

**MINUTES OF THE 1587th MEETING OF THE DELHI URBAN ART COMMISSION (DUAC)
HELD ON THURSDAY, APRIL 08, 2021.**

A: The Secretary, DUAC welcomed the Chairman and the Members to the first meeting of the reconstituted Commission. The Commission was appraised on procedural aspects. The items of the agenda were thereafter considered.

Sl. No	PROPOSAL	OBSERVATIONS /RECOMMENDATIONS	DECISION	REMARKS
B. Project Proposals:				
1	Layout and building plans proposal in respect of Hospital for Vikrant Children Foundation and Research Centre at FC-30, Press Enclave Road, Saket, New Delhi.	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded by the South-DMC (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The Commission did not approve the layout and building plan proposal at its meeting held on January 04, 2019 and December 28, 2020 respectively specific observations were given.</p> <p>3. The revised layout and building plans proposal received (online) at formal stage was scrutinised along with the replies submitted by the architect in response to the observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observation letter no: OL-18122055073 dated 31.12.2020 and following observations were given:</p> <p>a) For convenience of the users/patients/visitors and appropriate drop-off experience, parking shall be suitably relocated to the South-west side along the boundary wall.</p> <p>b) Sustainability features shall be as per point no. 7 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on the DUAC website at www.duac.org.</p> <p>c) All service equipment at the terrace should be properly camouflaged (in terms of the point nos. 10, 11 &12 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on DUAC website at www.duac.org.</p>	Approved, observations given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.
2	Revised Building plans proposal in respect of addition/alterations in respect of the	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded by the South-DMC (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The Commission approved the building plan at its meeting held on July 22, 2002 and the NOC for completion plan proposal was approved in the</p>	Not approved, observations given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without

<p>Higher Secondary School, Block-S, Greater Kailash Part - II, New Delhi.</p>	<p>meeting of the Commission held on July 19, 2005.</p> <p>3. The building plan proposal for additions/alterations (additional construction) received (online) at formal stage was scrutinised and following observations were given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The proposal has been submitted for addition/ alteration (addition of 4th floor above). A lot of live/dead load is being added to the existing building. Considering structural changes the building shall be so designed that it can withstand weather effects, impacts from calamities like earthquake etc. An undertaking is required for the structural stability of the existing superstructure clearly indicating that it is safe and can withstand the additional load. b) The Commission observed that overall height of the building has been increased, for the convenience of the users (students/teachers etc.), thus lifts of appropriate sizes and numbers shall be added to the structure in accordance with the relevant guidelines/norms/statutory provisions in this regard. Addition of lifts may have a bearing on the visual, aesthetics of the elevational façade which may be reviewed in the subsequent submission. c) Entry/exits to the school, including gate widths shall be relooked at considering the movement/circulation/parking of the buses/cars etc. d) Hard paving areas shall be minimised, wherever possible green pavers shall be used. Peripheral greens shall be ensured. e) The left-over spaces in the car parking area shall be suitably landscaped with proper curb stones etc. f) Sustainability features shall be as per point no. 7 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on the DUAC website at www.duac.org. g) All service equipment at the terrace should be properly camouflaged (in terms of the point nos. 10, 11 &12 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on DUAC website at www.duac.org. 		<p>awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.</p>
---	---	--	---

