

Government of India
Ministry of Culture
National Monuments Authority

24 Tilak Marg, New Delhi – 110001
Dated: 21st January, 2015

Please find enclosed herewith minutes of the 117th meeting of NMA held on 6th and 7th January, 2015 at Currency Building, Kolkata, for information and necessary action, if any.

Encl. As above


(Pankaj Rag)
Member Secretary

1. Prof. Himanshu Prabha Ray, Chairperson, NMA.
2. Mr. Mohammad SALEem Beg, Whole Time Member, NMA
3. Dr. Pukhraj Maroo, Part Time Member, NMA
4. Sh. Bharat Bhushan, Part Time Member, NMA
5. Ms. Shalini Mahajan, Part Time Member, NMA
6. Dr. P.K. Mishra, Regional Director (Eastern Region), ASI and Competent Authority, West Bengal.
7. Dr. O.P. Misra, Consultant (Archaeology), NMA
8. Sh. A.K. Patel, S.A., AI, Kolkata Circle, Kolkata
9. Sh. Jeeban Patnail, S.A., Excavation Branch, ASI, Bhubaneswar
10. Sh. Anjan Mitra, INTACH, Kolkata
11. Sh. G.M. Kapoor, INTACH, Kolkata
12. Sh. Gautam Haldar, A.S.A., Kolkata Circle, ASI.,

Minutes of the 117th meeting of NMA held
on 6th and 7th January, 2015 at Currency Building, Kolkata

The 117th meeting of the NMA was held on 6th and 7th January, 2015 at Currency Building, Kolkata, in the office of Regional Director (Eastern Region), ASI. and Competent Authority.

The meeting was attended by the following participants:-

Prof. Himanshu Prabha Ray	Chairperson, NMA
Sh. Saleem Beg	Part Time Member, NMA
Dr. Pukhraj Maroo	Part Time Member, NMA
Sh. Bharat Bhushan	Part Time Member, NMA
Ms. Shalini Mahajan	Part Time Member, NMA
Sh. Pankaj Rag	Member Secretary, NMA
Sh P K Mishra	Regional Director ASI, Eastern Region & Competent Authority under Section, 20 C, D & E
Dr. O.P. Mishra	Consultant (Archaeology),
Sh. A.K. Patel	Superintendent Archaeologist ASI, Kolkata
Sh. Jeeban Patnayak	SA ASI Excavation Branch, Bhubaneswar
Sh. Anjan Mitra	INTACH Kolkata
Sh. G.M. Kapoor	INTACH, West Bengal.
Sh Gautam Halder	Assistant Superintending, Archaeologist, ASI Kolkata Circle

The meeting started with the welcome and introductory remarks by the Chairperson and Member Secretary NMA.

1. Convener INTACH, Kolkata, Mr. G.M. Kapoor and Architect Sh. Anjan Mitra gave a brief description and details about the draft byelaws prepared by INTACH for Currency Building. They also referred to the bye laws provided by them recently for the Currency Building, Metcalf House and St. Johns Church, all located in BBD Bagh, Kolkata. The three bye-laws provided by INTACH are identical in nature and details. These bye laws were prepared by them in response to observations of the Chairperson and some Members conveyed to them on receipt of the first draft of bye-laws in October, 2013. The observations comprised of general comments and some specific requirements. After due discussions the following observations were conveyed to the INTACH representatives

- INTACH will amend the draft on the basis of specific comments conveyed by NMA and will consolidate the bye-laws of specific monuments into a cogent and logical whole.

- A heritage zone shall be demarcated within the larger heritage area of BBD Bagh, Kolkata.
 - The bye-laws shall provide zoning and sub-zoning of regulated areas of the monuments under reference clearly demarcating open areas, facades, height of buildings and other characteristics.
 - The Bye-laws shall follow the sequence notified in the NMA Rules-I and II Schedule (Rule 22), parameters of heritage bye-laws.
 - West Bengal has also notified heritage regulations under the state act 'the West Bengal Heritage Commission act 2001'. The act, inter alia, provides for notifying buildings from grade-1 to grade iii. The notified buildings are granted protection of varying degrees. The heritage byelaws may include list of such notified buildings within the regulated area and beyond in BBD Bagh. Buildings with similar characteristics but not notified within the regulated areas also need to be listed as part of the document.
 - The final draft to be submitted by INTACH shall be consolidated and made part of the first document submitted in 2013.
2. With a view to ensure effective implementation of the act, it was desired that ASI may approach Kolkata Municipal Corporation for demarcating prohibited and regulated areas of the protected monuments in their master plan as also for incorporating the relevant provisions of AMASR Act.
 3. It was also suggested that RD/CA/SA ASI may organize an interaction/ workshop with the city stake holders in coordination with Kolkata Municipal Corporation. The interaction shall aim at creating synergies and awareness among the stakeholders about the provisions of act and responsibilities of State and central institutions.
 4. The need for periodic interaction with field staff officers of ASI for discussing matters pertaining to the AMASR Act was emphasized by the participants.
 5. RD and CA West Bengal mentioned that on his appointment as CA, he was not provided with all the records regarding NOC etc from the predecessor CA, in the meeting, serious view was taken of non-availability of complete records of NOC applications. It was conveyed to the CA that this being a matter of concern, necessary steps should have been taken to retrieve the record and NMA be intimated about it in time. The CA was instructed to access and build the record of NOC applications by obtaining necessary details from ASI and erstwhile CA. MS NMA shall supervise this and if required take up the issue with the concerned authorities. The CA shall provide updated list of applications received, applications under process and the details of cases sent to NMA.
 6. The meeting was also informed that in some cases, permissions have been granted by KMC without obtaining NOC from NMA. SA ASI, produced a letter

