/ amenities at the protected monument and the work may be done under supervision of ASI.

Case no. 16

(Shri Prashanth Vaijinath Kore, Bidar, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+ 2 floors with height being restricted to 11.5 mtrs in all (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to use local/ traditional material in the construction.

Case no. 17

(Shri Vijay Bhagwandas Gilda, Gulbarga, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+ 2 floors with height being restricted to 26 feet 2 inches in all (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may also be advised to use local/ traditional material in the construction.

Case no. 18

(Manager, Nirmala Convent School, Kumta, Karnataka)

On perusal of the application it was noted that the applicant already seems to have constructed ground, 1st and 2nd floors and permission sought for the 3rd floor appears to be an attempt to regularize the whole matter. Therefore, it was decided that the applicant should in the first instance provide appropriate clarification as to how existing construction was undertaken without permission. Moreover, the distance verification should be certified by the CA as reliance on Google earth map on such a sensitive matter cannot be made.

Case no. 19

(Shri Shridhar S. Rokade, Gadag, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the construction being restricted to ground + 1 only and 7 mtrs height in all, keeping in view the type of buildings existing in the vicinity.

Case no. 20

(Smt. Shalini T. Nayak, Uttar Kannada, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application while it was observed that construction has already taking place up to 1st floor, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case and the applicant should be informed that there should be no further construction beyond ground + 1 floor without taking permission.

Case no. 21

(Shri Basanagoud A. Hiregoudar, Gadag, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor structure with height of 16 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 22

(Shri Praveen Ramchandrappa Anegundi, Gadag, Karnataka)

After perusal of this application it was noted that construction was already started by the applicant and completed upto ground floor level. While it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground + 1 floor, the total height may be restricted to 8 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. and penalty of Rs. 25,000 may be imposed on the applicant for having undertaken the work without permission and this amount should be utilized for providing facilities/ amenities at the protected monument and the work may be done under supervision of ASI.

Case no. 23

(Shri Srinivasa Rao Sakaray, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh)

This case was examined in detail and it was noted that although the applicant's plot is at a distance of 68 mtrs, he has given an undertaking to start the construction work at 101 mtrs i.e. from the prohibited limit and use the intervening 33 mtrs as a land scaped garden.

(7) contd...

It was also noted that the applicant proposes to construct 75 residential units of ground + 1 level as a housing society complex. Other aspects were examined in detail such as the surrounding area, the nature of the town etc. and after due consideration it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for the proposed construction of ground + 1 floor with height of 7.8 mtrs (including parapet, mumty etc.) with the stipulation that sloping roof should be incorporated and with stone finish.

Case no. 24

(Shri Kesavan V.N. and Smt. Vesu, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor structure with height of 6.95 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 25

(Shri Rajiv Hazarika, Sivasagar, Assam)

This proposal is of a construction in the prohibited area where repairs are proposed to be undertaken. Further no details of the proposed repairs have been provided which should be done so in order to examine the case.

Case no. 26

(Project Director, Sivasagar, Assam)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor structure with height of 7.8 mtrs+ maximum additional 3 mtrs for roof top structures.

Case no. 27

(Shri Rajesh Kumar Agarwalla, Sivasagar, Assam)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ~~ground~~ repairs of floor structure(with height of 15 ~~mtrs +~~) ~~some additional 3 mtrs for roof top structures.~~ (see) There will be no addition, horizontally or vertically.

Case no. 28

(Shri Saligram Tiwari, Varanasi, U.P)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor structure with height of 12.10 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

The following cases from the list of the 2nd day were taken up :

Review case no. 1 of Mumbai was considered in the light of the decisions in case no. 13 of the fresh cases list of the first day. In the light of that, it was felt that the request of the applicant for an increase in sanctioned height limit from 70 mtrs to 125 mtrs could not be considered at this stage.

(Review cases)

Case no. 1

(Shri S.G. Dalvi, Mumbai)

This case pertains to Mumbai where the applicant has already got NOC from ASI for construction with height of 50.9 mtrs in one block and 62.15 mts for block 2. The applicant has not yet started construction, though he has been renewing the validity of his NOC from time to time, and has sought increase in height limit to 102 mtrs. Detailed reasons for the same have been provided by the applicant and he has also made an another submission that for the present increase in height limit should be considered upto 70 mtrs, instead of 102 mts as applied for by him. In view of that and keeping in mind the discussions/ decisions in fresh case no. 13 as referred to above, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case by way of revising the permissible height upto 70 mtrs in each block with a further 5 mtrs in all for roof top structures.

(Deferred cases)

Case no. 1

(Smt. Sadhana Singh Chouhan, Madhya Pradesh)

This case was considered in the 4th meeting of NMA on 1.12.2011 and it pertains to application for construction of a house near *Heliodors Pillars*. The case had been deferred to seek some clarifications which have now been received. The clarifications provided were gone through and a detailed discussion were held regarding the case, its location etc. After due consideration, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor+1 floor with total height of 8.5 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) and subject to the condition that ASI will be associated at the stage of digging of foundation/construction and subsequently also, in case of any archaeological remains/materials being found during such work.

The remaining cases listed could not be taken up due to paucity of time.

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

MINUTES OF THE 85th MEETING OF NMA
(By Circulation)

General guideline taken while considering the proposals for construction of basement in residential projects:

No basement will be allowed for the proposals for which construction sites fall under Regulated zone-I (i.e. 100 m to 200 m limit) and beyond 200 m limit construction of basement is permissible.

Case No. : 01 Shri Vijay Kumar Gupta, 49, Uday Park, New Delhi

After perusal of the application it is recommended to grant the NOC for construction of boundary wall on the front side of the house up to a height of 3 meters may be allowed. Besides, CA's comments regarding the neglected state of the monument at Masjid Moth may please be conveyed to this office and ASI.

Case No. : 02 Sh. Swaran Singh Chawla and Smt. Rita Johar Chawla, 50, Uday Park, New Delhi-110049

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of basement + stilt + 4 storeys with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. It is advisable that CA's comments regarding the neglected state of the monument at Masjid Moth may please be conveyed to this office and ASI.

Case No. : 03 Sh. Ravi Gupta and Sh. Rajiv Gupta, D-16, Hauz Khas, New Delhi – 110016

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of basement + stilt + 4 storeys with the total height up to 17.00 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 04 Sh Rajender Kumar Wason, Dr. Ashok Wason and Sh. Vijay Kumar Wason, C-6/2, Rana Pratap Bagh, New Delhi- 110007

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 storeys with the total height up to 17.75 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 05 Smt. Anita Jain and Smt. Swati Jain, A-22, C.C. Colony, Delhi-110007

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 storeys with the total height up to 18.00 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. As the building site is only at a distance of 112 meter from the monument, permitting the construction of a basement is not advisable.

Case No. : 06 Sh. Pradeep Kumar, D-2/8, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi-110007

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 storeys with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 07 Sh. Ram Kishan Gupta, B-29, C.C. Colony, Delhi – 110007

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 storeys with the total height up to 17 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 08 Sh. Vijay Kumar Jain, 110, Veer Nagar, Jain Colony, G.T. Road, Delhi- 110007

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for Construction of stilt + 4 storeys with the total height up to 17.78 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 09 Sh. Rakesh Goel, Sh. Naresh Goel, Smt. Sarla Goel and Sh. Dhruv Sehgal, B-45, C.C. Colony, Delhi – 110007

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 storeys with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 10 Sh. Sudhir Goyal, 2624-A, Hudson Lane, Kingsway Camp, Delhi – 110009

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 storeys with the total height up to 17.75 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 11 Sh. Prem Chand Gupta, B-35, C.C. Colony, Delhi-110007

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 storeys with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 12 Shri Gaurav Sethi and Smt. Namita Sethi, B-202, Block-B, Surajmal Vihar, Delhi

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of basement + stilt + 4 storeys with the total height up to 17 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 13 Smt. Kuldeep Kaur Bawa, A-2, Nizamuddin West, New Delhi-110013

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 storeys with the height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. in the regulated area of Chausath Khamba i.e. after leaving a setback of 3.050 meters so that there is no construction within the prohibited limit. As the construction site is very close to the protected monument, the construction of a basement cannot be approved.

Case No. : 14 Smt. Vijay Gupta, K-5, Green Park Main, New Delhi- 110016

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 storeys with the height up to 17 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. in the regulated area of Biran ka Gumbad i.e. after leaving a setback of 3 meters so that there is no construction within the prohibited limit. As the construction site is very close to the protected monument, the construction of a basement cannot be approved.

Case No. : 15 **Smt. Yedla Manikya Mala, C-12, First Floor, Green Park Main, New Delhi**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. As the construction site is only 166 meters from the protected monument, the construction of a basement cannot be approved.

Case No. : 16 **Shri Sunil Jain and Smt. Bharti Jain, U-6, Green Park Main, New Delhi**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of third floor on the existing floors provided total height of the building should not exceed 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 17 **Sh. Ashok Kumar, 3163, Basti Pujabiyan, Subzi Mandi, Delhi-110007**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 17 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 18 **Sh. Kamal Talwar, Sh. Harvinder Singh, Sh. Arvinder Singh and Sh. Satvinder Singh through GPA Sh. Arvinder Singh, 3166, Punjabi Basti, Subzi Mandi, Delhi- 110007**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt+4 floors with the total height up to 17 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 19 **Smt. Manju Sharma, Sh. Suresh Kumar Sharma, Smt. Asha Kaushal and St. Indu Kalra through Smt. Asha Kaushal Power of Attorney holder, X-40, Green Park Main, New Delhi – 110016**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. As the construction site is only 184 meters from the protected monument, the construction of a basement cannot be approved. Besides, CA may please confirm the distance from other monuments in this area as the Google map suggests that the site may be nearer to one of the five other monuments in the vicinity.

Case No. : 20 Fr. George Abraham, Secretary, Delhi Catholic Archdiocese, C-1, Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of G + 3 floors with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. Besides, CA may please confirm the distance from other monuments in this area as the Google map suggests that the site may be nearer to one of the five other monuments in the vicinity.