		4. The architect was advised to adhere to the above observations and furnish a pointwise incorporation/reply.		
3	Completion plans proposal in respect of Oncology Block and Revalidation plan in respect of Lady hardinge medical college and associated hospitals at Shaheed Bhagat Singh Marg, New Delhi.	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded by the NDMC (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The Commission approved the Comprehensive Redevelopment Plan for the Lady Harding College and residential housing complex at its meeting held on June 23, 2010 and the revised Comprehensive Redevelopment Plan was approved in the meeting of the Commission held on February 02, 2011.</p> <p>3. The completion plan proposal for NOC received (online) was scrutinised following observations were given:</p> <p>a) It was observed that while forwarding the proposal to the Commission at the completion stage following observation/recommendations has been made in Part-C (completion stage) by NDMC:</p> <p><i>“..... Observations/recommendations of the sanctioning authority while forwarding the matter to DUAC for consideration in the Performa Part-C of the Completion stage from serial no 1 to 4 indicates the following:</i></p> <p><i>“.....NO.....”</i></p> <p>b) The Commission consider the proposals based on the certification related to building bye-laws etc. furnished by the concerned local body. Taking into considerations the observations/recommendations made and forwarded by the concerned local body i.e. NDMC, the proposal was found not acceptable and referred back to New Delhi Municipal Council (NDMC) for clarification and confirmation.</p>	NOC for completion not approved, observations given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.
4	Layout and building plans proposal in respect of New	1. The proposal was forwarded by the PWD (GNCTD) (online) for consideration of the Commission.	Not approved, observations	The Commission decided to take

<p>campus of Ambedkar University at Dheerpur, Delhi.</p>	<p>2. The Commission did not approve the layout & building plan proposal at its meeting held on February 05, 2021 specific observations were given.</p> <p>3. The revised layout and building plan proposal received (online) at formal stage was scrutinised along with the replies submitted by the architect in response to the observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observation letter no: OL-010122161001 dated 10.02.2021 and following observations were given:</p> <p>a) The Commission appreciated the efforts made by the architect to revise the scheme to the extent that appropriate pedestrian connections have now been made throughout the campus. Some improvements shall further be required to improve the overall pedestrian connectivity/experience, taking into consideration the convenience of the first time users and their guardians. The connections made to the various use zones shall be appropriately indicated/shown in the layout plan.</p> <p>b) The Commission reiterated its earlier observations given at its meeting held on December 18, 2020 that considering the usages, scale of the project, the architect/proponent, may consider to put up the proposals for approval in the following manner:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>a. Master Plan of the entire scheme.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>b. Plans, Elevations, Sections and other details of Individual blocks.</i></p> <p>c) MLCP is located far away from the auditorium (capacity for 1000 users), theatre cum convention block, administrative block, amphitheatre etc. where congregation of large gathering is expected and needs reconsideration with proper contemplation.</p> <p>d) The VIP drop-off shall be such planned so as to have direct/unhindered connections to the auditorium block.</p> <p>4. The architect was advised to adhere to the above observations and furnish a pointwise incorporation/reply.</p>	<p>given.</p>	<p>action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.</p>
---	---	----------------------	--

5	Revised layout and building plans proposal in respect of Expansion and Remodelling of Dr. Hedgevar Arogya Sansthan at Karkardooma, Delhi.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal was forwarded by the PWD (GNCTD) (online) for consideration of the Commission. 2. The Commission approved the layout and building plan proposal at its meeting held on August 19, 1999. Building plan proposal for expansion/remodelling was approved in the meeting of the Commission held on September 20, 2017 specific observations were given. 3. The building plan proposal for expansion & remodelling received (online) was scrutinised and following observations were given: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The proposal has been submitted for addition of two more floors above the existing super structure. A lot of live/dead load is being added to the existing building. Structure shall be such designed that it can withstand weather effects, impacts from calamities like earthquake etc. and can withstand the additional load. b) The sizes, capacity of the lifts shall adhere to the relevant /applicable regulations. c) Sustainability features shall be as per point no. 7 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on the DUAC website at www.duac.org. h) All service equipment at the terrace should be properly camouflaged (in terms of the point nos. 10, 11 &12 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on DUAC website at www.duac.org. 	Approved, observations given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.
6	Revised layout and building plans proposal in respect of Construction of New Hospital Blocks (A & B) at Babu Jagjivan Ram Memorial Hospital at Jahangirpuri.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal was forwarded by the PWD (GNCTD) (online) for consideration of the Commission. 2. The Commission approved the layout and the building plan proposal at its meeting held on November 15, 1988. 3. The revised layout and building plan proposal for addition of new blocks (Block-A & B) and two MLCP's received (online) was scrutinised and following observations were given: 	Not approved, observations given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.

