

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 3rd Meeting of 2015 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 26th March 2015 at 09.30 am.

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

 - The Hon S Linares (MSCHY)
(Minister for Sport, Culture, Heritage & Youth)

 - The Hon Dr J Cortes (MEH)
(Minister for Environment & Health)

 - Mr H Montado
(Chief Technical Officer)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

 - Miss K Lima
(Minute Secretary)
- Apologies:**
- The Hon Dr J Garcia (DCM)
(Deputy Chief Minister)

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

Approval of Minutes

113/15 – Approval of Minutes of the 2nd meeting of 2015 held on 18th February 2015

The Commission approved the Minutes of the 2nd meeting held on 18th February 2015.

Matters Arising

114/15 – BA11378 – 7c Engineer Road – Proposed construction of detached villa in vacant plot

DTP advised that following refusal of the proposal by the DPC, the applicant lodged an appeal with the Appeals Tribunal. The Tribunal upheld the appeal and asked the applicant to carry out further design work.

The Commission welcomed the applicant Mr Edward Lloyd Davies.

Mr Davies told the Commission that he submitted his formal planning application in December 2014 and that since then he has taken the advice of the Town Planners and produced a revised plan. He said that he has also taken advice from GONHS and that the largest tree on the site will be incorporated into the development. He said that he has also worked closely with the Government Archeologist. Mr Davies said that the house has been set back 2.5 metres from the road and that they will be retaining natural vegetation. He said that they will also be including planters along the roadside. Mr Davies also told the Commission that they will be improving energy efficiency by incorporating solar panels and photovoltaic cells. He said that he wishes to build a house that is in keeping with its surroundings and sensitive to its position.

The Commission did not have any questions and thanked Mr Davies.

DTP informed the Commission that the application was for a three storey house with the lower level being the garage area. He said that in the revised design the building has been set back and landscaping introduced. DTP said that the main body of the house has been set back with terraces on the front. He said that the mature tree is also being kept. DTP said that the development covers the whole plot but that the house has been moved westwards away from the adjacent property. He said that the revised design has a more contemporary approach with the use of vertical glazing and glazed balustrades.

DTP said that the Ministry for Heritage and the Heritage Trust have highlighted that the area is an old burial ground and therefore an Architectural Watching Brief is necessary. DTP said that the Heritage Trust also felt that the building should be set further back from the road.

KB highlighted that the landscaping on the plan differs from the landscaping on the photo montage. DTP said that the DPC should follow the design on the plan.

DTP recommended approval of the revised design.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

CAM said that although the new design would require less excavation, there would be the possibility of a higher number of burials on the site and that trials would have to be done. The Chairman said that the Government Archeologist would be present on site during works.

Mr Davies confirmed that there is one marked burial but that it is outside the site footprint. He said that they would have to agree on a method of work with the archeologist.

MEH said that he did not agree with the proposal. He said that it is often the case that developers commit to retaining trees and then do not.

KB said that since the location is at the entrance of the Nature Reserve, it would be better to set the house back further. He said that indigenous trees should be planted as this is already a naturally wooded area. CAM agreed with KB and said that if indigenous trees are not planted, the development will change the character of the lane.

The Chairman advised that the Commission has to take a decision on whether to accept the original application as this was allowed by the Appeals Tribunal or to approve the revised design.

MEH said that the revised application is better but that it can be further improved.

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

7 in favour

0 objections

4 abstentions

The Commission approved this application subject to a landscaping scheme to be provided and the applicant to fine-tune the designs following advice from the Town Planners.

115/15 – BA13200 – Casino Calpe, Line Wall Road – Conversion of existing window to doorway

DTP said that this application was previously refused by the Commission but that the applicant is requesting that the Commission reconsiders its decision. DTP said the developer has justified the proposal by saying that some members of the club are restricted in mobility so they need to relocate the bar to the ground floor and therefore want to improve access. DTP said that the Commission previously refused the application on the grounds that they did not feel that it was justified and that it would alter the character of the building.

DTP recommended that the Commission maintain their decision as there are two other entrances which could be used. He said that there is already an appropriate access within a modern extension. DTP said that the club argues that if the existing access is used, there will be a clash of staff and members using the same doorway. DTP said that from a planning perspective the reasoning for this proposal is not justified.

