

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of 2018 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 20th February 2018 at 9.30 am.

Present:

Mr P Origo (Chairman)
(Town Planner)

The Hon S Sacramento (MHE)
(Minister for Housing and Equality)

The Hon Dr J Cortes (MEHEC)
(Minister for Education, Heritage, Environment & Climate Change)

Mr H Montado (HM)
(Chief Technical Officer)

Mr G Matto (GM)
(Technical Services Department)

Mrs C Montado (CAM)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

Mr Kevin De Los Santos (KS)
(Land Property Services)

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

Mrs J Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)

Mr C Viagas

Mr Viv O'Reilly
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

In Attendance:

Mr P Naughton-Rumbo (DTP)
(Deputy Town Planner)

Mr. Robert Borge
(Minute Secretary)

Apologies:

The Hon Dr J Garcia

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018
(Deputy Chief Minister)

Mr M Cooper
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

50/18 – Approval of Minutes

The Minutes for of the 1st meeting of 2018 held on 24th January 2018 were deferred, to be approved via round robin.

Matters Arising

51/18 – F/15002/17 – 91 Main Street – Proposed redevelopment of the site including the retention of the Main Street façade to provide a new building for commercial, office and residential uses.

This application had previously been considered in November 2017 when it was deferred by the Commission as they felt that the proposed height of the building was excessive, the façade should be retained as is and that the reduced shop front was out of proportion with the streetscape.

DTP informed the Commission that the applicant had taken the Commission’s comments on board and was now retaining the Main Street façade, including original window openings and floor levels. Three additional storeys would be constructed at the rear part of the building and an additional storey set back was proposed on the front part of the building. The front and back buildings would have flat sedum roofs and solar panels were also being proposed. The height would be seven meters less than originally proposed.

DTP recommended approval of this revised application with conditions for swift/bat surveys and boxes and for the colour scheme to be approved.

The Commission approved this application unanimously.

The Chairman commented that this application was a good example of urban renewal where the façade can be retained and the building improved.

Major Developments

52/18 – O/15176/17 – Devil’s Tongue, Queensway – Proposed multi-storey mixed use development comprising residential, commercial, retail, café/restaurants and underground car park.

This application to construct a multi-storey mixed use development was present to the Commission by Mr Tom Adams and Ms Ailsa Connery the architects who designed the development.

Mr Adams described the location as disjointed from the neighbouring Ocean Village site and was locked by Queensway. He proposed to divert traffic from Queensway onto Waterport Road and also increase the width of Devil’s Tongue. Ms Connery explained that they had been briefed to design a multi-use residential building with high quality housing with various amenities. Ms Connery added that they had looked into the Traffic Management Plan, as well as the

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

Development Plan, and found that the site was an important junction and would need to incorporate it into their scheme and offer back improvements to the road network.

Mr Adams also explained that they were looking into pedestrianizing Queensway and connecting the building to the City Walls via a bridge to incorporate green zones and open spaces. Ms Connery stated that she had met with the Heritage Trust and Town Planning to discuss how best to approach the vista of the building as due to its form and massing it could be seen as imposing. She added that due to its proximity to the old town it would form part of the public realm. Mr Adams commented that the building would have a dynamic form connecting to the old town and that the increased shop frontage would activate the area making it a destination for the public. Car Parking could be found at basement level. Floors 3 to 6 would house offices connected by a bridge over the podium level. The remaining floors would house residential units and the building would have a green roof.

MEHEC asked whether the inclusion of opening up the city walls was part of the proposal.

Ms Connery replied that the city walls were being looked at as an amenity but it was not part of the proposal.

The Chairman asked whether they had met with the Traffic Authority.

Mr Adams replied that they had met with Town Planning and Mott Macdonald in order to rationalise and put back into the sustainable traffic plan and introduce cycle lanes and bus stops.

The Chairman noted that long vehicles would not have sufficient turning circles.

Mr Adams replied that they may need to investigate further and was mindful that this was a work in progress.

CAM commented that the building would be very tall and although the Heritage Trust shared their vision of possibly opening up the city walls to the public it was not comfortable with a permanent bridge.

Mr Adams replied that they were happy to explore the possibility of a tunnel being used instead.

The Chairman asked whether they had considered the possibility and cost of building underground.

Ms Connery answered that they had spoken to Engineers and thought it was feasible.