dated 25.06.2014 where in the issue of sanctioning building plan in respect of four structures was taken up with KMC.. The meeting was also informed that in two cases, the matter is sub-Judice with the Hon'ble High court of West Bengal. The court has also passed an interim order in these two cases. The meeting was also informed that the CA West Bengal has been impleaded as a respondent. It was decided that CA shall immediately engage a competent lawyer for representing his office in the High Court and plead for seeking prior NOC as laid down in the AMASR Act. The violation of the act needs to be placed before the Hon. Court for seeking appropriate orders. The expenses of engaging the lawyer shall be borne by NMA. The names of the two cases and the writ petitions were given as under;

- M/s Sishmahal Construction Pvt. Ltd., 2A Ganesh Chandra Avenue Kolkata-13, Near Metcalfe Hall, Construction of Building, Hon'ble Calcutta High Court writ petition No. 13889 (w) of 2014.
 - M/s Number Nine Towers Pvt. Ltd., 242, B.B. Ganguly Street, Kolkata- 12, Near Metcalfe Hall, Construction of Building High Court writ petition No. 14944 (w) of 2014.
7. The NMA has also taken note of the information received about the proposed construction of Kolkata Metro Rail Corporation, purportedly, within the prohibited area of Currency Building. However, CA stated that so far no application has been received from Kolkata Metro Corporation for the project.
 8. In the meeting, it was desired that appropriate reuse plan be made by ASI in consultation with the relevant authorities both for the Currency Building and Metcalfe House Vacated/handed over to ASI. These buildings deserve to be converted into cultural spaces both due to their architectural significance and their location in prominent heritage area.

The meeting ended with thanks to the Chair.

National Monuments Authority

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

MINUTES OF THE 118th (1st Day) MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs, 24, Tilak Marg,
New Delhi 110001
Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 27th January, 2015

The meeting was attended by the following Members:

1. Prof. H.P. Ray, Chairperson NMA
2. Sh. Saleem Beg, Member NMA
3. Sh. Pukhraj Maroo, Member NMA
4. Sh. Bharat Bhushan, Member NMA
5. Ms. Shalini Mahajan, Member NMA
6. Mr. Pankaj Rag, Member Secretary.

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Review Cases

Case no.01

(Sh. Nitin Kohli, D-124, Saket, New Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the case was **recommended** earlier with maximum total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc). The case has been reviewed for the requirement of basement and it has been decided to allow the basement in this case with the depth of 3.05 m., as the site is 240 m. from the monument and CA had inadvertently missed out the requirement of basement in the Form II.

Case no.02

(Sh. Imtiyaz Safibhai Shaikh, Gujarat)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the case was **recommended** earlier with maximum total height of 17.4 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc). The case has been reviewed for the requirement of basement in both the blocks A & B; and it has been decided to allow the basement in this case with the depth of 3.05 m in both blocks, as the property is located outside the old city area.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.03

(Sh. Ashok Madhukar Deshpande, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to get the following information/clarifications from the CA and applicant:

1. The present status of the construction site i.e whether work has been started on the previously approved proposal as provided in 114th meeting
2. A fresh inspection to be done of the site
3. City development plan for Nashik

Thereafter, the case will be considered at NMA again. A letter has already been sent to the applicant in this regard.

Deffered Cases

Case no.01

(Sh. Ramji and Sh. Laxman Pandey, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to ask for Archaeological Impact Assessment Report to be done by ASI and submit to this office for considering the proposal.

Case no.02

(Sh. Jai Prakash Dubey, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to ask for Archaeological Impact Assessment Report to be done by ASI and submit to this office for considering the proposal.

Case no.03

(Sh. Pankaj Gupta, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to ask for Archaeological Impact Assessment Report to be done by ASI and submit to this office for considering the proposal.

Fresh Cases

Case no.01

(The Executive Engineer, Palakkad, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 floor with maximum total height of 13 mtrs (including mummy, water storage tank, parapet etc), total area 493.40 sqm.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.02

(Mr. Abdul Latheef, Cherumanangad, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF with maximum total height of 4.15 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), total area 35.08 sqm.