The Commission maintained their previous decision and refused this application.

116/15 – BA13316 – Police Barracks, Castle Road – Refurbishment and reconditioning of Historic Building Complex with part demolition and extension to provide new residential complex and public open areas

DTP reminded the Commission that Outline Planning Permission was granted with the condition that the applicant reconsiders the demolition of Block E. He said that the applicant has provided reports on the feasibility of retaining the building and referred members to the copies circulated with the agenda.

In terms of logistics, the applicant claims that access to the other blocks would be more difficult if Block E is retained and that retaining it would increase costs. They have confirmed that the financial viability of the project will be reduced if they have to retain Block E. DTP said that the architect has suggested that by removing Block E they would open up the area and improve access, ventilation and emergency access. He also said that the structural engineer has confirmed that there is extensive structural damage to the building and that the east façade requires remedial works. He also said that this block is different to the others as it was used as a club and therefore, drainage services would have to be installed. The structural engineer has also confirmed that the existing decks are rotten and collapsing. DTP said that the applicant has confirmed that they cannot retain Block E.

MSCHY said that as Minister for Heritage, he believes that the façade is important to the character of the road. He suggested that the applicant could consider retaining the façade even if the rest of the building is removed and green areas introduced.

MEH said that the overall benefit to the area in restoring a building that has been decaying for so long is such that he would support the development with or without Block E.

KB agreed with MSCHY on keeping the façade.

CAM said that the Heritage Trust is supportive of the regeneration of the Police Barracks but that they cannot support the demolition of Block E without clear justification or exploration of the different possibilities. She said that the Heritage Trust has spoken to the applicant but that they feel that there are still unanswered questions with regards to maintaining the façade and what financial support might be available to the developer.

The Commission welcomed the developers Mr Desmond Walsh and Mr Jason Cisarello.

Mr Cisarello told the Commission that they now have a full understanding of the cost of the project and that it is not economically viable to retain any part of Block E. He said that structurally everything is possible but that if they want to maintain the overall aesthetics of the development then it will not be economically possible.

The Chairman suggested that since HMGOG assigned the development via tender, perhaps the developer could come to an agreement with Government on lowering the tender premium or perhaps the possibility of financial assistance.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

Mr Cisarello said that they have already met with Government and that they are not offering any financial assistance.

GM asked what the original submission in tender was. Mr Cisarello said that their tender application involved a complete restoration of the Police Barracks but that this was submitted without having undertaken in depth studies on the overall cost of the project.

GM said that it is up to the applicant to ensure economic viability from the start and that they did propose to retain all of the buildings. Mr Cisarello said that their application did not include parking or the elevated courtyard, which have been imposed on them by the Commission. He said that excavation increases the costs significantly.

JH said that the elegance of the existing streetscape is valuable to the community. Mr Cisarello said that the value of the community asset that they will be providing by including parking and courtyards is larger than the small proportion that is being removed.

JC said that he agreed with Minister Cortes in that the overall benefit of the development is greater by demolishing Block E, as it opens up the area and improves the streetscape. JC said that retaining the façade would be challenging and costs would be astronomical.

Mr Cisarello said that the bottom part of the structure of the façade has no mechanical value and that the façade is already falling eastwards.

CAM said that the Heritage Trust sees the benefits in saving the estate but that they always try to push to save that little bit extra. She said that the debate is on how we as Gibraltar can help in keeping the façade.

MSCHY said that it is often the case that when a developer wants to do something it is done but when they do not want to do it, it is always costly.

MEH said that there is a danger of losing the project and condemning the area to being an eyesore for more years. MEH said that we always seem to want to retain what we have but that in the future people will value the open space.

MSCHY said that if the cost of retaining Block E is so high that it will jeopardise the whole development, then he would not risk the whole project to retain this. He said that he is pushing to retain the building but that if he is convinced that this is not viable then he would accept demolition.

CAM said that she shared MSCHY's view and that she would suggest that if it is not possible to retain the building or the full façade, then perhaps they could maintain the columns. CAM said that if retaining any part of Block E is not possible, the Heritage Trust would have to accept the demolition if salvaging the whole estate depends on this.