Case No. : 21 Smt. Bimla Devi, Sh. Narender Kumar, Sh. Pawan Prasad, Sh. Rajindera Kumar and Sh. Varinder Kumar, J-14, Hauz Khas, New Delhi- 110016

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for additional construction on second floor and addition of third floor on the existing building provided total height of the building should not exceed 14.63 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 22 Smt. Anju Malhan

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of basement + stilt + 4 storeys with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 23 Smt. Prem Kumari Puri, D-190, Saket, New Delhi – 110017

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for additional construction from ground to second floor on the existing building provided total height of the building should not exceed 11.74 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 24 Sh. Subhash Chander Batra, B-7, NDSE-II, New Delhi – 110049

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 17 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. As the construction site is only 128 meters from the protected monument, the construction of a basement cannot be approved.

Case No. : 25 Sh. Sunil Kumar, Sh. Shekhar, Sh. Jal Prakash and Sh. N.K. Dass, 19, Amrit Nagar, Kotla Mubarkpur, New Delhi- 110003

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. As the construction site is only 134 meters from the protected monument the construction of a basement cannot be approved.

Case No. : 26 **Sh. Ramesh Yadav, Sh. Rvinder Yadav and Sh. Vipul Yadav, B-135, East of Kailash, New Delhi**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for additional construction on Ground +3 floors provided total height of the building should not exceed 14.41 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 27 **Sh. Ram Nath Mehta, 5485, Shora Kothi, Paharganj, New Delhi – 110055**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of Stilt + GF+3 storeys with the total height up to 17.42 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 28 **Sh. Prabhat Kumar Verma & Sh Arun Kumar Dhir through their Attorney M/s Uppal Housing Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Uppal Housing Pvt. Ltd through its Director Sh. Rakesh Uppal, K-100, Hauz Khas Enclave, New Delhi- 110016**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of basement + stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 29 **Sh. Tejinder Singh and Sh. Inderjit Singh, B-2/41, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi- 110029**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of basement + stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 30 **Sh. A.K. Jain and Smt. Jugnu Jain, 8/6, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi- 110016**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of Stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 31 **Sh. Deepak Malik, 8/7, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi – 110016**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 17 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. As the construction site is only 106 meters from the protected monument, the construction of a basement cannot be approved.

Case No. : 32 **Smt. Veena Bajaj, 2/31, Sarvapriya Vihar, New Delhi – 110016**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. As the

construction site is only 126 meters from the protected monument, the construction of a basement cannot be approved.

Case No. : 33 **Sh. Anoop Saxena, Smt. Poonam Saxena, Sh. Satish Chandra Saxena and Sh. Rakesh Kumar Saxena, B-1/15, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi- 110029**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. As the construction site is only 170 meters from the protected monument, the construction of a basement cannot be approved.

Case No. : 34 **Sh. Nitin Gupta, B-29, NDSE-I, New Delhi – 110049**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. As the construction site is only 132 meters from the protected monument, the construction of a basement cannot be approved.

Case No. : 35 **Smt. Satya Gilani, Smt. Meenakshi Gilani and Smt. Vandana Gilani, Y-21, Hauz Khas, New Delhi-110016**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for additional construction on ground floor and addition of first, second third floors provided total height of the building should not exceed 16.46 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 36 **Sh. Ashok Talwar, Smt. Poonam Talwar, Smt. Madhu Soni and Smt. Swarn Suri, N-36, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi- 110017**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. As the construction site is only 162 meters from the protected monument, the construction of a basement cannot be approved.

Case No. : 37 **Sh. Yogeshwar Nath and Smt. Anjala Nath, 36, Hanuman Road, New Delhi – 110001**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for additional construction on existing building provided total height of the building should not exceed 16.70 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc.

Case No. : 38 **Sh. Kamal Dhawan, Sh. Varun Dhwan and Smt. Sweety Dhawan, S-179A, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi- 110017**

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for construction of stilt + 4 floors with the total height up to 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water storage tank etc. As the construction site is only 156 meters from the protected monument, the construction of a basement cannot be approved.

The above cases (serial no 1- 38) were circulated to all members of NMA and on receipt of concurrence from the members, the decision in respect of each of the 38 cases is as recorded.

NOC recommendation to be issued accordingly.

Individual concurrence of each member received by mail/note has been placed in a separate file folder. For reference please refer to folder no. "NMA/Circulation/85".

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

MINUTES OF THE 86th MEETING (1st Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 21st May, 2013

The minutes of the 85th meeting which were circulated on the first day of the 86th meeting have been confirmed, there being no comments from any of the Members.

The proceedings started with presentations made by NHAI, National Zoological Park, Delhi and Highways Deptt., Karnataka.

Thereafter, the following cases were taken up for consideration:

(Deferred Cases)

Case no. 1

(Technical Director, Pune Municipal Corporation, Pune, Maharashtra)

The clarifications as asked for were provided by the applicant and these were perused. After perusal, it was noted that the issues raised by NMA have been properly addressed and keeping that in view and other relevant aspects, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of Grade Separator and Storm water drain which does not involve construction/erection of any structure above the ground level. The applicant would also follow the conditions stipulated hereby:

a. To set up a Monitoring cell that includes members from PMC/ASI.

b. To set up an Interpretation Centre at/near monument to provide heritage awareness among public.

c. To engage Deccan College for preparation of Heritage Zone Management Plan for Pataleshwar Caves and Shaniwar Wada monuments.

d. To prepare a mitigation plan to address the issues created by vibration, pollution and traffic as a consequence of operation of the grade separator.

Case no. 2

(National Zoological Park through its Director Shjri Amitabh Agnihotri, Mathura Road, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and having seen the presentation made in this regard, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). It is advisable that the applicant should follow the design suggestion as provided by NMA. Suggestions to be attached with the recommendation. A write-up on Kos Minar may also be sent.

Fresh Cases

Case no. 1

(AIADMK through its General Secretary Ms. J. Jayalatithaa, AIADKM Paliamentary Office, 111, Parliament House, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 2

(Air Commodore Sh. Sanjay Agarwal, 7, Base Repair Depot, Air Force Station, Tughlakabad, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 12 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 3

(Sh. Niraj Kumar HUF and M/s Tridev Associate through its partners Sh. Nitin Aggarawal and Sh. Hans Raj Gupta, 8/6, Block-41, Singh Saba Road, Subzi Mandi, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was noted that construction has already taken place. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) and a penalty of Rs. 50,000 may be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without prior permission and this amount should be utilized through ASI for providing amenities/facilities to the protected monument.

Case no. 4

(Smt. Kamla Rani, A-181, Gujranwala Town, Part-I, Delhi)

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

Case no. 5

(Sh. Kanwal Kant, 1418-1421, 1424-1427, Kashmere Gate, Delhi)

The application was perused and although the proposal is for proposed repair and renovation which is located in the prohibited area, the applicant should firstly have the approval of HCC (Heritage Conservation Committee) as mentioned by the CA.

Case no. 6

(Sh. Mukesh Gupta and Smt. Padma Gupta, Panchsheel Enclave, New Delhi)

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

Case no. 7

(Sh. Abhijeet Singh, B-12, NDSE-I, New Delhi)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant should construct the building only after 100 mtrs and there is no permission for basement construction.

Case no. 8

(Sh. Joseph Tertullian Lobo and Smt. Jenifer Lobo, K-41, NDSE-II, New Delhi)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 9

(Smt. Renuka Jolly, 236, Kailash Hills, New Delhi)

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

Case no. 10

(Sh. Y.N. Bhargava, Prithiviraj Road, Opposite Safdarjung Tomb, New Delhi)

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

Case no. 11

(Smt. Baljit Kaur, Sh. (Col.) Giri Raj Singh and Sh. (Capt.) Anu Raj Singh through his GPA Sh. Giri Raj Singh, P-24, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi

After perusal of the application it was noted that construction has already taken place. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) and a penalty of Rs. 50,000 may be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without taking prior permission and this amount should be utilized through ASI for providing amenities/facilities to the protected monument.

Case no. 12

(Dharamvir Singh, A-93, NDSE-II, New Delhi)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 13

(Smt. Padma Vati, A-3, Green Park Ext. New Delhi)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 14

(Smt. Suman Mulchandani, Sh. Ramesh, B. Mulchandhani and Sh. Ashok B. Mulchandhani, 37, Sadhana Enclave, New Delhi)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in

this case with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). Basement is not permitted. MS

Case no. 15

(Smt. Kajlash Khanna, Sh. Navneet Khanna and Sh. Manoj Kumar Gulati, 75, Block-172, Jorbagh, New Delhi)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 16

(Smt. Aarti Singhal, 4, Amrita Shergil Marg, New Delhi)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 14.85 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). Applicant should not construct the ~~permission~~ basement as the site is only 155m from the monument.

Case no. 17

(Executive Engineer, DUSIB, Govt. of NCT Delhi, Office of the Executive Engineer, R.P. Bagh, Delhi)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.16 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 18

(U.P. State Bridge Corporation Ltd., Nirbhay Nagar, Gailana Road near Ashopa Hospital, Agra, U.P.)

The proposal relates to construction of rail over bridge situated near Sikandra. The over bridge would start at a distance of 108 mtrs from the protected monument boundary and then go in a direction away from the protected monument. After examining the matter in detail, it was decided to recommend

grant of NOC in this case. While executing the work attempt should be made to design the over bridge in a sensitive manner keeping in view of the historical monuments in the area.

Case no. 19

(Sh. Devendra Thapak, Mauza Babarput P.P. Nagar, Sikandra, Agra, U.P.)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+ 1 floor with a total height of 9 m inclusive of roof-top structures.

Case no. 20

(Project Director, National Highways Authority of India CMU, Mathura at Faridabad)

The presentation had been given by NHAI on this proposal which is for six laning of the Delhi – Agra National Highway. There are several monuments along the route which are likely to be affected by this project. After going through all the relevant aspects, it was decided that NHAI should be asked to prepare **a comprehensive plan** to cover all the protected monuments along the route which should take into account issues like mitigation measures, reducing pollution due to increase traffic flow, damage preventive measure etc. The attempt should be to try and create a heritage zone (perhaps in two clusters for all the monuments.)

Left over fresh NOC case from 85th Meeting (2nd Day):

Case no. 01

(Sh. B. Jagdish Prabhu, Karkala Kasaba Village, Karkala Taluk, Udupi, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 floor with total height of 30 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 02

(Sh. Shivaram Devadiga, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was observed that the distance of proposed site from the boundary is 397.35 mtrs which is beyond 300 mtrs. Therefore, as per CA report, NOC is not required in this case.

