

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 16th Meeting of 2014 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 17th December 2014 at 09.30 am.

- Present:**
- Mr P Origo (Chairman)
(Town Planner)

 - The Hon Dr J Garcia (DCM)
(Deputy Chief Minister)

 - The Hon P Balban (MTTT)
(Minister for Transport, Traffic and Technical Services)

 - Mr H Montado
(Chief Technical Officer)

 - Mr G Matto (GM)
(Technical Services Department)

 - Mrs C Montado (CAM)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

 - Mr C Perez (CP)
(Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History Society)

 - Mr J Collado (JC)
(Land Property Services Ltd)

 - Mrs J Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)

 - Mr C Viagas (CV)
(Heritage & Cultural Agency)

 - Mr W Gavito
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)
- In Attendance:**
- Mr P Naughton-Rumbo (DTP)
(Deputy Town Planner)

 - Miss K Lima
(Minute Secretary)
- Apologies:**
- The Hon Dr J Cortes (MEH)
(Minister for Environment & Health)

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

Dr K Bensusan (KB)
(*Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History Society*)

Mr J Mason
(*Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar*)

Approval of Minutes

783/14 - Approval of Minutes of the 15th meeting of 2014 held on 27th November 2014

The Commission approved the Minutes of the 15th meeting held on 27th November 2014 subject to the following amendments in bold:

Minute 711/14 – Page 2

CAM said that the black and white colour scheme was adopted in the 1900s **as in the 1800s military properties were often painted in blue (i.e. the Blue Barracks) or mustard as it was considered that ‘white was bad for the eyes’**. However, she said that although fairly recent, the black and white colour scheme has become traditional for ex-MOD quarters.

Minute 719/14 – Page 11

CAM said that the Heritage Trust values the improvements being made to the hotel and the attempts to break up the impact on the views. CAM also said that they would concur with the recommendations made by the Chairman in his report with regards to the WW2 monument. She said that they are most concerned about **development into** area 3.

Minute 720/14 – Page 14

CAM highlighted that the Development Plan refers to the importance of preserving old buildings **and their setting in the old town**.

Minute 726/14 – Page 21

DTP also said that the Heritage Trust wants the site to be recorded before works commence to ensure that architectural features, **such as significant fire places**, on site are retained. DTP said that the Heritage Trust has congratulated the applicant on their proposal **which retained much of the character of the building**.

Minute 733/14 – Page 26

CAM said that the Heritage Trust would have requested that the extension be **set back**.

Matters Arising

784/14 – BA10830 – Lucas Imossi Motors Site, Waterport Circle – Proposed 18 storey building comprising ground floor commercial and residential over

DTP reminded the Commission that the proposed revisions were approved by the Commission at the previous meeting except for the filling in of the gap at the top of the building, as the Commission considered that not having a setback between the buildings would make the development appear overly massive. DTP said that an alternative scheme has been produced.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

The Commission welcomed the architect, Mr Chan.

Mr Chan told the Commission that they have revisited the building elevations and come up with the idea of putting more vertical emphasis on the building to break up the massing. He said that they have introduced a projecting element to the building and changed the colour of the materials on the balconies which are now white instead of blue. He also said that although the building appears to be taller than the others, it is the same height. Mr Chan also said that by changing the design, they will be able to make use of the roof.

JC asked what the vertical poles are made of. Mr Chan said that they would be powder coated metal or concrete.

JC said that his worry was that maintenance of the building will eventually be passed on to the management company and that it will be neglected if maintenance is too costly. Mr Chan said that the vertical columns can be maintained from the balconies.

The Commission did not have any further questions and thanked Mr Chan.

JH said that it would be useful to have details on the renewable energy sources that will be used. The Chairman said that this has to be provided as part of the planning process.

The Commission approved the revised design.

785/14 – BA13165 – 10 Naval Hospital Road – Proposed alterations/extension of existing building to include alternative access to current property, extending of garage, addition of extra room above garage and new terrace

DTP said that the proposal is to create a garage within the building by constructing over the existing car port. He said that a terrace will also be created over the garage. DTP advised that the design has been revised and the render colour toned down. He also said that the colour of the garage doors has been changed, the balustrades have been substituted with railings and the windows on the east and south elevations have been changed. DTP said that there is already a mixture of building types in the area and that the architectural style of this development has a modern approach.

JH said that the revised design is not very different to the original plan.

The Chairman said that the architect does not want to detract from Merlot House, Vineyards and Rosia Steps House at the rear, hence the architectural style adopted.

CAM said that the Heritage Trust is concerned that this building will have an impact on the entrance into Admiral's Place. She said that although the design has been toned down, it is still box-like and could be further improved. CV concurred with CAM.

JH said that the development would degrade the aesthetics of the area. She said that it is necessary to maintain space between buildings and that therefore, she would not support this

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

application. She asked whether any objections have been received from residents of the area. The Chairman said that no objections have been received.

CAM said that the difficulty which the Heritage Trust has with this application is that they do not object to the extension but have reservations on the chosen architectural treatment. She said that other than putting a pitched roof on the extension, there are not many changes that can be made. She said that a pitched roof would result in the removal of the terrace.

The Chairman said that the applicant has confirmed that they have been liaising with Land Property Services with regards to the overhang of the staircase over Rosia Steps.

JH asked what the height from the staircase to the steps is as Rosia Steps are used regularly. DTP said that the staircase would not be near to the steps as these turn before you get there. The Chairman said that they would require approval from the Landlord.

The Commission took a vote on this application with the following result:

3 in favour

2 against

6 abstentions

The application was approved subject to the colour scheme and architectural details being addressed and a pitched roof being introduced.

786/14 – BA13252 – Units 1Y & Z Casemates Square – Proposed refurbishment and fit out of bar/restaurant and external alterations

DTP told the Commission that the applicant has submitted a revised application as the Commission did not consider that their original application was sympathetic to the area. DTP said that two options have been provided:

1. A covered external terrace with a pergola and green roof. DTP said that the structure allows for the existing trees to be retained. He said that it will be a simple pergola to reduce possible obstruction of the views of the building.
2. A more modern canopy in the form of a ‘tree’. DTP said that this will cause minimum interruption of views.

DTP also told the Commission that the boundary wall will be limestone clad with glazed panels with the restaurant name on every other panel. He also said that the first floor terrace has been reduced and the rear patio store has been removed from the scheme.

DTP advised that from a planning point of view there are some concerns with the treatment of the 1st floor terrace and the scale of the signage.