		<p>a) The hospital faces an important road i.e. outer ring road connecting the city of Delhi to the neighbouring states. The Commission opine that considering location of the hospital building blocks shall be such placed that the elevations be designed contextual to the surroundings introducing a cultural, urban, visual and aesthetically pleasing experience of city of Delhi to the visitors.</p> <p>b) Proposed MLCP's faces the outer ring road. Taking into considerations the observations made in the point 'a' above, it was suggested to relocate the MLCP's suitably to get the desired view (<i>preferably by swapping the location of building block 7 with 6</i>).</p> <p>c) Apart from private vehicles the complex will attract users from IPT (intermediate para transit). The linkages to Public Transport facilities (bus stop, metro stations etc.) and IPT's (<i>Taxi stand, Auto/ Rickshaw stand</i>) shall be clearly marked on the layout plan.</p> <p>d) The existing residential areas shall be screened appropriately by using architectural mechanisms to maintain privacy.</p> <p>4. The architect was advised to adhere to the above observations and furnish a pointwise incorporation/reply.</p>		
7	Completion plans proposal in respect of Commercial building at 2 Tolstoy Lane for M/s Sindhu Realtor Pvt. Ltd.	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded by the NDMC (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The Commission approved the building plan proposal at its meeting held on February 19, 2014 and the revised approval was given in the meeting of the Commission held on July 24, 2019 specific observations were given.</p> <p>3. The revised building plan proposal received (online) for NOC at completion stage was scrutinised along with the replies submitted by the architect in response to the observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observation letter no: OL-31012150003 dated 10.02.2021 and following observations were given:</p>	NOC not approved, observations given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.

		<p>a) The proposal being at Completion stage needs to provide an actual Artwork executed at the site. From the photographs submitted for work of art, it is evident that the art works have been just placed on the ground without thoughtful design considerations.</p> <p>b) Work of art of suitable scale, size and material be such planned/located with focal points incorporated with landscape work so as to enhance and impart character/identity to the complex. Spaces shall be identified thoughtfully and the work of art be placed at an appropriate level (human eye) and merge with the pedestrian movement in the complex.</p> <p>4. The architect was advised to adhere to the above observations and furnish a pointwise incorporation/reply.</p>		
8	Revised Building plans proposal in respect of Multi level parking with Commercial Development at Pitampura MRTS Station, Madhuban Chowk.	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded by the DDA (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The Commission approved the building plan proposal at its meeting held on March 01, 2017. The Commission did not approve the building plan proposal at its meeting held on February 19, 2021 specific observations were given.</p> <p>3. The revised layout and building plan proposal received (online) at formal stage was scrutinised along with the replies submitted by the architect in response to the observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observation letter no: OL-16022122005 dated 24.02.2021 and following observations were given:</p> <p>a) It was observed that in terms of one of earlier observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observation letter no. DUAC observation letter no: OL-16022122005 dated 24.02.2021 indicated at sr. no. 3(b, c, d, f) inadequate compliance for this has been given.</p> <p>b) The parking calculations given for the DMRC usages and the commercial component appears to be inappropriate especially considering the addition of 3 movie screens with a seating capacity of 384 persons and commercial/restaurant spaces, which is going to attract huge footfall</p>	Not approved, observations given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.

