F. No. 1-A/NMA/NOC-2014
Government of India
Ministry of Culture
National Monuments Authority

The approved minutes of 130th meeting held on 28th and 29th December, 2015 is hereby forwarded for perusal and comments, if any.

(Navneet Soni)
Member Secretary
08.01.2016

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

MINUTES OF THE 130th MEETING OF NMA

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

Time & Date - 10.30 P.M on 28th and 29th December, 2015

*****

The meeting was attended by the following:

1. Mohd. Saleem Beg, Chairperson(I/C) and Member NMA
2. Sh. Bharat Bhushan, Member NMA
3. Sh. Pukhraj Maroo, Member NMA
4. Ms. Shalini Mahajan, Member NMA
5. Sh. T.J Alone, Director, ASI
6. R.S Fonia, Joint Director, ASI
7. Sh. Navneet Soni, Member Secretary

Agenda Item No. 1

The minutes of the meetings of National Monuments Authority held on 27th November 2015 and 9th December 2015 were confirmed.

After deliberation it has been decided that in future agenda for the NMA meetings will be mailed in advance to the members. It has also been decided that the minutes of the meetings will also be mailed to each member and amendments if any should be incorporated before placing the same in the next meeting for confirmation.

Agenda Item No. 2

Approval of the Heritage Bye laws of Shiva Temple, Patambi, Jugal Kishore Temple, Vrindavan and BBD Bagh, Kolkata.

The NMA discussed several issues pertaining to the Bye laws of these three monuments in the presence of INTACH representative. It was observed that INTACH has not incorporated the few suggestions of NMA members which were already sent to him regarding the monument of Jugal Kishore Temple, Vrindavan and BBD Bagh, Kolkata. Some other suggestions/modifications were also proposed by members for the bye laws of Shiva Temple, Patambi. These bye laws were approved by Authority subject to incorporation of all the suggestions/recommendations proposed by members of NMA, which were already communicated to INTACH.

It was also decided that as the processing of remaining bye laws received from INTACH have got inordinately delayed, Member Secretary will ensure that INTACH makes presentations for these and that these are finalized expeditiously. In fact this is a decision which was taken in 129th meeting as well.

Agenda Item No. 3

Member Secretary explained the brief background of the issue issue relating to levy of penalty/fine upon those cases where construction in the regulated area has already been undertaken or completed without prior permission under AMASR Act, though the construction are within permissible limits and would have otherwise approved. Member Secretary placed a circular letter issued by the then Member Secretary NMA on 9th May 2013 to all Competent Authorities regarding levying of penalty/fine. It was noted that Director General ASI had been holding the Additional charge of Member Secretary NMA at that time.

However, another letter has been circulated under the signature of Director General ASI dated 06.08.2015 in which it has been mentioned that as per the legal opinion obtained by ASI there is no provision of imposing penalty/fine by either NMA or the CA without going through the legal process prescribed under section 31 of AMASR Act.

After due deliberation it has been decided that while the Authority is not authrised to impose penalty/fine there is no bar on imposing regularization charges in such cases where the construction/renovation undertaken without permission is otherwise within the permissible limit. It was also noted that the decision to impose penalty/fine taken by the Authority in the past had been taken with the consent of Director General ASI who is also the ex-officio member of the Authority.

It was also noted that even in previous case the amount has not been collected as a fine because in that case the fine would have to be deposited with the Government. However, with a view to remove the ambiguity in the matter, the letter written by DG, ASI to the Member Secretary conveying the legal opinion shall be replied to and t would be clarified to him that the Authority is actually collecting regularization charges in those cases where the permission would otherwise be granted and where relevant documents are available to the Authority. The Authority invariably awaits the reply of the show cause notice issued by the ASI before recommending the NOCs. This clarification shall be endorsed to all the Competent Authorities as well. Competent Authorities will take appropriate action on cases pending with them due to instruction issued by DG ASI vide letter dated 06.08.2015. As discussed with the RDs present in the meeting, NMA will issue guidelines in respect of utilization of regularization charges (RC).

