

**MINUTES OF THE 106th MEETING OF THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION
COMMITTEE (HCC) HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 2022.**

A. Proposal:

Item No.1: Repair/renovation in respect of B-24, Ground and Mezzanine Floor, Inner Circle, B-Block, Connaught Place.

1. The Heritage Conservation Committee (HCC) did not approve the proposal for repair/renovations/interior works forwarded by the NDMC (online) at its meeting held on September 8, 2021, the following specific observations were made:

“1. The proposal forwarded by the NDMC (online) was scrutinized. It included the work in terms of Plastering/cladding and patch repairs, Flooring and re-flooring, repairs of fallen bricks and stones, pillars, beams, whitewashing, painting including erection of false ceiling, erection of internal partitions, replacing of old sanitary fixtures in toilets, replacement of electrical wiring and fitting, replacement of old sanitary pipes, the opening of doors within owner’s plot, execution of HVAC works.

2. *The proposal received (online) was scrutinized and found not acceptable, following observations were made:*

a) *Discrepancies have been observed viz-a-viz work details submitted for approval, as per Para-1 above and the drawings/photographs provided. The proposal indicates work in terms of repairs including fallen bricks and stones, pillars, beams etc. which need to be substantiated with an appropriate number of existing site pictures to understand the existing site conditions (in correlation to the works indicated in para-1 above) with proper uncut views from all sides, including external façade. The proposal also includes works related to fallen bricks and stones, pillars, beams etc. The structural safety of the buildings should be ensured.*

b) *It was observed that in the proposal front facade has been altered. Front columns have been proposed with groves and beam shown at the mezzanine level. No changes/projections are permitted on the external side/facade, which should be retained as per the original design.*

c) *The HCC observed that most of the drawings submitted are of low resolution and blurred and not easy to comprehend. The same shall be resubmitted in a high-resolution format. The current submission lacks legibility & clarity.*

d) *The quality of 3D views should improve; the current 3D views do not explicate the design scheme adequately. The submitted 3-d views and site pictures are from a scanned copy and are not comprehensible. Thus, the submission needs to be revised and resubmitted.*

e) *Internal photographs of the existing toilet along with fittings and fixtures and 3D views of the proposal with fittings & fixtures shall also be submitted for consideration by the HCC.*

f) *It was suggested to use the energy-saving fittings and fixtures for all electrical appliances and sanitary fittings.*

g) *NDMC shall ensure that the placement, size, colour, text etc. of the Signages/signboards etc. be as per approved policy/guidelines prepared by NDMC for the Connaught place area.*

3. *Overall, HCC opines that the submission is incomplete, due to lack of clarity and inadequate drawings, it is not acceptable and returned to NDMC. NDMC shall also ensure that the proposal completed in all respect be forwarded for the consideration of HCC.”*

2. The revised proposal for repair/renovations works forwarded by the NDMC (online) includes the works in terms of plastering/cladding and patch repairs, flooring and re-flooring, repairs of fallen bricks and stones, pillars, beams, white washing, painting including erection of false ceiling, erection of internal

partitions, replacing of old sanitary fixtures in toilets, replacement of old sanitary pipes was scrutinised and found acceptable, the following observations were made:

- a) No changes/projections are permitted on the external side/facade, which should be retained as per the original design.
- b) The structural safety of the buildings should be ensured. Heritage Character comprising of architectural elements such as arches, cornices, quoins, gables, architraves, Palladian-style windows etc., should be retained in the modifications.
- c) It was suggested to use the energy-saving fittings and fixtures for all electrical appliances and sanitary fittings.
- d) NDMC shall ensure that the placement, size, colour, text etc. of the signages/signboards etc. be as per approved policy/guidelines prepared by NDMC for the Connaught place area.

Item No.2: Repair/renovation in respect of Premises no. 14, Block-E, Connaught Place, New Delhi.

1. The proposal forwarded by the NDMC (online) was scrutinized. It included the work in terms of plastering, painting/whitewashing, flooring/re-flooring, false ceiling, POP punning, wall panelling, waterproofing, repair of plumbing works, repair of the staircase and all other works mentioned under the ambit of clause 2.0.1(d) of unified building bye-laws 2016.
2. The proposal was scrutinized and found not acceptable, the following observations were made:
 - a) The Committee observed that while submitting the list of the works for repair/renovations to be undertaken, the comments received from NDMC has indicated the following:

“.....and all other works mentioned under the ambit of clause 2.0.1(d) of unified building bye-laws 2016.....”