		<p>(including vehicular traffic) to the complex. The details (break up) of the existing number of car parks + additional parking need to be supplemented separately in the submission, so as to clarify the distribution of parking for various uses in the site to appreciate it further.</p> <p>c) The proposed parking lot is to be used by the metro users in great numbers also, thus option of direct connection with the proposed parking lot at the concourse level of the metro station nearby be explored, with appropriate design mechanisms, for better pedestrian connectivity, efficiency and convenience.</p> <p>d) To obstruct the flow of slow-moving traffic (<i>e-rickshaw etc.</i>) bollards have been placed on both ends of the service road in the proposal (<i>ownership may have been with some other external government agency</i>) adjoining the proposed parking lot appears to be not feasible, needs clarification.</p> <p>4. The architect was advised to adhere to the above observations and furnish a pointwise incorporation/reply.</p>		
9	<p>Revised layout and building plans proposal for additions/alterations in respect of MBS College of Architecture at Plot no. 1, Sector -9, Phase -1, Dwarka.</p>	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded by the DDA (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The Commission approved the building plan proposal at its meeting held on November 04, 2004 and the NOC approved in the meeting of the Commission held on May 30, 2018. The Commission did not approve the revised building plan proposal for additions/alteration at its meeting held on February 19, 2021 specific observations were given.</p> <p>3. The revised building plan proposal for additions/alterations received (online) at formal stage was scrutinised along with the replies submitted by the architect in response to the observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observation letter no: OL-08022122004 dated 24.02.2021 and following observations were given:</p> <p>a) Sustainability features shall be as per point no. 7 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on the DUAC website at www.duac.org.</p>	<p>Approved, observations given.</p>	<p>The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.</p>

		b) All service equipment at the terrace should be properly camouflaged (in terms of the point nos. 10, 11 &12 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on DUAC website at www.duac.org .		
10	Completion plan proposal in respect of Residential building at plot no. 68, Golf Links, New Delhi.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal was forwarded by the NDMC (online) for consideration of the Commission. 2. The Commission approved the building plan proposal at its meeting held on April 16, 2014 and the NOC for completion plan proposal was approved in the meeting held on December 16, 2015. The proposal for additions/alterations was approved on the meeting of the Commission held on December 4, 2019. The Commission did not approve the NOC at its meeting held on March 16, 2021 specific observations were given. 3. The revised proposal for NOC for completion plan proposal received (online) was scrutinised along with the replies submitted by the architect in response to the observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observation letter no: OL-02032150010 dated 22.03.2021 and found acceptable. 	NOC approved.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.
11	Proposal for Construction of ROB/RUB on Cost sharing basis on Railway crossing no. LC- 12 (Delhi-Ambala Line).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal was forwarded by the PWD (GNCTD) (online) for consideration of the Commission. 2. The proposal received (online) at formal stage was scrutinised and following observations were given: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The width of the pedestrian path shall be suitably widened for better pedestrian connectivity, efficiency and convenience. b) The railing and parapets along the stretch shall be so designed so as not to mar the aesthetics and enhance the overall visual, environmental, urban experience along the stretch. 	Approved, observations given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.
12	Completion plans proposal in respect of Service Apartment at plot no. 4B, Mayur	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal was forwarded by the DDA (online) for consideration of the Commission. 2. The Commission approved the layout and building plan proposal at its 	NOC approved, observations given.	The Commission decided to take action in the

	<p>Vihar District centre, Delhi.</p>	<p>meeting held on January 06, 2010 and the revised layout and building plan proposal was approved in the meeting held on November 02, 2011. The layout and building plan proposals were again revised and approved by the Commission at its meeting held on August 03, 2016 and later on September 20, 2017 respectively.</p> <p>3. The proposal for NOC for completion plan proposal was not approved in the meeting of the Commission held on March 16, 2021 specific observations were given.</p> <p>4. The revised completion plan proposal received (online) was scrutinised along with the replies submitted by the architect in response to the observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observation letter no: OL-24022148005 dated 22.03.2021 and found acceptable.</p>		<p>matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>Layout and building plans in respect of proposed Group Housing for an area on 7.87 Hect. on RLDA land adjoining Swami Narayan Marg, Ashok Vihar for M/s Godrej Green Woods Private Ltd.</p> <p><i>(conceptual stage)</i></p>	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded directly by the architect (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The layout and building plan proposal received (online) at conceptual stage was scrutinised and following observations were given:</p> <p>a) Keeping in mind environmental considerations and climatic conditions of the city of Delhi, orientation of some of the blocks from fenestrations point of view shall be ensured and relooked at.</p> <p>b) Considering impact on surrounding environment, scale and size of the proposal it shall be ensured that only treated water shall be used for landscaping purposes.</p> <p>c) The location of fire paths shall be well co-ordinated with respect to the landscaping provisions/drawings.</p> <p>d) The tresses falling within the curated forest shall have the required Soil fill to accommodate the proposed vegetation. Native plantation shall be ensured throughout the site.</p> <p>e) Sustainability features shall be as per point no. 7 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on the DUAC website at</p>	<p>Accepted, observations given.</p>	<p>The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.</p>

