

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 10th Meeting of 2015 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 3rd September 2015 at 09.30 am.

- Present:**
- Mr P Origo (Chairman)
(Town Planner)
 - The Hon Dr J Garcia (DCM)
(Deputy Chief Minister)
 - The Hon Dr J Cortes (MEH)
(Minister for Environment & Health)
 - Mr E Hermida (EH)
(Technical Services Department)
 - Mr G Matto (GM)
(Technical Services Department)
 - Ms D Smith (DS)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)
 - Dr K Bensusan (KB)
(Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History Society)
 - Mr C Russo (CR)
(Land Property Services Ltd)
 - Mrs J Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)
 - Mr C Viagas (CV)
 - Mr W Gavito (WG)
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)
- In Attendance:**
- Mr P Naughton-Rumbo (DTP)
(Deputy Town Planner)
 - Mr Christopher Key (CK)
(Assistant Town Planner)
 - Miss K Lima
(Minute Secretary)
- Apologies:**
- Mr H Montado (HM)
(Chief Technical Officer)

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

Mrs C Montado (CAM)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

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

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

Approval of Minutes

508/15 – Approval of Minutes of the 9th meeting of 2015 held on 26th August 2015

The Chairman advised that the approval of the Minutes would be deferred as some members who were present at the last meeting were not present at this meeting and would be unable to comment. He said that comments and approval will be considered by round robin and if there were any clarifications these would be considered at the subsequent meeting.

Matters Arising

509/15 – BA13356 – Unit 28 Eaton Park – Proposed construction of a rest and changing facility

DTP told the Commission that the applicant has confirmed that they will be removing the unauthorised structure rather than carrying out a Geotechnical Survey as requested by TSD. DTP said that the Town Planning Department will monitor this to ensure that the structure is removed.

510/15 – BA13424 – 15 Gardiner’s Road – Erection of new passenger lift and ancillary items

DTP advised that the applicant has requested that their application be deferred so that they can meet with other residents of the area to discuss and address issues. This matter was carried forward.

511/15 – BA13514 – 4-10 Police Barracks Lane – Proposed townhouse development of 8 residential units

And

BA13637 – Police Barracks, Castle Road – Proposed 3 studio apartments as a replacement for previously approved basement area

DTP said that the Commission refused the previous application for 4-10 Police Barracks Lane which was for the construction of a two storey extension. DTP said that issues raised at the previous meeting related to overdevelopment, massing, and overshadowing. DTP told the Commission that a revised proposal has been submitted by the applicant which removes a whole storey from the original submission and provides a flat roof instead. A cantilever on the west side has also been removed. DTP said that the revised proposal introduced two gaps into the building to break up the massing and provide vertical circulation. He said that the proposal is for 8 one bedroom flats with a green roof.

The Commission welcomed the objector Mr Jason Cisarello.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

Mr Cisarello told the Commission that he represents Decor Construction (developer of Police Barracks) and 13 future residents. Mr Cisarello said that the revision does not go far enough to address their concerns. He said that the exact height of the extension has not been specified but that it will affect the apartments on the lower floor of their development, as well as the arches on the west façade of Police Barracks. Mr Cisarello highlighted the high historical value of Police Barracks, especially the arches, and said that they object on the basis that this development will have a negative effect on breathing space and openness of their development; it is against the Development Plan 2009; and it is out of character in the area. Mr Cisarello said that 4-10 Police Barracks Lane is only 1.4m away from Police Barracks and that the proposed extension would affect 25% of his development. Mr Cisarello highlighted privacy issues as there would be windows directly in front of balconies and bedroom windows of Police Barracks. Mr Cisarello also said that the Development Plan refers specifically to the preservation and importance of the arches at Police Barracks and said that obstructing them would be contrary to Development Plan policy. He added that views of the building from the town area will also be affected. Mr Cisarello also told the Commission that the applicant refused to defer their application to allow further discussions with Decor Construction and to try to come to an agreement.

MEH said that Mr Cisarello has focused on the negative aspect of the proposed development claiming that the views of future residents of Police Barracks will be affected. However, he said that the view of others will be improved since the area which is now neglected will be improved.

The Chairman said that Mr Cisarello refers to the Development Plan and suggests that the proposal will be out of character. He asked Mr Cisarello why he considered that the proposal will not fit into the streetscape.

Mr Cisarello said that allowing the proposal to proceed would set a precedent and that only the existing bungalows should be refurbished.

DS said that the Heritage Trust would prefer low rise buildings with pitched roofs. She said that almost all of the buildings around this one have pitched roofs and that this affords them a vernacular feel. She said that just because something will be new it does not mean that it will be an improvement.

KB concurred with DS. He said that he is almost always in favour of green roofs but that in this location it is important to maintain important swift populations and therefore, a pitched roof would be more suitable.

The Chairman asked Mr Cisarello why he considers that the arches will be destroyed as they would still only be visible from the lane beneath.

Mr Cisarello said that the entire visual aspect of the arches should be retained.

JH said that the revised application is better than the original but suggested that perhaps it could be further improved.

The Chairman said that at present in order to see the arches one has to walk into the narrow lane and look up. He said that it would be the same regardless of having the extension or not.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

Mr Cisarello claimed that the arches on the lower floors are visible from the town area.

CV reminded Mr Cisarello that the Commission wanted them to preserve the arches when they first presented their proposal for Police Barracks, whilst the developer wanted to demolish parts of the building. CV thought that the revised proposal is an improvement from the original. CV said that perhaps it is not viable to fix the bungalows as they are. He also said that he is not convinced by Mr Cisarello's arguments and that rights to light are civil issues and views are not protected.

Mr Cisarello said that he is referring to urban renewal concepts which have been suggested for the upper town area. He said that urban renewal is not just about redecorating but about creating spaces which people can use and identify with. He said that they have designed Police Barracks with this in mind. Mr Cisarello said that developers should not repeat mistakes of the past; Police Barracks being an example as it did not have internal toilets or open spaces. He said that it is important to embrace the building and create something that people want and require.

The Chairman told Mr Cisarello that he has submitted an application for 3 studios on the ground floor of Police Barracks Lane yet in these he seems not to have any issues of privacy. The Chairman said that those studios were originally proposed as stores.

Mr Cisarello said that they decided to convert them into studios as the previous proposal did not work.

CR asked whether it would be possible for both developers to discuss issues and come to an agreement. Mr Cisarello said that they approached the developer asking them to defer their application so that they could have the opportunity to meet but although they were happy to meet, they did not want to defer.