The Committee opines that the premise is in the grade-II of the heritage list and is situated in the Connaught Place area. The provisions as stipulated under clause no: 2.0.1(d) of the unified building bye-laws 2016 (UBBL) do not apply to the listed heritage properties. NDMC/architect/proponent should clearly indicate the list of repair/renovation works to be undertaken and be forwarded under relevant clauses/provisions of the unified building bye-laws 2016 (UBBL) for the consideration of the HCC.
3. Also, the quality of 3d views is not appropriate. They are very sketchy and the scale, proportion, materials etc. are not understood clearly. The HCC did not appreciate the quality of 3D views submitted for its consideration. Annotated 3D views clearly specifying the materials to be used shall be provided with before and

after images of the proposed design scheme, for better understanding. Thus, the submission needs to be revised accordingly and resubmitted.

4. In view of the insufficient information provided by the architect, the proposal was found to be unacceptable and returned to the concerned local body i.e. NDMC.

Item No.3: Proposed Repair and Renovation Works at Premises No. K-36, First Floor, Outer Circle, Connaught Place.

1. The Heritage Conservation Committee (HCC) did not approve the proposal for repair/renovations/interior works forwarded by the NDMC (online) at its meeting held on November 2, 2021, the following specific observations were made:

- “1. The proposal forwarded by the NDMC (online) was scrutinized. It included the work in terms of Plastering and patch repairs, Flooring and re-flooring, Opening of door within own’s plot, White washing, painting, etc. including erection of false ceiling, Erection of internal partitions, Replacing of old sanitary fixtures in toilets, Replacement of electrical wiring and fitting, Replacement of old sanitary pipes, Demolition of existing sunshade in middle open area.*
- 2. The proposal received (online) was scrutinized and found not acceptable, the following observations were made:*
 - a) Discrepancies have been observed viz-a-viz work details submitted for approval, as per Para-1 above and the drawings/photographs provided. The proposal indicates work in terms of opening of a door within own’s plot, demolition of existing sunshade in the middle open area, replacing of old sanitary fixtures in toilets, replacement of old sanitary pipes etc. which need to be substantiated with an appropriate number of existing site pictures to understand the existing site conditions (in correlation to the works indicated in para-1 above) with proper uncut clear views from all sides, including external façade.*
 - b) The HCC observed that most of the drawings submitted are not self-explanatory and easy to comprehend. The current submission lacks legibility & clarity. The quality of 3D views should improve; the current 3D views do not explicate the design scheme adequately. The submitted 3-d views and site pictures are from a scanned copy and are not comprehensible. Thus, the submission needs to be revised and resubmitted.*
 - c) The structural safety of the buildings should be ensured. Heritage Character comprising of architectural elements such as arches, cornices, quoins, gables, architraves, Palladian-style windows etc., should be retained in the modifications.*
 - d) It was suggested to use the energy-saving fittings and fixtures for all electrical appliances and sanitary fittings.*
 - e) NDMC shall ensure that the placement, size, colour, text etc. of the Signages/signboards etc. be as per approved policy/guidelines prepared by NDMC for the Connaught place area.*
- 3. Overall, HCC opines that the submission is incomplete, due to lack of clarity and inadequate drawings, it is not acceptable and returned to NDMC. NDMC shall also ensure that the proposal completed in all respect be forwarded for the consideration of HCC.”*

2. The revised proposal for repair/renovations works forwarded by the NDMC (online) includes the works in terms of plastering/cladding and patch repairs, flooring and re-flooring, white washing, painting, etc. including erection of false ceiling, erection of internal partitions, replacing of old sanitary fixtures in toilets, replacement of old sanitary pipes, demolition of existing sunshade in the middle

open area was scrutinised along with the previous observations of the HCC and found not acceptable, the following observations were made:

- a) The Committee observed that while considering the proposal for repair/renovation at its meeting held on November 2, 2021, very specific detailed comments were given. The HCC observed that one of the observations was related to :

“.....demolition of existing sunshade in middle open....”

The Committee requested the architect to substantiate the same with an appropriate number of existing site pictures to understand the existing site conditions better with proper uncut clear views from all sides. But, the compliances on this aspect was found to be missing in the submission.

3. In view of the insufficient information provided by the architect the proposal was found to be unacceptable and returned to the concerned local body i.e. NDMC. The NDMC shall ensure that the proposal completed in all respect be forwarded for the consideration of the HCC.