Agenda Item No. 4

The categorization of the monuments of Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Bhopal and Vadodara circles.

The categorization of the centrally protected monuments under the jurisdiction of Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Bhopal and Vadodara Circles have been discussed in detail and have been approved subject to incorporating the following notes at category VIII, while categorizing the monuments of each circle.

It should be clearly mentioned that the Heritage Zone/Archaeological Parks were proposed by NMA or Local Planning Body.

It should be mentioned in each Bye-laws that "Heritage Zones and Archaeological Parks have been proposed as a distinct category in areas where more than one centrally protected monument or one or multiple archaeological sites are located. The Local Bodies/concerned agencies may accordingly delineate these Zones and Parks in consultation with Heritage experts/agencies and/ or Archaeological Survey of India to determine their boundaries. It is also proposed that these categories may form part of the Master Plan or Developmental Plan. Further, guidelines and developmental controls may be separately notified for the Heritage Zones/Archaeological Parks with a view to protect their historic settings."

Agenda: 5

Leftover cases of 128th meeting

Case no. 1

(Smt. Sapna Kehar W/o Shri Rajesh Kehar, Smt. Shivani Kehar and others, Amritsar, Punjab)

After careful consideration of the application, it was noted that the proposed construction site is in prohibited area i.e. 85 mtrs from the boundary wall of the protected monument, so it was decided to reject the application as no construction is allowed in prohibited area apart from repair and renovation work and NOC shall be granted only to the condition if, applicant would apply afresh for construction only in the regulated area.

Case no. 2

(Smt. Chanchal Rani W/o Shri Naresh Kumar Luthra, Batala, Gurdaspur, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for new-construction of G+1 floor with the total height of 26'-0" including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area GF- 1151.73 sft and FF- 627.36 sft.

Case no. 3

(Shri Rajinder Kumar S/o Shri Mohan Lal, Bathinda, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for new-construction of first floor over existing ground floor with the total building height of 26'-0" including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area F.F – 253.00 sft.

Case no. 4

(Shri Manmohan Singh S/o Shri Mohinder Singh, Bathinda, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for new-construction of G+1 floor with the total height of 26'-0" including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area G.F – 360.00 sft and F.F – 180.00 sft.

Case no. 5

(Smt. Meena Rani W/o Shri Surinder Pal, Bathinda, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for new-construction of G+1 floor with the total height of 26'-0" including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area G.F – 1170.00 sft and F.F – 585.00 sft.

Case no. 6

(Shri Kamaljit Kumar S/o Shri Bakhshish Lal, Bathinda, Punjab)

After careful consideration of the application, it was decided to defer the case on the following grounds:

1. Site inspection report of the site
2. To clarify whether the owner and the applicant is different or not
3. CA to clarify the issue on 100% ground coverage of the proposed plot and to send a revised building plan.

Case no. 7

(Shri Kamaljit Kumar S/o Shri Bakshish Lal, Bathinda, Punjab)

After careful consideration of the application, it was decided to defer the case on the following grounds:

1. Site inspection report of the site
2. To clarify whether the owner and the applicant is different or not
3. CA to clarify the issue on 100% ground coverage of the proposed plot and to send a revised building plan. Incorporating set back and other requirements.

Case no. 8

(Shri Subhash Chander Sekhri & Shri Narinder Kumar Sekhri S/o Late Shri Chaman Lal, Jalandhar, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction for G+1 floor with the total height of 37'-3" including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area G.F – 2240.875 sft, F.F – 2012.875 sft, Mumty – 236.25 sft.

Case no. 9

(Shri Baldev Singh S/o Shri Tara Singh, Ludhiana, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to ask SA ASI, Chandigarh Circle to clarify whether any show cause notice was issued to the applicant for unauthorized construction and also a status report on the proposed site of construction.

Case no. 10

(Shri Mandeep Kumar S/o Shri Surinder Kumar Sharma, Jalandhar, Punjab)

After careful consideration of the application, it was decided to defer the case on the following grounds:

1. To clarify the area left for setbacks for the proposed site of construction
2. CA to clarify the issue on 100% ground coverage of the proposed plot and to send a revised building plan.