Case no. 03

(Smt. Savitha, Barkoor, Udupi, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for single storey with the total height of 15 ft (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 04

(Project Director, Musafirkhana & Honda, Santebennur town, Channagir, Davanagere, Karnataka)

The applicant had not come for PPT as asked for. So it was decided to send a reminder to the applicant for the same.

Case no. 05

(Project Director, Kaitabeshwara Temple, Kotipura Village, Soraba Taluk, Shimoga, Karnataka)

The applicant had not come for PPT as asked for. So it was decided to send a reminder to the applicant for the same.

Case no. 06

(Project Director, Kedareshwara Temple, Balligavi Town, Shikaripura Taluk, Shimoga, Karnataka)

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

Case no. 07

(Sh. E.D. Rajashekar, Belur, Hassan, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground floor with the total height of 4.48 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 08

(Smt. Nithu Rani, Srirangapatna, Madya, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+2 floors with total height of 10.65 mtrs. (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 09

(Smt. B. Saraswati, Madhugiri Fort, Tumkur, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 floor with the total height of 3.6 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 10

(Smt. N. Ratna, K.R. Pet, Mandya, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Ground floor with the total height of 10 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). As the proposed construction is only 107.65m from the monument, no basement is to be allowed.

Case no. 11

(Sh. B. Keerthivarma Shetty, Moodabidri, Magalore, Dakshina Kannada, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was noted that construction has already taken place. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with the total height of 25 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) and a penalty of Rs. 25,000 may be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without prior permission and this amount should be utilized through ASI for providing amenities/facilities to the protected monument.

Case no. 12

(Sh. Sukeerthiraj Ajri, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 floor with the total height of 25 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 13

(Smt. K. Vasanti M. Ballal, Hiriyangadi, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 26 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 14

(Sh. Suresh Ballal, Karkala Taluk, Udupi, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 floor with total height of 29 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 15

(Sh. Prakash Pal S/o Madhava Pai, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+ 1 floor with the total height of 25 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 16

(Sh. Pavananjaya Hedge, Hiriyangadi, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+ 1 floor with the total height of 24 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 17

(Dr. P. Keshava Malya, Dhanashala, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+ 1 floor with the total height of 30 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 18

(Sh. Shivamurthy B.S. Belavadi, Chikmagalur, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for single storey with the total height of 15 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 19

(Sh. N. Parshavanath, Moodabidri, Dakshina Kannada, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 floor with the total height of 28 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 20

(Sh. Prashantha V.K., Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 floor with the total height of 25 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 21

(Sh. M. Vishwanatha Bhat, Karkala, Udupi, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 floor with the total height of 24 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 22

(Sh. Sriman Narayana, Bellary, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was noted that construction has already taken place. It was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with the total height of 7 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc.) and a penalty of Rs. 15,000 may be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without taking prior permission and this amount should be utilized through ASI for providing amenities/facilities to the protected monument.

Case no. 23

(Dist Health and Family Welfare Officer, Bellary, Karnataka)

After examining the proposal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for single storey with the total height of 6.60 mtr. (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may be advised to use indigenous tiles, local materials and stone etc for the construction.

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

MINUTES OF THE 86th MEETING (2nd Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 22nd May, 2013

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Deferred Case

Case no. 1

(M/s Pearl Printers and Publishers Ltd., Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18.10 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. for a school building.

Review Cases

Case no. 1

(Shri K.H. Jivarajanji, Mumbai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to modify the NOC recommended earlier and to now **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 18 mtrs, with building height to be retained at 15 mtrs and additional 3 mtrs for mumty, parapet, water tank etc.

Case no. 2

(S.P. Associates, Mumbai)

After perusal of the request of the applicant it was decided to modify the earlier recommendation and to now **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the height of 50 mtrs i.e. total building height to be retained at 45 mtrs and additional 5 mtrs for roof top structures.

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

MINUTES OF THE 86th MEETING (3rd Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 22nd May, 2013

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Fresh Cases

Case no. 1

(Parth Construction, Mumbai)

Case no. 2

(M/s Raj Developers, Mumbai)

When the above two cases were being discussed, Member Secretary made the following observation:

There is no finality about guidelines for Parel Monument. Although, building survey has been done by CA, Mumbai and attempt has been made within NMA to do zoning/sub-zoning, so far agreed guidelines could not be prepared. In the absence of this, decisions pertaining to Parel monument and the other monuments in Mumbai city in particular relating to height would be rather arbitrary as there is no ground for allowing or not allowing in specific cases. A suggestion had been made by Member Secretary, in the previous meeting that for Mumbai city, the norm of allowing maximum permissible height up to 70 mtrs may be adopted as this is the limit up to which clearance from State High-rise Committee is not required. This suggestion was made while considering Parel monument case and that the same norm may be adopted for Jogeshwari caves as well as other monuments in Mumbai city. This suggestion had been accepted. Also some specific conditions may be applied for clearance of cases that, (i) this norm would not be a precedent once the guidelines are finalized and, (ii) in review cases, once an applicant has sought increase in height which may have been below 70 mtrs, further review would not be entertained. This suggestion had been accepted.

Contd..

Based on the above, Member Secretary suggested that these two cases may also be considered on the basis of the above guideline. While Members agreed to the suggestions as made above by Member Secretary, it was requested that in these two cases under reference relating to Jogeshwari Caves, since a building survey report by CA Mumbai has been received, they may like to examine that and then give their suggestion relating to these two cases. This was agreed to and it was also decided that in case Members are unable to provide their views by 3rd June, 2013, the cases would be disposed of as per the line of action suggested by Member Secretary.

Case no. 3

(Hubtown Ltd., Mumbai)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that the applicant has already constructed five buildings out of his work proposal without taking prior approval from ASI/NMA. And for left over two buildings (one Rehab and one Sale), the applicant has asked for the permission for construction. After consideration of the matter, and after going through the submissions of the applicant relating to non-taking of NOC earlier, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case subject to the following conditions:

a) Penalty of Rs. One lakh to be imposed for the already constructed buildings without taking prior approval.

b) From this penalty amount, the applicant has to provide amenities/facilities at the protected monument i.e. Mahakali Caves under guidance and supervision of ASI.

c) The applicant should get constructed an Interpretation center within his property site to provide heritage awareness among public.This is to be done under guidance and supervision of ASI Mumbai Circle.

d) For proposed Rehab building (block-VI) height should not exceed 30.37 mt. (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc) and for proposed Sale building height should not exceed 75mt. (including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank etc).

Case no. 4

(Shri Madhu N.C., Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor structure with height of 15 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 5

(Shri N.C. Harsha, Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor structure with height of 15 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 6

(Shri S.P. Nemirajaiah, Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground + 1 floor with height of 18 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 7

(Smt. Sarojamma, Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor structure with height of 15 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 8

(Shri Ravi, Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor structure with height of 10 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may be advised to incorporate a sloping roof.

Case no. 9

(Smt. Shivadevamma B.M, Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground + 1st floor structure with height of 6.26 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 10

(Poornaprajna Education Centre, Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground +1st +2nd floor with height of 11.55 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 11

(Shri Anoop Kumar S.N., Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the proposal site is at a distance of 315 mtrs from the protected monument. That being the case, no action is required from NMA as the site falls beyond the regulated limit.

Case no. 12

(Smt. M.R. Vijayalakshmi, Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor structure with height of 30 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 13

(Shri K. Raja, Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground + 1st floor with height of 7 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 14

(Dr. K.M. Metry, Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground + 1st floor with height of 26 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). A basement of 4 feet may be allowed.

Case no. 15

(Smt. Ramaniyamma, Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor with height of 10 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 16

(Chief Executive Officer, Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for single storey with height of 15 feet (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 17

(Mrs. Jayam Natarajan, Mr. N. Ashok, Mr. N.Suresh, Plot No. 3, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for stilt+1st+2nd floor with height of 15.67 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) as per building plan submitted by the applicant.

Case no. 18

(Mrs. Jayam Natarajan, Mr. N. Ashok, Mr. N.Suresh, Plot 1A, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for stilt+1st+2nd floor with height of 15.67 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) as per building plan submitted by the applicant.

Case no. 19

(Mrs. Jayam Natarajan, Mr. N. Ashok, Mr. N.Suresh, Plot 4, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for stilt+1st+2nd floor with height of 15.67 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) as per building plan submitted by the applicant.

Case no. 20

(Mrs. Jayam Natarajan, Mr. N. Ashok, Mr. N.Suresh, Plot No. 1B, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for stilt+1st+2nd floor with height of 15.67 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) as per building plan submitted by the applicant.

Case no. 21

(Thiru P.S. Bharath Kumar, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 with height of 11.08 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 22

(Thiru M.N. Vijayanathan, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was noted that the case belongs to megalithic sites and the purpose of construction is residential, in accordance with the maximum height provided around this monument 15.67 mtrs so far, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.67 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 23

(Thiru P. Kishore Kumar, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 with height of 9.06 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 24

(Shri A.C. Raju, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was noted that the case belongs to megalithic sites and the purpose of construction is commercial, so as per earlier decision, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 16.26 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). So far maximum height provided around this monument is 19.75 mtrs. As the construction is 19.7 m from the monument, a basement is not to be built.

Case no. 25

(Thiru M. Shanmugam, 433/2, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 with height of 9.12 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 26

(Thiru M. Shanmugam, 433/3, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 with height of 9.12 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 27

(N.R. Manigantan, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was noted that the case belongs to megalithic sites and the purpose of construction is residential, in accordance with the maximum height provided around this monument 15.67 mtrs so far, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.67 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 28

(Smt. S. Vijayakumari, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor structure with height of 4.85 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 29

(Smt. R. Padmavathy, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 with height of 7.46 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant is advised to incorporate with sloping roof, if possible.

Case no. 30

(Thiru S. Sugavanam, Chennai)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 with height of 8.10 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 31

(Shri Kishore Kumar Jain B., Chennai)

After examining the proposal, it was noted that construction had already taking place without taking prior approval. Therefore CA clarification is needed in this matter, after that matter could be considered again.

Case no. 32

(Shri Abdul Aziz, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for single storey with height of 4.15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 33

(Shri Roy & Smt. Sreeja, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was noted that construction had been started without obtaining prior permission. So, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for two storey structure with height of 7 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) with the stipulation that the applicant would, by way of penalty, contribute the amount of Rs. 15,000 towards development of facilities and amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 34

(Shri Udaya Bhaskar, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 with height of 7.75 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

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

MINUTES OF THE 87th MEETING (1st Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 25th June, 2013

The minutes of 86th meeting which were circulated on the first day of the 87th meeting have been confirmed, there being no comments from any of the Members.