Item No.4: Proposed internal Repair and Renovation Work at ECE House, Ground Floor, 28 K.G.Marg, New Delhi.

1. The Heritage Conservation Committee (HCC) did not approve the proposal for repair/renovations/interior works forwarded by the NDMC (online) at its meeting held on December 01, 2021, the following specific observations were made:

“1. The proposal forwarded by the NDMC (online) was scrutinized. It included the work in terms of Change of electrical conduiting, wiring, fittings and fixtures, Air conditioning installations works, Plastering, cladding and patch repair, Flooring and re-flooring work, Ceramic tile Dado work, Change of Sanitary fittings, False ceiling work, POP works, Painting and polishing work, Internal partition works, Wooden panelling.

2. *The proposal received (online) was scrutinized and found not acceptable, the following observations were made:*

- a) *From the proposed design scheme, project report and the existing site photographs submitted by the architect/proponent the Committee observed that extensive work of repair and renovation is likely to be undertaken at the site including air conditioning (AC). The Committee opines that the proposed works shall be substantiated with an appropriate number of existing site pictures (in correlation to the works indicated in para-1 above) with proper uncut views from all sides to understand the existing site conditions better, including external façade (from all the four sides).*
- b) *Also, before and after images viz-a-viz repairs works to be undertaken and the proposed design scheme with 3D views shall be submitted to understand the proposed renovation design scheme clearly. Since extensive air-conditioning works are to be undertaken, the proposed design scheme to conceal the outdoor AC units shall also be submitted with an appropriate mechanism to avoid spoiling the external façade and marring the visual and urban aesthetics of the heritage-listed property.*
- c) *The structural safety of the heritage building should be ensured. Heritage Character comprising of architectural elements etc. should be retained in the renovation/ modifications.*

- d) *Internal photographs of the existing toilet along with fittings and fixtures and 3D views of the proposal with fittings & fixtures shall also be submitted for consideration of the HCC.*
 - e) *No changes/projections are permitted on the external side/facade, which should be retained as per the original design.*
 - f) *It was suggested to use the energy-saving fittings and fixtures for all electrical appliances and sanitary fittings.*
 - g) *NDMC shall ensure that the placement, size, colour, text etc. of the signages/signboards etc. be as per approved policy/guidelines prepared by NDMC.*
3. *Overall, HCC opines that the submission is not comprehensive and self-explanatory, due to lack of clarity and sufficient information provided, it is not acceptable and returned to NDMC. The architect was advised to comply with the above observations and re-submit the revised proposal after incorporating all the suggestions.”*
2. The revised proposal for repair/renovations works forwarded by the NDMC (online) includes the works in terms of change of electrical conduits, wiring, fittings and fixtures, air conditioning installations works, plastering, cladding and patch repair, flooring and re-flooring work, ceramic tile dado work, change of sanitary fittings, false ceiling work, POP works, painting and polishing work, internal partition works, wooden panelling was scrutinised along with the previous observations of the HCC and found not acceptable, the following observations were made:
- a) The Committee took a note (*brought to its notice by NDMC*) that the heritage structure is a two-storied building comprising of ground and first floor and the proposal for internal repair/renovation is on the ground floor.
 - b) The heritage structure is in the grade II of the heritage list and situated in the Connaught Place area. From the photographs submitted by the architect/proponent, HCC members showed their displeasure upon seeing the distortion of the facade of the Heritage structure caused by elements put haphazardly on the facade including outdoor airconditioners, DG exhaust pipes, AC ducts, high tension wires/cables supported on the metal tray, punctured walls with hooks for supporting utilities, dilapidated condition of the heritage façade etc. which have badly marred the aesthetics and spoil the sanctity of the heritage structure.
 - c) Taking into consideration the facts enumerated above, the HCC requested the concerned local body i.e. NDMC to request the proponents to prepare a comprehensive scheme to ensure retrofitting/renovation of the elements on the facade so as to ensure the preservation of the heritage structure in its original form.
 - d) Also, extensive air-conditioning, electrical, lighting works etc. are to be undertaken, the architect was suggested to prepare a design scheme for concealment of these elements including DG exhaust pipes etc at least from the ground floor to avoid spoiling the external façade and marring the visual and urban aesthetics of the heritage property.
3. Due to insufficient compliances and the lack of clarity given by the architect/proponent the proposal was found to be unacceptable and returned to

the concerned local body i.e. NDMC who was requested to impress upon the proponents to prepare a comprehensive scheme to ensure retrofitting/renovation of the elements on the facade so as to safeguard the preservation of the heritage structure in its original form.