MHE commented that the inclusion of a pedestrianised area was not very clear as the building will have 71 flats and 71 parking spaces and the road would be widely used.

Mr Adams replied that they had read the Traffic Management Plan and Development Plan and understood that parking was an issue but they wanted to offer connection points to the old town and a more balanced approach by having traffic flow around the perimeter.

Mr Nick Culatto was invited to address the Commission to present objections on behalf of his clients Petrol. Mr Culatto stated that his clients objected to pedestrianizing the main thoroughfare as they failed to see how adding a further 71 parking spaces would assist with traffic

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

flow. Mr Culatto added that they also objected on heritage grounds as the building would be a few metres away from the city walls and there was a specific policy on adding anything on to the city walls, such as the bridge proposed by the applicant. Mr Culatto also stated that the leaseholders and occupiers complained there was no consultation process in place.

Mr Chris Finch, representing Mr Albert Parody, was invited to address the Commission. He stated that this development would adversely affect his client's business. Mr Finch added that Mr Parody's buses had been fuelled at the site for more than 60 years and felt that developers should consider the wider aspects of a site such as how it would affect locals, not just the locality.

DTP referred members to copies of objections that had been circulated with their agenda. Thirteen objection letters had been received, together with a petition with 141 signatories opposing this development. Objections were presented on grounds that the height, massing and scale of the building was excessive; it did not integrate well with surrounding estates; loss of sunlight and privacy; impact on neighbouring open space and the additional traffic congestion it would produce.

The applicant made counter arguments to the objections stating that the scheme had been well designed to fit into its surroundings; a precedent had already been set on buildings of a similar height and that there were developments of a similar height close to city walls.

DTP reported that an application on this site for a car showroom and 10 storey office block had been considered by the DPC in 2002/03 but no final decision had been taken.

The following comments were received from consultees:

- Civil Aviation Authority – Would need to resolve any infringements of airfield safeguarding surfaces.
- DoEHCC – Would need to submit sustainability report and landscaping details. 10% of parking spaces need to have electrical car charging facilities.
- Technical Services – The building would exceed its footprint and that the applicant was dismissing the use of an important arterial road.
- Ministry for Infrastructure and Planning – The applicant should allow space for the possibility of a cycle lane from Waterport to Market Place and they were not supportive of the closure of Queensway.
- Traffic Commission – Were also against the closure of Queensway, noting that Devil's tongue is a side road and there would be insufficient space for Heavy Goods Vehicles to turn.

DTP reported that Town Planning had met with the applicant and although Town Planning did not have any objections in principle they did raise a number of concerns. Town Planning felt that the development should be restricted to the footprint and the building should be set back along Waterport Road as it would erode the vista and frame an iconic view of the Old Town. There were also concerns regarding the proximity to the city walls and the applicant should look into setting back the building. Although the applicant has attempted to break up the western elevation, DTP recommended that it should be further broken up as the western elevation was quite extensive. DTP also recommended that the applicant reconsider re-orientating the retail units on the ground floor of the North façade. DTP also noted that the current proposals for car parking did not meet

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

regulations. DTP commented that any elements that do not form part of the application should be omitted or at least made clear that they do not form part of the application.

CAM commented that she agreed with Town Planning's concerns adding that she felt the height of the building and the proximity to the city walls was excessive. She also mentioned that she could not support the proposed treatment for the top of the walls, which were not part of the project.

MEHEC also remarked on the impact this project would have on the wall.

JH concurred with DTP's report and felt that the application should be deferred. JH also took up the issue that the applicant was promoting this development as another retail hub when it was already clear that Ocean Village had failed to sustain such activity seeing many businesses convert to office use.

MHE stated she was concerned with the proposed height and how it would affect the view of Moorish Castle from Waterport Road. MHE added that if two storeys were for commercial units the applicant may consider consulting with other businesses in the area.

MEHEC noted that he felt the building may be too tall due to its proximity to the city walls.

The Chairman explained that the applicant had wanted to present the application to the Commission, so that it could express any concerns that could be addressed.

KDS excused himself from the meeting at 10:45 am and was replaced by Mr Alfred Brittenden (AB)

The Commission refrained from taking a decision to allow the Applicant to consider the issues raised and revise the scheme accordingly.

Other Developments

53/18 – F/15202/17 – 4 – 14 Police Barracks Lane – Proposed residential development and extension to building.