Case no.03

(Mr. A. Sasi Kumar, Triprayar, Kerala) After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 10 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc) after extending the proposed SF over existing GF+FF; total plinth area for proposed SF=80.50 sqm.

Case no.04

(Mr. Madhavan Nampoothiri & Smt. Drowpathi Devi. M.V., Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF+1 floor with total height of 9.52 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 238.56 sqm.

Case no.05

(Mr. Shajan. N.V., Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF with total height of 4.85 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 80.96 sqm.

Case no.06

(Mrs. C.K. Bhagyam, Sulthan Bathery, Wayanand, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 floor with total height of 8.43 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 235.50 sqm. for the case which is located at a distance of 180 m from the protected monument, Jain Temple, Sulthan Bathery.

Case no.07

(Mrs. C.K. Bhagyam, Sulthan Bathery, Wayanand, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 floor with total height of 7.53 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 203.18 sqm. for the case which is located at a distance of 145 m from the protected monument, Jain Temple, Sulthan Bathery.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.08

(Mrs. C.K. Bhagyam, Sulthan Bathery, Wayanad, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 floor with total height of 7.88 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 237.45 sqm. for the case which is located at a distance of 160 m from the protected monument, Jain Temple, Sulthan Bathery.

Case no.09

(Mrs. Santha C.G., Cherppu, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF with total height of 4.30 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with plinth area 97.24 sqm.

Case no.10

(Circle Inspector of Police, Mattancherry, Ernakulam, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 floor with total height of 9.55 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 211.35 sqm.

Case no.11

(Sh. Muthammed Kabeer, Sulthan Bathery, Wayanand, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 floor with total height of 7.25 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc)., with total area 439.32 sqm. for the case which is located at a distance of 266 m from the protected monument, Jain Temple, Sulthan Bathery.

Case no.12

(Sh. Muhammed Kabeer, Sulthan Bathery, Wayanand , Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 15.65 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 3518.40 sqm. for the case which is located at a distance of 270 m from the protected monument, Jain Temple, Sulthan Bathery.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.13

(Fr. Vicar, Sulthan Bathery, Wayanand, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+2 storey with total height of 12.40 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 1569 sqm.

Case no.14

(Mr. Vijayan P.A., Cherumanangad, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 storey with total height of 6.40 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 137.59 sqm.

Case no.15

(Mr. Kunjumon, Kattakampal, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF+1 storey with total height of 7.40 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area of 127.54 sqm. and the applicant may be advised to have sloping roof for the proposed new construction.

Case no.16

(Mr. K.M. Moidunni Haji, Kattakampal, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF with total height of 6.50 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area of 189.35 sqm.

Case no.17

(Sh. Bobby Johnson, Sulthan Bathery, Wayanand, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF+1 storey with total height of 9.03 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area of 338.91 sqm.

Case no.18

(Mr. Kombathayil Mammu, Palakkad, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC with total height of 10 mtrs (excluding mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc) with mumty, with total area of 564.03 sqm., as recommended by CA keeping the surrounding structures in view.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.19

(The Secretary, Peruvanam Siva Temple, Cherppu, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF with total height of 4.05 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 57.35 sqm.

Case no.20

(Sh. Jitesh Dutt M. & Mrs. Savithri Antherjanam, Pattambi, Palakkad, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF+1 floor with total height of 8.10 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 189.40 sqm.

Case no.21

(Mr. Vasudevan, Mattancherry, Ernakulam, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF+1 floor with total height of 7.85 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 30.78 sqm.

Case no.22

(Mr. Biju V. Mattancherry, Ernakulam, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for extension of FF over existing GF, with total height of the building limited to 6.71 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 95.70 sqm.

Case no.23

(Smt. Nalini Ramakrishnan, Cherppu, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF+1 floors with total height of 7.35 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area of 153.43 sqm. Since the distance of the proposed construction is only 101 m. from the protected boundary, therefore it needs to be ensured that no construction takes place in the prohibited area.

Case no.24

(Mr. Nallinan, Kattakampal, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF with total height of 4.10 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 75.45 sqm.

Case no.25

(Mr. V.A. Abdul Gafoor, Mattancherry, Ernakulam, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, members observed that the construction has already taken place without prior approval. Therefore, it was decided to ask the CA whether any show cause notice was issued to the applicant, if not then a show cause notice should be issued for the unauthorized construction by the applicant and the same should be forwarded to NMA once the reply of the show cause notice provided by the applicant.

Case no.26

(Mr. Chandran K.G., Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF with total height maximum of 4.30 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), floor area 92.52 sqm.

Case no.27

(Smt. Naseeba, Kattakampal, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF+1 with total height maximum of 7.25 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), floor area 146.38 sqm.

Case no.28

(Mr. Muhammed Ashraf. P., Kasargod District, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF+1 with total height of 7.50 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), total floor area 156.92 sqm.