Item No.5: Proposal in respect of repair and renovation at M-126 & M-128 Outer Circle, Connaught Place.

1. The proposal forwarded by the NDMC (online) was scrutinized. It included the work in terms of demolition & reconstruction of the parapet, Demolition of old damaged plaster & re-plastering/patch repairs as and where required, Demolition of old existing flooring, provision of waterproofing treatment & re-flooring on top, Opening and closing of windows, ventilators & doors (internal side), Repairs & rehabilitation of brick walls/brick plaster, Demolition of old sunshade and reconstruction of new sunshade exactly same as per the existing sunshade within the inside courtyard and external face, Providing putty/POP punning/painting including false ceiling/gypsum at appropriate usable height, Demolition of existing internal non-load-bearing partition walls, Demolition of existing slab and reroofing with new RCC slab at the existing height with new water proofing and terracing on top, removal of malwa and clearing the site from all debris and unserviceable material.
2. The proposal was scrutinized and found not acceptable, the following observations were made:
 - a) The heritage structure is in the grade II of the heritage list and situated in the Connaught Place area. From the photographs submitted by the architect/proponent, it was evident that the heritage structure is in a highly dilapidated condition. To assess the ground situation, it was decided to make a site visit by the sub-committee comprising of the following members along with the architect/proponent and submit its report for consideration by the HCC:

i.	ADG (works), CPWD	... Member, HCC
ii.	Dr Archana Verma	... Member, HCC
iii.	Commissioner Planning, DDA	... Member, HCC
iv.	Chief Architect, NDMC	... Member, HCC
v.	Mr N. K. Garg	... Chief Engineer, Str. CDO, Member, HCC
vi.	Ms Ruby Kaushal	... Member-Convener, HCC
 - b) Given the facts enumerated above, the proposal for repair/renovation is not accepted and returned to NDMC.

Item No. 6: Building plans in respect of 1834, ward no. VIII, Khatikan, Chowk Shah Mubarak, Kucha Pati Ram, Sita Ram Bazar-Site visit report.

A. Background:

1. The proposal forwarded by the North DMC (online) was considered by the Heritage Conservation Committee at its meeting held on December 30, 2021, the following

Page-6/9

Minutes of the 106th Meeting of The Heritage Conservation Committee (HCC) held on Wednesday, March 16, 2022.

observations were made:

1. The proposal was forwarded by the North DMC (online) for consideration by the Heritage Conservation Committee (HCC). Earlier HCC approved the proposal at its meeting held on June 1, 2018, the following observations were made:

“1. The proposal was forwarded by the North DMC online for consideration of the HCC. The proposal is in Grade-III of the heritage notified list of the MCD area.

2. The proposal was scrutinized. It was found acceptable and approved with the following observations:

- (i) The drawings do not have clarity with respect to recent construction, if any, undertaken without the permission of the local body which should have been indicated along with the proposed conservation plan in the existing building. An actual site plan be accordingly submitted to North DMC for appropriate decision in the matter. HCC’s approval is only towards the existing heritage structure excluding any new construction.
- (ii) The existing residential land use should be retained.
- (iii) No changes are permitted on the external side/facade, which should be retained as per the original design.
- (iv) The structural safety of the buildings should be ensured.
- (v) Heritage Character comprising of architectural elements such as arches, cornices, quoins, gables, architraves, Palladian-style windows etc. should be retained in the modifications.”

2. The revised proposal for additions/alterations was scrutinised and observed that the architect has not indicated the changes made/proposed from the previous approval given by the HCC in the year 2018. Also, some of the photographs submitted by the architect has indicated that the structure work is already in progress at the site with the erection of RCC columns and beams.

3. The HCC observed that the proposal is of historical importance and requires a careful selection of materials/techniques/work execution. To assess the ground situation, it was decided to make a site visit by the sub-committee comprising of the following members along with the architect/proponent and submit its report for consideration by the HCC:

i.	ADG (works), CPWD	... Member HCC
ii.	Chief Engineer (Structure, CDO), CPWD	... Member HCC
iii.	Chief Town Planner, TCPO	... Member HCC
iv.	A representative from ASI	... Member HCC
v.	Dr Archana Verma	... Member HCC
vi.	Member-Secretary	... Member Convener

c) Given the facts enumerated above, the proposal is not accepted and returned to North DMC.”