DTP informed the Commission on this application for a proposed residential development and extension which followed on from an Outline Application which had been approved in November 2015. The design was very similar to the previously approved design. The building would be terminated with a flat green roof including solar panels and air conditioning units.

The following comments were received from consultees:

- Ministry for Heritage – Objected to this application as it destroyed the vernacular.
- Heritage Trust – Objected to the loss of the pitched roof and questioned whether consideration had been given to using the roof as a loft.
- DoEHCC – Required Swift/Bat Surveys to be carried out.

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

DTP reported that the sustainability report had been submitted and the DOEHCC response was awaited. DTP recommended approval of this application subject to conditions to address the consultees' comments.

The Commission voted on this application.

In favour: 9
Against: Nil
Abstentions: 2

This application was approved by the Commission.

A 15 minute break was held at 10:55 am. KB excused himself from the meeting and was substituted by Mr Charles Perez (CP).

54/18 - F/15222/17 - 11 The Sails, Queensway - Proposed internal and external alterations to apartment layout and installation of new glass curtains.

This application was to build an extension and enclose the applicant's terrace with glass curtains as well as make some internal alterations. DTP referred members to copies of objections that had been circulated with their agenda.

Mr D Wood was invited to present his objections to the Commission. He stated that the development was designed in a traditional Mediterranean style with a distinctive gap in between the three distinct buildings. He felt that if the proposal went ahead it would be contrary to the building's design and would set a precedent for other residents to construct flat roof boxes, taking away the open feel of the Marina. Mr Wood also stated that the photo montage presented was incorrect and misleading and also was not similar to works carried out at 17 and 32 The Sails. Furthermore, Mr Wood objected to the applicant's proposal to change the location of the kitchen which would now be above a bedroom.

A second objector, Mr Stern, addressed the Commission stating that the plans presented by the applicant would set a precedent and that the step design of the development would be broken. Mr Stern also claimed that there would be a security risk to his apartment as the flat roof would link apartments 12 and 18; apartment 18 is rented out. Mr Stern also mentioned that the applicant did not have the support of the management committee to carry out these works.

MHE commented that concerning the security issues raised, his example already occurred in other parts of the building.

Mr Stern replied that there was a 7 foot wall between both apartments and the flat roof would give easier access to cross over the wall.

Ms Jackie Anderson addressed the Commission on behalf of Mr Robert Isaacs who resides at apartment 26. Ms Anderson stated that Mr Isaacs was also the Chairman of the management committee and strongly opposed the applicant's proposal. He felt it would spoil the development's aesthetic, was not in keeping with the rest of the Marina and would also set a

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

precedent. Mr Isaacs also owns an apartment at Cormorant Wharf and felt that the view will be infringed upon from further extensions thus, having a detrimental effect on property values. Ms Anderson also explained that extensions would result in higher costs to the community as building insurance fees would rise.

MEHEC asked Ms Anderson whether the views expressed were Mr Isaacs' personal opinions or that of the committee.

Ms Anderson replied that they were his personal views.

MEHEC asked what the committee's views were.

DTP replied that Richardson's Estate Agents were representing the committee and had submitted comments stating that they felt the design was detrimental to the development.

GM noted that some committee members had submitted personal letters stating they supported the extension.

Mr Dominic Harvey from AKS, representing the applicant, made counter representations stating that there was already precedence for extensions in the area and that his client had a 150 sqm terrace and wished to cover only 35 sqm. He further explained that the terrace was a narrow space and did not get much use due to the wind. Mr Harvey clarified that the extension would not be seen from the ground and would only be seen from a specific point. He also stated that the extension had been redesigned and had set the extension back in order to minimise the visual impact.

DTP reported to the Commission that Town Planning concurred with the objections received to the proposal as the style of architecture to the three buildings was distinct and the separation between the three was important. Although the extension proposed was minor and there have been other extensions in the area, they were different to the one proposed. This extension would erode the building line. In October 2017 an application was submitted for a similar extension at Ordnance Wharf which was refused by the Commission. DTP recommended the Commission refuse this application for reasons explained above.

CV commented that although he did not consider the building line would be dramatically affected and the applicant had already compromised in setting back the extension, the Commission should avoid setting precedence for this type of extension.

MHE remarked that she did not feel this application would affect the buildings and that the applicant has already compromised on his original designs.