Mr Cisarello said that they are fully aware of the costs and that retaining any part of Block E is economically unviable for them.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

CV said that he had doubts about the possibility of undertaking a complete restoration as was proposed in the tender application. He said that by not removing Block E the value of some of the properties is reduced. CV said that he agreed with MSCHY in that the applicant should explore retaining the façade with gardens at the rear; however, he said that by doing this the profit margins would be less. CV also said that he would not be against the developer constructing an additional storey if this increases profit and allows them to retain the façade.

Mr Walsh said that the beams on the ground floor of Block E are corroded and that the top floor façade is separated.

Mr Cisarello told the Commission that they are already at the point where profit is just enough to attract investors. He said that this is one of the most complex developments that they have done in terms of costs. Mr Cisarello reiterated that if they cannot demolish Block E, the project will not be economically viable.

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

JH said that even retaining part of the façade would maintain the streetscape and that this should be costed and a technical assessment carried out.

MSCHY said that he did not object to the demolition of Block E as long as the façade is retained. He insisted that if proof is provided that keeping the façade is not viable, then he would agree to the full demolition.

CAM said that CV's suggestion of adding a floor could be explored.

The Commission requested a site meeting to be arranged and deferred this application so that the applicant can submit proof of costs.

117/15 – BA13356 – Unit 28, Eaton Park – Retrospective application for changes to perimeter wall, temporary scaffold racks and construction of a structure comprising a restroom and changing area

The Chairman confirmed that he has met separately with the applicant and the objector informing them that a geotechnical survey was required if they wanted to proceed with the application as submitted. He said that the applicant was going to resubmit revised plans that show less permanent access/use and more transitory use of the site and present these to be considered or not warranting a geotechnical assessment of the cliffs above.

This application was carried forward.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

118/15 – BA13399 – Windmill Hill Road – Construction of a warehouse/industrial unit with ancillary offices and facilities

DTP said that when this was considered previously, the Commission felt that the proposal was not the best use of the land and that there were competing demands for use. He said that since then the Town Planners have met with MEH and HMGOG officials to discuss the most appropriate use. DTP said that they have agreed to relocate the warehouse, reserve car parking in the area, and introduce landscaping to act as a screen to the perimeter of the building. DTP said that the applicant has been asked to redesign the warehouse and provide revised plans.

JH said that the buildings should be changed from white to another colour which better suits the environment.

This application was deferred as the Commission requested that the applicant submits revised designs.

119/15 – BA13412 – 5-13 Flat Bastion Road – Proposed restoration and refurbishment, with an additional floor, to create 10 apartments and parking

DTP told the Commission that following the last meeting the Chairman met separately with the objectors and the applicant. DTP said that the applicant has made some changes to the design including providing an internal door to the refuse area; provision of a pedestrian refuge within the garage area; and vehicles to exit the garage in a forwards direction. He also said that there has been a minor change to one archway.

The Commission welcomed Mrs Navarro on behalf of the Flat Bastion Road Tenants Association who is objecting to the proposal.

Mrs Navarro told the Commission that they are still strongly opposed to the tender award which should have not have taken place as the tenants of the area were in negotiations with a Minister. Mrs Navarro said that the values of safety which the Commission has encouraged for other projects such as Police Barracks are not being encouraged in this development. Mrs Navarro said that the whole of Gibraltar, especially the residents of the area, will be suffering the consequences of this. Mrs Navarro told the Commission that the tenants association met with the Chief Minister and that he has agreed to take this matter on board.

MEH asked why the applicant and the objectors have not met together.

Mrs Navarro said that they will not meet with the developer as they are opposing the tender award. Mrs Navarro said that she understood that the developer met with the Chairman and that he has agreed to lower the level of the roof which would make a difference to her personally as her property is located directly behind. However, she said that by allowing this development the residents are missing out on the opportunity to have this derelict building demolished and the area used for projects that will benefit the community as a whole.

The Commission did not have any further questions and thanked Mrs Navarro.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

MEH said that this is not a planning issue as the objectors are disputing the tender award. He said that since the Chief Minister is involved perhaps this matter should be considered elsewhere or the Commission should be informed of other discussions before taking a decision.

The Chairman said that the objections made were planning considerations and therefore the Commission has to consider these in relation to the application. However, he said that it is possible to defer a decision if they require more information.

CV highlighted that this case is different to others as neighbours usually encourage investment in derelict buildings and are usually against bin stores and bus stops as these may encourage vermin and loitering.