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

The Commission welcomed Mr Jonas Stahl representing the applicant.

Mr Stahl said that this is an outline application and that his client welcomes comments from the Commission to improve on their design. With regards to points raised by the objector on breathing space and light, Mr Stahl said that they inherited the narrow lane and have tried to take comments on board by reducing the size of their development significantly. He said that reducing the size of their development has a commercial effect. Mr Stahl said that he does not agree that their proposal is contrary to the Development Plan. He said that he does not feel that the view of the lower floors of Police Barracks would be affected as they are not currently visible from any angle other than the lane below the building. Mr Stahl also said that there are other taller buildings in the vicinity, some of which are 4 to 5 storeys high. Mr Stahl said that he has tried to take a photo of the arches but that the only place from where he has been able to take the photo is the top floor of the O'Callaghan Elliott Hotel. With regards to privacy issues, Mr Stahl said that this cannot be avoided due to the narrowness of the lane but said that they have reduced the number of windows on the east elevation and maximised the number on the west elevation. Mr Stahl also said that they have introduced gaps between their buildings which allow views through their development. Mr Stahl also said that the objector refers to parking provision but that there is no road access to their development so parking is not possible. He added that his client would be willing to have a

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

pitched roof to maintain character of the buildings but has not included this in their proposal to maintain the height of their development to a minimum. In relation to the comments that his client refused to meet with the objector, Mr Stahl said that they submitted their application and that it is up to the Town Planner to decide when the Commission considers it.

DTP asked Mr Stahl whether the applicant would consider installing fixed glazing and/or obscure glazing on the east elevation at the southern end of the building in order to address the issue of privacy. Mr Stahl said that they would consider this but that they are limited by the footprint of their site. He said that the distance of 1.4m is measured at the narrowest part and that he believed that in most places there is a distance of 1.7m to terraces and a further metre to actual windows. He said that it actually sounds worse than it is.

JH asked whether there is a minimum distance that should be kept between buildings. DTP said that there is not a stipulated limit in relation to privacy and that the Commission must use its discretion when considering the issue.

Mr Stahl highlighted that the current building has a pitched roof and therefore, views are already affected. He said that the proposed extension is not substantially higher than the top of the existing pitched roof.

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

The Chairman suggested that the Commission should consider application BA13637 at this point in the meeting.

The Commission welcomed the architect for Police Barracks and Mr Cisarello.

The Architect told the Commission that following further investigations they have decided to create 3 studio apartments as a replacement for the previously approved basement area. He said that they did not know whether this would be possible due to the definition of the arches, hence why they originally proposed the lower level as storage. He confirmed that internally the existing structure is in a good condition and that they will be using natural ventilation and tanking. He also said that they will be creating two entrances for the three apartments from Police Barracks Lane.

CV suggested that they are doing exactly the same as the other application, which they are opposing to, by creating three apartments directly behind and near to a building that is already there.

Mr Cisarello said that they have moved the living areas of the three apartments to the back of the property and added a balcony so that windows are further away.

The Chairman said that people that move into the upper town area expect to be in close proximity to others as it is a close-knit urban settlement.

Mr Cisarello said that he accepts that the existing building in front of his development has to be refurbished but that an additional storey is not necessary. He said that the apartments on the ground floor of his development are already there and they are just refurbishing them. He added that by allowing extra floors on the property in front of his issues would be increased.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

CV thought that by converting the units on the ground floor from storage to residential, the developer of Police Barracks is increasing privacy issues.

The Commission did not have any further questions and thanked Mr Cisarello and his architect.

Regarding BA13514, CV said that in his point of view pitched roofs are not traditional of all buildings in the town area as some original buildings have flat roofs. He said that he is generally happy with both proposals.

MEH said that with regards to BA13514, he can understand the argument that views from the apartments proposed in BA13637 will be lost. However, he also said that by reviewing the original proposal and converting stores to residential units, the applicant of BA13637 is going against their own objection raised in respect of BA13514 as they are placing apartments directly behind an existing building. MEH also said that green roofs have become a precedent in some Government buildings and that although pitched roofs might be more traditional in the town area, flat and green roofs would be better.

The Commission took a vote on application BA13514 with the following result:

7 in favour

0 against

4 abstentions

The Commission approved application BA13514.

MEH said that the applicant should be conditioned to providing swift nests. The Chairman said that this is a condition in all applications.

DS suggested that the applicant could be asked to consider more obscure windows and to offset these.

The Commission also took a vote on BA13637 and unanimously voted in favour of the proposed studio apartments and approved the application.

512/15 - BA13633 - Unit 16, Waterport Terraces - Proposed fit out of vacant shop/office and new vehicular access

DTP reminded the Commission that the Commission raised concerns at a previous meeting with regards to vehicular access being permitted in a pedestrian area. He said that the application was deferred so that the Management Company could confirm that they will be able to police this and to clarify land issues.

DTP said that it has been confirmed that the Headlease only covers part of the area.

DTP advised that TSD recommends that the views of the Traffic Commission should be obtained prior to approving vehicular access.

From a planning perspective, DTP said that there is no concern over this application other than the vehicular access. DTP said that the area is a pedestrian area and vehicular access should not be permitted. He said that the area was only designated to be used by emergency vehicles, refuse

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

collectors and one disabled resident who has a special concession. DTP added that when the development was first designed, the agreed solution was that commercial units would be serviced from the garage; DTP thought that this position should be maintained.

CR asked whether the Management Company has commented. DTP confirmed that they have no objection to the proposal.

DS asked whether there is a service area in the garage. DTP said that at the last meeting JC confirmed that there is no space within the garage as all parking spaces have been allocated to residents. CR confirmed that there is no space within the garage and suggested that perhaps the Management Company would prefer commercial units to be serviced from outside.

Mr Stahl (architect representing the applicant) told the Commission that there is a doorway at the rear of the unit but that the two parking spaces on either side of the doorway have been allocated to residential units. Mr Stahl said that the Management Company is satisfied with their proposal as most of the affected area is public area and not within the Lease owned by them. He said that they already have a permit which allows access for one vehicle at a time into this area. Mr Stahl said that prior to accepting the Lease, his client insisted that vehicular access was essential for their business and a permit was issued before completion of the Lease.

CR recalled that the applicant requested permission from the Traffic Commission to access the road. Mr Stahl said that they have a permit for one vehicle with no time stipulated on the permit. He said that the vehicle is a small van and that they only carry out deliveries twice a day during working hours. Mr Stahl also told the Commission that there is nothing in the area to prevent vehicles from entering.