Case no. 11

(Smt. Baano W/o Shri Aslam Khan, Jalandhar, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for commercial construction of basement+G+1 floor with the total height of 38'-6" including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area G.F=F.F – 250.00 sft., mumty – 108.00 sft., basement – 250.00 sft.

Case no. 12

(Shri Rakesh Kumar S/o Shri Banarasi Dass, Jalandhar, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for commercial construction of G+2 floors with the total height of 38'-6" including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area G.F=FF=SF – 306.00 sft.

Case no. 13

(Shri Vijay Kumar Ohri S/o Shri Om Prakash Ohri, Jalandhar, Punjab)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of first floor over existing ground floor with the total height of 27'-0" including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area FF = 1411.00 sft.

Case no. 14

(Shri Bhagwan Singh Arora S/o Shri Sham Singh Arora, Amritsar, Punjab)

After careful consideration of the application, it was decided to defer the case on the following grounds:

1. The distance from the protected area has to be re-verified by SA, ASI, Chandigarh Circle
2. A joint inspection report of the proposed site in the presence of SA Chandigarh Circle, CA, Chandigarh, local authority and the applicant

Case no. 15

(Shri Neeraj Behal S/o Shri Kamal Behal, Amritsar, Punjab)

After careful consideration of the application, it was decided to ask CA to provide a clear architectural plan mentioning the purpose of NOC of the proposed construction as the building plan provided by the applicant do not match with the details provided by CA in Form II.

Case no. 16

(Shri Neeraj Behal S/o Shri Kamal Behal, Amritsar, Punjab)

After careful consideration of the application, it was decided to ask CA to provide a clear architectural plan mentioning the purpose of NOC of the proposed construction as the building plan provided by the applicant do not match with the details provided by CA in Form II.

Case no. 17

(Smt. Rabiam Bi, Goa)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for reconstruction of residential house/shed with the total height 3 meters including mumty, parapet, mumty, water-storage etc.

Case no. 18

(Shri Abubakar Mohammad Yasin Shaikh, Self and POAH Shri Zuberahmmad Mohammad Yasin Shaikh and others)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential construction with total building height to be restricted to 17.4 mtrs including mumty,parapet,water-tank etc. Also the applicant is advised to send a revised building plan upto a height of 17.4 mtrs.

Case no. 19

(Shri Jay Rajendrabhai Patel, Authorized Partner of Shivam Buildcon, Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential and commercial construction with the total height to be restricted to 22.80 meters including mumty,parapet, water-tank etc. Also the applicant is advised to send a revised building plan upto a height of 22.80 mtrs.

Case no. 20

(Ashapriya Mohapatra, Bhubneshwar, Odisha)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential construction of G+1 floor with the total height of 6.45 meters including mumty,parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area GF=FF – 206.80 sqm.

Case no. 21

(Somajit Mohanty & Others, Bhubneshwar, Odisha)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential re-construction with the total height to be restricted to 17.5 meters including mumty,parapet, water-tank etc. keeping in view the height of surrounding building. Also the applicant is advised to send a revised building plan upto a height of 17.5 mtrs.

Case no. 22

(Shri Sanjib Sen, Bishnupur, West Bengal)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential construction of G+1 floor with the total height of 19 feet (5.79 m) including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area GF-70.30 sqm, FF- 72.30 sqm.

Case no. 23

(Dr. Bijoy Gupta & Smt. Joyshree Gupta, Bishnupur, West Bengal)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential construction of G.F with the total height of 19 feet (5.79 m) including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area G.F -80.67 sqm.

Case no. 24

(Mr. Madanan, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential construction of G+1 floor with the total height of 6.81 meters including mumty,parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area GF=FF – 99.02 sqm. The applicant may be advised to incorporate a sloping roof in the construction work.