JH noted that she appreciated the design change but concurred with DTP's comments and that setting precedence on creeping should be avoided.

The Commission voted on this application as follows:

In favour: 4

Against: 4

Abstentions: 3

Approved
DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

The Chairman used his casting vote and the application was refused.

55/18 - F/15271/17 - 4 Pitman's Alley - Proposed top floor extension to provide offices, with new lift and stairs within existing stairwell.

This application followed on from the Outline Application which had previously been presented in September 2017. The general refurbishment proposed was in line with that presented at Outline, but the applicant was now proposing to also install a lift within the internal patio. The additional storey would be an open plan office. At Outline the application was conditioned to omit the window closest to Pitman's Court due to the proximity of the window to an objector's balcony; windows onto a light well needed to be obscured and the roof terrace redesigned to avoid overlooking balconies at Pitman's Court.

The roof now would be a flat green roof with a service hatch to provide access for maintenance, solar panels and air conditioning units. One objection has been received from Mr Ramon Vazquez concerning the proximity of the window to his balcony, which has not been omitted as previously conditioned. DTP explained that it was felt that omitting the window did not respect the symmetry of the facade and therefore had recommended using obscured glazing and the window would be fixed. However, Mr Vazquez still had some concerns.

Mr Vazquez addressed the Commission, stating that the window would be 50 cm from his balcony and still had some security concerns.

Mr John O'Reilly, representing the applicant, responded that they had included a window but that it was blocked from within; there was no access to that window.

DTP reported that the application generally followed the outline application and that the applicant had addressed the Commission's conditions. He recommended approval subject to various conditions including swift and bat survey to be undertaken, the number of nest boxes to be agreed, details of solar panels to be submitted and that the DOECC to be consulted on the details of the green roof.

The Commission unanimously approved this application.

56/18 - F/15277/17 - 1 Corral Road - Proposed redevelopment of the existing 'Eurolife Building' to provide a 120 bedroom hotel with restaurant and roof-top bar.

This application was deferred to allow time for the applicant to complete the statutory notification process.

57/18 - F/15285/17 - 62-64 Irish Town- Proposed construction of a rooftop extension and proposed internal alterations.

This application was to fill in an existing terrace on the 4th floor to create a full storey and for an additional storey to be constructed utilising a mansard roof with a roof terrace above. There had been some concerns with the massing and height of the additional storey as the applicant wished

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

to include a stair core access to the roof terrace. An alternative scheme was submitted with roof access now being via a hatch. Two options were presented for the perimeter of the roof terrace, either iron railings or a glass balustrade. DTP recommended the use of iron railings which would be in keeping with the type of balustrades on the balconies on the west façade.

Heritage Trust had expressed concerns with the incremental increase in height of this building although it acknowledged that the effect was compensated for the relative difference in heights of the building to Irish Town and Line Wall Road. It also had some concerns with the massing of the new roof although considered that as it was within a terrace of buildings the gables would not be very visible. DoEHCC had requirements for nesting boxes to be installed and 5% landscaping.

DTP reported to the Commission that building had been previously sensitively refurbished and the main concern related to the mansard roof and overall visual impact of the additional storey. The 4th floor infill was not considered to have any negative impact and the fact that the building was located in a terrace of buildings meant that the gables of the mansard would not be very visible and the visual impact would therefore be low. DTP commented that the option with the 6th floor staircore added considerable mass and height was not considered acceptable. The option with just a roof hatch would have less impact. A skylight into the stairwell to provide natural light would also be incorporated.

DTP recommended approval of Option B (omission of staircore to roof and replacement with access hatch) and that the roof perimeter should incorporate railings rather than glass balustrade as this was more in keeping with the building

The Commission unanimously approved this application following DTP's recommendations.

58/18 - O/15286/17 - John Snow House, 35 Europa Road - Proposed construction of extension to existing property.

A previous application for the enclosure of the verandah and the demolition of the front walls had been presented to the Commission in September 2017 where it had raised serious concerns with the proposals. The applicant had reconsidered his proposals and the current application now proposes a two storey side extension on the south side over a terraced area of the garden with low level planting. The applicant was also going to divert some steps which go from the lower garden to a parking area. The applicant was also looking to incorporate an ensuite bathroom into one small part of the existing verandah.