DTP also said that Land Property Services has confirmed that HMGOG has not consented to the terrace on the first floor from a Landlord point of view. He also said that they have confirmed that the rear patio is not part of their lease and that they only have a right of access to the toilets. DTP also said that HMGOG has not approved the proposal to demolish a wall to provide access to Grand Battery or permission for tables and chairs, as works will be carried out to the Northern Defenses.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

DTP said that the Ministry for Heritage has advised that the revised proposal is more acceptable and said that they prefer the more modern approach. They have also commented on the scale of the signage. DTP said that the Planning Department concurs with the comments made by the Ministry for Heritage.

DTP said that the modern canopy reduces the visual impact and said that from a planning perspective this option would be recommended. DTP also said that they would not have any objection in principle to the proposal for the first floor terrace but that it could benefit from the introduction of a glazed balustrade. DTP also suggested that signage should be reduced.

CAM said that the Heritage Trust concurs with the comments made by DTP.

DCM said that previous concerns have been addressed and that he prefers option two.

MTTT said that the Department of Environment has not received a copy of the building application and that energy efficiency methods should be considered.

CV said that he concurred with comments made and that the magazine at the rear of the premises could be used. CV also suggested that perhaps individual lettering could be used for the signage.

JC asked whether railings have been considered instead of glass panels on top of the dwarf wall. The Chairman said that during a site visit it was suggested that either railings like those in Casemates Barracks or glass panels could be used. JC said that glass will give it a more modern look. DTP said that the glass panels will provide wind protection.

GM asked whether assurances have been received confirming that they will not request permission to fully enclose the canopy with screens in the future. The Chairman said that they do not have confirmation from the applicant but that in order to do so they would have to revert with a new application.

The Commission approved option 2 (modern design) with clear signage. Town Planners to work on the design of the signage with the applicant.

787/14 – BA13341 – 58/3 Engineer Lane – Proposed construction of summer lounge and utility room to roof terrace

DTP said that the Commission previously refused the construction of the extension right up to the front of the building and requested that it be set back. DTP said that the applicant has set back the extension by 1 metre as requested and constructed a parapet wall which is more in keeping with the streetscape.

The Chairman confirmed that a meeting was held on site with the Government structural engineer and the agent. He said that the structural stability of the building is not a major concern and that the setback will not adversely affect the structural stability of the building. He said that once the extension has been setback, this will be checked by the structural engineers.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

CV highlighted that these works were carried out unauthorised and that there is no evidence that the wall is not susceptible to wind loading and will not be structurally affected.

The Commission approved the revised application.

Major Developments

788/14 – Ref 1281/48 – Eastside Marina Breakwater

DTP advised that the Commission is to consider the scoping opinion prepared by the Town Planner which was circulated to members prior to the meeting. He said that the project is to construct a marina break water and that it is part of a larger project. DTP said that it will comprise either caissons or rock construction. DTP also said that the design is being assessed for transboundary impact and that the developers are working towards there being no impact.

JH said that the ESG agreed with the general assessment regarding discussion on the impact on the sea bed and water flow. She asked whether the Commission will be privy to the reports on the assessments made.

DTP said that the usual consultees will be consulted on the results of the assessments carried out. He also said that the reports are publicly available and that an EIA assessment certificate will be provided.

JH also said that the previous assessment (an earlier EIA) for Sovereign Bay highlighted that there would be a need for manual cleaning of the waters at Eastern Beach as the large reclamation would impede the waters ability to ‘self-clean’, and that this should also be highlighted here. She said that it would be useful to have information on how the land based project will be developed.

DCM said that the land site went out to tender with specifications on what the Government would like to see developed in the area. He said that 18 applications were received which were narrowed down to 7.

JH asked whether the tender bids received are for the entire plot. DCM said that some are for part of the plot and others for the entire plot.

The Commission approved the EIA scoping opinion.

789/14 – BA12850 – Rosia Bay – Redevelopment for leisure uses

DTP said that at the beginning of the year the Commission indicated that the proposal was acceptable subject to an EIA being carried out. He said that the proposal includes a refurbishment of the mole including rock armour; introduction of mooring; haul in and out; extension to beach; construction of a bar/restaurant and a water park. DTP said that the scoping opinion was circulated to members prior to the meeting.

JH said that the ESG has raised an issue with regards to the assessment of the road use above Rosia Bay especially during the summer months. She said that mitigation has to be scoped in at

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

this point. JH said that TSD has also highlighted this issue. JH also highlighted that if the stadium development were to proceed at Europa Point, this would be another access point. DTP confirmed that an assessment on road use has been included in the scope together with cumulative effects.

The Commission approved the scoping opinion.

790/14 – BA13338 – Eurotowers south plot, Europort Road – Proposed 12 storey building including two levels of commercial space to match adjacent development

DTP reminded the Commission that in October 2010 permission was granted for the construction of an 11 storey building to be used as a data centre. He said that development never started and that more recently a 5 storey development was approved for the same site. However, DTP said that a new application has been received for a 12 storey residential building.

The Commission welcomed Mr Dominic Harvey the applicant's architect.

Mr Harvey told the Commission that the footprint remains the same but that the applicant has set back the building to the same position as the existing façade. He said that a new landscaped area with pool has been included in the proposal. Mr Harvey said that parking will be provided in the existing car park. Mr Harvey advised that the ground floor will be designed for commercial units. He said that there will be 9 apartment levels with a penthouse on top and that the layout of the apartments can be changed if required. Mr Harvey said that they will be using current materials but which will provide a similar look to the existing buildings. Mr Harvey also said that the apartments have been designed to have secondary rooms next to the existing building and that louvers will be installed on balconies to provide added privacy. He also said that solar panels will be installed in the roof and that electrical vehicle charging points will be provided.

The Chairman asked Mr Harvey what car ratio the existing car park can accommodate and whether they will be landscaping the pool area. Mr Harvey said that they will be providing one car parking space per apartment. With regards to the landscaping, Mr Harvey said that it is an existing grass area and that it will be maintained as a green area with trees and planting.

GM declared an interest as a resident of Eurotowers. GM said that the residents of Eurotowers are not objecting to the proposal but want clarification as the footprint of the building projects over certain boundary lines. He questioned whether the plans provided are a real representation of the actual footprint.

CP asked what the function of the green area is at the moment. Mr Harvey said that it is the access to the landscaped area and commercial units. He also said that the refuse area would be moved to the south side. The Chairman said that they would need to rethink the relocation of the refuse storage area as it would not be possible to access it via the public car park nor lead to any reduction of car parking.

DCM highlighted that this is the same plot which was going to be developed into a commercial building, which was smaller in scale and for which there were previous objections. Mr Harvey

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

said that the advantage of having changed to a residential scheme is that there will be less privacy issues as the residential building will have less glazing and smaller openings.