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Case no. 1

(Smt. Shalu Gupta and others, 101, Anand Lok, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. However, basement is not permitted, as the plot is within 200m fr monument.

Case no. 2

(Shri. Rashid Khalid Kidwai, 63, Anand Lok, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures and one basement, as the plot is at a distance of 244 m from monument.

Case no. 3

(Smt. Susmita Shekhar, Secretary General, PHD, Chamber of Commerce & Industry, 4/2, Siri Institutional Area, August Kranti Marg, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for additional construction on 5th floor only with the total existing height of 24.10 mtrs+ 3 mtrs for roof top structures.

Case no. 4

(Shri. M.K. Chhabra, 13, Siri Fort Road, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures and one basement, as the site is 252m from monument.

Case no. 5

(Smt. Krishna Mathur through her GPA Sh. Rajiv Kumar, D-236A, Sarvodaya Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. However, basement is not permitted, as the plot falls within 200m from monument.

Case no. 6

(Smt. Poonam Chopra and Sh. Rakesh Chopra, C-204, Sarvodaya Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures and one basement, as plot is 260m from monument.

Case no. 7

(Shri Ravdesh Singh Sodhi, C-5/12, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. However, basement is not permitted, as plot is within 200m. from monument.

Case no. 8

(Smt. Meenu Behal and others, D-2/5, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures.

Case no. 9

(Shri Hardev Singh, D-5/3, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. However, basement is not permitted, as plot is within 200m. from monument.

Case no. 10

(Sh. Arun Sehgal & Sh. Sanjay Kumar Gupta, C-10, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures.

491

Case no. 11

(M/s Salasar Dham Techno Build Pvt. Ltd. Through Sh. Parveen Kumar Gupta, Khasra no. 675/153,676/153,677/153,677/154,678/154), Gur Mandi, Rajpur Chhawni, Opp. Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was noted that a portion of the property lies within 100 mtr prohibited limit. The applicant has proposed to leave a 3 mtr portion which falls in the prohibited area and begin the construction thereafter beyond 100 mtr limit. After perusal of the details, it was observed that there is presently a large open space between the protected monument and the proposed construction site. Keeping that in mind and also the fact that this would be the first line of construction beyond the prohibited limit it was decided that while NOC may be recommended in this case, the applicant should be advised to maintain a 3 mtr strip of land across the length of the plot facing the monument as vacant for the reasons mentioned above and this strip of land may be landscaped/ developed as a green area.

Case no. 12

(Shri. Sheikh Salman Saeed, G-50 (TF), Nizamuddin West, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.5 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) and one basement, as the site is 242 m. from monument.

Case no. 13

(Shri Mohd. Yusuf Butt & others, G-48, Nizamuddin West, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures and one basement, as the site is 270 m. from monument.

Case no. 14

(Sh. D.K. Mehta, D-11, Nizamuddin West, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) and one basement, as the site is 272 m from monument.

Case no. 15

(M/s Unique Buildwell (India) Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Trinity Buidcon (India) Pvt. Ltd through Sh. Ravinder Taneja, 7, Hailey Road, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 17.42 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) However, basement is not permitted, as the plot is within 200 m. from the monument.

Case no. 16

(Smt. Feroza Begum & others through SPA Sh. Shiekh Mohd. Naqi, Municipal No.1 (4736), ward no. XI, Plot No. 23, Ansari Road, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. However, basement is not permitted, as the site is within 200m. from the monument.

Case no. 17

(Smt. Feroza Begum & others through SPA Sh. Shiekh Mohd. Naqi, Municipal No.2 (4736), ward no. XI, Plot No. 23, Ansari Road, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. However, basement is not permitted, as the site is within 200m of the monument.

Case no. 18

(Smt. Feroza Begum & others through SPA Sh. Shiekh Mohd. Naqi, Municipal No.3 (4736), ward no. XI, Plot No. 23, Ansari Road, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. However, basement is not permitted, as the site is within 200m of the monument.

Case no. 19

(Smt. Feroza Begum & others through SPA Sh. Shiekh Mohd. Naqi, Municipal No.4 (4736), ward no. XI, Plot No. 23, Ansari Road, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. However, basement is not permitted, as the site is within 200m of the monument.

Case no. 20

(Shri Anand Prakash Shrivastava, C-36, NDSE-I, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. However, basement is not permitted, as the site is within 200m of the monument.

Case no. 21

(Shri S.K. Prabhakar, A-63, NDSE-I, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for addl. one floor with total height of 16.15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 22

(Shri Jitendriya Sanyal, D-127, Panchsheel Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures.

Case no. 23

(Sh. Anand Ramnani & Sh. Sunil Ramnani, A-1/19, Panchsheel Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.69 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 24

(Shri Manoj Kumar Jain, A-7,Gali No.3,Sanjay Nagar,Sarai Pipal Thala,Adarsh Nagar, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures and impose a penalty of Rs. 25,000 for undertaking work without permission, which would be utilized for the provision of some amenities/facilities at protected monument which would be done under supervision of ASI.

Case no. 25

(Shri Dhan Singh, 7/8, Sarvapriya Vihar, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15.01 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.).

Case no. 26

(Executive Engineer/SWD-5/DDA/Sarita Vihar)

After perusal of the application and noting that it is related to renovation/ improvement of existing surface parking it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 27

(M/s Madhukar Multispeciality Hospital & Research Centre, Plot No. 5, FC-29, Geetanjali Faculty Centre, Near Malviya Nagar Metro Station, Delhi)

After perusal of the case it was observed that the applicant had obtained NOC from ASI earlier for construction upto 5th floor with height of 26.50 m. On perusal of the application now it is seemed that the applicant wants to complete unfinished construction as per NOC received from ASI and also wants to add new 6th and 7th floors. After examination of the case, it was decided that NOC may be recommended for the completion of the building up to the level for which NOC was granted by ASI only. No additional construction beyond the 5th floor would be permissible.

Case no. 28

(Sh. P.P. Kapahi & Sh. Sudhir P. Kapahi, 16, NDSE-II, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures and one basement, as the site is 230m. from monument.

Case no. 29

(Sh. Anil Verma, B-3/4, Safdarjung Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures and one basement, as the site is 280m. from monument,

Case no. 30

(Sh. S. Mohd. Zaki & Sh. Munsif Zaki, D-11, Nizamuddin West, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures and one basement, as the site is 280m. from monument.

Case no. 31

(Sh. Rajesh Bhargava, 1/3, Roop Nagar, Subzi Mandi, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 16.10 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) and one basement, as the site is 230m. from monument,

Case no. 32

(Shri Rajesh Bhargava, 1/4, Roop Nagar, Subzi Mandi, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 16.10 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) and one basement, as the site is 220m. from monument,

Case no. 33

(DMRC through CPM-3 (line-7) Sh. Aashish Bansal, DMRC, (Tuglak Cresent Park, Tuglak Road), MRTS work, line-7 of Delhi MRTS phase-III, Ring Road, NDSE, Delhi)

After perusal of the application and noting that the proposed work involved inwards construction both above and below the ground level, it was felt that more detailed examination is required and accordingly it was decided to defer the proposal for a future meeting of the NMA.

Case no. 34

(Sh. Satish Chandra Mishra & others, 76, Sunder Nagar, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 16.76 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) and one basement, as the site is 218 m from monument.

Case no. 35

(Smt. Shobha Sanwalka, 38, Anand Lok, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures.

Case no. 36

(Sh. Daya Gupta & Sh. Durga Prasad Tripathi, K-1, NDSE-I, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. However, no basement is permitted, as the site is 136 m from monument.

Case no. 37

(President/Secretary, Sy. No. 99(P) and 101 (P) at Kaddirampura, ~~Andhra Pradesh~~ Bengaluru)

After perusal of the application it was noted that this proposal relates to rehabilitation of the unauthorized occupants evicted at Hampi. After consideration of the matter, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for ground+1 floor constructions with total height of 8 mtrs as per plans submitted. The constructions should be undertaken in a manner that local material (stone) could be used for the façade and the overall construction is in harmony with the surroundings. Care should also be taken so that roof top structures also ~~pink~~ in with the surroundings.

Case no. 38

(The District Court, Alibag, Maharashtra)

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, water-tank etc.

Case no. 39

(The Collector, Raigad, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) restricted to G+1 and one basement.

Case no. 40

(The Divisional Controller, Gujarat State Transport Corporation, Godhra, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.431 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 41

(Shri Subramanyam, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the height of 7.25 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) with the suggestion that the façade, roof etc. should be as per existing building as far as possible.

Case no. 42

(Smt. Thankam A., Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.35 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc).

Case no. 43

(Mrs. V. Fousiya, Wayanad, Kerala)

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, water-tank etc).

Case no. 44

(Smt. Saudha Mohd. Ali & Smt. Shajira Saleem, Thrissur, kerala)

After perusal of the application and keeping in view the vicinity and surroundings, it was decided, to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor construction only with total height to be restricted to 6 mtrs including (mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to complete roof in traditional sloping style with manglorian tiles.

Case no. 45

(Mrs. Vasantha K.P., Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 3.70 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant may ensure that during digging of basement local ASI should be informed, in case any archaeological remains being found.

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

MINUTES OF THE 87th MEETING (2nd Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 25th June, 2013

The following cases were taken for consideration:

Case no. 46

(G. Ajit Kumar, President, Penugonda Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC to undertake the repairs and the applicant would be advised to make use of stone material for the repairs. The repair work is limited to the following items i.e.:

a) Stone cladding where damaged.
b) Strengthening of soil below the walls

There should be no additional construction or any horizontal or vertical addition.

Case no. 47

(Ch. Venkata Subbarao, Bapatla, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.95 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 48

(Sh. V. Sarada, Bapatla, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the construction work seems to have been completed. It is necessary to have a clarification on the same from the CA.

Case no. 49

(Sh. Girish Chandra Thapliyal, Shashtradhara Road, Nalapani, Dehradun, Uttarakhand)

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.