JH asked whether the new public bus service will pass along this area as this seemed to be highlighted in plans. The Chairman said that he was not aware of this and that in the original scheme this area was presented as a pedestrian zone. EH clarified that although this was presented in the traffic plan, the situation has been reviewed and at present the bus will not pass through this area.

DS said that areas are often designed for a particular purpose such as a pedestrian zone and then there is a discrepancy between that and what is allowed. The Chairman said that this is something that has been identified in areas such as Waterport Terraces and Tradewinds and that designated areas are not being pinpointed on plans so that this situation does not reoccur.

DCM suggested that if the Commission is minded to approve the proposal, the Traffic Commission's views should be sought first.

The Commission took a vote on this application and unanimously approved it in principle subject to the Traffic Commission's recommendations.

The Chairman suggested limiting access to the same hours as vehicles are permitted in Main Street; that is up to 11am. The Commission concurred.

513/15 – BA13639 – Maunzell’s Winze, Admiralty Tunnel – Proposed additional jet fans along Maunzell’s Winze

DTP told the Commission that this application was approved in July 2015 but that after the meeting additional comments were received from the Department of Environment raising concerns that additional hot air would affect speleothem in the tunnel. DTP said that the Department of Environment consulted the GONHS Cave Unit who recommended that the decision be reconsidered and air expelled out of the tunnel. DTP said that the applicant has requested that the Commission defers a decision so that they are able to respond to the recommendation.

MEH said that this is a serious issue as the cave is a living thing and processes are ongoing. He said that it should be kept as natural as possible.

KB highlighted that two undiscovered species are present within Ragged Staff Tunnel and these could be affected.

The Commission deferred this application.

514/15 – BA13651 – 1c North Mole Road – Proposed refurbishment of office and workshop facilities

DTP advised that this application was previously deferred by the Commission as they requested further details on why they are proposing a blast proof wall. DTP said that the applicant has confirmed that the blast proof wall is for safety and that a letter explaining this was circulated to members prior to the meeting. DTP said that the wall will protect control rooms and allow them to meet health and safety regulations.

The Commission approved this application.

Major Developments

515/15 – BA13383 – Naval Grounds, Reclamation Road – Phase 1 of proposed mixed use development comprising multi-storey car/coach park, residential, office and commercial, and associated car parking and ancillary facilities

BA13736 – Naval Ground, Reclamation Road – Proposed mixed use scheme with residential, commercial, ancillary and parking areas

DTP advised that outline planning permission was granted and full planning would be submitted in phases. He said that BA13383 refers to amendments to the proposal for buildings A and B, and BA13736 refers to the proposal for building C.

The Commission welcomed Mr Jimmy Garbarino and Mr Mark Roberts.

Mr Roberts told the Commission that they are seeking full planning permission for buildings A and B and approval for the design and environmental measures for building C, including storm drainage and lighting issues. He also said that in their revised proposal they will be taking the park through the development. Mr Roberts said that building C will be located between building B and the car park. He explained that the ground floor will be commercial units, levels 1 and 2 car parking and residential above. Mr Roberts said that access will be permitted from the courtyard

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

onto Queensway. He also said that the design of the façade will be similar to phase 1 in order to have a coherent design. Mr Roberts advised that a detailed design for buildings A and B has been completed. He also said that the pool has been relocated to level 8 which is the roof of building C and that there will be a bridge link from other buildings, which will be landscaped. Mr Roberts also advised that minor amendments have been made to window designs and the roof of building B. He added that landscaping is a key feature of the development and that there will be an open courtyard with planting, trees and seating areas. Mr Roberts said that the landscaping theme will be continued throughout phase 2 and that the design concept will be continued in the garden at roof level. Mr Roberts added that they will be creating public open spaces and will be erecting a sculpture; the design of which will be decided through a public competition.

JH asked whether the landscaping would be visible from Line Wall Road. Mr Roberts said that the garden area will be in front of the bastion.

JH also requested details on the type of trees that will be planted at ground level. Mr Roberts said that the trees will be between 6 and 8 metres tall subject to planning approval. He said that trees will assist in dissipating wind. JH said that the Commission should be given the opportunity to view landscaping plans.

Mr Garbarino confirmed that they will be introducing public access to the roof of building E as was suggested by GM at a previous meeting.

Mr Roberts said that they have changed the profile of buildings C and D to lower them and break the façade on Queensway.

GM asked whether the architectural treatment of the car park will be continued throughout buildings B and C. Mr Roberts said that the mesh design will not be integrated throughout. GM thought that one building will be a monolithic structure whilst the others will look like traditional buildings. He suggested that some features could be followed to create a link between buildings.

JH thought that greenery is great to mask buildings but could not see how the landscaping would be appreciated by people on Line Wall Road since building A will be standing in front of it. Mr Roberts said that it would be visible since there is a split between buildings A and E. The Chairman said that it would only be visible from the Community Centre or Zoka Flank.

DTP said that there will also be landscaping on the east terrace of level 6 of building A.

With regards to the access road to the coach park, Mr Garbarino told the Commission that Government is dealing with this. He said that the bus stop would have to be moved from its current location due to turning circles and that plans in this regards have been sent to TSD.

JH requested information on renewable energy methods. Mr Roberts said that they will be having a centralised hot water system and energy recovery in offices. He said that design details have been included in their application. JH asked whether any solar paneling will be incorporated. Mr Garbarino said that they will have photovoltaic panels at the top of buildings A and B.

DTP advised that regarding landscaping the Department of Environment recommends semi-mature trees. He also said that there are no planning issues and that changes implemented

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

actually result in a reduction in massing whilst maintaining the same design. DTP recommended approval.

The Commission approved applications BA13383 and BA13736.

516/15 - BA13686 - Ex-Med Rowing Club, Glacis Road - Proposed new multi-storey car park (with additional dedicated areas for local residents & others) with eco vertical living green walls and photo-voltaic panels, with retail and commercial space on the ground and lower floors and modern elliptical shaped residential space above

DTP advised that he would not be dealing with this application since he lives opposite the proposed development. He said that documents related to this application were circulated to members prior to the meeting and that CK would be presenting the proposal.

KB declared an interest as Wildlife Gibraltar has been asked to produce the design for planting.

The Commission welcomed Mr Kevin Heaver.