Case no.29

(Sr. Sudhakaran, Ariyannur, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF+1 floor with total height of 7.20 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), total floor area 222.58 sqm. for the case which is located at a distance of 174 m from the protected monument, Near Burial Cave, Ariyannur.

Case no.30

(Sh. Sudhakaran, Ariyannur, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 floor with total height of 7.20 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), total floor area 214.14 sqm. for the case which is located at a distance of 197 m from the protected monument, Near Burial Cave, Ariyannur.

Case no.31

(Sh. Sudhakaran, Ariyannur, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 floor with total height of 7.20 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total floor area 222.58 sqm. for the case which is located at a distance of 167 m from the protected monument, Near Burial Cave, Ariyannur.

Case no.32

(Sh. Sudhakaran, Ariyannur, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 floor with total height of 7.20 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), total floor area 222.58 sqm. for the case which is located at a distance of 185 m from the protected monument, Near Burial Cave, Ariyannur.

Case no.33

(Sh. Sudhakaran, Ariyannur, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 floor with total height of 7.20 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), total floor area 214.14 sqm. for the case which is located at a distance of 205 m from the protected monument, Near Burial Cave, Ariyannur.

Case no.34

(Smt. Devaky Amma & Ammini Amma, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for Ground floor with total height of 5.74 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), total floor area 119.67 sqm.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.35

(Mr. V. Ramalingam, Mattancherry, Ernakulam, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+2 floors with total height of 10.50 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total plinth area 1210.80

Case no. 36

(Mr. Hari Chakkrat, Kadavallloor, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 floor with total height of 7.05 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with floor area 128.26 sqm.

Case no.37

(Mrs. Beena, Mattancherry, Ernakulam, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 floor with total height of 7 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with floor area 44.64 sqm.

Case no.38

(Mr. P.S. Rajagopal, Eyyal, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+1 floor with total height of 6.60 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with floor area 104.44 sqm.

Case no.39

(Mr. Mustafa, Eyyal, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF+1 with total height of 6.55 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total floor 118.34 sqm.

Case no.40

(Mr. P.K. Hassankutty, Cherumanangad, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF with total height of 4.30 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total floor 79.86 sqm.

National Monuments Authority

Case no. 41

(Mrs. Sophia Dhayana Dcootho, Mattancherry, Ernakulam, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF+1 with total height of 7 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total floor 44.64 sqm.

Case no. 42

(Smt. Saibuneesa, Palakkad, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for extension of FF floor over existing GF; with total height of the building to be limited to 7.25 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total floor area 121.09 sqm.

Case no. 43

(Sh. Muhammed Moosa, N.& N. Haris, Palakkad, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF+2 with total height of 10.25 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total floor 298.91 sqm.

Case no. 44

(Smt. Hari Priya Devi C. Thrivallam Kerala)

After perusal of the application, members observed that the construction has started without prior approval. Therefore, it was decided to ask the CA whether any show cause notice was issued to the applicant, if not then a show cause notice should be issued for the unauthorized construction by the applicant and the same should be forwarded to NMA once the reply of the show cause notice provided by the applicant. ¹⁵ received.

Case no. 45

(Mr. Abdul Rahiman Aboobacker, Kasargod District, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, members observed that the construction has already taken place without prior approval. Therefore, it was decided to ask the CA whether any show cause notice was issued to the applicant, if not then a show cause notice should be issued for the unauthorized construction by the applicant and the same should be forwarded to NMA once the reply of the show cause notice provided by the applicant. ¹⁵ received.

Case no. 46

(Mr. K.A. Abdulla Haji, Kasargod District, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF with total height of 4.70 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total floor area 144.90 sqm.

Case no. 47

(Administrator, Ariyannur, Thrissur, Kerala)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for ground floor with total height of 6.45 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total floor area is 1313.61 sqm.

Case no. 48

(Papineni Radhakrishna, Bapatla, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh)

After perusal of the application,, it was observed that proposed re-construction work falls under prohibited area; hence, it was decided to reject this case. Also a status report may be asked from the CA on the Stop Notice as provided to the applicant by the ASI officials and what further action has been taken.

Case no. 49

(V. Siva Prasado Rao and V. Balachandrao Rao, Bapatla, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh)

After perusal of the application,, it was observed that proposed re-construction work falls under prohibited area; hence, it was decided to reject this case. Moreover, if there is requirement of renovation work, the details of the renovation to be submitted by the applicant and the permission for renovation can be considered by the CA himself.

Case no. 50

(Sh. Pritam Singh, Green Park Main, South Delhi, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for stilt+4 floors with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total floor area is stilt=187.44 sqm, GF=187.44 sqm, FF =187.76 sqm, SF 187.76 sqm, TF 187.76 sqm. But basement is not allowed until the modified exercise is undertaken and it shall be considered on the basis of the result of the mapping exercise.