Case no. 50

(Sh. Jagmohan Singh Kafola, Shashtradhara Road, Nalapani, Dehradun, Uttrakhand)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.8 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 51

(Smt. Sunita Rana, Shahastradhara Road, Dehradun, Uttrakhand)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 22 ft including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 52

(Smt. Anita kumar w/o Sh. Susheel Kumar, Sahastradhara Road, Dehradun, Uttrakhand)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 28 ft. including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 53

(Sh. Jag Jeewan Singh Bhisht, Sahastradhara Road, Near Appolo International School, Dehradun, Uttrakhand)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height 25 feet 9 inches including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 54

(Smt. Divya Rastogi and Bharti Rastogi, Kashipur, U.S. Nagar, Uttrakhand)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.84 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 55

(Sh. Teerth Dorna Sagar Geenroddhar, Kashipur U.S. Nagar, Uttrakhand)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 6.10 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 56

(Sh. Anil Kumar Agrwal, Drona Vihar, U.S. Nagar, Uttrakhand)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 6.05 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 57

(Sh. Shankar Lal Arora S/o Sh. Khemchand Arora, Roopwas, Bharatpur, Rajasthan)

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

Case no. 58

(Sh. Bishnu Prasad Panda, Bhubneshwar, Khurda, Odisha)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+2 floors with total height of 11 mtrs. The decision was taken keeping in view present surroundings & predominance of low rise buildings of the proposed site.

Case no. 59

(Sh. Nakir Uddin, Panbari area, Dhubri, Assam)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 12 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 60

(Mrs. Aruna Das, Jonaki Nagar, Sivasagar, Assam)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 4.80 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 61

(Sh. Nobin Kumar Gogoi, Near Sivasagar Tank, Sivasagar, Assam)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 1.80 mtrs for brick boundary wall, 1 mtr for brick drain and 1.80 mtrs for gate post.

Case no. 62

(Ms. Malaya Borgohain, Jaysagar, Sivasagar,Assam)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 35 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 63

(Smt. Munmun Bhattacharya, Guptipara, Hoogly, West Bengal)

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, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 64

(Sh. Mahesh Narain Sharma, Chiria Jhil, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.90 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 65

(Smt. Bimlesh Kumari w/o Sh. Chhatar Singh, Smt. Vidhaya Devi D/o Sh. Bhud Ram, Smt. Shakuntala W/o Sh. Dhani Ram, Smt. Tejpali w/o Sh. Khemchand, Aurangabad, Palwal, Haryana)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor with the total height of 15 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 66

(Sh Satish Kumar S/o Sham lal, Kikkar Bazar, Bhatinda)

This is a case of repair. Accordingly, the application is being sent back to CA for necessary action at their end.

Case no. 67

(Smt. Shashi Bala w/o Sh. Raj Kumar, Bathinda, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 26 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 68

(Sh. Bhim Singh S/o Sh. Balwant Singh, Bathinda, Punjab)

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

Case no. 69

(Smt. Suman w/o Sh Munish kumar bansal, Bhatinda)

This is a case of repair. Accordingly, the application has to be sent back to CA for necessary action at their end.

Case no. 70

(Sh. Vijay Kumar W/o Sh. Kartar Chand, Jalandhar, 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.)

Case no. 71

(Managing Director, Punjab Health Systems Corporation, Amritsar, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for with the total height of 19.25 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 72

(Smt. Veena W/o Sh. Jagdish Parkash, Batala, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for with the total height of 27 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 73

(Sh. Ashok Kumar S/o Sh. Parshotam Lal & Smt. Pankaj Rani W/o Sh. Ashok Kumar, Jalandhar, Punjab) – Proposed location- B-8/166, Lamba Bazar

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 32 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.) and construction work should be in harmony with the surrounding buildings/structures.

Case no. 74

(Sh. Tara Singh S/o Lashkar Singh, Jalandhar, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total the height of 27 feet (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.).

Case no.75

(Sh. Ashok Kumar S/o Sh. Parshotam Lal & Smt. Pankaj Rani w/o Sh. Ashok Kumar, Jalandhar, Punjab) - Proposed location- B-4/53, Lamba Bazar

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 32 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.) and construction work should be in harmony with the surrounding bldgs./structures.

Case no. 76

(Smt. Sucheta Rani W/o Sh. Harsh Mohan Ohri, Jalandhar, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 31 feet 6 inches (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.).

Case no. 77

(Sh. Karamvir S/o Dalip Chand, Jalandhar, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 16 feet 3 inches (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 78

(Smt. Prem Kaur W/o Sh. Ravinder Singh 7 Sh. Vikaramjit Singh, Ropar, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it felt necessary that the provided distance is needed to be verified by the CA, whether it is from the protected limit or from the boundary wall of the monument.

Case no. 79

(Smt. Bimla Devi Memorial Trust Trustee-Ved Prakash Gupta)

After perusal of the application, it felt necessary that the applicant should be asked for a PowerPoint presentation on the work plan in an ensuing meeting of NMA.

Case no. 80

(Public Works Department, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was felt necessary that the applicant should be asked for a PowerPoint presentation on the work plan in an ensuing meeting of NMA.

Case no. 81

(Sh. Nagesh Goenka, 268, Udhyog Vihar, Phase-IV, Gurgaon, Haryana)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that there is no proper building plan showing elevation, height etc. Hence, the applicant should be asked to submit the required documents for further consideration of the case.

Case no. 82

(Torrent Power Ltd, Bijli Ghar, Agra, Uttar Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 12 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 83

(Pushpanjali Construction Pvt. Ltd. Baipur, Agra, Uttar Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 9.14 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 04

(Director, Annapurna Polymers Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad, Gujrat)

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 construction work should be in harmony with the protected monument and the CA is requested to monitor/ensure the work.

Case no. 05

(Sh. Vinod Kumar Gupta S/o Sh. Mohan Lal Gupta, Bathinda, Punjab

After examining the details provided by the applicant, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for the specific repair only. There should be no additional construction or any horizontal or vertical addition.

Case no. 06

(Sh. Jang Bahadur Kohli s/o Sh. Som Dutt, Nurmahal, 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 (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc). The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument /sites

Synopsis of Review Case For 87th meeting (2nd Day)

Case no. 01

(Shri Anil Babanrao Thorve, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to re-consider the case and the height is now allowed is 18m (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.) for construction of residential building.

Case no. 02

(Hemkunt Sahib Infrastructures Developers Ltd., New Delhi Municipal Corporation)

No review has been considered for this project.

Case no. 01

(Thiru B. Jeevanantham,Thanjavur, Town survey no. 850 to 852, Tamil Nadu)

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, water storage tank, etc.) The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument /sites.

Case no. 02

(Thiru B. Jeevanantham, Town Survey No. 816 & 817, Ward No. 3, Thanjavur Tamil Nadu,)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.19 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.) The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument/sites.

Case no. 03

(Thiru K. Senthilkumar, Thanjavur, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9.78 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument /sites.

Case no. 04

(Thiru R. Ravindranath Rao, Thanjavur, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.46 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc). The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument/sites.

Case no. 05

arna, Ponmar Village, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu) ask the applicant for

After perusal of the application, it was decided to have an archaeological assessment report of the site keeping in mind the site's proximity to the protected monument.

Case no. 06

(N. Reguranjan, Thirupporur, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.61 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. The proposed construction may be in harmony with the protected monument/sites.

Case no. 07

(Ms. A. Kavitha, Thirupporur, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 4.57 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc). The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument/sites.

Case no. 08

(R. Nagalingeswaran, K.S. Subi, Thirupporur, Kanchipuram, Tamiil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 7.84 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc). The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument/sites.

Case no. 09

(K. Srinivasagan, Kundrathur, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.90 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc). The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument/sites.

Case no. 10

(Thiru R. Sridhar, Sembakkam & Nanmangalam Village, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 10.07 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc). The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument/sites.

Case no. 11

(Smt. Rajeshwari Bhima Rao, Sembakkam & Nanmagalam Village, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

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). The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument/sites.

Case no. 12

(S. Ramkumar, Plot no 3,Sembakkam & Nanmangalam village, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.11 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc). The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument/sites.

Case no. 13

(S. RamKumar Plot no 2, Sembakkam & Nanmangalam Village, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.11 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc). The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument/sites.

Case no. 14

(Sh. Rajashri Rajan Jahangirdar, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case and the total height of the building should be restricted to 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.)

Case no. 15

(Sh. Dattatrya Tulsiram Raskonda & Anad Tulsiram Raskonda, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the construction work has already taken place without taking prior approval. Hence, the SA/CA should issue show cause notice to the applicant to arrange to demolish the unauthorized construction.

Case no. 16

(Sh. Vijay Kumar Rajaram Kasar and Vishnukant Rajaram Kasar, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 11.80 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc). The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument/sites.

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

MINUTES OF THE 87th MEETING (3rd Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 26th June, 2013

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Case no. 01

(Project Director, National Highway Authority of India, CMU, Mathura at Faridabad, Agra)

After perusal of the application and considering the details of comprehensive plan, it was decided to **recommend** of NOC in this case for road widening of the national highway.

Case no. 02

(Smt. Jyoti Pandey w/o Sh. Ganesh Dutt Pandey, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 3.64 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc). The proposed construction may be harmony with the protected monument /sites.

Case no. 03

(Manager, Nirmala Convent School, Kumta, Belgaum, 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 with total height of 14 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc.), it was also decided to impose a penalty of Rs. 1 lakh for construction without permission and the amount would be utilized by the way of providing amenities/facilities at the protected monument under the guidance of ASI.

509

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

MINUTES OF THE 88th MEETING (2nd Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 10th July, 2013

The cases that had remained outstanding from the list of 87th meeting were taken up first for consideration. Following decision were taken up in respect of those cases. (Cases pertaining to sl: no. 17-41 of the list of cases of 87th meeting).

Case no. 17

(Shri Purushottam Dnyaneshwar Kanade, Pune)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures.

Case no. 18

(Shri Chitnis, Yadnyavalkya Ashram, Pune)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures.

Case no. 19

(Shri Santosh Dattatray Jadhav, Pune)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for one storey with total height of 5.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 20

(Shri Ashokrao Kashinath Mahindrakar, Solapur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case G+2 with total height of 11.80 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 21

(Shikshanmaharshi Bapuji Salunkhe Mahavidyalaya (Karad), Sh. Swami Vivekananda Shikshan Sanstha, Kolhapur)

After perusal of the application it was observed that there is some lack of clarity about the limit of the prohibited area, especially with respect to the boundary of the protected monument. This point may be revarified by the CA and the case would be considered thereafter.