		<p>www.duac.org.</p> <p>f) All service equipment at the terrace should be properly camouflaged (in terms of the point nos. 10, 11 &12 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on DUAC website at www.duac.org.</p> <p>3. All the observations given by the Commission should be adhered to in the formal proposal to be subsequently submitted thereafter and submit a pointwise reply of the compliance, for consideration of the Commission.</p>		
14	<p>Layout and building plans in respect of proposed Group Housing on 2.89 Hact. On RLDA land adjoining Swami Narayan Marg, Ashok Vihar for M/s Godrej Green Woods Private Ltd.</p> <p><i>(conceptual stage)</i></p>	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded directly by the architect (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The layout and building plan proposal received (online) at conceptual stage was scrutinised and following observations were given:</p> <p>a) Keeping in mind environmental considerations and climatic conditions of the city of Delhi, orientation of some of the blocks from fenestrations point of view shall be ensured and relooked at (<i>especially the orientation of the EWS block</i>).</p> <p>b) Considering environmental, ecological and scale and size of the proposal it shall be ensured that only treated water shall be used for landscaping purposes.</p> <p>c) The location of fire paths shall be well co-ordinated with respect to the landscaping provisions/drawings.</p> <p>d) The tresses falling within the curated forest shall have the required Soil fill to accommodate the proposed vegetation. Native plantation shall be ensured throughout the site.</p> <p>e) Sustainability features shall be as per point no. 7 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on the DUAC website at www.duac.org.</p> <p>f) All service equipment at the terrace should be properly camouflaged (in terms of the point nos. 10, 11 &12 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on DUAC website at www.duac.org.</p>	Accepted, observations given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.

		3. All the observations given by the Commission should be adhered to in the formal proposal to be subsequently submitted thereafter and submit a pointwise reply of the compliance, for consideration of the Commission.		
15	Building plans proposal in respect of RRTS Stabling Yard & Supporting residential facilities at Jangpura, New Delhi. <i>(Conceptual stage).</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal was forwarded directly by the architect (online) for consideration of the Commission. 2. The Commission accepted the concept of housing scheme at its meeting held on December 18, 2020 but did not accept the concept of the building plan proposal for stabling yard at its meeting held on February 19, 2021 and specific observations were given. 3. The revised building plan proposal for stabling yard received (online) was scrutinised along with the replies submitted by the architect in response to the observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observation letter no: OL-05022127009 dated 24.02.2021 and found acceptable. 	Accepted.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.
16	Revised Building plans in respect of Addition/alterations in Motel building situated at Khasra No. 41/9 Min, 12 Min, 37/23/2, 24/2, 41/3, 41/2/2, 41/2/3, 31/2/1 at Village Samalkha and Khasra no. 450 at Village Rajokri. <i>(Conceptual stage)</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal was forwarded directly by the architect (online) for consideration of the Commission. 2. The Commission accepted the concept of building plan proposal for additions/alterations at its meeting held on November 20, 2019 but did not accept the concept of the revised building plan proposal for additions/alterations at its meeting held on March 02, 2021 specific observations were given. 3. The revised building plan proposal for additions/alterations received (online) at conceptual stage was scrutinised along with the replies submitted by the architect in response to the observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observation letter no: OL-18022127014 dated 04.03.2021 and following observations were given: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Commission consider the proposals based on the certification related to building bye-laws etc. furnished by the concerned local body. It was observed that the Development Control Regulations (DCR) related to the proposal submitted along with the submission are incorrect. The same shall be reviewed and correct DCR's be submitted. 	Not accepted, observation given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.