Case no. 25

(Mr. Shameer, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential construction of GF with Stair room with the total height of 5.75 meters including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area GF- 74.99 sqm. The applicant may be advised to incorporate a sloping roof in the construction work.

Case no. 26

(Mr. Latheef, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential construction of G+1 floor with the total height of 8.49 meters including mumty,parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area GF=FF – 276.95 sqm.

Case no. 27

(Smt. Ammini Unni, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for extension of existing ground floor with the total height of 4.10 meters including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area GF -49.91 sqm.

Case no. 28

(Shri K.S. Chawla, D-91, Masjid Moth, Panchsheel Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the appliciton, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential construction of second floor over existing G+1 floor with the total building height of 12.58 meters including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with the proposed area of S.F -129.65 sqm.

Case no. 29

(Shri Hukam Chand Gupta, 22, Uday Park, Masjid Moth Ext., Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential construction of basement+stilt+4 floors with the total height of 18 meters including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area Stilt=GF- 134.54, FF=SF=TF – 132.25 with basement- 72.55 sqm; depth – 2.89 mtrs.

Case no. 30

(Shri Sharad Chauhan, C-1/20, Safdarjung Development Area, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for additional construction on GF and FF and new-construction of SF and TF with the total height of 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area GF=FF=SF=TF – 159.56 sqm.

Case no. 31

(Shri Manoj Kumar and Shri Sanjay Raheja, 346, Chirag Delhi, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential construction of Stilt+4 floors with the total height of 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area Stilt=GF=FF=SF- 76.53 sqm, TF- 59.61 sqm.

Case no. 32

(Shri Kamal Mohan Lamba, F-6, Hauz Khas, Delhi)

After careful consideration of the application, it was decided to defer the case on the following ground:

1 CA Delhi submit revised drawings/building plan of the proposed construction after leaving 100 mtrs and mandatory setback of the property.

Case no. 33

(Smt. Sheela Singhal, C-9, NDSE-I, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential re-construciton of Stilt+4 floors with the total height of 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area Stilt=GF -130.26 sqm, FF=SF=TF – 127.78 sqm.

Case no. 34

(Smt. Vijay Gupta, C-103, East of Kailash, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential construction of Stilt+4 floors with the total height of 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area Stilt=GF- 89.91 sqm, FF=SF=TF – 86.43 sqm.

Case no. 35

(Shri Munish Kumar, C-17, Hauz Khas Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential construction of basement +stilt+4 floors with the total height of 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area Stilt=GF=FF=SF=TF- 187.49 sqm. with basement area – 116.47 sqm; depth – 2.90 mtrs.

Case no. 36

(Shri Pearlinder Singh, Shri Harinder Singh, Mrs. Neelam Singh and Shri Brijinder Singh, C-48, Malviya Nagar, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential re-construction of basement+stilt+4 floors with the total height of 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area Stilt=GF – 180.10 sqm, FF=SF=TF – 177.52 sqm with basement- 126.326 sqm; depth – 3 mtrs.

Case no. 37

(Smt. Veena Dhawan, C-7/9, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for residential construction of Stilt+4 floors with the total height of 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area Stilt=GF -210.715 sqm, FF=SF=TF – 208.179 sqm.

Cases for Deferred

Case.1

(M/S Sai Devgiri Velley, Building No. 3, Apna Bazar, Jalna Road, Aurangabad)

After perusal of the application and Sale Deed, it was decided to reject the proposal for construction of commercial building for the following reasons:

1. The open space/natural landscape surrounding the protected site, giving a historic setting to the monuments and needs to be preserved.
2. The population pressure / density to be avoided around this monument

Hence, the project should be moved beyond regulated area of the monument.

Case no. 2

(G. Corp properties Pvt. Ltd Regal Buildtech Pvt. Ltd IHHR Hospital Pvt. Ltd, Pune)

After perusal of the application and Sale Deed, it was decided to ask CA, Maharashtra the following points:

1. Why the Impact Assessment not done by Pune INTACH for this proposal as decided in the previous meeting.
2. To get clarification from Prof. Shinde, Deccan College to give documentary evidence on the two proposals where NMA had approved 90 mts for two towers around this monument as mentioned by him in the letter dated... on the archaeological assessment.