Case no. 51

(Ms. Ruchica Singh Wadhwa and Sh. Paramjeet Singh Gulati, Nizamuddin W
Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of floors with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, pa total floor area is stilt=125.35 sqm, GF-125.35 sqm, FF 123.05 sqm, SF 123.05 sqm.

Case no. 52

(Sh. Poshak, Hauz Khas, South Delhi, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of M floors with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, pa total floor area is stilt=87.36 sqm, GF-87.36 sqm, FF =87.36 sqm, SF 87.36 sqm. But basement is not allowed until the modified exercise is undertaken considered on the basis of the result of the mapping exercise.

Case no. 53

(Sh. Anil Krishna, Sarvapriya Vihar, South Delhi, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC construction on Ground, First & Second Floor and construction of Third Floor height of building 17.72 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet. total area of GF=94.55 sqm., FF=SF=TF=92.50 sqm. But basement is not alle^{exi} modified exercise is undertaken and it shall be considered on the basis of the mapping exercise.

Case no. 54

(M/s Pushpvihar Ayyappa Sewa Samiti (Regd.), Saket, South Delhi, Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of basement+3 floors with total height of 13.60 mtrs (including mumty, water s parapet etc), with total floor area GF 689.592 sqm., FF-321.445 sqm., SF - and with a depth of 3.65 m for basement.


Case no. 55

(Smt. Neeta Aggarwal through her GPA Of Sh. Gaurav Aggarwal, NDSE-I, S Delhi)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of basement+stilt+4 stories with total height of 18 mtrs (including mumty, wa tank, parapet etc), with total floor area stilt-125.28 sqm., GF-125.28 sqm, FF-1 SF-125.28 sqm., TF-125.28 sqm.

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

The approved minutes of 118th meeting held on 27th January, 2015 and 28th January, 2015 is hereby forwarded for perusal and comments, if any.



Pankaj Rag
(Member Secretary)

National Monuments Authority

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

MINUTES OF THE 118th (2nd Day) MEETING OF NMA

Venue - Conference Hall, NMA Hqrs, 24, Tilak Marg,
New Delhi 110001
Time & Date - 10.30 A.M on 28th January, 2015

The meeting was attended by the following:

1. Prof. H.P. Ray, Chairperson NMA
2. Sh. Saleem Beg, Member NMA
3. Sh. Pukhraj Maroo, Member NMA
4. Sh. Bharat Bhushan, Member NMA
5. Ms. Shalini Mahajan, Member NMA
6. Mr. Pankaj Rag, Member Secretary.

The following cases were taken up for consideration:

Fresh Cases

Case no.01

(Sh. Raj Kumar Aulila s/o SH. Ghanshyam, Bharatpur, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for ground floor with the total height of 17 ft. (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 37x54 sqft.

Case no.02

(Smt. Anjana w/o Sh. Satish Mittal, Roopwas, Bharatpur, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC for ground floor with the total height of 10 ft. (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 40x48 sqft.

Case no.03

(Dr. Roopa Goyal w/o Sh. Devendra Goyal, Ajmer, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has already completed the construction work without permission. Therefore, it was decided to confirm with CA whether any show-cause notice was issued to the applicant for carrying out construction without prior approval and if not, show cause notice must be issued immediately and the reply received from the applicant be sent to NMA.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.04

(Sh. Abdul Salaam S/o SH. Mohd. Hanif Ansari, Todarsingh, Tonk, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC ground floor with maximum total height of 12 ft. (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), total area 40x30 sqft.

Case no.05

(Smt. Lali Devi w/o Sh. Ram Sahai Mali, Todaraisingh, Tonk, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application, it was noticed that the proposal for construction falls under prohibited area. Hence, the case was rejected for construction. Applicant should submit details for repair and renovation of the house to CA.

Case no.06

(Sh. Mohd. Javed S/o Sh. Abdul Rahim Julaha, Todarisingh, Tonk, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application and the provided photographs, it seems that the applicant had already completed the construction work without permission. Therefore, it was decided to confirm with CA whether any show-cause notice was issued to the applicant for carrying out construction without prior approval and if not, show cause notice must be issued immediately and the reply received from the applicant be sent to NMA.

Case no.07

(Smt. Pani Devi w/o SH. Balu Mali, Todaraisingh, Tonk, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application, it was noticed that the proposal for construction falls under prohibited area. Hence, the case was rejected. Applicant should submit details for repair and renovation of the house to the CA.

Case no.08

(Sh. Dwarka Prasad S/o SH. Badri Prasad, Roopwas, BHaratpur, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC ground floor with maximum total height of 15 ft. (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 99x20 sqft.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.09

(Smt. Manju Garg w/o SH. Gopi Chand Garg, Roopwas, Bharatpur, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for ground floor with total height of 12 ft. (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area 20x40 sqft. The NOC ^{is} only for Manju Garg.