Mr Heaver told the Commission that their application includes car parking, commercial retail premises and residential accommodation. He said that car parking facilities are being designed in association with HMGOG but that his client would like to request that if private purchasers do not wish to purchase a parking space, these can be allocated for use by the general public. Mr Heaver said that they are looking to provide the maximum number of parking spaces possible which is 591 spaces. 200 spaces will be for public use and the remainder for Ocean Village and local residents. Mr Heaver said that they have tried to make the building aesthetically pleasing and soften the impact by maintaining an active frontage on the west façade. He said that there will be independent units with their own access on the ground level. Mr Heaver also said that they will incorporate a wall of photovoltaic cells to generate renewable energy and will be introducing a living wall. Mr Heaver said that they are seeking advice on the appropriate species for the living wall.

With regards to the residential accommodation, Mr Heaver said that they have created a tower to provide a counterpoint. He said that it is structurally challenging to provide residential accommodation over a car park and that it is essential that they use an appealing form. He also said that recessing the building and the absence of hard angles reduces the massing. He said that the architecture will be contemporary to match Ocean Village and that the building will be environmentally friendly and extensive amenities will be provided at roof and deck level. Mr Heaver told the Commission that a total of 120 apartments will be provided, ranging from studios, 1, 2 and 3 bedrooms. He said that they seek permission to reconfigure layouts depending on demand. Mr Heaver said that the building has an iconic design and that it addresses and alleviates parking pressures in the area. He also said that the photovoltaic and living wall will be a first for Gibraltar.

Mr Heaver advised that they have consulted affected parties. They have met with St Anne's School, commissioned an Aeronautical Study and consulted the RAF. Mr Heaver added that the proposed building is lower than neighbouring buildings. He said that they have received numerous letters of support and no objections to date.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

JH welcomed the level of consultation for this project. She said that St Anne's school will be dwarfed by the development and will be affected by noise and vibration. She said that she expects measures to be taken during the works to minimise impact and address structural issues. JH asked Mr Heaver whether they are aware of any potential underground contamination on this site.

Mr Heaver confirmed that they have found evidence of contaminated soil and that their strategy will be to cap most of it and only remove some in a controlled manner. He said that they had originally considered building a basement level but that this was removed from the plans due to contaminated soil.

JH said that she is not sure whether they will be able to include all of the landscaping proposed on the plans as part of the area is public highway. Mr Heaver said that they might not be able to provide all of the proposed landscaping as there might be services running under the public highway but that they are considering extending planters to have a hanging green canopy.

DS asked whether research has been done on what used to be on this site in terms of archaeology. She recommended that an Archaeological Watching Brief should be carried out. The Applicant confirmed that an Archaeologist has been engaged and that they have met with the Government Archaeologist, Mr Kevin Lane.

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

CK told the Commission that the application was subject to public participation and that 7 letters of support were received as well as a petition supporting the application from tenants of Glacis Estate. He also said that the Director of Civil Aviation has removed his objection in part and will remove it completely subject to an Aviation Assessment being carried out.

The Department of Environment has commented on their standard requirements including dust control, energy efficiency and performance measures and landscaping.

The Ministry of Heritage requires an Archaeological Assessment to be carried out.

From a planning point of view, CK said that the composition of uses is in compliance with the previously approved scheme. He said that the only difference is the introduction of commercial units but that these would be acceptable. He also said that the height is comparable to that of surrounding buildings and that the massing and height of the car park is acceptable. The car park addresses the parking problem in the area. With regards to the green wall and photovoltaic wall, CK said that this provides an attractive and unique façade. However, he raised concerns on the massing of the residential scheme and suggested that the applicant could have presented various designs. He also said that the applicant has not provided photomontages showing the impact on views from certain sites and that this would have been useful. He added that whilst the development has many positive points, further dialogue with the applicant on the design would be recommended.

DCM said that following planning recommendations, he would not have any objection to the scheme in general terms. He agreed that the design is subjective and that each individual would have their own opinion. He said that personally he was happy with the design. DCM also said that he would prefer having tall buildings outside the city wall and welcomed the parking element as

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

there is demand for parking in the area. He said that the green wall is a novel concept and welcomed the idea, as well as the idea of having a green canopy over the pavement.

JH highlighted that she is not aware of the previous scheme as she was not part of the Commission at the time when it was considered. She said that it is important to safeguard quality of life and that the point made by the Planning Department on views is a valid one, as many views are being lost as a result of new developments. She welcomed the environmental aspects of this development but asked whether it could be lowered to minimise impact.

DS thought that the massing is excessive but acknowledged that it would be similar to other buildings in the area. She said that the Heritage Trust also prefers high-rise buildings outside the city walls. She agreed with JH in that the building will be a large block, almost impenetrable in terms of views. She also agreed that it would have been useful for the Commission to be presented with different design choices rather than a fait accompli.

MEH said that the applicant has gone to great lengths to design an environmentally friendly building. He said that the vertical façade with photovoltaic cells is a good proposal which should be followed by others. MEH thought that the development would look good from the Upper Rock and said that he would probably be supporting this application due to its environmental aspects.

CV said that high-rise buildings should be encouraged outside the city walls. He also welcomed the proposed environmental aspects and energy performance measures. With regards to views, CV said that high-rise buildings will always have an impact on views and that strategic views should be set by the Commission to ensure that these are preserved. MEH concurred.

DS asked where the entrance to the complex would be. The Chairman said that the entrance would be from the corner of Bayside and Glacis Road.

JH asked what the capacity of the current car park is. CK said that there are currently 76 car parking spaces. JH said that this is already a very busy road and that providing more car parking spaces will increase the number of vehicles in the area. CK said that a study has been carried out and that the car park will not generate a significant increase in vehicle movements.

The Chairman asked whether a pedestrian entrance to Glacis Estate will be provided. Mr Heaver confirmed that this will be provided.

The Commission approved this application.

Other Developments

517/15 - BA12509 - 2 & 3 Kavannah's Court - Proposed residential development and associated car parking

BA13600 - 10 Morello's Ramp - Proposed demolition of 5 storey building

DTP suggested that the abovementioned applications should be considered simultaneously.

DTP advised that BA12509 was already granted planning permission but that revisions have been made to the proposal as the applicant purchased the site immediately adjacent. DTP explained

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

that the main changes include the introduction of an additional level of car parking and a car stacker within the building. DTP said that ground, first and second floors will be car parking. He said that the number of apartments has been increased from 12 to 16 and the number of car parking spaces has been increased from 24 to 38. DTP advised that the approved scheme was for residential units on the second floor and that the revised proposal is for residential units from the third floor up. He said that on the third floor there will be 4 podium apartments and 1 studio. There will be 5 apartments on the fourth level, 2 apartments with a communal swimming pool and grounds on the fifth level, 2 apartments on the sixth level and one apartment on the seventh and eighth levels. The ninth floor will house the building's services. In total the building will be 9 storeys high and there will be an increase in the general height of the approved proposal. DTP provided photomontages submitted by the applicant.