The Chairman confirmed that written objections have been received from residents of Eurotowers. Mr Harvey said that one objection was on the height of the development; he said that it will be the same height as the existing buildings and that it is acceptable in terms of the Development Plan policy. Mr Harvey also said that they will be improving the amenities of the residents by providing a pool and landscaped area which will also be available to residents of Eurotowers. Mr Harvey said that a second objection referred to the previous proposal for a data centre. He said that the revised proposal is smaller and that the issue of overlooking has been addressed by having smaller windows and incorporating visual screening by installing timber louvers on balconies.

DCM said that he was concerned that the previous application caused some controversy and that the developer has now reverted with plans for a larger building. Mr Harvey said that fewer objections have been received in respect of this application and that he can only assume that it has been better received.

JH asked whether the pool/garden area will be available to the public. Mr Harvey said that the pool will be available to all residents and that it will possibly be available to people using the commercial premises, for example if these are occupied by a restaurant.

MTTT said that the developer has addressed the matter of electrical charging points and solar panels. However, he said that the Department of Environment has also requested that they incorporate swift boxes. Mr Harvey confirmed that they will look into this. MTTT also raised concerns about the relocation of the bin store and said that this should not affect the parking spaces in the public car park.

The Commission did not have any further questions.

DTP told the Commission that 3 objections have been received from residents. He said that objections are based on loss of light, views, privacy, disturbance during construction, loss of value and increase in traffic.

From a planning point of view DTP said that it is an area of high-rise development and therefore, the scale would generally be acceptable. He also said that the architectural style would be acceptable in this area. DTP said that there will be some loss of open space although it is not clear whether this area is well used at present. He said that 3 trees will be lost but that new ones will be planted and a landscaped area will be provided. He said that street planting and seating will also be introduced.

DTP said that the Heritage Trust has not raised any concerns from a heritage point of view.

DTP also told the Commission that although this proposal is higher than the previously approved application, it is more acceptable at this location than in other areas. He said that there will be a distance of 9 metres between the existing building and the new one, which is a large gap in terms

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

of privacy. He also welcomed the introduction of vertical screening to minimise any potential overlooking. DTP said that there are no planning objections to the proposal. However, he said that the relocation of the bin store should be reconsidered. He also said that the developer has to ensure that the car parking requirement is met.

JH said that although the reclaimed land was set to be developed, it does not mean that it is necessary to develop on every open space. She said that it is important for urban planning to include areas for community use.

JC highlighted that when the previous proposal was considered, there was controversy with regards to the height and that this is a higher building. He questioned how many more luxury developments Gibraltar needs. He also said that the parking at the rear of Eurotowers has already been used as an argument for previous development. The Chairman said that the applicant would have to satisfy the requirement by providing a plan showing the allocation of parking spaces per residential unit and commercial spaces.

HM raised concerns over the issue of parking availability if the existing parking has already been allocated. The Chairman said that they have satisfied the requirement in their submission. DTP said that parking provision for the existing buildings was provided within Eurotowers itself.

The developer confirmed that the car park behind Eurotowers is currently used for monthly rental car parking. He said that part of the car park will be designated to the new development and the other part will continue to be public. He also said that the area of the pool is not currently used by anyone and that it will be put to better use.

JH said that during a site visit the developer had given assurances that the green area at the rear will be preserved and that the development would be set back from the road.

JC suggested that a site visit might be useful before the Commission proceeds to take a decision on this application. The Chairman said that he did not feel that there was a need to hold another site visit as the location was well known.

CV said that he was swayed to approve the application as areas for community use have been developed near to this area, for example Commonwealth Park and Governor's Parade. He said that the Development Plan highlights this area as an area for high-rise development. He also said that he did not consider that the difference in height to the previous application is significant. He did feel that some details have to be checked.

JH said that open areas need to be maintained within densely populated areas. She said that it is important to protect heritage but also livability.

The Chairman said that this area was planned for development and that residents knew that they were moving into an area of high-rise development. He also said that the public were able to come forward to comment but that only 3 objections were received under section 21.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

GM was asked whether residents had been notified. He said that residents were notified by letter but that the content of the letter does not go into specific details. He said that they had not been notified under a Section 21 notice. The Chairman said that it is a burden to have to notify over 700 residents but that it has been the practice to issue the Section 21A notices on residents' Committees and their respective management companies for them to act on behalf of residents. GM read out the letter sent to residents by Bentleys Management Ltd. He said that there is no mention in the letter of what the building will be in terms of height and massing.

The Commission took a vote on this application with the following result:

5 in favour

0 against

5 abstentions

The Commission approved this application.

791/14 – BA13354 – Devil's Tower Hostel, Devil's Tower Road – Proposed demolition of existing worker's hostel building complex to allow for new hotel and apartment block including access/delivery road

DTP explained that this application involves the demolition of the existing workers' hostel. He said that the proposal is for a hotel development with some residential apartments. He said that a 6 storey building will be constructed including 30 apartments and 40 car parking spaces within the building. He said that the hotel ground floor will have a hotel lobby, reception and commercial units. The common areas of the hotel including a bar and meeting rooms will be on the first floor level. The upper floors will be hotel rooms. DTP also said that the car park frontage will mimic the frontage of the Devil's Tower Road car park. The hotel frontage will be glazed and a mix of materials and colour will be used to break up the massing. DTP also advised that laybys have been included off Devil's Tower Road and on Halifax Road, and that a service road will be created at the rear of the hotel through Halifax Road.

DTP said that one objection has been received from a resident of the building at the rear on the basis that the new development will cause a towering effect, loss of light and dust and noise during construction.

DTP advised that the Department of Environment has commented on their usual requirements on dust control, energy performance, refuse facilities, 5% of the site to be landscaped, provision of electrical charging points and swift boxes.

DTP also said that the Ministry for Heritage and the Heritage Trust has requested that an Archeological Watching Brief is carried out.

DTP said that the Traffic Commission has objected to the layby on Devil's Tower Road as it is a dual carriageway and they are trying to limit the amount of entrance and exit points on to it.

From a planning point of view, DTP said that the project is generally welcome as the area will become more prominent once the tunnel is completed. He said that the proposal is generally in line with the Development Plan. However, he said that there are concerns regarding the treatment of the frontage of the apartment building on the car parking levels and that the planners would

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

like to discuss possible improvements with the applicants. He also said that they welcome the introduction of planting. DTP recommended approval.

JH asked whether the Development Plan advocates industry and hotels in the same area. She said that at present this area is industrial and that mixed use is a concern. She concurred with comments made by the Traffic Commission as Devil's Tower Road is already a busy road. JH also questioned whether there is a need for so many hotels in Gibraltar.

DTP said that the Development Plan highlighted the area of Devil's Tower Road as an area to be improved in general in terms of frontage. He said that the general use of the area is already commercial with residential premises above. DTP said that access and congestion would be improved by providing a link road through Halifax Road.

The Chairman reminded the Commission that planning permission was granted to Stagnetto Ltd to construct a new warehouse. The Chairman also said that mixed uses in some areas works well.