Case no. 3

(Mr. Ikramuddin Essa Khan & Others, D-12, Venus Park Soc., Kalyani Nagar, Pune)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 20 mts (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) keeping in view the previous approvals of NMA. The applicant is also advised to send the revised building plans with the height upto 20 mts.

Case no. 4

(Regional Tourist Officer, Regional Tourist Office, 64, Taj Road, Agra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to defer the case as the comments of DG, ASI have not been received yet by this office. Thereafter, this case will be re-considered.

Case no. 5

(Sh. Inder Chand Jain & others, 22/156, Moti Lal Nehru Road, Agra)

After perusal of the application and Schedule II details, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 21 mts (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.). Also, the applicant is also advised to send the revised building plans with the height upto 21 mts.

Case no. 6

(Uttarakhand Tourism Development Board (U.T.D.B, Lakhamandal, Uttarakhand)

After perusal of the application and status report by ASI, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for repair and renovation work subject to the conditions that the suggestions made by ASI should be complied with.

Case no. 7

(Uttarakhand Tourism Development Board (U.T.D.B, Hanol, Uttarakhand)

After perusal of the application and status report by ASI, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for repair and renovation work subject to the conditions that the suggestions made by ASI should be complied with.

Case no. 8

(Smt. Savitri Devi W/o Sh. Vijay Gupta, Present-: Vijay Gupta H. No. 133/1, Purani Mandi, (Bodia Kua), Ward No. 12, Narnual)

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 10.63 m (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.) with built up area GF=57.23 sqm, GF=49.64 sqm

Case no. 9

(Chief Municipal Officer, Nagar Parishad Lanji, Amgaon Road, Lanji, Tehsil Lanji, MP)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to reject the proposal as the proposed site falls under the prohibited area. The SA is also advised to take action as per law.

Case no. 10

(Shri Laxmi Narayan Shivhare, S/o Late Gyasiram Ji Shivhare , B-17, Ashok Vihar, Tansen Road, Gwalior, MP)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 11.50 mts (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) with a basement upto 3 mts depth and with floor area Block A= 7984.11 sqm and Block B = 392.12 sqm.

Case no. 11

(District Collector, Office of the District Collector, Civil Station, Ayyanthol, Thrissur)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case with the total height of 10.75 mts (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) with floor area 1655 sqm.

Case no. 12

(Sh Prasadan K.S, Thrissur)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of GF+Stair room with the total height of 07.07 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) with floor area 100.56 sqm.

Case no. 13

(Mrs. Dhanya Manoj, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of GF with the total height of 4.15 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) with floor area 80.48 sqm.

Case no. 14

(Mr. Muhammad Rafi, Thrissur, Kerala)

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 7.70 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) with floor area 262.73 sqm.

Case no. 15

(Mr. V.M. Shahul Hameed, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction with the total height of 11.40 mtrs (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) as recommended by CA, Kerala. Also the applicant is advised to send a revised building plan upto a height of 11.40 mtrs.

Case no. 16

(Shri Umesh Chand Gupta, A-9 & A-10, Geetanjali Enclave, Delhi)

After careful consideration of the application, it was decided to defer the case on the following ground:

2 CA Delhi submit revised drawings/building plan of the proposed construction after leaving 100 mtrs and mandatory setback of the property.

3 To submit documents allowing present land use of the property.

Case no. 17

(Shri Manish Uppal, N-55, Panchsheel Park, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of basement+stilt+4 floors with the total height of 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area stilt=GF – 378.95 sqm, FF=SF=TF – 373.47 sqm with basement area -347.38 sqm & depth- 3.65 mtrs.

Case no. 18

(Shri Dharam Vir Chawla, 19, Sadhna Enclave, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of basement+stilt+4 floors with the total height of 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. with floor area Stilt- 209.47 sqm, GF- 227.19 sqm, FF=SF=TF – 225.09 sqm with basement area – 209.47 sqm & depth – 2.90 mtrs.