DTP advised that the Ministry of Heritage has commented that although there are no archeological conditions, the number of storeys contravenes the height limit within the town area as the Development Plan refers to no more than 5 storeys.

DTP said that no objections have been received from the Heritage Trust.

DS said that she had not seen the revised proposal prior to the meeting hence why the Heritage Trust has not submitted any comments. JH said that the ESG had not seen the revisions prior to the meeting either.

DTP said that the revisions would have been sent to the departments that are part of the consultation process. He said that the most striking feature is the height of the proposed development and suggested that it is excessive for this setting. DTP said that the building should be assimilated into the landscape.

MEH thought that the building mass is excessive and that if permitted, it will be used as a reference point for future buildings. He said that he is not discouraging tall buildings in agreed locations but not in this area.

The applicant's architect, Mr Daniel Rios, told the Commission that the existing building which they intend to demolish is only one floor shorter than the proposed. He said that they have introduced communal areas at the back of the development to reduce height.

JH highlighted that when this application was previously considered, CAM said that the existing building was not in such a bad state and that it might be possible to refurbish it.

Mr Rios said that they arranged a site visit with CAM during which it was confirmed that the building is in a bad condition and unstable.

DS said that she has been informed that some storeys were added to the existing building in the 1940/50s and therefore, the building does not have any quality in terms of heritage. She said that the Heritage Trust would therefore not object to its demolition but do object to the revised proposal.

The applicant, Mr Mark Estella, told the Commission that they have excavated at ground level and lowered the ground by 10m which would make the building lower.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

GM said that the urban setting of the revised proposal will set a precedent. He said that there is a perception of building line and that the revised proposal breaches this. GM thought that the applicant is trying to create too many activities at podium level and that the height has been increased due to the loss of lower levels for other uses rather than residential.

Mr Rios said that the podium was originally on the second level of the car park. He said that since they have excavated, the building has been dropped down into the ground. Mr Rios also said that they have moved the apartments to the side to create an open area in the centre. Mr Rios added that the previous owner of the building claimed that he had planning permission to extend the building by one storey.

Mr Estella told the Commission that there used to be further residential units in the area which they have demolished. He said that there were around 15 to 20 squats which were built on a slope and therefore, had a similar effect.

The Chairman said that if they could distribute from the tower it would have a far less towering effect. Mr Rios said that the photomontage gives the impression of a towering effect but that it is set back.

CV said that the Development Plan should be followed and that it does not allow demolition of buildings within the town area unless there is a valid reason. He said that neither does it allow buildings which are over 5 storeys high. However, he said that the reality is that unless you are on a high floor of Leanse Place you would not be able to see this building. CV recommended removing one storey and said that the applicant should provide further photomontages as they have only provided one helicopter shot.

Mr Rios said that they can provide other views and 3D models.

CV said that a new building should be inspired by the old but that developers should not try to recreate and imitate vernacular buildings.

Mr Estella told the Commission that one of the positive factors of increasing the height is that they will be creating 20 car parking spaces for residents of the area who are not residents of the estate. He said that there are no sidewalks or parking in this area and that this deters people from wanting to live here.

DS said that the applicant is not a developer for altruistic reasons but that she does not consider that there is a meritorious reason for the Commission to overlook the height.

JH recalled that a proposal for a multistorey car park at this location was refused and that when the previously approved design was presented to the Commission it was considered that it was more appropriate for the area. She said that the approved design was much more in keeping with the existing building and felt that the Commission is being pressured to accept the revised proposal.

The Chairman said that there is no pressure on the Commission to take a decision.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

JH said that it would be wrong for the Commission to be forced to take a decision at this meeting as they had not seen the revisions prior to the meeting. The Chairman said that this is the case with many applications as the organisations represented by some members are not part of the present list of consultees.

DTP explained that the parking policy is a 1:1 ratio. He said that as a minimum they would have to provide 16 car parking spaces. DTP said that the Commission has sometimes imposed more parking spaces on developments outside the town area but that in town it is usually one parking space per apartment. DTP said that the applicant is overproviding in terms of car parking in both schemes and that parking for local residents was also part of the original scheme. In terms of height, DTP said that this is not set by the Development Plan but that the Plan does refer to anything above 5 storeys as a high building which needs to be justified.

DCM said that 20 parking spaces for non-residents is a public gain. He said that a photomontage from Leanse Place would be useful. He also said that the project is welcomed in principle as it would form part of urban renewal within the town area. DCM said that in terms of design it is up to individual taste whether you like it or not. He said that the question is whether the Commission wants to allow the last storey or not as it is this storey that makes it taller than the existing building.

DS asked whether a 3D model could be provided. Mr Rios said that they can provide a 3D model and that they have not been able to provide it on time for this meeting as the designer was on leave.

DS welcomed the fact that the town area is being regenerated and said that she respected the work being done by this company.

Mr Estella told the Commission that the stacker is new technology being introduced to maximise car parking space and said that the Government is keen to introduce these. He said that it may look bigger as it is shown in front of the building on the drawings but that is on excavated land.

DTP said that a 3D model would be useful in terms of considering visual impact within site context but said that it should also be considered within the wider landscape.

The Chairman asked the Commission whether they are minded to approve the proposed demolition. MEH said that this would be against policy since the applicant does not have approval for their revised proposal.

Mr Rios told the Commission that they would be willing to remove one storey in order to reduce the height.

CR referred to the plans submitted and said that he is not convinced that the proposed building is only one storey higher than the existing. JH concurred.

GM said that it may be best for the Commission to defer a decision until further information is provided.

CV said that the applicant has confirmed that they are willing to remove one floor.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

CR said that a revised proposal with the removal of one storey should be submitted as the Commission might still not deem it acceptable.

The Chairman suggested that the Commission should approve the revised design subject to changes to the design elements as proposed by the Commission. He said that information on height and character could be provided at the next meeting.

The Commission deferred a decision until further information and photomontages showing the height are provided.

With regards to BA13600, DTP said that one objection had been received and previously circulated to members, but that it was mostly based on non-planning issues related to the erection of scaffolding and protection of buildings. This application was also deferred pending a decision on BA12509.