Case no.10

(Sh. Vijay Goyal Sh. Hari Goyal S/o Sh. Shivcharan Lal, Roopwas, Bharatpur, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application, it was noticed that the proposal for construction falls under prohibited area. Hence, the case for re-construction was rejected. Applicant should submit details for repair and renovation of the house to the CA.

Case no.11

(Sh. Ajjurrehman S/o Sh. Saiyed Abdul Rehman, Ajmer, RAjasthan)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to ask for more information from applicant regarding details of parking, circulation plan, shops ^{etc.} and it ^{should} also be enquired how ~~then~~ the applicant applied to as construction of house. Hence, the CA should clarify the mismatch between the Form II and building plans.

Case no.12

(Smt. Umrav Kanwar W/o SH. Manak Chand, Ajmer, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application and the provided photographs, it seems that construction has already started. The applicant should provide the details of floor area of the work proposal. Also, if the work has been started then whether any show cause notice was issued by the CA or not.

Case no.13

(Sh. Ved Prakash Gupta s/o Sh. Mohan Lal Gupta, Ajmer, Rajasthan)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for G+2 floors with total height of 39 ft. (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc) with one basement.

Case no.14

(Smt. Sumitra Paru Madkaikar, Old Goa, North Goa, Goa)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC ^{for} construction of first floor above the ground floor with total height of 7 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area of GF-3.5 sqm, FF-3.2 sqm.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.15

(Sh. Balasaheb Manikrao Bhujbal, Court Lane, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has already completed the construction work without permission. Therefore, it was decided to confirm with CA whether any show-cause notice was issued to the applicant for carrying out construction without prior approval and if not, show cause notice must be issued immediately and the reply received from the applicant be sent to NMA.

Case no.16

(Sh. Kishanrao Ranuba Lingayat, Daulatabad, Aurangabad, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has already completed the construction work without permission. Therefore, it was decided to confirm with CA whether any show-cause notice was issued to the applicant for carrying out construction without prior approval and if not, show cause notice must be issued immediately and the reply received from the applicant be sent to NMA.

Case no.17

(Sh. Ashish Vijaykumar Malani, Daulatabad, Aurangabad, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has already completed the construction work without permission. Therefore, it was decided to confirm with CA whether any show-cause notice was issued to the applicant for carrying out construction without prior approval and if not, show cause notice must be issued immediately and the reply received from the applicant be sent to NMA.

Case no.18

(Mr. Nitin Ganpatrao Thanekar, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has already completed the construction work without permission. Therefore, it was decided to ask the CA whether any show cause notice was issued or not.

Case no.19

(Sh. Sanjivan Balaram Ghodke, Bagampura, Aurangabad, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC ground+3 floors with total height of 13.95 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area of GF-3.66 sqmt., FF-20.18 sqmt., SF-20.18 sqmt., TF-16 sqmt.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.20

(Sh. Satish RAmnarayan Bihani, Mrs. Mangala Satish Bihani, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for basement+GF+2 floors with total height of 12.05 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area GF-124.30 sqmt., FF-102.85 sqmt., SF-77.04 sqmt.

Case no.21

(Mr. Krishna Panditrao Shinde, Aurangabad, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for basement+GF with total height of 6.10 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area of basement-36.78 sqm., GF-36.78 sqm.; and depth of basement should be 1.20 mtrs.

Case no.22

(Sh. Adinath Narayan Jadhav, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for GF+2 storeys with total height of 10.8 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area of GF-25.12 sqmt, FF-25.12 sqmt., SF-4.77 sqmt.

Case no.23

(Sh. Prakash Ramanlal Bakliwal & 3 others, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to **recommend** grant of NOC for basement+stilt+3 storeys with total height of 15.40 mtrs (including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc), with total area of stilt GF-138 sqmt., FF & SF-132 sqmt.; and the depth of basement should be 2.4 mtrs.

Case no.24

(Chief officer, Municipal Council, Sindkhedraja, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has already started the construction without permission and the show cause notice was issued. Therefore, it was decided to ask the C.A. to submit the show cause notice and the reply received from the applicant be sent to NMA.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.25

(Mr. Kashid Jotiram Gopal, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of Stilt+2 Floors with the total height of 11.3 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 101.13 sqm. on Stilt and 147.35 sqm. on GF & FF.

Case no.26

(Shree Mahalaxmi Traders, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction with the total height of building restricted to 15 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 212.40 sqm. on each floor. The height restriction is in accordance with cases done so far from the area.

Case no.27

(Mr. Devrao Panduranga Patil, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of GF+1 with the total height of 9.91 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 82.37 sqm. on GF and 73.58 sqm. on FF.

Case no.28

(Mr. Yogesh Madhukar Jadhav, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction with the total height of Buildings restricted to 15 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 1111.23 sqm. on each floor of Building no. 1 & 2, floor area of 1536.87 sqm. on each floor of Building no. 3, 4 & 5 and floor area of 705.96 sqm. on each floor of Building no. 6, as the buildings around are generally G+3. The applicant should submit revised plans for the buildings.

