

पत्रांक 2566 / 12-1(1) दिनांक, देहरादून, 21, अप्रैल, 2016
सेवा में,

प्रभागीय वनाधिकारी,

चकराता वन प्रभाग, चकराता ।

विषय: जनपद देहरादून में विसोगीलानी से उटैल होते हुये थैना मन्दिर होकर काहा-नेहरा-पुनाह मोटर मार्ग का निर्माण कि०मी० 1 से 5 तक। लम्बाई 4.700 किमी के निर्माण हेतु वांछित वन भूमि 2.065 हेक्टर)

संदर्भ: प्रस्ताव संख्या FP/UK/ ROAD/ 11427 /2015

महोदय,

अपर प्रमुख वन संरक्षक एवं नोडल अधिकारी के स्तर से प्राप्त ई०डी०एस० क्वेरी दिनांक 1-4-2016 के द्वारा निम्न प्रकार बिन्दुवार आपत्ति का विवरण निम्न प्रकार है ।

आपत्ति	निराकरण
1. Short narrative of the project does not give adequate information in Part I.	
2. Total period for which forest land to be diverted is not mentioned in Part I.	
3. Authority letter is not uploaded for applicant in Part I, It is issued in favour of V. D. Bhatt, A.E.	
4. The GPS coordinate marked digitally on GIS software generated georeferenced map for the area proposed for diversion in 200-300m distance and each turn of the proposed road and be uploaded in the designated place in Part I.	
5. GPS coordinate marked digitally on georeferenced map for every corner of land proposed for CA in two patches is not provided. The google image is not accepted for the purpose. It should be uploaded in the designated place in Part I.	
6. In the map uploaded in Part I, it is seen the presence of another alignment marked in blue color and described as another proposed alignment, but no details has been provided in the column of B, B-1 in Part I regarding the status of the proposal pertaining to this alignment.	
7. The State Govt may clarify that why the State Govt don't prepared a consolidated proposal for the proposed road because in general the Govt of India does not consider the piece meal proposal.	
8. There are two numbers of patches are marked for CA but in Part I, the detail is provided for only one patch. The State Govt may provide separate detail for individual patch in the designated column in Part I.	
9. Copy of ownership proof, MoU signed between User agency and the present owner and copy of non encumbrance certificate regarding area proposed for CA is not uploaded in the designated place of Part I.	
10. CA stipulation is not commensurate with the land diverted in the district need clarification and necessary correction.	
11. Approximate distance of area proposed to be diverted from forest boundary is not provided in Part II.	
12. Part I, II, III, IV and V which is provided in online web portal for the proposal is not enclosed with the hard copy.	

कृपया उपरोक्तानुसार बिन्दुवार आपत्ति का निराकरण करते हुए संगत दस्तावेज संलग्नक के रूप में बिन्दुवार अपलोड करें तथा उक्त की हार्ड प्रति साथ-साथ उपलब्ध करायी जाये। अधूरा अस्पष्ट प्रस्ताव कदापि न भेजें।
भवदीय,

(आर०के०मिश्र)

मुख्य वन संरक्षक,

अयमुना वृत्त, उत्तराखण्ड, देहरादून ।

संख्या 2566 (1) / 12-1(1) उक्त दिनांकित ।

प्रतिलिपि अधिशासी अभियन्ता, अस्थाई निर्माण खण्ड, लोक निर्माण विभाग, सहिया को सूचनार्थ एवं आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेतु प्रेषित ।

(आर०के०मिश्र)

मुख्य वन संरक्षक,

अयमुना वृत्त, उत्तराखण्ड, देहरादून ।

EDS dated 01-04-2016 FP/UK/ROAD/11427/2015

1. Short narrative of the project does not give adequate information in Part I.
2. Total period for which forest land to be diverted is not mentioned in Part I.
3. Authority letter is not uploaded for applicant in Part I, It is issued in favour of V. D. Bhatt, A.E .
4. The GPS coordinate marked digitally on GIS software generated georeferenced map for the area proposed for diversion in 200-300m distance and each turn of the proposed road and be uploaded in the designated place in Part I.
5. GPS coordinate marked digitally on georeferenced map for every corner of land proposed for CA in two patches is not provided. The google image is not accepted for the purpose. It should be uploaded in the designated place in Part I.
6. In the map uploaded in Part I, it is seen the presence of another alignment marked in blue color and described as another proposed alignment, but no details has been provided in the column of B, B-1 in Part I regarding the status of the proposal pertaining to this alignment.
7. The State Govt may clarify that why the State Govt don't prepared a consolidated proposal for the proposed road because in general the Govt of India does not consider the piece meal proposal.
8. There are two numbers of patches are marked for CA but in Part I, the detail is provided for only one patch. The State Govt may provide separate detail for individual patch in the designated column in Part I.
9. Copy of ownership proof, MoU signed between User agency and the present owner and copy of non encumbrance certificate regarding area proposed for CA is not uploaded in the designated place of Part I.
10. CA stipulation is not commensurate with the land diverted in the district need clarification and necessary correction.
11. Approximate distance of area proposed to be diverted from forest boundary is not provided in Part II.
12. Part I, II, III, IV and V which is provided in online web portal for the proposal is not enclosed with the hard copy.