DCM welcomed the development in comparison to what exists at this site at present. He said that it is positive that people are willing to invest in hotels in Gibraltar as there is a demand. He also said that the previous administration was about to approve proposals for various hotels in this area.

CP disagreed with the removal of the layby on Devil's Tower Road as he said that taxis will stop in the middle of the road to drop of customers and create tailbacks. He said that this will cause health and safety issues. The Chairman said that the hotel entrance will be on the northern end.

Mr Jason Cano confirmed that the entrance to the hotel will be on the northern corner and that access will be from either Devil's Tower Road or Halifax Road. He also said that there will be a layby on the other side of the hotel for coaches. He said that the layby in front of the hotel was designed only for taxis.

MTTT said that he would be in agreement with the layby on the side of the hotel. He said that cars would not be allowed to stop on Devil's Tower Road to collect or drop off passengers. Mr Cano said that taxis will be able to use the side layby.

JC said that the footprint of their land is wider than the land included in their proposal. Mr Cano said that the plot is in line with the access road at the rear of the building and that they have had to include an access road within their boundary. He said that if the access road can be outside their boundary, they would have no issue in using their area to provide parking spaces.

JC suggested that the layby should be larger so that it can accommodate more vehicles arriving at the hotel at the same time.

MTHT suggested that perhaps the car park frontage could be a green wall. Mr Cano said that they will consider this.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

The Chairman said that a condition of the permit would have to be to not allow the layby on Devil's Tower Road.

The Commission approved this application with this condition and the requirements forwarded by the respective consultees and the external appearance of the multi-storey car park incorporating a green wall.

792/14 – BA13383 – Naval Grounds Reclamation Road – Proposed mixed use development comprising of multi storey car/coach park, residential, office and commercial and associated car parking and ancillary facilities

The Commission welcomed Mr Mark Roberts and Mr Jimmy Garbarino.

Mr Roberts said that they are applying for full planning permission for phase 1. He said that pedestrian wind comfort reports have been carried out and mitigation measures proposed. He also said that a traffic survey has been carried out and that although there will be an increase in traffic, it will not have a significant impact.

Mr Roberts said that phase 1 will involve the construction of two 13 storey buildings; Building A on the south east corner of the site and Building B on the south west corner. He said that the buildings will be on either side of the park. He also said that ground level areas will be accessible by raising the parking and enhancing pedestrian routes through courtyards. He also told the Commission that commercial and retail spaces will be provided and that access and the use of the area around the city walls will be improved.

Mr Roberts advised that the designers of Commonwealth Park have been commissioned to design the park. He also said that Building A will relate to the angular bastion walls and that Building B will be different with large balconies on the west façade. Mr Roberts said that they will be implementing a solar powered centralised system; recovery of waste heat; LED lighting; rainwater harvesting; and high performance windows. He suggested that the development will encourage investment and vibrancy in the heart of Gibraltar.

The Chairman asked for details on the roof of the car park for the private development. Mr Roberts said that there will be a pool and landscaping on the roof.

The Commission did not have any further questions.

DTP told the Commission that the Director of Civil Aviation has not objected to the proposal subject to lighting of cranes and buildings and a study being carried out to demonstrate that glazing will not cause any glare. If there is glare, non-reflective glazing has to be used.

DTP also advised that the Department of Environment requires dust control measures; energy performance measures; landscaping; provision of details of plant species; incorporation of swift and bat boxes; provision of electrical charging points; and the introduction of renewable technology.

DTP said that the Heritage Trust has not raised any objections.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

DTP also said that the GRA has highlighted that the tall buildings could affect radio networks and therefore, the developer should accommodate the possible installation of antennas.

DTP said that the incorporation of a palette of materials and colours fits into the town area. He welcomed the introduction of courtyards and the park. DTP also said that they have suggested to the developer that they consider incorporating public art in the courtyard and that the developer is keen on this. DTP confirmed that the applicant has provided information on sustainability measures, as well as a wind study and mitigation measures which include the incorporation of awnings on ground levels and balconies. DTP recommended approval.

The Commission approved this application.

Other Developments

793/14 – BA12379 – 6 Hospital Steps – Proposed opening of bathroom window

DTP informed the Commission that an objection has been received from a neighbour as the new bathroom window would encroach on to their property. DTP also said that this is a retrospective application. He said that the window is on a high level and obscure glazing has been used. DTP said that there are no planning objections as the issue of encroachment would have to be addressed between the two parties.

The Commission approved this application.

794/14 – BA13026 – 4 Orchid House, The Clifton's, Europa Road – Enclosure of ground floor terrace

BA13355 – 1 and 2 Orchid House, The Clifton's – Enclosure of ground floor terrace

The Commission considered the abovementioned applications simultaneously.

DTP informed the Commission that this is a retrospective application as a number of arches have been enclosed with glazing to close off terraces. He said that the reason why these have been enclosed is because residents were having problems with dust and noise from construction works in the adjacent site. DTP said that there are similar enclosures in the area for example in the ex-Naval Hospital building; he recommended approval.

CAM said that the Heritage Trust would not have supported enclosing the arches in this way. She said that the arches in the adjacent buildings have been closed due to the specific use of the building. CAM said that the issue of dust and noise would be over once construction is finalised.

DCM said that the building will look odd if some balconies are enclosed and others are not.

CV said that the balconies of the adjacent building had to be made safe due to the facility user. He said that if the applicants were only proposing to install glass curtains there would be some consistency. However, he said that it is not possible to control what curtains people place behind the glazing and that this is what makes it look inconsistent.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

DTP said that he understood the requirement to make the hospital balconies safe for users but that if the Commission refuses this application and the applicant appeals, from a planning point of view, it will be very difficult to defend it on the basis of visual impact.

JC asked why it is not possible to condition them to only glazing and no screening. The Chairman said that the Commission cannot condition them to having no curtains or to only having specific curtains.

CV highlighted that what is influencing the Commission in their decision is the blue curtains which have been installed by one of the applicants. However, he said that this is not within the Commission's powers.

JC questioned why it is not possible to control the colour of curtains if the Commission can control canopies. DTP said that the installation of curtains does not require planning permission.

CAM asked whether the glazing will be removed once works on the adjacent site have been completed. The Chairman said that if this is a condition of the permit they would have to remove it.

The Commission refused both applications.

795/14 – BA13322 – La Rotunda, 4 – 16 Winston Churchill Avenue – Demolition of a section of the site boundary to create a new egress from the site, including sliding gate and security controls

DTP advised that this is a retrospective application and that works have been stopped. He said that the proposal is to remove a section of the boundary wall and create vehicle access from the Western Beach area which would be controlled by a barrier. DTP said that the idea is that customers of the supermarket could make use of the Western Beach car park when the Eroski car park is full. DTP said that customers would exit directly on to Winston Churchill Avenue from the car park. He advised the Commission that although the opening was boarded up when works were stopped, this has been removed in the past few days, contrary to what the applicant agreed to.

