

**MINUTES OF THE 96<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION COMMITTEE**  
**(HCC) HELD ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2021.**

**Item No.1: Repair and Interior renovation in respect of Premises No. - C-11, Ground Floor and Basement, Inner Circle, Connaught Place.**

The proposal forwarded by the NDMC (online) was scrutinized.

**A. Background of the proposal as provided by NDMC:**

1. The proposal was earlier submitted by the project proponent to NDMC who found short comings in the proposal, in terms of guidelines issued by HCC vide its letter dated June 19, 2019, which are reproduced below:

*“... (a) (i) Existing site photographs should clearly show external facade & all internal wall face along with ceiling & floors accompanying the proposal of each floor besides photographs of the specific area where changes are proposed and should be properly numbered/named on the plan.  
(ii) Site photographs should be submitted to ensure that the site is properly visible as existing or else will necessitate going for a site visit.  
(iii) Clarity and quality of photographs should be ensured.  
(b) Three-dimensional views should clearly show the existing and proposed design changes and should correspond to drawings.  
(c) The drawings showing existing & proposed changes should be superimposed to clearly highlight the proposed modifications.  
(d) No changes/projections are permitted on the external side/facade, which alter the original heritage structure.  
(e) Heritage value and structural stability of the structure affected due to the changes proposed also be indicated on the superimposed drawings.  
(f) Heritage Character comprising of architectural elements such as arches, cornices, quoins, gables, architraves, Palladian-style windows etc. should be retained.”*

2. Accordingly, NDMC vide their reference dated 23.10.2020 conveyed the short comings to the project proponent on 06.11.2020. In response, the project proponent submitted their replies to the NDMC on 29.01.2021. Meanwhile the project proponent started carrying out the construction activity at site without taking prior approval of HCC.

3. Accordingly, NDMC issued a stoppage order which was challenged by the project proponent in the Hon'ble Delhi High Court. The Hon'ble Court order dated 13.01.2021 stipulated as follow:

*“...3. Let the authorised representative of the petitioner visit the office of the respondent on 14.01.2021 at 3.00 p.m. and furnish all the requisite documents as may be required by the Chief Architect for forwarding the case of the petitioner to the Heritage Conservation Committee.  
4. Once the documents have been furnished, respondent shall process the application of the petitioner expeditiously....”*

4. Subsequently, in terms of the directions of the Hon'ble Court, the project proponent submitted copies of the plans etc. to NDMC vide mail on 19.01.2021. After examining the application and scrutiny of the plans, NDMC again found deficiencies viz-a-viz the aforesaid guidelines issued by the HCC on 19.06.2019. The deficiencies were conveyed to the project proponent by the NDMC on 22.01.2021.

5. While the deficiencies were yet to be fulfilled, the matter again came up before the Hon'ble Delhi High Court on 28.01.2021. The High Court order dated 28.01.2021 stipulated as follow:

“... forward the application of these petitioners as it is alongwith the document submitted, to the HCC for its consideration.

7. In case there is any deficiency and any further requirement from the Petitioner, HCC shall communicate the deficiency and submit a report to the Court...

... 10. The HCC on receipt of the application shall proceed further and submit a report within 15 days as mandated by Clause 2.3.3(b) of the Unified Building Bye-laws...”

6. The project proponent submitted the revised proposal to the NDMC who again found deficiencies in terms of the guidelines of the HCC.

**B. Observations of the HCC:**

1. As per directions of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court order dated 28.01.2021, NDMC has forwarded the proposal to Heritage Conservation Committee (HCC) online. In terms of the directions of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court the proposal has to be considered by the HCC and its decision be conveyed within 15 days.
2. As per clause 1.3 of the Annexure-II of the Unified Building Bye Laws 2016 for Delhi (UBBL) additions/alterations, repair, renovations including painting of the listed buildings shall not be allowed except with the prior permission of the Chairman NDMC. Before granting such permission, NDMC shall consult the Heritage Conservation Committee.
3. The proposal for Repair and Interior renovation forwarded by NDMC (online) was scrutinized by the HCC and the following observations were made:
  - a) There is a mismatch between the submitted *existing site photographs* of premises and *existing site drawings*.
    - i. Internal door and partition wall which are visible in *existing site photographs* is not shown in *existing drawings*.
    - ii. Exit door on rear side as shown in *existing site drawings* also not seen in *existing site photographs*.
    - iii. From *existing site photographs* it was evident that the showroom is still functioning in the premises whereas existing site drawing does not reflect the same.
  - b) As the Heritage Conservation Committee (HCC) approves the drawings, the correct site drawings are required for consideration by HCC.
  - c) The opening of rear door defaces the heritage character and adversely affects the structural stability of the heritage building.
  - d) Overlapped layout plan mentions a list of works to be executed including plumbing works at sr. no-9. Internal photographs of the existing toilet along with fittings and fixtures and 3D views of proposal with fittings & fixtures to be

submitted for consideration of HCC.

4. The proposal shows an empty premise. The HCC intend to consider the proposed use of the premises after renovation as heritage and structural stability of the building may be affected by the proposed changes.
5. HCC opined that the proposal submitted by the architect/proponent is incomplete. In absence of complete information provided to HCC, it was difficult to comprehend the proposal.
6. In view of the above, the proposal is returned to the concerned local body i.e. NDMC for resubmission with request to get it rectified and resubmit the revised proposal incorporating all the deficiencies indicated above.

sd/-

**(Kamran Rizvi)**  
**Chairman, HCC**  
**Additional Secretary (D&UT),**  
**Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs,**  
**Government of India**

sd/-

**(Ruby Kaushal)**  
**Member-Secretary**  
**Heritage Conservation Committee**