The Commission decided to defer this application.

120/15 – BA13474 – 44a/b Town Range – Construction of new residential development

DTP advised that the outline planning design was for an 8 storey building with 38 apartments and 39 parking spaces. He said that the Town Range and Victualing Office Lane façade would be retained and roof gardens introduced. DTP said that the application is before the Commission for Full Planning Permission and that some changes have been introduced. He said that the location of balconies on the east elevation has been changed to either end of the building. He also said that the proportion of fenestration has been changed and that the central core of the building has been altered to have a vertical column. DTP said that the stair core and lift will be separate and offset. He also said that the spiral stairs on the front of the building have also been removed. DTP told the Commission that the revised plan includes 33 apartments and 35 parking spaces. He said that there is also a roof garden area and that the applicant has introduced higher windows, full glazing on upper levels and set back the top of the building. He said that the original façade is being retained on 2 elevations.

DTP said that the Heritage Trust has suggested that by moving the balconies the impact is reduced and the tapering effect has been removed. They have requested a Desk Based Assessment and a photo survey of the site.

DTP said that the Ministry for Heritage has asked whether it would be possible to dismantle the washroom and re-erect it elsewhere instead of demolishing it.

DTP also said that the Department of Environment has commented on their usual requirements including dust control, energy performance, 5% landscaped area, bat/swift survey and incorporation of bat/swift nests. They also require energy efficient measures to be incorporated.

DTP said that planning conditions require a report on energy efficient measures to be introduced but that this has not been received. He also said that no details have been provided with regards to the original architectural features being retained. DTP also said that the sight lines have not been confirmed either and that a Construction Management Plan would have to be included and details on the refuse storage area approved by the Department of Environment.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

DTP recommended approval of this application as it follows from their outline planning application with improvements having been made. DTP also recommended that the applicant reconsiders including glazing in the stair core at the southern end of the building.

CAM said that the Heritage Trust loathes to see the demolition of built environment but that they are concerned that the whole building will be lost if demolition of part is not allowed. She said that this is a real issue with old buildings in the town area.

The Chairman said that he is concerned that the applicant has not submitted some of the requirements of the outline permission conditions as details of the elevation viewed from the promenade to the west have not been provided. He said that the submission is not complete and recommended that the application be deferred.

The applicant told the Commission that they have submitted details on the west elevation. He also said that they are in discussion with their engineers on energy efficient measures.

CV said that energy performance does not fall under the remit of the DPC. He also said that it is difficult to see the western façade of the building from any point. The Chairman said that energy performance is a planning condition.

MEH said that energy performance may be part of building regulations but that the DPC needs to be reassured that conditions will be met.

DTP said that the applicant will be asked to submit a statement on energy efficiency measures being introduced.

CAM clarified that the Heritage Trust has accepted this specific proposal given the current state of the site but that this does not signify a blanket approval for other schemes.

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

10 in favour

1 objection

0 abstentions

The Commission approved this application subject to outstanding details being submitted.

Other Developments

121/15 – BA13475 – 1, 3, 5 & 7 Ocean Village Promenade – Application to extend use class to include office

The Commission welcomed Ms Sandra Lamplough on behalf of the applicant Ocean Village and the tenants of the four units in question.

Ms Lamplough told the Commission that the existing user clause was granted when the small boat moorings were at this location and when the coach park had not yet been relocated. She said that the footfall in these businesses has reduced and that they are struggling. Ms Lamplough said

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

that they currently have 100% occupancy in offices and that they have 2 or 3 interested parties in offices and therefore, want to extend the option to use these units as offices if required. She said that they have the support of the residents of Watergardens as they currently have issues with the noise from some of these premises, particularly Zest. She said that she is aware that the planning department is cautious of deviating from the original use but that it has now become clear that it is not viable to use these premises for their current use. She also confirmed that the walkway would remain open to the public.

The Chairman said that there are different use classes for offices. He asked whether there will be public counter interface. Ms Lamplough said that the interest that they have at present would not involve public counter interface.

JC asked whether the owners have the choice to sell or rent the properties. Ms Lamplough said that the owners have the option to either sell the lease or rent the unit.

DTP said that all of the current tenants have confirmed that they are willing to close their businesses and move on.

The Chairman said that a separate application has been received for the change of use of Sail 3. Ms Lamplough said that this is a separate application.