DTP also said that the Traffic Commission was unable to comment until HMGOG has completed the car parking arrangements for the area.

DTP said that TSD does not have an objection to the proposal subject to no impact on the access to the beach.

DTP advised that the Director of Civil Aviation has objected as the road which leads in and out of the Western Beach car park is a single lane with two-way traffic and therefore, would not be fit for purpose. He has also objected on the basis that the exit is on a blind junction with Winston Churchill Avenue. He has also highlighted that in the summer there are tailbacks onto the avenue and problems with vehicles accessing the road, with near incidents having occurred in the past. DTP said that the Director of Civil Aviation has requested that if approved, it should be subject

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

to the applicant installing a barrier at the junction with Winston Churchill Avenue to be controlled by Air Traffic Control.

DCM said that Government has not approved this request from a Landlord point of view. He said that Government has spoken to the applicant about extending the supermarket but that there is already pedestrian access to the beach area which people can use.

The Commission refused this application on traffic grounds and following recommendations made by the Director of Civil Aviation.

796/14 – BA13339 – 6 Sandpits Views, Sandpits Road – Proposed removal of pavement

DTP told the Commission that the proposal is to remove the pavement as there is insufficient parking in the garage area. They intend to create further parking spaces and to do so, would need more space between the pavement and existing parking spaces.

DTP said that a letter has been received from residents withdrawing initial objections to the proposal as the Management Company has explained why this is required. The Management Company has agreed to provide a demarcated area for pedestrians as an alternative, although it would not be a structure as such.

DTP also told the Commission that a Health and Safety Report submitted by the applicants has confirmed that the removal of the pavement is not a concern as traffic volume within the estate is low.

From a planning perspective, DTP said that the proposal to provide a demarcated area for pedestrians could work but that it seems a retrograde step to remove something that was designed for pedestrian safety.

The Commission approved this application.

797/14 – BA13344 – Sir Herbert Miles Road – Proposed creation of a new one storey building housing a shop, takeaway and ancillary facilities

DTP reminded the Commission that a similar application was received previously but that it was refused due to its design and on the basis that it was extending into the natural coastline. With regards to this location, DTP said that the car park in front of the proposed site is licenced to the residents of Both Worlds and therefore, this could be an issue.

DTP advised that two options have been proposed:

1. A building located against the boundary wall which would entail the removal of this wall. The building would be on the edge of the footpath and pedestrian access will be retained in front (west) of the building. A tables and chairs area with a pergola would be placed alongside the premises.
2. The building would be the same but shifted to the curb line and pedestrian passage would be at the rear (east) of the building.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

DTP said that the Department of Environment has commented on the requirement for dust control, energy performance, refuse and landscaping. He said that they have also raised concerns about the nature of the use as it could generate traffic and waste being discarded in the area. DTP said that a survey has shown that there will not be any impact on heritage.

DTP also said that the Ministry for Heritage has recommended that a more holistic approach should be adopted for this area.

DTP said that the Traffic Commission has objected to the proposal due to the loss of parking spaces.

From a planning perspective, DTP said that there is a concern that the proposal will result in development of a sporadic nature. He said that this area of natural coastline is gradually being eroded. DTP recommended refusal on the basis that it will remove open areas and due to the proposed architectural style not contributing to the general environment of the area. DTP also said that the pavement will be reduced by allowing tables and chairs within the public promenade. DTP said that this proposal could set a precedent and lead to further enclosures.

DCM thought that this proposal is an improvement on the original and said that he would prefer the promenade behind the building so that views can be enjoyed.

JH said that the ESG completely objects to the denegation of the natural coastline. She said that a proposal for a similar proposal at Camp Bay was rejected on the basis that it would break up views and on the issue of waste and creating a precedent.

The Commission took a vote on option 2 with the following result:

1 in favour

8 against

1 abstention

The Commission refused the application.

798/14 – BA13345 – 1 Camp Bay – Proposed enclosure and kitchen extension

DTP told the Commission that the proposal is to enclose an open pergola area and create a one storey extension to extend the kitchen. DTP said that the extension would be done in the existing barbeque area and that there will not be any loss of trees. He also said that the existing canopy will be replaced with a framed structure, sandwich panel roof and awnings.

From a planning point of view, DTP said that whilst there are no concerns with the proposed kitchen extension there are concerns over the proposed enclosure as it would enclose part of the public promenade and could possibly lead to the removal of direct access through this area. DTP also said that the applicant is proposing a more permanent structure and that it would be preferable to maintain a more seasonal structure.

DCM highlighted that the DPC has previously taken the decision to allow a more permanent structure at the bar further to the south of Camp Bay. He said that there needs to be an element of consistency.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

JH said that this area is a throughway and that the character of this area will be altered by allowing a more permanent enclosure. She said that the bar already has inside space and a terrace area. JH also said that she does not have an issue with the extension and that the applicant has done a lot in terms of green areas around their premises.

JC said that it seems that the applicant is trying to increase their floor space during the winter by enclosing their external area. JH said that the restaurant is never full and therefore, the need to enclose the external area cannot be justified.

The Commission approved the kitchen extension. The Commission rejected the proposed enclosure and requested that the applicant submits revised designs for an enclosure allowing public access.

799/14 – BA13346 – 14 St Christopher’s Court – Proposed internal and external alterations including extension and swimming pool

DTP said that the proposal involves internal works, a 2 storey extension and a pool on the east side. DTP said that the applicant is proposing to extend the property up to the retaining wall on Europa Road. He said that the proposed pool would result in the loss of a communal landscaped area. DTP said that the extension will have the same architectural style, finish and windows. DTP also advised that the new boundary wall will be a masonry wall with railings above.

DTP told the Commission that TSD has highlighted that the 2 storey extension would be too close to the retaining wall and that they would object to the proposal unless a 1 metre gap is maintained for future maintenance.

DTP said that LPS has not raised any objections.

From a planning perspective, DTP said that the extension is acceptable subject to the applicant meeting TSD requirements. He said that they would object to the loss of a communal landscaped area although no objection has been received from the management company. DTP said that although the area requested is not used at present, it is part of the common areas and that the proposal would result in the loss of landscaping.

The Chairman suggested that the Commission allows the construction of the pool with the applicant being required to submit a landscaping proposal. The Chairman confirmed that Sections 19 and 21 had been complied with .

The architect who was in the audience, highlighted that the retaining wall is staggered and therefore, the distance of 40cm is not realistic to the retaining wall element. He said that it would be 40cm from the base of the retaining wall.