Case no.29

(Mr. Sunil Sudhakar Kulkarni, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of Parking+GF+1 with the total height of 12.50 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 249.85 sqm. on GF and 238.57 sqm. on FF.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.30

(Mr. Sudhakar Bandivadekar, Maharashtra)

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 4.90 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 70 sqm.

Case no.31

(Mr. Promod Prakash Udale, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of GF+1 with the total height of 10.20 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 28.37 sqm. on GF & FF.

Case no.32

(Chairman, Panhala Education Society, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of first floor over Existing GF and construction of Ground Floor on open plot with the total height of 7.5 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 63.66 sqm. on GF & 148.82 sqm. on FF.

Case no.33

(Mr. Jeevan Sadashiv Patil & others, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of Parking+Stilt/GF+1 with the total height of 12.72 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 60.78 sqm. on Stilt/GF & FF.

Case no.34

(Mrs. Malati Prakash Hawaii, Mr. Sanjeev Anant Hawaii, Mr. Prashant Madhukar Hawaii, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of Parking+GF+1 with the total height of 8.60 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 109.80 sqm. on GF & FF.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.35

(Chief officer, Panhala hill station, Municipal council Panhala, Maharashtra)

The case has been discussed and recommended in 116th meeting held from 15th December to 17th December, 2014.

Case no.36

(Mr. Mujawar Mahemud Gafurbhai, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of Parking+GF+2 with the total height of 11.25 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 67.16 sqm. on GF & 92.63 sqm. on FF and 69.22 sqm. on SF.

Case no.37

(Mr. Amol Girdharilal Karwa, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction with the total height of building restricted to 20 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 144.22 sqm. on each floor. This is in accordance with decisions taken in earlier cases from the area. Applicant should submit a revised plan.

Case no.38

(Mr. Anil Ramesh Bhusari, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for reconstruction of well with the depth of 18.29 mtrs. below ground level.

Case no.39

(Mr. Anil Laxman Sutrave, Mr. pramod Laxman Sutrave, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has already completed the construction work without permission and the show cause notice was issued. Therefore, it was decided to ask the C.A. to submit the show cause notice and the reply received from the applicant to NMA.

Case no.40

(Mr. Dilip Sandipan Borude, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has already completed the construction work without permission. Therefore, it was decided to confirm with CA whether any show-cause notice was issued to the applicant for carrying

National Monuments Authority

out construction without prior approval and if not, show cause notice must be issued immediately and the reply received from the applicant be sent to NMA.

Case no.41

(Sh. Shashi Jadhav Developers Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to ask the applicant for the following clarifications/information:-

1. To get the Archaeological Impact Assessment done with the help of Deccan College, Pune and submit the same to NMA
2. The CA may be asked to send the City development plan for Nashik.
3. Fresh inspection report to be submitted with details of buildings in the area around the Pandav Caves, as there is over-writing in the existing report.

Case no.42

(Mr. Rajendra R. Kakare, Mr. Shikant R. Kakare, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has completed the construction without permission and the show cause notice was issued. Therefore, it was decided to ask the C.A. to submit the show cause notice and the reply received from the applicant be sent to NMA.

Case no.43

(Mr. Jagdish Ramji Mothghare, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has completed the construction without permission and the show cause notice was issued. Therefore, it was decided to ask the C.A. to submit the show cause notice and the reply received from the applicant be sent to NMA.

Case no.44

(Sh. Dattatray Eknath Nale, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of Parking+3 floors with the total height of 16.42 mtrs. including mumty, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 311.27 sqm. on each floor.

Case no.45

(Sh. Dhanraj Ramji Armorikar, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has completed the construction without permission and the show cause notice was issued. Therefore, it

National Monuments Authority

was decided to ask the C.A. to submit the show cause notice and the reply received from the applicant be sent to NMA.

Case no.46

(Chief Officer, Panhala Hill Station Municipal Council Panhala, CTS No. 635/s, No. 8A/290, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of tower with total height of 6 mtrs. and the toilet block and watchman cabin, store room with the total height of 4.5 mtrs. including mummy, water storage tank, parapet etc.

Case no.47

(Mr. Shivaji Pundlik Bhusari, Maharashtra)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the proposed site falls in the prohibited area, therefore, reconstruction is not allowed but if the applicant wants to renovate the existing building, he can submit a fresh application to the Competent Authority.

Case no.48

(Sri. Manohar Hanumantappa Bammanahalli, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has already started the construction work without permission. Therefore, it was decided to confirm with CA whether any show-cause notice was issued to the applicant for carrying out construction without prior approval and if not, show cause notice must be issued immediately and the reply received from the applicant be sent to NMA.

Case no.49

(Sri. R Devadas, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has already started the construction work without permission. Therefore, it was decided to confirm with CA whether any show-cause notice was issued to the applicant for carrying out construction without prior approval and if not, show cause notice must be issued immediately and the reply received from the applicant be sent to NMA.