		<p>b) Attention of the Commission was drawn to the various provisions as stipulated under prevailing Master Plan for Delhi 2021 related to Motels etc. enumerated as under:</p> <p><i>“.....Motels (with sanctioned plans as on 07-02-2007 or whose proposal of Motel has been acceded to, 3{(including all such proposal of motels which were in process of examination or matter challenged in the court of law or having approval in files from DDA or 1[concerned municipal body] or not acceded to due to enforcement of MPD-2021 on 07.02.2007 are also eligible for sanction)}, which are in Commercial Areas or proposed Facility Corridor in Zonal Development Plans and Other use Zones).....”</i></p> <p>4. Taking into consideration the facts brought to the notice of the Commission, it was, accordingly, decided to request the architect/ proponent to furnish all the details related to previous sanction/NOC for completion plan of the proposal prior to 2007, if any, and any other information deemed fit, along with existing site conditions including drawings and photographs of existing structure and landscape, tree details etc., only then the proposal shall be reviewed and observations/comments be given by the Commission.</p>		
17	<p>Layout and building plans in respect of Boys' Senior Secondary School at Aya Nagar, Delhi.</p> <p><i>(conceptual stage)</i></p>	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded directly by the architect (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The layout and building plan proposal received (online) at conceptual stage was scrutinised and following observations were given:</p> <p>a) The proposed building appears to be non-air-conditioned. The provision made for air-conditioning units/ water coolers on the façade is not given in the proposal (drawings/3d views). The air-conditioner units/water coolers units would be an eye-sore to the building façade. To avoid the same, the provision shall be made in the design to accommodate the outdoor units, at this stage, so as not to mar the aesthetics.</p> <p>b) Provisions of cross ventilation shall be ensured in all rooms including multi-purpose hall.</p>	<p>Accepted, observations given.</p>	<p>The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.</p>

		<p>c) Considering overall visual, environmental, urban and aesthetic quality of the area, the car parking provisions made in the site layout shall be clearly indicated/shown in the 3D views (birds eye views). Also, the parking provisions shall adhere to all the applicable norms/regulations/guidelines etc. of the area.</p> <p>d) A lot of hard paved areas have been shown. To avoid heat island effect the same shall be minimised by converting them into hard green spaces.</p> <p>e) Keeping in mind the environmental considerations and the climatic conditions of the city of Delhi, the use of the glass on the façade shall be reduced especially on the south façade (heat gaining side) with proper understanding of its cleaning mechanism and other maintenance issues.</p> <p>f) The selection of the glass shall be as per relevant norms/guidelines/regulations etc.</p> <p>g) Sustainability features shall be as per point no. 7 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on the DUAC website at www.duac.org.</p> <p>h) All service equipment at the terrace should be properly camouflaged (in terms of the point nos. 10, 11 &12 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on DUAC website at www.duac.org.</p> <p>3. All the observations given by the Commission should be adhered to in the formal proposal to be subsequently submitted thereafter and submit a pointwise reply of the compliance, for consideration of the Commission.</p>		
18	<p>Revised elevations in respect of Commercial building at CS/OCF No.2, Sector-24, Rohini.</p> <p><i>(conceptual stage)</i></p>	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded directly by the architect (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The Commission approved the building plan proposal for additions/alterations at its meeting held on February 05, 2020, but did not accept the scheme for revised elevations at its meeting held on March 02, 2021 and specific observations were given.</p> <p>3. The revised proposal for elevations received (online) at conceptual stage was</p>	Not accepted, observation given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.