Heritage Trust commented that they welcomed the revised proposal and had no objections. Ministry for Heritage commented that the proposal was well designed and well thought out. No objections were received from the public.

DTP reported that the revised proposal was more sympathetic to the building, even though the building had been altered in the past.

Ministry for Heritage supported the application.

DTP commented that the proposal had been sympathetically designed and recommended approval of the application.

There was some discussion about how to protect existing trees close to the proposed site.

The application was unanimously approved by the Commission subject to conditions and

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

specifically that protective measures would be required to protect the existing trees.

59/18 – F/15287/17 – 3-5 St. Bernard’s Road – Proposed extension and alterations to property and construction of swimming pool.

This application was granted Outline planning permission in September 2017. The applicant wished to build an additional storey, construct a swimming pool and make some minor alterations. The outline permission included a number of conditions including the retention of the Jacaranda tree no vehicular access off Engineer Road and the ground floor finish of the St Bernard’s Road façade was to be a plain render.

Some changes had been made to the proposals for the first floor. The applicant wished to remove the Jacaranda tree which he claims was causing structural damage, and this would allow for an extension at first floor level. The applicant proposed replacing the Jacaranda tree with two smaller citrus trees. The design of the swimming pool had changed and now also wished to incorporate a sliding gate on to Engineer Road.

The additional storey would have a flat green roof including solar panels and air conditioning units housed within a louvered structure. Some small changes had been proposed for the fenestrations and they were also looking to extend the Master bedroom.

The applicant submitted a report stating that the Jacaranda Tree was still young and it would continue to grow. The roots were encroaching onto a retaining wall and the building’s foundations and would continue to affect retaining wall, foundations and underground services. They had considered root control system, cutting back of roots. The report also considered that removing/replacing the retaining wall could cause the complete instability of tree and collapse. The Planning and Building Control Department’s Structural Engineer had reviewed the report and commented that it would be difficult to keep the tree at its present location as it may cause the retaining wall to collapse, and a similar collapse already occurred in 2013. He felt it would be sensible to remove the tree and replace it with others in a suitable location.

DoEHCC were also consulted and believed that seeing as the tree was still healthy it should be retained but that this was for DPC to decide. DoEHCC recommended that if the tree were to be replaced it should be replaced with two large mature trees, not two small citrus trees as proposed by the applicant, and that the Jacaranda tree be carefully uprooted and planted elsewhere on the property where it would still be visible to the public. DoEHCC would need to approve the species and size of any replacement trees.

Technical Services Department had commented that the applicant must ensure that any retaining walls and slopes are stable during construction.

DTP remarked that the structure housing the air conditioning units should be relocated elsewhere within the site as they would be highly visible from the Upper Rock. The ground floor façade to St Bernard’s Road should be a simple render finish as required in the outline permission. Provisions for Swift/Bat nests should also be made, as well as an adequate landscaping plan. DTP recommended the omission of the sliding gate and that the Commission must take a view on what should happen with the Jacaranda Tree.

MEHEC commented that the applicant should submit details of the two trees he intended to plant

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

to replace the Jacaranda tree as the tree currently softens the visual impact of the wall on the western side, and two small citrus trees did not compensate for the loss of the Jacaranda tree. MEHEC also mentioned that the applicant should consider a green verge on the wall with plants that overhang and add volume.

The Chairman asked the architect, Mr John O'Reilly what was underneath the tree.

Mr O'Reilly replied that there was only soil under the tree.

The applicant, Mr Hans Huibgrete, addressed the Commission and insisted that after substantial investigation they found that the tree's roots were under the building and retaining wall, and above water tanks. He noted that the water tanks were not currently being used.

GM pointed out that the water tanks may be pressuring the trees roots to grow in another direction and if the tanks were demolished and filled with soil the roots would then not be pressured.

DTP commented that the department's Structural Engineer had reviewed the structural reports submitted by the applicant and could not conclude that the tree was not causing damage. He had particular concerns with the damage to the retaining wall. His view is that it would be sensible to remove the tree.

Mr O'Reilly remarked that the site was tiered and planting two orange or mandarin trees with a further small tree at the front right could compensate for the loss of the Jacaranda tree.

CP replied that compensatory measure of planting two orange trees was not suitable for the loss of a Jacaranda Tree.