Case no. 22

(Shri Nadeem Shafi Sarang, Sindhudurga, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 11.28 mtrs (including parapet, mumty, and water-tank etc.) for lower ground floor+ground floor+first floor as per enclosed drawings submitted by the applicant.

Case no. 23

(Shri Muniwar-Abad Charitable Trust, Pune)

After perusal of the application it was noted that the land of the applicant falls partly within prohibited area. The construction is proposed just after the 100 mtr limit. After perusal, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+2 floors with total height of 15 mtrs (including parapet, mumty, and water-tank etc.). For the area which falls within the prohibited limit and which is proposed to be developed as landscape area, no construction should be undertaken nor should there be any deep foundation or piling work.

Case no. 24

(Shri Sevaram Dulani Saraswati Fabrics Pvt. Ltd., Kolhapur)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+1 with the total height of 9.65 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). Applicant also advised to construct outside wall using stone/ rubble masonery.

Case no. 25

(Shri Rajendra R. Gholecha (POAH) of Shantadevi Rekhavchand & others and Shri Mohanlal K. Mangrani (POAH) of Nirmal Kumar B. Bagrecha & others, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G+2 floors with total height of 12.70 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant should try to retain some features of the façade which was existing on the 2nd floor and try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design.

Case no. 26

(Smt. Zoherabibi Mohammed Shakir Shaikh, Surat, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 18 mtrs in which 15 mtrs for parking (GF) +4 floors and additional 3 mtrs for roof top structures. The applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design.

Case no. 27

(Shri Yusuf Mohammed Punjani, Porbandar, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for GF+3 floors with the total height of 15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design.

Case no. 28

(Shri Kishanbhai Jethabhai Kishor & Sh. Dulabhai Ranabhai Odedra, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G.F.+3 storeys with the total height of 14.10 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) but with the condition that the applicant should try to retain existing façade to the extent possible and try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design.

Case no. 29

(Shri Gulam Kadar Kalubhai & others, Bharuch, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G.F+2 storeys with the total height of 10.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design.

Case no. 30

(Shri Sabbirhusen A.Rahim Amodwala & others, Bharuch, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G.F+2 storeys with the total height of 10.50 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) The applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design.

Case no. 31

(Shri Mayurkumar Vinodlal Surani & others, Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G.F+2 storeys with the total height of 13.20 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design and penalty of Rs. 1 lakh may be imposed on the applicant for the construction without prior sanction. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 32

(Shri Shitalbhai Bhailalbhai Patel, Panchmahal, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 13 mtrs in which 10 mtrs for G+2 floors + 3 mtrs for roof top structures. Third floor should be demolished as this was constructed without prior permission. ~~Also, the applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design~~

Case no. 33

(Shri Sadik Khan Kalikunjjama Khanji Talukadar, Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for GF+1 floor with the total height of 9.70 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). ~~The applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design and~~ A penalty of Rs. 1 lakh may be imposed on the applicant for the construction without prior permission and as per notice sanctioned by CA, Gujarat. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 34

(Shri Nandlal Jagjivan Kansara and Shri Ramniklal Jagjivan Kansara, Bhavnagar, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for GF+1 with the total height of 8.99 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant is advised to use tiled sloping roof on top of stair case incorporating in keeping with surrounding structures and remove parapet (photographs may be sent as a reference) and the applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design. Also, penalty of Rs. 1 lakh may be imposed on the applicant for the construction without prior permission and as per notice sanctioned by CA, Gujarat. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 35

(Shri Sandip R. Bhatt P.O.A.H. of Sh. Ashokbhai Vasudev Atve, Ahmedabad)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for hollow plinth/parking+GF+3 floors with the total height of 19.33 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design.

Case no. 36

(The Director, Kasturbhai Mayabhai Pvt. Ltd., Sh. Niraj Vasantbhai Shah, Ahmedabad)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case limited to total height of 22.8 mtrs (2.8 m for hollow plinth, 15 m for main building and 5 m for roof top structures). The applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design.

Case no. 37

(Shri Mohd. Ishak Sujauddin Saiyed & others, Vadodara, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for parking,G.F+2 floors with the total height of 16 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank and machine room). The applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design.

Case no. 38

(Shri Samirkhan Alinkhan Pathan & other partner of Mahi Developers, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for parking, G.F.+2 floors with the total height of 16 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank and machine room). The applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design.

Case no. 39

(Shri Bhogilal Manekdal Jinger, Vadodara, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G.F+2 floors with the total height of 10.80 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design. Also, penalty of Rs. 25,000 may be imposed on the applicant for the construction without prior permission as recommended by CA, Gujarat. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 40

(Shri Rajendra Manilal Thakkar, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G.F+1 floor with the total height of 7.90 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). ~~The applicant should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design~~ Also, penalty of Rs. 1 lakh may be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without prior permission and as recommended by CA, Gujarat. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 41

(Shri Yagna Bharatkumar Patel, Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G.F+4 floors with the total height of 17.75 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). The applicant should try to maintain façade of the existing building (photographs may be sent for reference) and should try to maintain general conformity with traditional architecture/design.

After that the following cases were taken up for consideration from the list of 88th meeting:

Deferred cases

Case no. 01

(Sh. Kanwal Kant, Kashmere Gate, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC to undertake the repair work as proposed. There should be no additional construction or any horizontal or vertical addition.

Case no. 02

(Rajiv Memorial Academic Welfare Society, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+3 stories with total height of 52 feet including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. The applicant should enclose the Kos Minar with a proper boundary wall and put some signages around it. This work may be done in consultation of SA Agra.

Case no. 03

(Sh. Anirudhacharya, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for three stories with total height of 13.10 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. The applicant should try to keep façade in conformity while constructing the building.

Case no. 04

(Sh. Nagesh Goenka, Agra, Uttar Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for two stories with total height of 13.75 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-storage tank and etc.

Case no. 05

(Medical Superintendent, Class-I, Rural Hospital)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 5.60 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.) for the proposed three buildings and 7.40 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.) for the proposed one building including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 06

(Sh. B. Gnanapragasam, Mammallapuram, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the construction work seems to have been completed. It is necessary to get a clarification on the same from the CA, and a Status report on the present site asked for earlier has still not been received from CA.

Case no. 07

(Thiru Kishore Kumar Jain. B., Chennai)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the old building (as per photo sent) should be demolished and this may be certified by CA. Thereafter, NOC would be issued for new construction.

Review cases

Case no. 01

(D. Charles Jeyasingh, Chennai)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground + 3 stories with total height of 19.39 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 02

(Shri Bimlendra Pratap Mishra,)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground + 5 stories with total height of 21 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.) as recommended in HIA, ~~with the proposed façade design~~. However, no basement is allowed in this case. The façade should be in harmony with the monument and an interpretation centre is to be provided.

Case no. 01

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

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for single storey with total height of 3.5 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. The applicant should incorporate colonnaded verandah in the front of the residential building instead of porch and sit out as proposed.

Case no. 02

(Sh. Premlala Madanlal Tiwari, Gulbarga, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for single storey with total height of 3.5 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 03

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

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground + 1 with total height of 27 feet including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 04

(Sh. Kirit L. Ladad, Gulbarga, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+1 with total height of 30 feet including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 05

(Sh. Namchandrappa. B. Devakki, Amargol, Dharwal, 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 with total max height of 6 mtr + 2 mtr for mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc. It was also decided to impose a penalty of Rs. 25,000 for construction without permission and the amount would be utilized by the way of providing amenities/facilities at the protected monument under the guidance of ASI.

518

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

MINUTES OF THE 88th MEETING (3rd Day) OF NMA

Venue	-	Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs., 24,Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110001
Time & Date	-	10.30 A.M on 11th July, 2013

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Review Cases

Case no. 06

(Sh. Malakajappa Malleshappa Bellad, Belgaum, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+1 with total height of 7.5 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. The applicant may incorporate sloping eaves/chhaja in the proposed design.

Case no. 07

(Sh. Revappa Malleshappa Bellad and Sh. Malakajappa Malleshappa Bellad, CTS No. 3186/A/1, Baihongal, Belgaum, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+1 with total height of 7 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. The applicant may incorporate sloping eaves/chhaja in the proposed design.

Case no. 08

(Sh. Revappa Malleshappa Bellad and Sh. Malakajappa Malleshappa Bellad, CTS No. 3186/A/2, Baihongal, Belgaum, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+1 with total height of 7.5 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. The applicant may incorporate sloping eaves/chhaja in the proposed design.

Case no. 09

(Smt. Chandrakala w/o Sh. Prabhurao Patil, Barid, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+2 with total height of 11.10 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. as per building plan submitted by applicant.

Case no. 10

(Sh. Rajkumar alias basava Kumar Patil S/o Kashinath Rao, barid, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+2 with total height of 11.40 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 11

(Sh. Yallappa Saibu Jadhava, Barid, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+2 with total height of 11.40 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 12

(Thiru M. Etti, Kanchipuram, Tamil nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for stilt+4 with total height of 17.53 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. as per building plan provided by applicant. But no basement is allowed in this case. The applicant should set up an Interpretation Centre/Room for the protected monument in question, in the proposed new construction.

Case no. 13

(Mr. D. Mallikarjuna Rao, Kanchipuram, Tamil nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+4 with total height of 19.88 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. The applicant should set up an Interpretation Centre/Room for the protected monument in question, in the proposed new construction.

Case no. 14

(The Director Indian Institute of Information Technology, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that the project is fairly large and it is at a distance of 275 m. So, it was decided to ask the applicant to redesign the plan so as to leave the 25 m stretch free from construction & take it beyond 300 m limit, thereafter, no clearance from NMA would be required. However, the applicant should set up an Interpretation Centre/Room for the protected monument in question

Case no. 15

(Thiru A. Lakshmi narayanan, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that out of the total land of the applicant, a large portion falls within prohibited area. This area has been left out of the construction proposal. It has also been observed that the area and surrounding vicinity is still largely undeveloped. Moreover, property is located at a level about 8 to 10 mtrs below the top of the hill on which the Megalithic Cists are located. After, taking into account these factors and also the recommendation of the Impact Assessment Report, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+8 floors with total height of 21 mtrs inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, machine-room etc. Besides this, the applicant should also follow the recommendation of the Impact Assessment Report regarding setting up Interpretation Centre, Heritage Conservation program etc. and as part of that, make provision for enclosing the protected site with boundary wall (which could be done by ASI). No construction activity should be taken up in the prohibited area of the property.