		<p>scrutinised along with the replies submitted by the architect in response to the observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observation letter no: OL-23022127017 dated 04.03.2021 and following observations was given:</p> <p>a) It was observed that in terms of one of earlier observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observation letter no: OL-23022127017 dated 04.03.2021 indicated at sr. no. 3(a, b, c, d) inadequate compliance for this has been given.</p> <p>4. The architect was advised to adhere to the above observations and furnish a pointwise incorporation/reply.</p>		
19	<p>Building plans in respect of Addition/alteration in Existing Commercial building at C2, District Centre Saket.</p> <p><i>(conceptual stage)</i></p>	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded directly by the architect (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The Commission did not approve the building plan proposal for additions/alterations at its meeting held on January 8, 2021 specific observations were given.</p> <p>3. The revised Conceptual plan proposal for additions/alterations received (online) was scrutinised along with the replies submitted by the architect in response to the observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observations letter no: OL-30122022068 dated 14.01.2021 and following observations were given:</p> <p>a) The parking provisions shall be compulsorily provided in the premises itself and adhere to the applicable regulations of the area.</p> <p>b) It was observed that the proposal has been submitted for addition of two more stories above on the existing super structure. A lot of live/dead load is being added to the existing building. Structure shall be such designed that it can withstand weather effects, impacts from calamities like earthquake etc. and can withstand the additional load.</p> <p>c) Sustainability features shall be as per point no. 7 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on the DUAC website at</p>	Accepted, observations given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.

		<p>www.duac.org.</p> <p>d) All service equipment at the terrace should be properly camouflaged (in terms of the point nos. 10, 11 &12 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on DUAC website at www.duac.org.</p> <p>4. All the observations given by the Commission should be adhered to in the formal proposal to be subsequently submitted thereafter and submit a pointwise reply of the compliance, for consideration of the Commission.</p>		
20	<p>Layout and building plans in respect of Girls' Senior Secondary School on khasra no. 321-325 at Sultanpur.</p> <p><i>(conceptual stage)</i></p>	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded directly by the architect (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The layout and building plan proposal received (online) at conceptual stage was scrutinised and following observations were given:</p> <p>a) The proposed building appears to be non-air-conditioned. The provision made of air-conditioning units/ water coolers on the façade is not given in the proposal (drawings/3d views). The air-conditioners units/water coolers units would be an eye-sore to the building façade. To avoid the same, the provision shall be made in the design to accommodate the outdoor units, at this stage, so as not to mar the aesthetics.</p> <p>b) Provisions of cross ventilation shall be ensured in all rooms including multi-purpose hall.</p> <p>c) Considering overall visual, environmental, urban and aesthetic quality of the area, the car parking provisions made in the site layout shall be clearly indicated/shown in the 3D views (birds eye views). Also, the parking provisions shall adhere to all the applicable norms/regulations/guidelines etc. of the area.</p> <p>d) A lot of hard paved areas have been shown, considering the heat island effect the same shall be minimised by converting it to the hard greens spaces.</p>	Accepted, observations given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.

		<p>e) Keeping in mind the environmental considerations and the climatic conditions of the city of Delhi, the use of the glass on the façade shall be reduced especially on the south façade (heat gaining side) with proper understanding of its cleaning mechanism and other maintenance issues.</p> <p>f) The selection of the glass shall be as per relevant norms/guidelines/regulations etc.</p> <p>g) Sustainability features shall be as per point no. 7 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on the DUAC website at www.duac.org.</p> <p>h) All service equipment at the terrace should be properly camouflaged (in terms of the point nos. 10, 11 &12 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on DUAC website at www.duac.org.</p> <p>3. All the observations given by the Commission should be adhered to in the formal proposal to be subsequently submitted thereafter and submit a pointwise reply of the compliance, for consideration of the Commission.</p>		
21	<p>Revised Building plans in respect of addition/alteration in Motel (Silver Oak) plot on Khasra no. 63/8/2 Min, 63/13 63/17 Min, 63/18 Min at Mundka Village, NH-10.</p> <p><i>(conceptual stage)</i></p>	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded directly by the architect (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The Commission approved the building plans proposal for additions/alterations at its meeting held on February 09, 2019 specific observations were given. The revised proposal for additions/alterations was approved in the meeting of the Commission held on September 25, 2019.</p> <p>3. The Commission did not approve the revised building plans proposal for additions/alterations at its meeting held on March 16, 2021 and specific observations were given.</p> <p>4. The revised building plan proposal for additions/alterations received (online) at conceptual stage was scrutinised along with the replies submitted by the architect in response to the observations of the Commission communicated vide DUAC observations letter no: OL -12032123007 dated 18.03.2021 and following observations were given:</p>	Not accepted, observations given.	The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.