Case no. 19

(Smt. Manu Alimchandani (Maiden Name Manu Uttam Singh, K-59-60, Green Park Main, New Delhi)

After careful consideration of the application, it was decided to defer the case on the following ground:

1 CA Delhi submit revised drawings/building plan of the proposed construction after leaving 100 mtrs and mandatory setback of the property.

Cases for Reconsideration

Case no. 1

(Shri Mahavir Prasad Mittal, B-15, C.C. Colony, Delhi)

After perusal of the application and Sale Deed, it was decided to extend the time for construction for further one year and revalidate the NOC in the name of Smt. Sangeeta Bansal with the same terms and conditions as mentioned in earlier NOC.

Case no. 2

(Kandi Construction, D.No. 1-8-432, Balasamudram, Hanumakanda, Warangal, A.P.)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of Stilt+4 floors with the total height of 15.65 mtrs. including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. as per Building Plan with plinth area of Stilt=178.68 sqm., GF=FF=SF=TF= 138.18 sqm.

Cases for Review of Basement

Case no. 1

(Shri J.K. Jain and Smt. Priya Jain, 50, Hanuman Road, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and representation for full basement, it was decided to amend the previous NOC in this case for construction of Basement+Stilt+4 floors with the total height of 17.36 mtrs. including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc.; with floor area of Stilt=321.50 sqm., G.F=314.53 sqm. F.F=316.29 sqm. S.F=270.11 sqm., T.F=271.66 sqm. & basement= 295.64 sqm. with depth of 3.40 mtrs.

Case no. 2

(Smt. Harish Malik, Ms. Jagdish Kumari Grover, A-16, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and representation of basement, it was decided to amend the previous NOC in this case for construction of Basement+Stilt+4 floors, with the total height of 18 mtrs. (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) with floor area of Stilt=G.F=125.39 sqm. & FF=SF=TF=123.06 sqm. & basement= 78.33 sqm.

Case no. 3

(Shri Praveen Mittal, B-7/91, Safdarjung Enclave Ext., New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and representation of basement, it was decided to amend the previous NOC in this case for construction of Basement+Stilt+4 floors, with the total height of 18 mtrs. (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) with floor area of Stilt=G.F=99.02 sqm. & FF=SF=TF=96.70 sqm.

Case no. 4

(Shri Pritam Singh, K-28, Green Park Main, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application and representation of basement, it was decided to amend the previous NOC in this case for construction of Basement+Stilt+4 floors, with the total height of 18 mtrs. (including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc) with floor area of Stilt=G.F=187.44 sqm. & FF=SF=TF=184.76 sqm. & Basement=127.34 sqm. with depth of 3.05 mtrs.

Cases for Review of Height

Case no. 1

(Shri Sachin Manikchand Shah, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application and representation for review of height, it was decided to amend the previous NOC in this case for construction with the total height of the building to be restricted to 18 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. as approved in the earlier cases around the Solapur Fort.

Confidential note:- WTM chairperson(I/C) was of the view that CA has made a case for revising the height allowed so far by NMA as the building around the monument are GF+7 floors. He also stated that NMA needs to justify the restricted or specified height by taking into account parameters like size of the structure, distance from the monument, surrounding height, prevailing bye laws etc. so that the restrictions don't look arbitrary.

Case no. 2

(Shri Prakash Kundar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application and representation for review of height, it was decided to amend the previous NOC in this case for construction with the total height of the building to be restricted to 20 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. as approved in the earlier cases around the Shaniwar Wada.

Case no. 3

(Shri Vikas Hari Lagoo, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application and representation for review of height, it was decided to amend the previous NOC in this case for construction with the total height of the building to be restricted to 20 mtrs including mumty, parapet, water-tank etc. as approved in the earlier cases around the Pataleshwar Caves.

