

No.5(1)/2006-HCC
No.8(1)/2006-HCC
No. 5(2)/2006-HCC

No.6(4)/2006-HCC
No.5(3)/2006-HCC

No.12(1)/2004-HCC
No.6(1)/2005-HCC

**MINUTES OF THE 12TH MEETING OF THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION
COMMITTEE (HCC) HELD ON FRIDAY, AUGUST 11, 2006.**

PRESENT :

- | | | |
|-----|--|------------------|
| 1. | Shri S.M. Acharya Additional Secretary M/o Urban Development | Chairman |
| 2. | Prof. A.G.K. Menon Conservation Architect | Member |
| 3. | Shri O.P. Jain Convener, INTACH | Member |
| 4. | Shri D.S. Meshram Urban Designer | Member |
| 5. | Shri V.K. Bugga Chief Town Planner, MCD | Member |
| 6. | Prof. M. Shaheer Landscape Architect | Member |
| 7. | Shri Subhash Kapoor ADG (Arch), CPWD | Member |
| 8. | Shri Sanjib Sengupta Chief Architect, NDMC | Member |
| 9. | Prof. K.T. Ravindran Urban Designer, SPA | Member |
| 10. | Smt. Madhu R. Mehta Secretary, DUAC | Member Secretary |
| 11. | Smt. Indu G. Chowdhury Architect C/o ADG(Arch) CPWD | |
| 12. | Shri G. Krishna Rao Architect NDMC | |

13. Shri S.K. Jain
Joint Commissioner of Police
Delhi Police
14. Shri S.N. Srivasativa
Joint Commissioner of Police

***Confirmation of the minutes of 11th meeting of the HCC**

The minutes of the 11th meeting of the HCC held on June 8, 2006 were confirmed and approved.

Item No.1. Indraprastha Girls Senior Secondary School, behind Jama Masjid, Chandni Chowk.

- (a) The proposal forwarded by the Chief Town Planner, MCD was examined and also discussed with the architect. The building is listed under category II of the MCD. It was brought to the notice of the HCC that the building was in dilapidated condition and required repair work. The main repair works indicated are;
 - i) Restoration of walls
 - ii) Floor restoration
 - iii) Seepage
 - iv) Roof restoration
 - v) Conservation of stucco work, wooden cill
 - vi) Chemical conservation of stone work
 - vii) Restoration of the stained glass
 - viii) Front & Rear Facade restoration & other work

The HCC observed that while it has no objection to the repair and restoration works but there should not be any additions to the building in any form for increasing accommodation etc.

Item No.2. Notification of Listing of Heritage buildings.

MCD List

The Chief Town Planner, MCD informed the HCC that the Secretary Department of Art And Culture, Govt. of Delhi has been again reminded for notifying the list of Heritage buildings.

NDMC List

The Chief Architect, NDMC under letter no. July 17, 2006 had forwarded the list of the Heritage Buildings as finalized by the Sub-Committee of NDMC for approval of the HCC.

The HCC decided to constitute a Sub-Committee to study the list, reclassify the grading and submit recommendations. The Sub-Committee will comprise of :-

- i) Prof. A.G.K. Menon
- ii) Prof. K.T. Ravindran
- iii) Shri O.P. Jain
- iv) Shri Sanjib Sengupta

It was decided that the above Sub-Committee would submit its recommendations/report to the Chairman HCC, who will then approve the list on behalf of HCC for sending to NDMC.

Item No. 3 : Layout plan for Arabic Senior Secondary School at Ajmeri Gate.

The proposal had been forwarded by the Chief Town Planner, MCD for consideration of the HCC. The supporting document, reports, model etc. had not been received from the architect. Also the architect was not present during the meeting. The consideration of the proposal was postponed with the observation that the architect to

submit the necessary supporting documents, report & model for consideration of the HCC.

Item No. 4. Proposal for restoration of Gole Market.

The proposal forwarded by the Chief Architect, NDMC was considered and discussed with him. He informed that the leasees were in agreement with the proposals. Since the architect was not present, the proposal could not be discussed with him.

The following observations were made:-

- i) It is not clear as to what are the additions proposed, like provision of railing was considered an addition. Additions need to be more specific.
- ii) The Sub-way shown in the drawings had not been shown in the model.
- iii) The design and pattern of paving is not clear from model. It need to be re-looked into.
- iv) It needs to be clarified as to what are the new interventions proposed in the existing building. More details in terms of intervention is required.
- v) The central court pergola/space frame on top level was not conducive to the conservation aspect.
- vi) The traffic management plan of the area should be submitted wherein the possibility of reducing the number of vehicles passing through need to be submitted & parking to be reflected in the model. Pedestrianisation of area all around the Gole Market would be an ideal situation which need due consideration.
- vii) The HCC observed that Gole Market is representative part of our Heritage, therefore the restoration at this stage is required. Though we are in agreement with NDMC with regard to the renovation but the finer details need to be presented to the HCC by the architect.

Item No. 5. Sub-Committee for formulation of Policy guidelines for buildings (non-listed) in Heritage Zone.

- (a) The matter had been considered by the HCC at its meeting held on June 8, 2006 and the following observations were made:-

“The consideration of the matter was deferred because Shri S.C. Bhatia, ADG (Arch.) had since retired and a new incumbent in place of him was yet to take over.”