518/15 - BA12974 - 9/1 Naval Hospital Hill - Request to replace existing windows

This item was deferred at the applicant's request.

519/15 - BA13126 - 13 Chicardo's Passage - Proposed redevelopment of building with additional storey extension

DTP advised that planning permission was granted in July 2014 but a revised proposal has been submitted which adds an extra storey instead of a flat roof terrace. They will also be creating a terrace on the north west corner of the building and installing a pitched roof and UPVC clad composite fenestration.

DTP said that the Ministry of Heritage has requested the installation of timber windows and doors and said that although there is currently a uniform window arrangement, a more random arrangement would be more traditional. They have also recommended that the garage should not be permitted but DTP said that this was already approved. Additionally, they have requested retention of the internal masonry staircase.

DTP also said that the Heritage Trust has recommended the use of clay tiles rather than the roof material which was previously approved. They also feel that the fenestration proposal lacks details but do not oppose UPVC clad composite fenestration subject to an example being provided. They have also requested the reinstatement of shutters.

The Department of Environment has commented on their standard conditions and requested that the applicant carries out a bat/swift survey.

JH said that the Commission should consider possible impact on neighbouring buildings.

DTP advised that the applicant had also been conditioned not to have decorative aspects around the windows.

The Commission approved the use of imitation slate tiles for the roof as has been used in other buildings such as Calpe Barracks.

The Commission approved this application.

520/15 – BA13519 – 10 Bright Cottage – Application to construct new extension above existing dwelling

DTP told the Commission that this application involves the construction of an extension above the existing dwelling and removal of the existing corrugated sheeting roof. He said that a new glass balustrade and new windows will be installed. No public comments have been received.

DTP said that the Heritage Trust has requested that fenestration should match existing and said that the proposed glass balustrade is out of character.

The Ministry of Heritage has requested the installation of timber windows.

DTP said that TSD has not raised any objections.

From a planning point of view, DTP said that there are no objections but that fenestration should be aligned and the character repeated in the lower level.

The Commission approved this application subject to alignment of fenestration and use of timber windows.

521/15 – BA13591 – 4 Cheshire Ramp – New swimming pool and extension at first floor level

DTP told the Commission that this property is a 19th Century ex Officers Quarters and that the proposal is to construct a swimming pool and extension at first floor level. The proposal also includes the introduction of a pergola and glass balustrades. DTP advised that upon inspection it was discovered that the pergola has already been constructed. DTP also said that the application was subject to Section 19 and no objections were received.

DTP said that the Heritage Trust does not object to the extension or glass balustrade at 1st floor level but object to the removal of the iron railings at ground level. They also object to the pool as it would result in the loss of a natural area and would affect the boundary wall.

The Ministry of Heritage does not object to the extension but is concerned about the pool proposal as it would result in the demolition of a boundary wall. However, DTP said that the applicant has confirmed that the boundary wall will not be demolished. DTP also said that the Ministry of Heritage has suggested that the cladding around the pool area should be improved.

DTP said that TSD has not raised any objections.

The Department of Environment has commented on their standard requirements including dust control and energy performance and efficiency.

From a planning perspective, DTP said that there is no objection to the extension on the first floor or to the glass balustrade. He said that if the pergola were to be approved, the applicant should not be allowed to enclose this in the future. He said that the landscaped area should be maintained and the cladding should be in keeping with existing. DTP said that although he would recommend approval, there is currently no fencing on the lower level of this side of the property and therefore, the boundary wall should be the same as the one approved for the neighbouring property to ensure consistency.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

JH asked why this building is not protected. The Chairman said that it is not a listed building. DS said that a schedule for buildings that should be listed has been submitted and that the Heritage Trust hopes that this situation does not continue to occur in the future.

MEH asked whether the extension will be cladded. The Chairman said that it will be rendered and painted white.

MEH thought that the pool area spoils the character of the property. He said that the MOD has handed these sites back to Gibraltar and that they are not being preserved.

The following was agreed:

1. The Commission deferred a decision on the extension. The proposal for the extension should be resubmitted with full details for consideration by the Commission;
2. The pergola should be removed and the wall restored;
3. The pool was refused as the existing architectural value of the façade will be obliterated and the character of the property affected;
4. The glass balustrading was refused but the applicant will be allowed to install balustrading subject to it being consistent with the one approved for the neighbouring property, i.e. iron railings with an option to incorporate a glass balustrade behind if desired.
5. The applicant was to be requested to submit revisions in accordance with the above for consideration by the Commission.

522/15 – BA13643 – 2 Public Market, Market Place – Proposed demolition and extension of unit to accommodate new take-away

DTP advised that a similar application for a single storey extension on the other side of this building was recently approved by the Commission. The premises will be used as a takeaway and fenestration will be provided both on the road side and market side. DTP also said that the proposed design is consistent with the existing building and that the toilets will be incorporated into the building.

DTP told the Commission that this application was subject to Section 19 and no objections were received. No objections have been received from the Heritage Trust, Ministry of Heritage or TSD. DTP recommended approval.

DTP said that the Heritage Trust highlighted that they should provide their own storage for street furniture within the premises.

The Department of Environments requires dust control and energy performance measures.

DS highlighted that the use of high chairs in front of the takeaway poses a safety risk.

JH suggested that a takeaway at this location might cause traffic or parking problems if people drive to the premises.

DS also suggested that the applicant should be responsible for maintenance and removal of rubbish from the area. The Chairman said that they would be conditioned to providing enough refuse bins.

The Commission approved this application.

523/15 - BA13653 - 34 South Barrack Road - Application to construct single storey extension above existing dwelling

DTP explained that the proposal is to construct an extension over the existing single storey dwelling and install a canopy over the main entrance. He said that the proposed style compliments the existing. Two sets of French doors will also be introduced to the top level to provide access to balconies. DTP said that this property is hidden from view.

DTP advised that there are no objections from the Ministry of Heritage, Heritage Trust or LPS.

The Department of Environment has raised their standard conditions and requires a bat/swift survey to be carried out.

DTP recommended approval.

The Commission approved this application.

524/15 - BA13657 - 6 Hargrave's Ramp - Proposed demolition of single storey extension to be replaced by two storey extension and other internal/external alterations to existing building

DTP said the proposal is to demolish a single storey extension which is located between the building and Charles V wall. He said that the applicant has been liaising with the Ministry for Heritage on works to repair damage to the wall. DTP advised that the two storey extension will be separated by 100mm from the wall. A balcony will also be incorporated at the rear to provide access to a higher level garden area.