JH said that the Commission has previously sought to preserve green areas in comparison to allowing pools and that allowing this would be a retrograde decision.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

The Chairman said that perhaps the applicant could be encouraged to preserve the green area whilst still constructing the pool.

The Commission approved the internal alterations and agreed that the applicant should provide revised designs for the construction of a pool within his existing land and that the two storey extension is set back from the retaining wall.

800/14 – BA13347 – 2a Castle Steps – Proposed swimming pool and works to terrace and porch areas

DTP advised that part of the boundary wall to this property collapsed during a storm. He said that the proposed works would be in a later extension to the property which is in poor condition. He also said that the applicant is proposing to construct a swimming pool with a glazed boundary treatment.

DTP said that the Heritage Trust has requested an Archeological Watching Brief.

DTP said that from a planning point of view there would be no objection to the glazed panels on the boundary wall as the building is set back. He said that the glazing can be seen from the road but that glazing has been introduced in other areas of the upper town, including Castle Ramp and John Mackintosh Wing. DTP said that there are no planning objections to this proposal.

The Commission approved this application.

801/14 – BA13348 – 3 Jasmine House, Waterport Terraces, North Mole Road – Installation of glass curtains

DTP advised that this is a podium level flat and that the proposal is to enclose the balcony with similar shutters to those on the higher level flats. DTP said that the reason given for this proposal is to provide security to the apartment.

DTP said that the proposal would change the character of the building and would set a precedent. DTP said that the balconies are a feature of the ground floor and that they are an integral part of the architecture. DTP also said that if security is a concern, a trellis could be installed on the side of the balcony which is easily accessed from outside. DTP recommended refusal of this application.

JC suggested that glass curtains might be a better option.

The Commission refused this application and suggested that the applicant considers frameless glass curtains as a solution.

802/14 – BA13349 – 34/36 Parliament Lane – Proposed flue extension

DTP said that the proposal is to extend the flue which serves the restaurant at ground level through the inner light well. DTP said that the proposal is for a free standing flue and that machinery would be enclosed.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

DTP told the Commission that the Environmental Agency has been consulted due to the proximity of the flue to the adjacent property. He said that there is some concern that fumes might penetrate the building. DTP said that the Environmental Agency recommended that the flue should be above the ridge line height. This would mean that it would exceed 4 metres in height and would have to go through public participation. DTP also said that the flue should look more like a traditional chimney.

The Commission deferred this application to allow the above matters to be raised with the applicant.

803/14 – BA13351 – GJBS, Mons Calpe Road, North Mole – Installation of ‘sample’ car stacker – HMGOG Project

DTP said that the proposal is to install a car stacker as a sample to test the concept. He said that it will be used for GJBS vehicles. DTP said that on the basis that this is only a pilot project, planning would not raise any objections. DTP advised that the only concern is that they are industrial in character and that this is the main entrance into Gibraltar for cruise passengers. DTP said that it might be better to have these within structures, such as the one that has been installed at No 6 Convent Place.

JH asked how long the pilot study will last. The Chairman said that no details have been provided.

DTP said that the Director of Civil Aviation has advised that if the car stacker causes problems with glare, mitigating measures should be introduced. However, he said that no problems are envisaged.

The Commission did not have an issue with this application.

804/14 – BA13362 – 10 Governor’s Street – Proposed conversion of window into new access with ramp – HMGOG Project

This item was deferred as requested by the applicant.

805/14 – BA13371 – Loreto Convent School, 13 Europa Road – Proposed construction of multi-purpose hall with classrooms underneath and roof top play area

DTP informed the Commission that outline planning approval was granted in February 2014. He said that changes have been made to the proposal including the removal of a balcony and widening of the sports hall which now overhangs the classrooms. He said that the benefit of this overhang is that it will provide shade to the classrooms. DTP also said that the car park on Engineer Road has been removed and that the area to the rear of the sports hall has been landscaped. DTP also advised that the architectural character has been improved by using a light grey limestone type cladding with timber paneling to break up the massing. DTP also told the Commission that a living wall has been introduced in the north and south facades. He said that 3 trees will be lost but that 6 new ones will be planted. DTP also said that rain water harvesting and swift nests will be introduced. DTP advised that the fence to the playground on top of the sports hall has been removed and that a curtain system will be introduced and used when

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

necessary; this will have less visual impact. DTP said that there are no planning objections to the revised proposal.

CP asked whether details on the composition of the living wall have been provided. DTP said that it would be a condition for the species type to be agreed prior to installation.

JH asked which trees were being removed and was advised that they were Jacaranda Trees. She asked whether trees have been assessed. DTP said that comments from the Department of Environment have not been received.

DCM said that this is an example of a project which has been improved and will result in good use of the space.

The Commission approved this application.

805/14 – BA13378 – Devil’s Tower Camp – Proposed officer’s mess – HMGOG Project

DTP said that construction will be on a site which was previously occupied by MOD housing. He said that this is part of the agreement for the reprovision of MOD facilities. DTP said that the building will be constructed on the north-east corner of the site and that it will be a mixed single and 2 storey building.

DTP advised that the Director of Civil Aviation has not raised any objections.

DTP said that the Department of Environment has commented on their usual requirements for dust control, energy performance, refuse provision and swift boxes. The latter point should be cleared with the Director of Civil Aviation.

CAM requested an Archeological Watching Brief.

The Commission had no other comments on this application.

806/14 – Ref 1225 – DPC policy – Subcommittee delegated powers

DTP advised that in the paper circulated to members prior to the meeting, the Subcommittee asked the Commission to consider the possibility of affording them additional delegated powers. DTP summarised the additional powers requested which include:

- Small scale external alterations that are not considered to have any significant visual impact;
- Changes of use that are not considered to have any significant impact;
- External alterations to a building or group of buildings where the principle of the external alterations has already been approved by the DPC;
- Construction of domestic swimming pools;
- Subdivision or amalgamation of residential, office or retail units.

JH asked whether the rationale for including construction of domestic swimming pools in the Subcommittee section was because people were avoiding applying formally for permission for said construction because of lengthy delays in the process. She said that a key issue is when a project

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

affects green/planted areas. DTP said that some applications do not pose any issues with green or communal areas even if there is public participation. JH said that she was sure that the Subcommittee will handle this well as long as the interest of environmental green areas is maintained.

DTP suggested amending the description of powers so that pools can be considered by the Subcommittee if they are to be constructed in patios but should be referred to the Commission if they are within a green area. The Commission concurred with this suggestion.

The Commission approved the request to extend the sub committee's powers subject to its comments on swimming pools proposed on green areas being determined by the Commission.

807/14 – Ref 1537 – Europa Pass Battery – In principle view on removal of timber framing to west elevation

DTP said that this is an in principle request from the residents for the removal of the timber frame structure on the west façade.