DTP asked whether the Commission can expect to have the same issue with the Sails and Ocean Village losing its leisure element. Ms Lamplough said that she did not think that this would happen as it is only the four businesses in this application that are having issues in attracting people to their premises. She said that some of the businesses are doing very well and others not so much.

DTP asked whether part of the problem is how much Ocean Village charges per metre squared. Ms Lamplough said that the amount charged is not extortionately high and that units in the area in question are at reduced rents.

The Chairman asked whether rental values are publicly available. Ms Lamplough said that rent is roughly around £200/m².

CV said that he understood their view that the relocation of the coach park might have affected business but said that this is now being replaced with homes for around 400 families and surely this would attract people to the area.

The Chairman said that in part it is Ocean Village's fault in that the entrances to the marina are not advertised properly. Ms Lamplough said that advertising schemes have been submitted for the DPC's consideration.

MEH said that this was the DPC's concern ten years ago; that the units would eventually become offices. Ms Lamplough said that the business market today means that they cannot make it work in its present form.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

HM asked whether the application is for a change of use or extension of the user clause. The Chairman said that they would like to extend their user clause to include A2 or B1. He said that A2 would have public interface and B1 would not. The Chairman recommended an extension of the user clause to include A2.

The Commission approved this application to include office use of any kind.

GM gave his apologies and left the meeting.

122/15 – BA12078 – 17/4 Gardiner’s Road – Application to construct 4 new parking bays

DTP said that when this application was considered by the DPC at a previous meeting, the ramped access encroached on to the public highway. DTP said that the plans have been revised and that the ramp access is now within the applicant’s own boundaries. He said that the building has been shifted slightly westwards. DTP recommended approval.

The Commission approved this application.

123/15 – BA12795 – South Jumpers Bastion, Rosia Road – Proposed office development

DTP said that the permit for this application is about to expire and that the applicant has requested renewal of their permit. He said that although this would have been considered by the Subcommittee, they were unable to reach a unanimous decision as the Heritage Trust maintained their objection.

CAM said that the Heritage Trust objected to the proposed height of the development but said that they are supportive of the use and solutions proposed.

MEH said that the developer should be told that if a one year extension is granted, it does not mean that if they reapply for an extension, it will automatically be granted.

JC said that the applicant is ready to proceed and is just waiting for an extension to their permit.

The Commission approved the extension of their permit for one year.

124/15 – BA13421 – 19 Genoa House, Catalan Bay Village – Construction of additional lounge and flat roof terrace to replace existing pitched roof

DTP said that this proposal involves the construction of a lounge area and terrace at roof level. He said that it is difficult to see the elevation from any point due to its location. DTP also said that similar works have been approved by the Commission in an adjacent building.

The Commission approved this application.

125/15 – BA13422 – 909 Royal Ocean Plaza – Installation of glass curtains

DTP advised that this application has been brought to the Commission as it is the first one in Royal Ocean Plaza. He said that any future applications would be dealt with by the Subcommittee. DTP said that the application is to install a frameless glass curtain system. He said that the apartment is on the 9th floor and that it is fairly windy. He also said that there have

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

not been any objections to the proposal. DTP said that the Town Planners have to go on site to verify minor details but that he would recommend approval.

JH said that installing glass curtains would change the way in which light and shade play on the building and would make it appear more box-like, impacting on the overall look of the building.

DTP said that the DPC tried to resist the installation of glass curtains for many years until the frameless system was introduced. He said that there would be an impact but that it has been allowed elsewhere.

The Commission approved this application.

126/15 – BA13424 – 15 Gardiners Road – Construction of new passenger lift

DTP told the Commission that representations have been received in respect of this application to construct a lift that would provide access to two flats. DTP said that objections are on the basis that there is a dispute over the ownership of the land and the fact that the lift would affect access to other properties and to a bin store.

From a planning point of view, DTP said that although the proposed lift is glazed and the cladding at the bottom similar to the cladding of the buildings, it is incongruous to the streetscape and stands out. DTP also said that it could create a precedent as most of the apartments on this street are on different levels. DTP recommended refusal.

The Commission welcomed Mr Alex Lugnani, lawyer representing the objectors Mr and Mrs Santos and Mr and Mrs Garcia.