DTP advised that the Ministry of Heritage considers that a 100mm gap between the extension and the wall is insufficient and has proposed a minimum of 500mm. They have also objected to the two storey extension as it obstructs views of the wall.

DTP said that the Heritage Trust does not object to the demolition but also want a 500mm gap to be maintained between the extension and the wall. They have suggested that the roof should also be sloped to reduce the impact on the wall.

DTP also said that the Department of Environment has requested that a bat/swift survey be carried out.

DTP advised that TSD has not raised any objections.

EH said that he was surprised that TSD has not raised any objections as the extension will be very near to the wall. He said that even 500mm might not be enough distance if TSD has to carry out any works to the wall in the future. He said that as a very minimum he would recommend enough width to be able to erect scaffolding.

MEH said that only a small section of the wall will be affected by the extension.

DS suggested that perhaps maintenance to the wall could be done prior to the extension being built.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

DTP said that although the Ministry of Heritage objected to a 2 storey extension, it would not be highly visible. DTP recommended approval in principle subject to TSD inspecting the wall and agreeing on a minimum distance between the wall and the extension.

EH suggested that the applicant could be asked to carry out any necessary works before building the extension.

The Chairman said that the Lease would include the requirement for access to be provided to public bodies should maintenance works be required. He also said that the applicant confirmed that all accretions will be removed.

DS said that she cannot vote in favour of this application if the extension abuts the wall.

CV suggested that a 100mm gap does not even help the applicant as they will not be able to maintain the narrow gap and will lead to an accumulation of rubbish. CV also said that this section of the wall is free standing and that repairs would be minimum.

The Commission agreed that TSD should carry out a survey of the wall and the applicant conditioned to carry out any necessary work. The Commission approved this application subject to the extension being set back by at least 500mm or a greater distance if required by TSD.

525/15 - BA13674 - Four Corners - Application to install 30m high radio tower, ancillary equipment and perimeter fencing - HMGOG Project

DTP informed the Commission that these works have already been carried out.

JH said that BFBS will also probably require provision of a mast. She requested details on specifications of the mast and said that it is a major structure which could have an impact.

The Chairman suggested that BFBS and the MOD could be asked to submit their requirements for masts and this could be added to the mast policy set by Government.

The Commission recommended that the MOD should comply with the policy set by Government on masts.

526/15 - BA13675 - 1 Campion House, Waterport Terraces - Proposed replacement of existing window and raising of existing parapet wall

DTP said that the proposal is to use the area above the main portico as a terrace. This would entail the conversion of a window into a door. DTP said that there are no planning objections.

DTP advised that an objection has been received from LPS and the Management Company as this area is part of the communal areas. However, this is a matter to be discussed by the applicant and the Landlord.

DTP recommended approval.

The Commission approved this application.

527/15 – BA13695 – Rooftop, Clifftops, 9 Windmill Hill Road – Proposed beautification of level 8 green roof and installation of glass solarium with internal access to apartment

The Commission welcomed Mr Mark Isola on behalf of the applicant.

Mr Isola told the Commission that his client has asked him to request that the Commission defers this application on the basis that he has just been instructed on this matter.

MEH highlighted that Mr Isola should be aware of the comments raised by the Department of Environment. He said that a previous condition of this development was that it should have a green roof and now it is being removed. Mr Isola said that he would be taking their comments on board.

The Commission deferred this application.

528/15 – BA13710 – Chatham Counterguard – Proposed installation of 10 wooden huts

DTP said that the proposal is to install 10 wooden huts that could be used for startup companies and which the applicant suggests would increase the footfall for the area. Landscaping will also be introduced. Four units would be placed by the American War Memorial and 6 on the northern side of Chatham Counterguard.

DTP advised that although the Heritage Trust does not object to the proposal, they feel that the 6 on the northern end are appropriate but the 4 on the southern end are not.

DTP said that from a planning point of view there are concerns about this proposal as the huts will impact on seating areas, cycle facilities and on the overall enjoyment of the area. If approved, DTP said that the huts should be installed in phases rather than simultaneously. He also said that if allowed an appropriate design should be agreed.

DS reiterated that the huts on the northern end are acceptable but the ones on the southern end are excessive.

CR said that this proposal would also have to be considered by HMGOG as Landlord.

The Commission felt that the huts will close up an area which has recently been opened up and beautified. He said that perhaps they could be installed elsewhere such as the Public Market courtyard or Fish Market Lane.

CV agreed that the area has successfully been regenerated and that these huts will have an effect on this.

The Commission refused this application for the reasons given above.

529/15 – Ref 1196 – My Wines, Chatham Counterguard – Extension of tables and chairs into area below American War Memorial

DTP told the Commission that the tables and chairs would only be placed below the American War Memorial temporarily as the applicant is looking at the possibility of providing seating on the roof of their vault.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

DTP said that from a planning perspective there are concerns with this application as tables and chairs have always been restricted to areas situated immediately in front of premises in question. He also said that there would be traffic issues as both waiters and customers would have to cross the road. The toilets would also be on the opposite side of the road.

The Commission refused this application on this basis.

530/15 – BA13717 – 94 Ragged Staff Wharf, Queensway Quay – Application to install glass curtains onto balcony

DTP advised that this is a retrospective application for the installation of glass curtains. He said that the property is north facing on the west side of the building.

The Commission welcomed Mr Mark Isola representing the Management Company.

Mr Isola told the Commission that the Management Company objects to this application. He said that the Development Plan promotes high standards of design and positive impact on people. He said that the quality of the original design should be maintained. Mr Isola raised concerns that increasingly more applications being received from tenants who wish to make changes to their premises which result in alterations to the original design of the building. He said that this is most visible on the marina side of the development. He also said that he is aware that one similar application has already been approved but suggested that if more are permitted it will be impossible to stop alterations in the future.

CR highlighted that the Management Company under the terms of the Underlease have a right to take legal recourse. Mr Isola said that they will do this but that they also wanted to object publicly.

The Chairman told Mr Isola that the Commission did receive representations from the Management Company through their lawyer at the time when a previous application was being considered. He said that the Commission felt then that there were not compelling reasons for them to object to the glass curtains on the upper floors and between columns.

Mr Isola said that from certain elevations this one in particular would be visible. He said that they would not have the right to object in an appeal.

The Chairman said that they would have the right to veto this application as Landlord.

Mr Isola suggested that if the Commission now agrees that these changes should not be permitted they could change the decision taken in the past.