JC said that this matter needs to be considered carefully as it is not certain whether there is an element of structural support in the frame. He said that if approved it should be subject to confirmation.

The Chairman suggested holding back this request and consulting Building Control. He said that if it is confirmed that there is an element of structural support in the frame, the applicants would have to revert with mitigating measures.

The Commission approved the principle of the removal of the frames subject to confirmation that there were no structural concerns.

Minor and other works – not within scope of delegated powers

808/14 – Ref N012/14 – Europa Estate – Removal of tree

The Commission refused the removal of the tree and recommended root surgery in accordance with the tree assessment undertaken.

809/14 – BA13210 – 15 Governor's Parade – Proposed refurbishment of existing property including installation of a three person lift

The Commission approved this application with a condition to improve the appearance of the façade.

810/14 – BA13333 – 11/2 South Barrack Road – Proposed timber terrace decking over mono-pitched roofs

The Commission approved this application.

811/14 – BA13350 – Unit 6E, 27 Castle Road – Proposed change of use from commercial unit to garage

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

The Commission approved this application.

812/14 – BA13360 – HM Naval Base, Gun Wharf, Queensway – Proposed refurbishment of stone building – HMGOG Project

CAM said that the small guardhouse could have been included in the scheme and repaired. HM said that the small guardhouse is not part of project Houston and is being retained by the MOD. The Chairman suggested that this could be raised at the interface meeting on conservation and other matters meeting with the MOD and HMGOG in January/ February 2015.

WG said that instructions are that it cannot be demolished but that there is no use for it.

The Chairman agreed to forward recommendations made by the Heritage Trust to the MOD.

The Commission approved this application but that the existing tree should be retained.

813/14 – BA13361 – 327 Main Street – Proposed conversion into offices including alterations and single storey extension

The Commission approved this application.

814/14 – BA13364 – Windmill Hill Signal Station – Provision of a new standby generator facility within a new building – MOD project

The Commission had no comments to make on this application.

815/14 – BA13366 – Gib Oil Forecourt, Line Wall Road – Proposed metal enclosure on forecourt to provide emergency backup power to the Primary Care Centre – HMGOG Project

The Commission had no comments to make on this application.

816/14 – BA13379 – Devil’s Tower Camp – Proposed remodeling of PRMC building’s 1st floor with addition of 5 new windows and external staircase – HMGOG project

The Commission had no comments to make on this application.

817/14 – BA13381 – Devil’s Tower Camp – External renovation to match adjoining SLA4, installation of new windows and doors within existing openings and internal alterations – HMGOG Project

The Commission had no comments to make on this application.

Applications granted permission by sub-committee under delegated powers (For information only)

818/14 – BA12694 – 9 Poca Roca, Upper Rock – Revised design

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

819/14 – BA12865 – 4 Scud Hill – Revisions to approved roof

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

820/14 – BA13008 – Buffadero Battery, Windmill Hill Road – Relocation of mobile antenna and installation of additional mobile antenna

JH requested clarification that there will only be one antenna as their planning application was for one antenna and not two, as mentioned in this application. She said that if there is more than one antenna, it should be submitted as a separate application.

DTP confirmed that they are proposing to install two antennas.

WG said that they do not have permission from the MOD yet as the MOD is waiting for advice on this matter.

The Commission asked the Chairman to request further information on this matter.

No permit would be issued until this matter was resolved.

821/14 – BA13230 – 151 Main Street – Proposed new advertisements

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

822/14 – BA13266 – 49 Rosia Dale – Conversion of roof space to form a store room

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

823/14 – BA13317 – 248 Main Street – Proposed change of use from Class A3 to A1

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

824/14 – BA13325 – 16 Rosia Court, Rosia Road – Proposed loft conversion and installation of timber staircase

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

825/14 – BA13329 – 15 Europa Pass Battery, Europa Road – Proposed internal alterations

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

826/14 – BA13334 – 1 Carter House – Application to construct new bathroom window on rear façade of building

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

827/14 – BA13336 – Suite 9.1 Europort – Proposed internal alterations

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

828/14 – BA13337 – 4 Trafalgar Road – Replacement advertisements

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

829/14 – BA13340 – 27/28 Tilbury Court – Proposed conversion of two flats into one

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

830/14 – BA13343 – 9 Europa Pass Battery, Europa Road – Proposed refurbishment

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

831/14 – BA13357 – 741 Europort – Proposed internal alterations

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

832/14 – BA13370 – 2 Rosia Cottages, Rosia Road – Proposed replacement of windows

The Commission noted the approval granted by the sub-committee.

Addendum

833/14 – BA13289 – 1 Eastern Beach Road – Proposed demolition of existing beach bar and construction of three storey boutique hotel

DTP advised that this application was deferred at the last meeting. He said that the proposal is to construct a 12 bedroom boutique hotel with a restaurant and terrace area. DTP said that it was deferred to allow HMGOG the opportunity to discuss other possibilities relating to this development. He said that HMGOG and the applicant have not been able to agree on any other option in terms of location.

DTP told the Commission that the applicant has produced revised elevations in which he takes into account comments made by the Commission. He said that more fenestration has been introduced following concerns raised by the Commission, who thought that the idea of creating a beach front promenade would be affected by this development. DTP said that the existing building already obstructs the concept to a certain extent but that the hotel development would make it more permanent and create a precedent.

JH said that it is a shame that an alternative site has not been found. JH also stated that she and the ESG were firmly in agreement with the Town Planners assessment and recommendations at the time of application to refuse this change of use request on numerous grounds.

DCM said that there is a history behind this issue and that given that the land is leased to the applicant, the only option is they either keep the existing premises or the Commission approves the proposed development.

The Commission welcomed the applicant Mr Jimmy Ellul and his architect Mr Daniel Rios.

Mr Rios told the Commission that HMGOG and his client met but that they were not able to agree on a different location. He said that they have introduced more glazing in the design to reduce visual impact. He said that the MOD requires that they use anti-glare glazing and that this might restrict visuals slightly. Mr Rios also said that they are trying to open up the ground floor level.

Mr Ellul said that they either retain the existing building or construct the proposed one. He said that views are already obstructed and that the matter has already been discussed in the past and

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

that there is no other choice in location. Mr Ellul said that they have been at this location for 12 years and that they have a 24 hour licence to operate, which is why they are worried about issues that may arise due to the proximity of the new residential units. Mr Ellul confirmed that if successful in their application, he will hand in his 24 hours licence and they will not cause any nuisance. He said that they will not be taking up any extra area to what they have now and that the height of the development will be the same as the car park.

DCM said that he shared the concern about possible nuisance to the housing estate. He said that it is up to the DPC to balance these concerns with planning views.

CV said that he preferred the revised design and that although he shares the Planners' views, he is not concerned about this development creating a precedent.