National Monuments Authority

Case no.50

(The Manager, Nirmala Convent School, (Primary School) 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 4.05 mtrs. including mummy, water storage tank, parapet etc., with plinth area of 28.28 sqm.

Case no.51

(The Manager, Nirmala Convent School, (High School) 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 2.5 mtrs. including mummy, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 20 sqm.

Case no.52

(Sri Tolcha Nayak, 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 4.5 mtrs. including mummy, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 66.50 sqm.

Case no.53

(Sri. T. Anil Kumar, Karnataka)

After perusal of the application, it was observed that the applicant has already started the construction work without permission. Therefore, it was decided to confirm with CA whether any show-cause notice was issued to the applicant for carrying out construction without prior approval and if not, show cause notice must be issued immediately and the reply received from the applicant be sent to NMA.

Case no.54

(Shri Jatin Das, Orissa)

After perusal of the application, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of Basement+GF+2 with the total height of 17.06 mtrs. including mummy, water storage tank, parapet etc., with floor area of 884.50 sqm. on GF & 900 sqm. on FF and 522.70 sqm. on SF and basement area 284 sqm.

Review Cases

Case no.01

(District Court Saket through Executive Engineer(C) Shri R.K. Tripathi, Delhi)

After perusal of this case, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for construction of basement. The same should be done under the supervision of ASI officials. If any archaeological remains are found, the work should be stopped immediately and NMA should be informed.

Case no.02

(Thiru S. Shiva Subramanian, Chennai)

After perusal of this case, it was decided to recommend grant of NOC in this case for minor changes in floor area as submitted by the applicant in the revised proposal.

Discussion on GDCR:

The copies of GDCR regulations had been circulated amongst the members on January 15, 2015; but no comments have been received. The matter had been put up and discussed in the 118th meeting held on 28th January. An email has been sent to all the members on 2nd Feb, 2015 for their comments on the GDCR regulations latest by 6th Feb 2015. The corrigendum will be issued separately.

Discussion on Delhi Basement Issue:

A committee had been constituted for the survey of Delhi basement issue. The members of the committee were Dr. Manoj Kumar, Consultant Archaeology, NMA, Sh Vishnukant, Asst. S.A, Delhi Circle, Sh. K.K Verma, Photographer, Delhi Circle and V.K Uppal, Surveyor, CA office Delhi. On December 12, 2014, the team had surveyed the area around the monuments from which NOC applications are received by NMA, to explore the possibility of available maps for that area/zone. Thereafter, two different reports had been submitted by ASI and NMA in this regard respectively. In both the reports, it had been indicated that near numbers of protected monuments, there is possibility of archaeological remains and hence, permission of basement may not be considered.

Presently, the matter was discussed in the 118th meeting of NMA held on 27th & 28th January, 2015 and it was decided to ask the Geospatial Ltd. for a Powerpoint Presentation in this regard to discuss the mapping exercise around the monuments.

National Monuments Authority

Discussion on Heritage Bye laws:

It has been decided to ask INTACH for the final versions of the following bye laws latest by 9th Feb, 2015:

1. Currency Building, *st. James Church, Metcalfe Hall*
2. Jugalkishore Temple
3. Gwalior Fort

Discussion on Categorization:

1. Vadodara Categorization –

- i. This had been discussed on 24th July 2014 in Ahmadabad meeting in the presence of the officers from CA, ASI, AUDA and AMC
- ii. The document had been circulated on 1st August 2014 to all the Members requesting comments/suggestions on the basis of the previous discussion.
- iii. In 109th meeting held on 2nd & 3rd September, 2014, the comments/report of the categorization had been requested to submit to the Authority latest by 7th September, 2014.
- iv. Thereafter, the draft categorization had been uploaded in the NMA website on 12th September, 2014 for a period of 30 days requesting comments/objections/suggestions from public. But no comments have been received in this during the period
- v. In 118th meeting held on 27th & 28th January 2015, it had been decided by the authority to finalize the Vadodara document and send it to Ministry for further necessary action.

2. Kolkata Categorization –

- i. The document had been circulated on 4th September 2014 to all the Members requesting comments/suggestions.
- ii. In a meeting of "Categorization of centrally protected monuments" held on 20th October, 2014, the verified copy of Kolkata categorization by SA, ASI had been circulated to the Members again with the request to send comments(if any) latest by 24th October, 2014.
- iii. In 111th meeting held on 28th October, 2014, it had been decided by the authority to upload the document to the website of NMA
- iv. Thereafter, the same had been uploaded in the NMA website on 10th November, 2014 for a period of 30 days requesting comments/objections/suggestions from public. But no comments have been received in this during the period.

National Monuments Authority

- v. In 118th meeting held on 27th & 28th January 2015, it had been decided by the authority to finalize the Kolkata document and send it to Ministry for further necessary action.