CR said that even if the DPC approves these applications the Management Company can issue a circular to residents advising them that they will not permit these changes. Mr Isola said that there will always be tenants that will go against this.

DS declared an interest as one of the directors of the Management Company for Ordinance Wharf. She said that residents require a Licence for any changes as if they do not hold a Licence they are not able to sell their property. She said that it is not up to the Commission to police this, although she sympathised with the Management Company.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

JH thought that the proposed glazing looks quite dark and said that if approved they should use the same materials as were used in the previous application in order to minimise impact. She said that glass curtains have been approved in many estates subject to them being clear and retractable.

The Chairman said that the Commission would not be able to defend their decision if they refused this application as another one has already been approved within the estate.

Mr Isola said that unfortunately in many circumstances the court takes the view that once planning permission has been granted it is hard for the Landlord to go against that decision.

GM suggested that a precedent has already been created especially by allowing permanent structures within the commercial units and public areas.

DTP said that members should keep in mind the history of such enclosures in Gibraltar. He said that in the past a policy decision was taken to allow frameless systems as these have minimal visual impact. He said that he agrees with Mr Isola in terms of quality of design but said that these enclosures have already been permitted within this estate in the past. He also said that the Commission needs to focus on whether the enclosure would have such a significant impact that it would warrant a refusal.

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

4 in favour

7 abstentions

The Commission approved this application.

531/15 - Ref 1196 - Provision of suitable sanitary accommodation in food premises that provide seating

DTP told the Commission that this is being considered as concerns were raised by the Environmental Agency. He said that the Commission is being asked to consider imposing a condition that food premises will have to provide sufficient sanitary facilities if they provide seating. DTP said that this could be influenced by the size, accessibility and nature of the business. If the business is able to demonstrate that they have access to other facilities such as public toilets, then the condition could be waived. Exemptions would be made for fast food premises that only provide a few high stools. DTP said that this protocol has been discussed and agreed by the Planning Department, Environmental Agency and HMGOG.

The Chairman said that this policy tries to manage fast food restaurants that have become full restaurants without facilities. He said that this is not a retrospective application and that the policy will only be implemented in future applications.

JH asked what would be the policy for beach bars as the public toilets usually close at a certain time. The Chairman said that they do not open after the summer season. MEH said that the owner of the bar at Western Beach closes and cleans the public toilets himself so that his clients have access to facilities. He suggested that the same could be done in other beaches.

The Commission agreed with the proposed policy.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

Minor and other works – not within scope of delegated powers

532/15 – BA12306 – Coaling Island – Additional plans to construct new changing room & security building, car parking and paved area

The Commission approved this application.

533/15 – BA13606 – 37 Admiral’s Place – Construction of a new extension over property to include new terrace and additional bedroom

The Commission approved this application.

534/15 – BA13685 – Devil’s Tower Camp, Devil’s Tower Road – Proposed New Parade Ground – HMGOG Project

The Commission did not have an issue with this application.

535/15 – BA13697 – 122 Irish Town – Proposed construction of additional floor

The Commission approved this application.

536/15 – BA13701 – Levanter Lodge, Rock Gun – Demolition of two storey, half block, half prefabricated building – MOD Project

MEH asked KB whether there are any concerns with this application and the following application, BA13702. KB said that there are no concerns as it is a prefabricated building.

MEH said that the MOD should guarantee that rubble will not be dumped anywhere and a Management Plan put in place. He also said that a flat roof with gravel would also be good for plants.

The Commission did not have an issue with this application.

537/15 – BA13702 – Levanter Lodge, Rock Gun – New building – MOD Project

The Commission did not have an issue with this application.

538/15 – BA13703 – Devil’s Tower Camp – New post office building – MOD Project

The Commission did not have an issue with this application.

539/15 – BA13704 – Devil’s Tower Camp – Demolition of one storey brick construction – MOD Project

DS said that an Archeological Watching Brief should be carried out.

The Commission did not have an issue with this application.

540/15 – BA13722 – The Dockyard, 74 Queensway – Replace roof of main stores – MOD Project

The Commission did not have an issue with this application.

541/15 – BA13739 – St Christopher’s School, Europa Point – New temporary ramp – HMGOG Project

DTP explained that the ramp will be installed on a temporary basis for a year and a half so that the first floor can be used as a nursery. He questioned why the ground floor cannot be used instead.

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

WG said that he did not have any information on this application.

DTP said that the concern is that it is a large structure and will be visible.

EH said that HM informed him that this application is related to Project Houston. He said that the MOD originally objected to moving out of their current premises but that the new CBF agreed to move the nursery but that this location is the only available option. EH suggested that it could be conditioned to being dismantled in the future when no longer required.

The Commission did not have an issue with this application.

542/15 - BABA13740 - HM Naval Base Gunwharf, Queensway Road - Application for partial demolition of wall and installation of new fence - HMGOG Project

The Commission did not have an issue with this application.

543/15 - BA13742 - Town Range - Proposed construction of gun shed for use by the re-enactment association - HMGOG Project

The Commission did not have an issue with this application.

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

544/15 - Ref 1196 - Upper Crust, 36 John Mackintosh Square - Request for Tables and Chairs Licence

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

545/15 - Ref N/013/15 - 22 Cornwall's Tower, Brympton - Request for the removal of Palm Tree

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

546/15 - BA13581 - 7 Rosia Dale - Consideration of details of proposed dormer windows

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

547/15 - BA13618 - 69/71 Main Street - Proposed conversion of two residential units into offices plus additional storey for replacement residential unit

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

548/15 - BA13708 - 28 Governor's Cottage, Dobinson's Way - Application to replace roof cladding and garage door

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

549/15 - BA13709 - 27 Governor's Cottage, Dobinson's Way - Application to replace roof cladding, garage door and construct minor extension at rear of premises

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

550/15 - B13711 - 1A Paradise Ramp - Proposed refurbishment and extension of residential premises

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

Approved
DPC meeting 10/15
3/9/15

551/15 - BA13713 - 75 Irish Town - Proposed minor alterations to commercial premises

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

552/15 - BA13719 - Ocean Village Car Park - Installation of stand-by generators with protective screen

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

553/15 - BA13720 - 297/299 Main Street - Application to replace asbestos roof

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

554/15 - BA13738 - 8 Carter House - Replacement of existing terrace gate

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

Any other business

555/15 - Next meeting

The next DPC meeting will be held on Friday 25th September 2015 at 9:30a.m.