- (b) The matter was now taken up for consideration since new incumbent Shri Subhash Kapoor, ADG Architecture was present. He informed the HCC that the next meeting of the Sub-Committee would be convened shortly to consider the subject matter.

Item No. 6. Redevelopment of Police Station at Mandir Marg.

- A. The proposal referred by the Chief Architect, NDMC had last been considered by the HCC at its meeting held on June 8, 2006 and the following observations were made:-

“(a) The proposal had last been considered at HCC meeting held on February 27, 2006 and the following observations were made:-

“(a) The proposal had been considered at HCC meeting held on December 19, 2005 and the following observations were made:-

“The proposal has been forwarded by the NDMC for consideration of the HCC. The proposal is for construction of Police Station building and staff quarters after demolishing the existing structures except the heritage building in the front. The Committee decided to defer the matter as it needs to be examined in more detail on the basis of the three-dimensional model when promoters and the concerned architect are also present for interaction.”

- (b) *The revised proposal was considered by the HCC wherein the architect had put up two alternative layouts.*

- (c) *In alternative one, the block-F had been pushed back, the orientation of blocks-E and D had been changed. The distance between the block-A (Heritage block) and block-C had also been increased.*
- (d) *In alternative two, the orientation of block-D,E,F had been revised and the distance between the heritage block –A and the block-C had also been increased.*
- (e) *The proposal was discussed with the architect and the HCC observed that the change in orientation of the blocks had not made any material difference.*
- (f) *The block-A i.e. Heritage block was away from the main road and the block-B & C dominated in terms of their height, volume and appearance from the main street was concerned. The heritage block has been smothered.*
- (g) *The HCC observed that the setback of the blocks-B & C from the main street, should be the same as that of the heritage block(A).*
- (h) *The HCC decided that the scheme will be considered further on receipt of alternative proposal.”*

B. The matter was now taken up, in view of a letter no.nil dated August 4, 2006 received from Prof. P.K. Choudhary, architect of the proposal.

- (c) The architect presented a photographic study of the whole site area particularly from Mandir Marg side during the meeting. It was brought out by him on the basis of the study that the Heritage Block (Block-A) was camouflaged by well grown up existing old trees and was hardly visible from Mandir Marg.
- (d) The HCC observed that on the basis of the studies put up by the architect and the work done if the proposed buildings are detailed out in harmony with the Block-A (Heritage Block) it may serve the purpose notwithstanding the development proposed being quite heavy. Therefore, the Committee found the alternative-I acceptable.

It was also observed that an attempt should be made by architect to bring the ethos respecting the architectural character of the Heritage Block (Block-A) in terms of detailing, colour scheme etc so that it appears as a source of inspiration for the rest of the complex. The HCC decided to approve the proposal with alternative-I and the architect was advised to submit the various details of the building blocks respecting the architecture character of the Heritage Block.

Item No. 7. Layout plan of Police Station Hauz Quazi (Shahjahanabad Walled City).

A. The proposal had been considered by the HCC at its meeting held on June 8, 2006 and the following observations were made:-

(a) *“The proposal forwarded by the MCD had been considered by the Delhi Urban Art Commission at its meeting held on May 8, 2006 and it had decided to refer the matter to the HCC for ascertaining its views.*

(b) *The proposal was examined and also discussed with the architect and it was found that the proposal as put up was based upon the normal master plan norms. It was felt that the building is in heritage zone and generally there are no setbacks of the buildings existing all-round because the buildings have the concept of internal courtyards. It was decided to refer the matter to the MCD with the observations that the matter may be examined in background of the existing system of the buildings in the surrounding area.*

(c) *The architect was advised to put up a model of the area around the site.”*

B. The proposal was now examined and discussed with Shri S.K. Jain, Joint Commissioner of Police & Shri S.M. Srivastava, Joint Commissioner of Police who expressed the urgency of redevelopment of the Police Station Complex at Hauz Qazi. The HCC was informed that the existing dilapidated old structures have already been pull down. Shri V.K. Bugga, Chief Town Planner, MCD, Member HCC stated that since there are no norms for the non listed buildings in

Heritage Zone, they have no alternative but to apply the prevailing master plan norms. He was requested to confirm the same in writing.

- (d) The HCC reiterated its observations of June 8, 2006 and observed that the proposed building be brought to the common building line and the architecture of the area existing need to be respected, the design should relate to the ethos of the Heritage Area. The HCC observed that it has already given its point of view and observations at its meeting of June 8, 2006. The HCC decided to convey its observations/views to the Delhi Urban Art Commission for appropriate action.

Addl. Item No.1 Working regime to be adopted by the H.C.C.

- (a) In order to prepare a working regime to be adopted by the HCC in evaluation of proposals and also for studying the problems in the list of Heritage Buildings the HCC decided to constitute a Sub-Committee comprising of the following: -

1. Prof. A.G.K. Menon
2. Prof. K.T. Ravindran
3. Shri O.P. Jain
4. Shri Sanjib sengupta

- (b) The HCC decided that the Sub-Committee would submit its reports in 3 weeks time, so that the same could be considered in next meeting of the HCC.

(Madhu R. Mehta)
Member-Secretary