Cases for public projects

Case no. 1

(Er. V.K. Nimesh, Executive Engineer, Executive Engineer, BM-III, Division (Civil), Palika Parking, NDMC, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to ask the applicant to submit drawings of the proposed work alongwith details and Site Plan marking the proposed sites with reference to the monuments.

Case no. 2

(Senior Superintendent, District Jail, Saharanpur, District Jail, Sahranpur, Agra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to ask ASI to take a view as the proposed site is located within the protected monument, Rohilla Fort.

Case no. 3

(Senior Superintendent District Jail, Aligarh, within premises of District Court, Hathras, Agra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to ask ASI to take a view as the proposed site is located within the protected area of Remains of an Old Hindu Temple inside the Dayaram's Fort.

Case no. 4

(Superintending Engineer, (Workshop), DVVNL, Dakshinanchal Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited, New Thermal Power Station Yamuna Bank, Agra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of Ground Floor of PCC Pole for rural electrification work of U.P. Government with the total height of 11 feet including mumty, parapet, water tank, etc. with floor area 378 sqm.

Case no. 5

(Director, Department Tourism, Orissa)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to ask the applicant to submit revised drawings for construction in regulated area and construction in the prohibited area is not permitted.

Case no. 6

(Trustee, Sagar Education and Charitable Trust, Divine Life School, Opp. Swaminarayan Temple, Vasna Barrage Road, Vasna, Ahmedabad, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC in this case for construction of fourth floor over existing Basement+GF+3 Floors with the total height of building restricted to 22.55 mtrs. including mumty, parapet, water tank, etc. with floor area of fourth floor=823.39 sqm.

Case no. 7

(Usha Breco Limited, Maa Mahakalika Udan Khatola, Manchi, Pavagadh, Taluka: Halol, Dist. Panchmahal, Gujarat)

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

Agenda Item No. 6

On the request of M/s. Rites limited they were permitted to meet the Authority and make a presentation on the alignment in respect of the protected monuments vis a vis the Metro Rail Transportation System proposed to be constructed for the cities of Kanpur, Varanasi, Agra and Meerut. After the presentation they were informed that no construction is allowed in the prohibited area of the protected monuments. The agency may finalize their plan keeping in view the provisions of AMASR Act and approach the CA of the respective area for any clarification in regard to the construction work proposed by them in the vicinity of the protected monuments.

Agenda Item No. 7; Additional Agenda Items

Item No.1

It has been brought to the notice of the Authority that permission was granted to Scindia School, Gwalior by NMA vide letter dated 18.12.2013 with the approval of the then Member Secretary NMA to undertake stone cladding work and erecting temporary canopies. CA in his letter dated 16.01.2014 stated that the School undertook new construction and not cladding as envisaged in the letter, which in his opinion was a violation of AMASR Act. The CA also mentioned that a show cause notice followed by demolition notice had been issued by SA Bhopal Circle on 14.11.2013. The matter had been placed before the 99th Meeting of NMA held on 3rd March 2014. However, the records reveal that NMA had not been informed about the fact that the work of construction was already in progress and that the CA Bhopal recommended cancellation of permission. The Authority was also not informed that the Member Secretary had already issued permission for construction of the façade. After deliberation the Authority is of the

view that if construction work has been undertaken by Scindia School in violation of provisions of AMASR Act the CA concerned should proceed against the violation as per law. Scindia School may be given an opportunity to explain its position and the matter may then be placed before NMA for a final decision.

The Authority recommended that the then Member Secretary communicated the permission for cladding without considering comments of CA and therefore his comments may be called for in this case and placed before the Authority in its next meeting.

Item No.2

The Member Secretary informed that in the audit conducted by the CAG for the accounting year 2012-13 & 2013-14 several issues have been raised in the audit paras. MS explained the comments of audit in brief and mentioned about the irregularity in printing work undertaken in September 2012 at a cost of Rs. 1.55 lakh, in February 2014 at a cost of Rs. 1.50 lakh and in May 2014 at a cost of Rs. 2.95 lakh through M/s. Aryan Books International. After going through the comments the Authority decided that obtain comments of the then Chairperson may be obtained on this issue.