JC said that it is a pity not to widen the pavement if this development is approved. He said that he personally does not like the proposed colour scheme.

Mr Rios said that they could relocate the hotel entrance or push the site out onto the beach in order to increase the width of the footpath. Mr Ellul said that they can shift the building onto their terrace which is part of their leased area.

DTP asked whether there is scope to shift the building northwards. Mr Rios said that it depends on whether HMGOG grants permission for this.

HM confirmed that the roads will not be affected by this development.

DCM said that the issue is that they have the lease for that area and that even if it were moved; it would still have to be a beach front location. DCM said that the Government is not willing to buy them out.

Mr Rios suggested that if most members are keen to approve the proposal, they could do so with conditions. He said that they can look into shifting the building but that he is worried that if they continue to make changes without approval, his client will have to invest more without any certainty.

The Commission took a vote on this application with the following result:

7 in favour

1 against

3 abstentions

The Commission approved this application subject to the developer incorporating the wider pavement and access points into the scheme.

834/14 – BA (not available at the time of the meeting) – Ex St Christopher’s School, Europa – Proposed works to accommodate new University – HMGOG Project

The Commission welcomed Mr Chris Riddell.

Mr Riddell introduced himself as the project manager and said that he is working with a team of professionals on the requirements of the university. He said that the location is the old St Christopher’s School, the Defensible Barracks and the so called Bomb-proof House. He said that the buildings have an element of decay and been subject to vandalism. He also said that they will be respecting heritage requirements in the refurbishment of these buildings. Mr Riddell told the Commission that the team of professionals came up with requirements which they then put to the industry. He also said that they have obtained advice from a UK consultant.

Mr Riddell said that the proposal maximises the use of the area in between the buildings by creating an atrium. He said that they will be preserving the garden at the rear. Mr Riddell also told the Commission that they will be preserving the traditional features of the old buildings. He said that the design allows for functions to be held within the building in the evenings and in any weather. Mr Riddell said that the ground floor will house the primary lecture rooms, refectory and the laboratories. He said that the university will have 4 faculties; the Health and Sports Studies faculties at the top end of the building and the School of Hospitality at the bottom end. Mr Riddell also said that they will have a training kitchen on top of the refectory. He added that an administration area has been included in the designs. Mr Riddell also said that there will be a restaurant with views of the bay, which may serve as an observation point. He said that the restaurant will be run by students. There will also be two receptions; one for visitors and another for students.

Mr Riddell confirmed that it will be possible to see the stonework and brickwork of the roof. He said that all walls which create a modern aspect will be demolished and replaced with glass. He also said that they will be preserving the courtyards and green areas and that the central lift and balustrading will be glazed.

The Chairman asked where the main entrance to the actual building is. Mr Riddell said that it will be on the eastern elevation.

DTP asked whether there is connectivity between both sides through the car park. Mr Riddell said that the university will expand eventually but that at the moment they have kept to the footprint afforded by Government.

JH said that the university will require outdoor facilities such as sports pitches. Mr Riddell said that there is a vast area of open space in this area.

DTP asked whether studies have been carried out on sustainability. Mr Riddell said that basic elements have been incorporated and that everything is low energy; for example efficient heat energy and LED lighting. He also said that the issue is that they model everything on the UK but that given that here it is a warmer climate he does not consider that it would be energy efficient to dry line the entire building.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

JH asked for clarification of a comment made by Mr Riddell during his presentation about how the restaurant could service the likes of the stadium. Mr Riddell stated that he had made a mistake. JH asked whether they will incorporate renewable energy systems into the early planning stages. Mr Riddell said that the building will allow for energy efficient measures to be incorporated. He said that for example solar panels could be installed on the flat roof of Bomb proof House. He said that infrastructure will be laid so that it may be adapted.

The Chairman said that energy efficient measures should be included in the design as the Commission requires this from the private sector.

MTTT said that the Department of Environment would encourage an A rating in energy efficiency, zero energy lifts, natural ventilation, electrical charging points, wind energy and solar thermal energy efficient measures.

Mr Riddell said that they have looked into wind measures.

CP said that they need to take into consideration bird migration and visual impacts. He said that if the height is reduced it might not affect birds.

Mr Riddell said that they need approval from the Commission as the university needs to be finished by 1st August 2015.

CV commended the project. He said that he would remove the castle-like entrance. He said that in terms of energy performance, it is already positive that they are recycling the building. CV said that the environment in this area is aggressive and that the weathering of the building has to be taken into account. He also said that the acoustics of the building need to be considered if they are exposing the stonework and that this can be done using carpets. CV also said that he does not foresee light pollution as an issue but that they should consult the lighthouse on the restaurant and whether it may have any negative effects. CV also said that air-conditioning ducting and equipment should not be seen outside the building.

Mr Riddell confirmed that they will install the air-conditioning elegantly by suspending them rather than breaking walls to try to hide the equipment.

CAM said that the concept is well thought and positive to conservation. She requested that plans are provided to the Heritage Trust. CAM questioned whether it would be a good idea to have an exposed seating area for the restaurant given the inclement weather in this area. Mr Riddell confirmed that the restaurant will also have an internal seating area. He said that it is not geared to be a fully functional commercial restaurant.

The Commission did not have any further questions.

The Commission did not have an issue with this application subject to recommendations being taken into account.

Approved
DPC meeting 16/14
17/12/14

Any other business

836/14 – BA13397 Marina Bay Development

The Chairman said that the public participation period ran over the Christmas period when the Town Planning offices will be closed and therefore the public would not be able to view the application. The Commission has the discretion to allow late representations and, he therefore asked the Commission to allow the closing date for public submissions to be 9th January 2015.

The Commission approved the closing date of 9th January 2015.

837/14 – REF: 1225 Voting system

CP highlighted that at the last meeting the Commission was directed to split the decision for an application by considering part of the application and not the other, whereas for other applications they are forced to consider the application as a whole. He said that the application for the Caleta Hotel, for example, should have been submitted as two applications and that he did not consider that it was right for the Commission to split the vote.

The Chairman said that the voting system is not cast in stone and that the Commission tries to work on a fair basis.

838/14 – Jumpers Bastion

JH highlighted that the fencing at Jumpers Bastion has not yet been fixed as agreed at a previous meeting when she raised this issue. She said that this matter should be addressed.

839/14 – BA13083 Ex- Risso Bakery site, Engineer Lane - Proposed hotel

JH asked whether there is a lead time from demolition to construction.

The Chairman said that this is currently going through the Building Control process.

840/14 – BA12124 The Sanctuary, Engineer Road - Residential development

JH requested an update on this development.

The Chairman said that he would report back to the Commission on this in January 2015.

841/14 – Next meeting

The Commission agreed to next meet on Wednesday 28th January 2015.