Case no. 16

(Thiru A. Ramachandran, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for stilt+2 with total height of 12 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 17

(Thiru R. Mohan, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for stilt+2 with total height of 9.85 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 18

(Thiru T. N. Ravichandran, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for stilt+2 with total height of 13.80 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 19

(Ms. V. Janaki, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for stilt+1 with total height of 7.60 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 20

(Avalon Technology and Services Pvt. Ltd, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+2 with total height of 17.15 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 21

(M/s. Third Wear Technical Services, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for stilt+3 floors with total height of 20 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 22

(Tmt. G. Vimili, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for stilt, ground+2 floors with total height of 12.28 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 23

(Thiru C. Selvaraj, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+ 1 floor with total height of 7.80 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 24

(Thiru R. Gangatharan, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the construction work seems to have been completed. It is necessary to get a clarification on the same from the CA, and a status report on the present site asked for earlier has still not been received from CA.

Case no. 25

(Tmt. A. Joachim Jerry, Kanchipuram, Tamil nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+ 1 floor with total height of 10.70 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 26

(Tmt. N. C. Fathima, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for Stilt + 2 with total height of 11.85 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 27

(The Secretary, S.I.V.E.T. College, S.No. 1/1, Gowrivakkam Village, Tambaram Taluk, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

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 ground+1 with total max height of 9 mtrs for mumty, water storage tank, parapet, stare-room etc.. It was also decided to impose a penalty of Rs. 1,00,000 for construction without permission and the amount would be utilized by the way of providing amenities/facilities at the protected monument under the guidance of ASI. The applicant should set up an Interpretation Centre/Room for the protected monument in question, in the proposed new construction.

Case no. 28

(The Secretary, S.I.V.E.T. College, S.No. 8/1, Gowrivakkam Village, Tambaram Taluk, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor with total height of 15.85 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 29

(Mr. P. Balachandran, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

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

Case no. 30

(Ms. Jennifer Ann Macedo, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor with total height of 13 feet 9 inches including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 31

(Sh. K. Anadan, Mamallapuram, Tamil Nadu)

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

Case no. 32

(Mr. A.P. Suresh, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor with total height of 14 feet including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 33

(Commissioner, Vellore City Municipal Corporation, Vellore, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for two floors with total height of 7.69 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. The applicant may incorporate sloping eaves/chhaja in the proposed design.

Case no. 34

(Mr. P. Rathakrishnan, Virudhunagar, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+1 with total height of 7.50 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and otla.

Case no. 35

(Mr. R. Saravanan, Virudhunagar, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+2 with total height of 8.60 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping roof and otla.

Case no. 36

(Smt. S.R. Ramya, Kanyakumari District, Tamil Nadu)

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 ground+1 with total max height of 7.50 mtrs for mumty, water storage tank, parapet, stare-room etc. It was also decided to impose a penalty of Rs. 20,000 for construction without permission and the amount would be utilized by the way of providing amenities/facilities at the protected monument under the guidance of ASI.

Case no. 37

(Tmt. K. Muniyammal, Kanchipuram, Tamil nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for stilt+ground+1 with total height of 12.30 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 38

(Mr. Lourenco X. Silveira, Candolim, North-Goa, Goa)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+1 with total height of 8 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 39

(Director, Directorate of Transport Government of Goa, Junta House, Panaji, Goa)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+2 with total height of 13 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

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

MINUTES OF THE 89th MEETING (1st Day) OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 2.30 P.M on 22nd July, 2013

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Deferred cases

Case no. 1

(Sh. Nitinbhai Ramjibhai Katar, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G.F+4 floors with the total height of 18.60 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). Also, penalty of Rs. 1 lakh may be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without prior permission as recommended by CA, Gujarat. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 2

(Shri Dayabhai Vasrambhai Ghagda, Trustee, Soni Nyat Samast Vadi, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for G.F+3 floors with the total height of 17.05 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). Also, penalty of Rs. 1 lakh may be imposed on the applicant for undertaking construction without prior permission as recommended by CA, Gujarat. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Fresh cases

Case no. 1

(Shri Satya Narayan Mishra & Smt. Usha Mishra, Flat No. 9, Dhyan Chand Marg, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of machine room and one room at 1st floor on the existing building with total height of 11.58 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.)

Case no. 2

(Sh. Mahant Manohar Nath, Shri Prachin Sheetla Mata Mandir, 70, Calcutta Gate, Jamuna Bazar, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was noted that this case pertains to repair/renovation of broken boundary wall & demolished chabutra and flooring of ground near main gate of Sh. Shitla Mata Mandir and after careful consideration of the same it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 9 feet for boundary wall and 1.5 feet for chabutra. However, no new construction or addition should be allowed.

Case no. 3

(M/s Atma Ram House Investments Pvt. Ltd. through Director Sh. R.P. Goel, 5, Tolstoy Road, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case with total height of 21 mtrs +5 mtrs for roof top structures. However, basement is not permitted and the applicant may explore feasibility and to try for surface parking.

Case no. 4

(Smt. Malka Rani Golhotra, G-9, Green Park Main, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for the total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. Basement is allowed since the site is 245m from the monument.

Case no. 5

(Shri. Rakesh Galhotra & Sh. Vikrant Galhotra, G-8, Green Park Main, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for the total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. Basement allowed as the site is 254m from the monument.

Case no. 6

(Shri Rameshwar Goswami, F-45, Green Park Main, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for the total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. However, no basement is allowed, as the site is 180 m from the monument.

Case no. 7

(Shri Panna Lal Jain, B-7, Green Park Main, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for 4 floors (basement+4) with the total height of 18 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc), as the site is 220m. from the monument.

Case no. 8

(Sh. Vijay Kumar Gupta & Sh. Lal Chand Gupta, 30, Sunder Nagar Market, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for 4 floors (basement+4) with the total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures, as the site is 266 m. from the monument.

Case no. 9

(Shri Anil Mithal & Smt. Kiran Mithal, C-51, Nizamuddin East, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for 4 floors (basement+stilt+4) with the total height of 18 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.), as the site is 274m. from the monument.

Case no. 10

(Sh. Moti Keswani through Sh. Raj Keswani, B-35, Nizamuddin East, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for the total height of 18 mtrs with building height not to exceed 15 mtrs and 3 mtrs for roof top structures. However, basement is not allowed, as the site is only 106 m. from the monument.

Case no. 11

(C.S. leasing Pvt. Ltd. through Director Sh. Sanjay Gupta, Minarva Cinemas, Plot No. 2763,2764 & 2765, Brompton Road, Kashmere Gate, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for 4 floors (2 basements+GF+3) with the total height of 18 mts (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant may be suggested to put some archival photos of the old Minerva cinema, if available, in the lobby/foyer of the new building.

Case no. 12

(Sh. Ranojoy Mukherji, Jorbagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for 4 floors (basement+stilt+4) with the total height of 18 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc), as the site is 238 m. from the monument.

Case no. 13

(M/s New Food Street Products Pvt. Ltd through Director Sh. Sameer Mahendru, Jorbagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for additional construction on 2nd floor and construction of 3rd floor with the total height of 18 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.).

Case no. 14

(Office of the Executive Engineer, Flyover Project Division, F-123, PWD through P.K. Sharma, east Kidwai Nagar, Delhi)

After examining the application, it was noted that this is proposal for construction of elevated Barapullah Road Extension from Jawaharlal Nehru Stadium to INA Market. It was decided that the applicant may be asked to make a presentation on the case covering all aspects.

Case no. 15

(Shri Narinder Nath Dhingra, P-23, Malviya Nagar, Delhi)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for 4 floors (basement+stilt+4) with the total height of 18 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.), as the site is 212 m. from the monument.

Case no. 16

(Sh. V.D. Agarwal owner Pushpanjali Construction Pvt. Ltd. Agra & Mr. Jaideep Tiwari, (Secretary), Mahavir Cooperative Housing Society Ltd. Agra)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of 5th floor with the total height of 15 mtrs (excluding mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). Regarding basement, this work may be done under supervision of ASI. The applicant should also set up an interpretation centre to highlight the monument/heritage of the area.

Case no. 17

(Shri K. Narasimha Pai & Smt. Amruthakala N. Pai, Udupi, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of G+1st floor with the total height of 35 feet (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to incorporate with sloping roof.

Case no. 18

(Shri Mallikarjuna,D.No. 227, Asst No.-267 at Panduranga Colony, Bellary, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of 1 storey with the total height of 5 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant may advised to incorporate sloping chajjas.

Case no. 19

(Shri Somanna, Assessment No. 1067/1555 at Bazaar Road, Nanjangud, Mysore, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of G+1 with the total height of 30 feet (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). It was noted that no basement was shown in the plans submitted by the applicant. The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping chajjas.

Case no. 20

(Shri R. Chandrashekar & Smt. Shashikala, Assessment no. 1471/A & 1424/A at Kurubageri, Nanjangud Town, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of ground floor with the total height of 13 feet (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). As per plans submitted by applicant, no basement was shown. The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping chajjas.

Case no. 21

(Smt. U.S. Vijayalakshmi, assessment no. 1109/1072 at R.P. Road, Nanjangud, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of G+1 with the total height of 6.75 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping chajjas.

Case no. 22

(Shri M. Chandrashekhar, assessment no. 1500/1452 at thopina beedi, Nanjangud Town, Mysore, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of ground floor with the total height of 3.75 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping chajjas.

Case no. 23

(Shri Subbu, Assessment no. 1198/1160 at Kayangadi Beedi, Nanjangud, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of ground floor with the total height of 5 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping chajjas.

Case no. 24

(Shri Manjunatha Kulkarni, assessment no. 1067/1033 at R.P. Road, Nanjangud, Mysore, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of G+1 with the total height of 6.9 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant may be advised to incorporate sloping chajjas.

Case no. 25

(Smt. Anju S. Rajenavara, assessment no. 251-250-251 E Division, Mettiluhole Road, Harihara, Davanagere, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of 3 floors with the total height of 11.19 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.).

Case no. 26

(Smt. G.M. Nagarathana, assessment no. 255/254/255 E Division, Mettiluhole Road, Harihara, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of 2 floors with the total height of 6 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.).

Case no. 27

(Shri B.N. Chandrashekhar, Kh. No. 3388/2894 Vaalagada Street, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of G+1 with the total height of 7.01 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.).