2. Accordingly, Sub-Committee has undertaken a site visit on February 4, 2022, and the observations of the sub-committee are as given below:

B . Site Visit Report:

1. In terms of the decision taken by the Heritage Conservation Committee (HCC) at its meeting held on 20.12.2021, a sub-committee comprising of the following visited the site at 03.00 PM on Friday the 04th February 2022:

- a) Mr Rabindra Kumar ... ADG (works), CPWD, Member, HCC
- b) Dr Archana Verma ... Member, HCC
- c) Mr N. K. Garg ... Chief Engineer, Structure CDO, Member, HCC
- d) Ms Ruby Kaushal ... Member-Convener, HCC
- e) Mr Anil Rathour ... TCPO (representing Chief T. Planner, TCPO)
- f) Mr Rajeev Kr Gaur ... Assistant Secretary (T), HCC
- g) Ms Shikha Verma ... Asstt. Town Planner, North DMC
(Representing Chief T. Planner, MCD)

Also present:

- a) Ms Aishwarya Tipnis ... Conservation Architect
- b) Mr Atul Khanna ... Owner (Representative)
- c) Mr Shiven Khanna ... Owner (Representative)

2. The Sub-committee took an extensive tour of the premises and discussed, in detail, with the conservation architect issues concerning restoration/conservation processes including materials/techniques/work execution of the heritage structure. The following observations were made:

- a) The team has also taken note that the property was declared as a Grade-III listed heritage property under the supplementary list of heritage properties vide gazette notification no: F.13 (43)/MB/UD/2014/1602 dated 29.07.2016.
- b) The heritage structure is built in the pre-independence era (*early 19th Century*) and the proposal is for the addition/alteration over the existing superstructure. On visual inspection of the premises, the Committee observed that at present only the ground floor and part first floor is existing. The architect/proponent informed the committee that part of the first floor was collapsed on its own some time back. Taking into consideration the time of construction of the premises, especially in view of Delhi lying in seismic Zone-IV of Earth Quake grading, it was, accordingly, suggested that the structural safety analysis of the complete structure (*including foundation, basement, superstructure etc.*) is necessarily be carried out by an authorised Structure Engineer for the structural safety of the existing structure (existing ground floor and part first floor) as well as for proposed two additional floors (*first and second*) above, that the building is structurally safe for the users.
- c) Plumbing, sewage disposal, kitchen drainage, electrical fittings, wire conduits, lighting arrangements shall be such planned to have a minimum adverse effect on the heritage structure.
- d) During inspection conservation Architect and owner informed that they will use Lakhori bricks and lime mortar for the construction of the wall as existing in old walls. They shall use Lakhori bricks and lime as informed.
- e) It was also suggested that any new structure to be built at the site must contain the original heritage character of the site while ensuring crucial structural safety concerns.

The site visit report was placed before the HCC for its consideration. The Committee discussed in detail the provisions as stipulated under Clause 7.26 of

the Unified Building Bye-Laws 2016 (UBBL) for Delhi (*provisions for grade-III heritage properties, Annexure-II*), the same are reproduced as under:

Grade-III

Heritage Grade-III comprises building and precincts of importance for townscape: that evoke architectural, aesthetic or sociological interest though not as much as in Heritage Grade-II. These contribute to determine the character of the locality and can be representative of lifestyle of a particular community or region and may also be distinguished by setting, or special character of the façade and uniformity of height, width and scale.

Heritage Grade-III deserves intelligent conservation (though on a lesser scale than Grade-II and special protection to unique features and attributes)

Internal changes and adaptive re-use may by and large be allowed. Changes an include extensions and additional buildings in the same plot or compound. However, any changes should be such that they are in harmony with and should be such that they do not detract from the existing heritage building/precinct.

Development permission for the changes would be given on the advice of the Heritage Conservation Committee.

All development in areas surrounding Heritage Grade-III shall be regulated and controlled, ensuring I that it does not mar the grandeur of, or view from Heritage Grade-III.

The HCC taken a note that:

“.....Internal changes and adaptive re-use may by and large be allowed. Changes an include extensions and additional buildings in the same plot or compound.....”

C. Conclusion:

The current heritage proposal is for the vertical expansion (*addition of a part first & second floor*) above on an existing building comprising of a ground floor and part first floor. Taking into consideration the provisions for grade-III heritage buildings as indicated above, it was, accordingly, decided to seek suggestions/comments from the DDA and North DMC in this regard so that an appropriate decision shall be taken by the HCC.

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