Mr David Orfila, who prepared the Structural Engineering report, informed the Commission that from a structural point of view the tree was damaging the retaining wall and the area around it. He added that the tree is continuing to grow and although they have looked into saving the tree and the retaining wall eventually the soil will just fall away. He also said the tree was the wrong one to plant and in the wrong place.

MEHEC commented that if there was no other option but to remove the tree he would welcome that a suitable tree be planted in its place and one of the proposed trees to be planted at the rear should be a Jacaranda.

Mr Huibgrete insisted that there was no space to plant a Jacaranda tree, adding that the tree had also been assessed by a tree surgeon who determined the tree was ill.

DTP replied that DoEHCC's assessment was that the tree was healthy.

The Chairman asked the members of the Commission whether they would like to read the Structural Engineer's report based on Mr Orfila's report, to which the members agreed.

The Chairman noted that the applicant should consider consulting with relevant experts and his architect where the Jacaranda tree is to be replanted and submit further plans.

The Commission were in favour of most of the proposals submitted but requested that an

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

alternative to the proposed air conditioning enclosure on the roof be submitted. The Commission did not approve the applicant's proposal for a sliding gate on to Engineer Road.

The Chairman stated that the sliding gate proposed would result in the loss of parking spaces and the traffic authorities had refused this proposal, and their decision had been ratified by the Commission.

This application was deferred to allow the applicant to submit revised plans and so that the various structural reports could be circulated to Members.

60/18 - F/15343/18G - Eastgate Roundabout - Proposed new customs area, including a two storey office building, passport control cabin, vehicle search facility and a fence to the perimeter of the site.

This GoG application was to reconfigure the area adjacent to the air terminal to provide a new Customs area for vehicles importing goods into Gibraltar. The proposal involved the construction of a two storey office building, vehicle search building, passport control building, security barriers and perimeter walls and fencing. It also involved the provision of car parking adjacent to the Airport Terminal building.

The following comments had been received from consultees:

- Director of Civil Aviation - requirement for access to fuel farm had not been taken into account; there is normally a security requirement that prevents parking within 30m of terminal and they would need to consult with the Air Terminal manager about this; Crane, bird and dust management plans must be implemented during construction; no upward lighting should be permitted..
- Heritage Trust - Desk Based Assessment and Archaeological Watching Brief required.
- Traffic Commission - Tight turning access on entry to the site made Long vehicle circulation within the customs area impossible, this needs to be addressed.

DTP reported that there was no in-principle objection to the proposed use but there were concerns that the boundary treatment would present a very hard frontage to what will become the principal access into Gibraltar. Consideration should be given to boundary landscaping, permeable surfacing, green/ brown roofs.

The Commission had no objections to this application but the matters raised by DTP and the consultees should be considered.

Minor Works - not within scope of delegated powers

61/18 - O/15309/17 - 6 Europa Views Terraces, Europa Road - Proposed new loft access and installation of skylights.

Approved
DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

The Commission approved this application.

CAM noted that the Heritage Trust objected to the enclosure on the ground floor that had taken place many years ago.

62/18 -D/15282/17 - 78 Queensway - Proposed demolition of building 84, comprising a two storey office building of steel construction/masonry cladding.

The Commission approved this application.

63/18 - F/15372/18 - 117 Main Street - Proposed modifications to approved planning application F/14880/17.

The Commission approved this application.

DTP informed the Commission that after the agenda had been published it was deemed that some of the proposed rear windows needed to be agreed with Town Planning and a condition would be included to this effect

Applications Granted by Subcommittee under delegated powers (For Information Only)

64/18 - BA13293 - Ocean Village - Proposed project to increase the diversity of wildlife within Ocean Village to encourage native birds by using indigenous planting and substitution of additional planting.

Consideration of request to renew Planning Permit for a further three years.

65/18 - F/13995/16 - Orion House, 6 George's Lane - Proposed construction of a two storey, extension on the roof and general refurbishment of existing building.

Consideration of proposals for building signage to discharge condition 6 of Supplemental Planning Permit No. 5451A.

66/18 - F/15021/17 - 17 Gibraltar Heights - Proposed replacement of windows facing internal courtyard.

67/18 - F/15025/17 - 504 Express Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

68/18 - F/15056/17 - 507 Seamaster Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed installation of glass curtains and internal alterations.

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

69/18 - F/15197/17 - 2/3 Fraser's Ramp - Proposed subdivision of conversion of a one bedroom flat into a one bedroom flat and a bedsit.