Case no. 28

(Shri B.N. Seetharamaiah, Kh. No. 3914/2802 at Ramaraya Street, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of ground floor with the total height of 4.13 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant may advised to cooperate with partial sloping roof over verandah. A copy of Kanchipuram guidelines may be sent to CA Bengaluru for suggested design of such constructions (located in temple town like situations).

Case no. 29

(Shri B.A. Manjunatha, Kh. No. 4616/A/3444/A at Gunikeri Street, Hassan, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of ground floor with the total height of 4.93 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.).

Case no. 30

(Shri B.R. Mallikarjuna, A.R. No. 4660/3485, 4659/3484, 3761/2844, 3959/2842, 3960/2843 at Temple Road, Belur, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for basement+G+1 with the total height of 27 feet from ground level. Applicant may be suggested to incorporate with sloping roof on 1st floor and finishing material should be locally compatible material.

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

MINUTES OF THE 90th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 08th August, 2013

Minutes of the 89th meeting which was circulated amongst Members were confirmed

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Deferred cases:

Case no. 1

(Miranda House (Girls Hostel), University of Delhi, Delhi)

The clarification submitted by the applicant was perused. The college has prepared an action plan as suggested by National Monuments Authority. It was decided that the college may be advised to develop their museum with the assistance of National Museum or museum branch of ASI. Also, students of the college should be involved in organizing programmes to create and spread heritage awareness amongst the general community in the area. With these observations, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case.

Case no. 2

(Thiru R. Gangatharan, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction stilt+ground+2 with total height of 10.07 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Review cases

Case no. 1

(Sh. Ashok Kumar Sarawgi, Assam)

On perusal of the application, it was noted that the project of commercial bldg. had been previously recommended with the total height of 12 mts (including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc). Now, the applicant is asking for a height extension to 36.11 mtrs. But keeping in mind, the surrounding area of the proposed site and the purpose of project, it was decided to retain the earlier decision.

Case no. 2

(M/s. Sahana Properties & Resorts Pvt. Ltd., Andheri West, Mumbai)

This case of SRA development had earlier been granted 15 mtrs height in September, 2012. The project actually envisages two blocks of construction, one of 73 mtrs and other of 193 mtrs. On review of the case, and keeping in view the guidelines adopted for Mumbai, especially for SRA cases, it was decided to now recommend grant of NOC for total height of 70 mtrs for each block + another 5 mtrs for roof top structures.

Case no. 3

(Thiru H. Vasanthakumar, Chennai)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of commercial building with total height of 20.25 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Left Over Cases from 89th meeting-22/07/13

Case no. 31

(Sh. Praveen Sandeep Lobo & Prajwith Jigwin Lobo, Moodbidri, Dakshina Kannada, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for basement, ground, first & second floor with total height of 12.11 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 32

(Mrs. M.S. Ponnappa, Kodagu, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for GF+FF with total height of 10.7 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 33

(Smt. Lalithamma, Santhebennur, Davanagere, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for GF+FF with total height of 6.0 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 34

(Sh. Nagaraja S.R., Santhebennur, Davanagere, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for two stories with total height of 8.05 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 35

(Sh. Shanthiraj Kambli, Betkerei, Moodbidri, Dakshina Kannada, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for GF+FF with total height of 10 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 36

(Sh. Krishnappa, Ikkeri, Shimoga, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for GF with total height of 3.65 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 37

(Smt. Anasuya, Mandya, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for GF+FF with total height of 6.6 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 38

(Shri Vardhamanaiah, Mandya, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for one storey with total height of 18 feet including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 39

(Director, Department of Mines & Geology, Bellary Town, Karnataka),

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the construction work seems to have been started. It was felt necessary that clarification be provided by CA as to whether the construction had already started and if so the reason for not obtaining permission earlier.

Case no. 40

(Panchayat Development Officer/Secretary, Shimoga, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor with the total height of 8.69 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). The applicant may advised to incorporate sloping chajjas.

Case no. 41

(Sh. K.N. Surendranath, Madhugiri, Tumkur, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground floor with the total height of 3.6 mtrs (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.).

Case no. 42

(Smt. Vijayakumari, Santhebunnur, Devanagere, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground + first floor with the total height of 30 ft (incl. mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.).

Fresh Cases of 90th meeting – 08.08.13

Case no. 1

(Thiru V. K. Sudhakaran, Ariyanoor, Kandanassery, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for new construction of double storey house with total height of 7.00 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 2

(Sh. Anandh K.V. Chowannur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of house with one floor + stair room with total height of 7.45 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 3

(Sh. K. Mohammed Sali, Kasargod, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for extension of first floor single room with total height of 8.1 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 4

(Sh. C. Rajeev, Palakkad, Kerala)

On perusal of the application, it was noted that the proposal is for addition of area to already existing building. After due consideration, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for the additional area proposed with total height of the building at 11.79 mtrs excluding mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.(any addition to roof top structure should not exceed further 5 mtrs in any case).

Case no. 5

(Sh. S.K. Shukla, Rana Pratap Marg, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of seven stories including basement with total height of 20.15 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 6

(M/s. J.K. Associates, Shaniwar Peth, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of residential & commercial building ground+3 with total height of 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 7

(Sh. Samarth Mandal, Smt. Supriya S. Kale (P.A. Holder) Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of residential & commercial building parking+ground+5 floors with total height of 15.09 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 8

(Sh. Anant Narayan Vaidya, Jogeshwari, Mumbai, Maharashtra)

On perusal of the application, it was noted that this proposal is for addition of floor to already existing building. After consideration, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for proposed addition of floors subject to increase in the height of building being limited to 10.2 mtrs over the level of existing building inclusive of mumty, parapet, water-storage tank, etc. up to height of 24.5 mtrs.

Case no. 09

(M/s. Natu Satkar Waghchoure Associates, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of residential building ground+5 with total height of 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 10

(Sh. Rudrappa Hemudri Jatti, Ghodeshwar, Sholapur, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of commercial building basement+ground floor with mezzanine with total height of 6.625 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 11

(Sh. Sunil Sidram Mhetre, Ghodeshwar, Sholapur, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of commercial building ground floor with total height of 6.32 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 12

(Sh. Prashant Ankush Mhetre, Ghodeshwar, Sholapur, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of commercial building ground floor including mezzanine floor with total height of 7.55 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 13

(Sh. Alum Chaitnya Promoters & Builders, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of residential building ground+3 with total height of 14.90 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. subject to Municipal Corporation satisfying itself of the stability of the existing building.

Case no. 14

(Bharucha & Motiwala (Poona) Pvt. Ltd., Yerwads, Pune, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that ASI has issued a notice in 2010 to the applicant for carrying out construction in prohibited area; it is, therefore, needed to know the present status of the site and the detailed work proposal.

Case no. 15

(Administrator, Dwarkadhish Temple, Dwarka, Okhamandal, Jamnagar, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC to undertake repair and renovation work only. There should be no additional construction or any horizontal or vertical addition.

Case no. 16

(The Dy. Conservator of Forest, Forest Department, Daman, Daman & Diu (UT))

After perusal of the application, it was noted that, it is a huge work proposal in the prohibited/protected area of centrally protected monument "Moti Daman Fort". It was felt necessary ask the applicant to make a power-point-presentation for the detailed work proposal.

Case no. 17

(Sh. Aliasagar Shabbirhusen Vasanwala, Bharuch, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction ground+2 with total height of 10.86 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 18

(Smt. Rukhsar Gafurkalim Shaikh, Bharuch, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for ground+2 with total height of 11.90 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 19

(Sh. Mohmad Aslam Abdul Kadar Qureshi (POAH of Sh. Wajidkhan Islamudin Pathan & Others))

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of hollow plinth+GF+3 with total height of 19.50 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc. One of the members felt that the decision should be kept on hold, as Ahmedabad is applying for World Heritage City status.

Case no. 20

(Sh. Ashokbhai Jayantilal Patel and Maitri Ashokbhai Patel, Director A.J. Investment Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for GF+6 with total height of 22.80 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 21

(Sh. Rifakat Hussain Abdul Rehman Nagdawala and others, Bharuch, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for basement+GF+5 stories with total height of 21.54 mtrs including basement, mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 22

(Sh. Mehbubkhan Ibrahimkhan Kapadiya and Others, Bharuch, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for basement+GF+1 with total height of 8.83 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 23

(Sh. Abdul Kadar Tayyabbhai and others)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for basement+GF+3 stories with total height of 15.86 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 24

(Sh. Usmanali Alladdin and others, Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the applicant has already completed the construction work up to certain height limit. Hence, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for hollow plinth+GF+3 stories with the total height of 15.40 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). Also a penalty of Rs. 1 lakh for undertaking construction without prior permission as recommended by CA, Gujarat should be imposed. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 25

(Sh. Yasirbhai Arifbhai Memon, Mangroi, Junagadh, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the applicant has already completed the construction work up to ground floor. Hence, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for basement+GF+2 stories with the total height of 12.55 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). Also a penalty of Rs. 50,000 for undertaking construction without prior permission as recommended by CA, Gujarat should be imposed. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 26

(Sh. Shaikh Salim Bilal Ahmed, Mangrol, Junagadh, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application it was observed that the applicant has already completed the construction work up to first floor. Hence, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for basement+GF+2 stories with the total height of 11.26 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc). Also a penalty of Rs. 50,000 for undertaking construction without prior permission as recommended by CA, Gujarat should be imposed. This amount should be utilized for providing facilities/amenities at the protected monument under overall guidance of ASI.

Case no. 27

(Sh. Bharatbhai Manubhai Rao, Self and POAH of Sh. Pinal Bharatbhai and Others, Vadodara, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for GF+Parking+3 stories with total height of 12.14 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 28

(Sh. Saeed Shahabuddin Multani, Bharuch, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for GF/parking+4 stories with total height of 14.10 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water storage tank, etc.

Case no. 29

(Sh. A.K. Gupta (Chief Engineer, DMRC, Parliament Street, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to ask the applicant to come for a power-point-presentation for the proposed work proposal of construction of office building.

Case no. 30

(Sh. S. Jethwani, Chief Engineer / PD DMRC, Malviya Nagar, South Delhi, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was noted that, it is a fairly large project of construction for commercial complex and hence, it is required to ask the applicant to come for a power-point-presentation for the proposed work proposal.