		<p>a) Attention of the Commission was drawn to the various provisions as stipulated under prevailing Master Plan for Delhi 2021 related to Motels etc. enumerated as under:</p> <p><i>“.....Motels (with sanctioned plans as on 07-02-2007 or whose proposal of Motel has been acceded to, 3{(including all such proposal of motels which were in process of examination or matter challenged in the court of law or having approval in files from DDA or 1[concerned municipal body] or not acceded to due to enforcement of MPD-2021 on 07.02.2007 are also eligible for sanction)}, which are in Commercial Areas or proposed Facility Corridor in Zonal Development Plans and Other use Zones).....”</i></p> <p>5. Taking into consideration the facts brought to the notice of the Commission, it was, accordingly, decided to request the architect/ proponent to furnish all the details related to previous sanction/NOC for completion plan of the proposal prior to 2007, if any, and any other information deemed fit, along with existing site conditions including drawings and photographs of existing structure and landscape, tree details etc., only then the proposal shall be reviewed and observations/comments be given by the Commission.</p>		
C. Additional Items:				
1.	<p>Building plan for additions/alterations in respect of the Indian Institute of Public Administration on plot no-5B, I.P. Estate, Ring road, New Delhi</p>	<p>1. The proposal was forwarded by the North DMC (online) for consideration of the Commission.</p> <p>2. The building plan proposal for additions/alterations (demolishing the existing auditorium and proposing an academic block) received (online) at formal stage was scrutinised and following observations were given:</p> <p>a) The Commission observed that the existing building was constructed in the year 1954 situated among the various building blocks of identical forms, shape, architectural elements etc. and located in a prominent area of the New Delhi.</p> <p>b) The Commission desired that the proposal cannot be studied in isolation i.e. it needs to be reviewed in conjunction with the surrounding facilities, therefore, 3D views of the site shall be superimposed with the existing context of the surroundings including road networks, structures</p>	<p>Not approved, observations given.</p>	<p>The Commission decided to take action in the matter without awaiting confirmation of the minutes of the meeting.</p>

		<p>around the site, for better understanding of the proposal in the actual environment to make it clearer.</p> <p>c) Also, the submitted site photographs do not clearly indicate the required details. An appropriate number of site pictures shall be provided. They need to be submitted with proper uncut views from all the sides.</p> <p>d) An appropriate number of annotated site photographs clearly showing the existing site conditions, including the existing buildings on the site, be given to understand the extent and the type of existing construction.</p> <p>e) Since, the proposed building is located among the various existing buildings having similar forms, elevational/architectural features, etc. It was suggested that the character of the proposed building be contextual to the surroundings.</p> <p>f) The stilt area of the proposed facility can be used for common activities such as cafeteria, sit-outs etc. as it would be easily accessible for the users. The option of basement can be explored for accommodating the parking, currently proposed in the stilts.</p> <p>g) Glass has been used extensively on the North-East façade. Its use shall be reduced and understanding of its cleaning mechanism and other maintenance issues shall be mentioned in the proposal.</p> <p>h) Considering the scale and size of the lecture halls, the provisions made the lifts, lobby and toilets shall be relooked at including internal fixtures arrangements and the layout in the toilets.</p> <p>i) Sustainability features shall be as per point no. 7 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on the DUAC website at www.duac.org.</p> <p>j) All service equipment at the terrace should be properly camouflaged (in terms of the point nos. 10, 11 &12 of the CPAA (Criterion for Project Assessment and Approval) available on DUAC website at www.duac.org.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		3. The architect was advised to adhere to the above observations and furnish a pointwise incorporation/reply.		
--	--	---	--	--

The following were present at the Meeting of the Commission held on Thursday, April 08, 2021 from 03.00 PM onwards:

1. Shri Ajit Pai, Chairman, DUAC
2. Prof. Dr. Mandeep Singh, Member, DUAC
3. Shri Ashutosh Agarwal, Member, DUAC