70/18 - F/15236/17 - Unit 1, Carmel House, 4 King's Yard Lane - Proposed internal alterations and replacement of windows.

71/18 - F/15241/17 - 11/1 South Barrack Road - Proposed internal alterations and replacement of windows facing South Barrack Road.

72/18 - F/15243/17 - 5.26 World Trade Centre, Bayside Road - Proposed internal alterations.

73/18 - F/15244/17 - 703 Europlaza - Proposed installation of glass curtains on kitchen balcony and replacement of existing glass curtains on living room balcony.

74/18 - F/15247 - 708 Viking Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

75/18 - F/15255/17 - 1214 Sand Dune House, Beach View Terraces - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

76/18 - F/15260/17 - 79 Ragged Staff Wharf, Queensway - Proposed replacement of two wooden windows with white UPVC double glazed windows to match original profiles.

77/18 - F/15266/17 - 50/2 City Mill Lane - Proposed internal alterations.

78/18 - F/15270/17 - New Aloes, Europa Road - Proposed replacement entrance gate and creation of permanent planters.

79/18 - F/15272/17 - The Elliot Hotel, 2 Governor's Parade - Proposed refurbishment of the 8th floor of the hotel including the conversion of meeting rooms to six hotel bedrooms and extension to existing restaurant as well as extension and alteration works to the 9th floor of hotel to form one additional bedroom, alterations to lift shaft, façade repair works and installation of mechanical plant enclosure.

80/18 - F/15276/17 - 1.22 World Trade Centre, Bayside Road - Proposed internal alterations.

81/18 - F/15278/17 - 28 Sea Daffodil House, Waterport Terraces - Retrospective application for internal alterations.

82/18 - F/15291/17 - 41 Main Street - Proposed extension and internal alterations to first floor offices.

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

83/18 – F/15294/17 – West One Development, Europort Avenue – Proposed change of use from commercial to offices as well as proposed internal alterations.

84/18 – F/15295/17 – 12.06 Royal Ocean Plaza – Proposed internal and external alterations.

85/18 – F/15296/17 – 4.3.01 & 4.3.02 Eurotowers – Proposed amalgamation of two offices.

86/18 – F/15297/17 – 12 Admiral Place, Naval Hospital Road – Proposed internal alterations.

87/18 – F/15301/17 – The Foyer, Neptune House, Marina Bay - Retrospective application to replace entrance doors with electric automatic doors.

88/18 – F/15302/17 – 9 Johnstone’s Passage – Retrospective application for the conversion of unit to shop and office space.

89/18 – F/15303/17G – G24 Europa Business Centre – Proposed internal alterations.

GoG Project

90/18 – F/15310/17 – 508 World Trade Centre, 6 Bayside Road – Proposed internal alterations.

91/18 – A/14683/16 – Gedime Motors, 2A Eaton Park – Proposed installation of fascia sign.

92/18 – A/15259/17 – NatWest, 55 Line Wall Road – Proposed replacement signage.

93/18 – A/15264/17 – 44 Main Street – Proposed replacement fascia sign.

94/18 – A/15300/17 – NatWest, Eurolife Building, Corral Road – Proposed replacement signage.

95/18 – A/15318/18G – Queensway, Winston Churchill Avenue, Waterport Roadway, North Mole Road – Proposed installation of lamppost banners from the 3rd February to the 10th March 2018 to advertise the Gibraltar Snooker Open.

GoG Project

96/18 – A/15319/18G – Queensway, Winston Churchill Avenue, Waterport Road, North Mole Road – Proposed installation of lamppost banners from the 27th January to the 4th March 2018 to advertise the World Pool Masters XXV.

GoG Project

97/18 – A/15335/18 – 17 Fish Market Road – Proposed installation of fascia sign.

98/18 – A/15341/18G – Post Office, Main Street – Proposed installation of street banner from the 27th January to the 10th March 2018 to advertise the World Pool Masters XXV and the Gibraltar Snooker Open.

GoG Project

Approved

DPC meeting 2/18
20th February 2018

99/18 - A/15351/18G - Casemates Square - Proposed installation of banner to promote Rock Fashion Rocks event.

GoG Project

100/18 - A/15367/18 - Imperial Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village Avenue - Proposed hoarding signage.

101/18 - Any other business

102/18 - Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on 28th March 2018.