Mr Lugnani told the Commission that he was instructed by his clients to write to the Commission in February to object to this proposal. Mr Lugnani said that he is aware that legal ownership of the land does not fall under the remit of the Commission but that in their view the area belongs to the Management Company of 8 Gardiner's Road and that they are not in agreement with the proposal. He also said that his client's access to their property will be affected. Mr Lugnani said that plans appear to show that the lift would be built on part of the landing structure which is used by his clients for access and that this would limit his clients' enjoyment of the communal areas. Mr Lugnani said that his clients use an area above the refuse bins to rest goods being taken up to their properties and that the lift structure will result in this being removed. Mr Lugnani said that no provision is being made to reprovide the bin structure and that the full extent of his clients' only access is being compromised as the landing provides space in which to move around. He also said that there will be an impact on the streetscape and that it will set a precedent.

MSCHY asked Mr Lugnani to whom the stairs belong. Mr Lugnani said that the stairs belong to the Management Company.

The Chairman reminded the Commission that planning permission is not subject to Landlord consent.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

MSCHY asked whether the objectors would remove their objection if the lift is made accessible to them. Mr Lugnani said that he has not been informed by his clients on whether they would agree to this. He said that this has not been considered as they have not seen plans to this effect. Mr Lugnani also said that his clients' property is further back so the landings to the lift would have to be much larger.

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

The applicant, Mr Matthews, told the Commission that his wife has spoken to the objector about the possibility of allowing them to use the lift and that they were happy to consider this. He said that they are willing to accommodate them if they can.

MEH said that the proposed lift would not be in keeping with the streetscape. He said that the design of the flats at different levels is an issue and that it would be good to come up with a general solution for the area.

JC asked whether the Highway Section has commented on this application. DTP said that they have stated that if the structure is on the public highway, they would object to any loss of parking. The architect confirmed that there will not be any loss of parking areas and that it will only encroach part of a pedestrian area which is not used as cars park in front of it.

MEH said that if the streetscape of the area were different he would be against the proposal but that in this case he is in favour as improving accessibility is more important.

MSCHY thought that accessibility should be addressed but a solution found that would help more residents of the area.

The Commission deferred this application and asked the applicant to consider the design.

127/15 – BA13427 – Winston Churchill Avenue – Application to construct multi-storey storage facility

DTP informed the Commission that the proposal is to construct a 3 storey building. There will be 2 warehouses on the ground floor with a loading/unloading area off Devil's Tower Road. The first floor will be used for commercial storage and the second and third floors will be domestic storage. DTP also said that there will be two staircases on either end of the building for access and that the architectural treatment will follow Devil's Tower Road car park but will have a curved form.

DTP said that the Heritage Trust does not have any objections but felt that the architectural treatment increases the massing of the car park. They also felt that the building is overpowering instead of being a backdrop to the Cross of Sacrifice.

DTP also told the Commission that the Director of Civil Aviation requires an FOD and Bird Management Plan. He has also highlighted that the proposed site overlaps with the MOD boundary line. DTP said that the applicant has been informed of the latter point.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

DTP also said that the Traffic Commission requires that the entrance into the car park from Winston Churchill Avenue and the exit onto Devil's Tower Road are maintained. DTP said that this has an impact on the layout of the development.

DTP said that there are no planning objections and said that whilst he accepts the comments made by the Heritage Trust, he feels that the proposed architecture fits into the surroundings.

MEH suggested deferring this application due to comments made by the Traffic Commission. He also said that the design should be amended to make the building a suitable backdrop to the Cross of Sacrifice.

JC said that traffic issues may be significant and may make this project unviable.

JM said that the MOD has concerns with the boundary line as a 3 metre boundary is required for safety to the airport.

The Commission welcomed Mr Paul Collado, Mr Chris Revagliatte and Mr Aurelio Falero.

Mr Collado told the Commission that they have spoken to the MOD and that they are willing to relax their requirements in terms of the boundary line.

JM said that if the proposal is approved, the Air Cadet building would have to be moved and that this would be an issue. Mr Collado said that they have met on site with the MOD and identified a possible site to which it could be relocated.

In terms of the building being a backdrop to the Cross of Sacrifice, Mr Collado said that they are looking to be creative and that the applicant is willing to work on the design.

Mr Falero also said that they can address the traffic issues by realigning the boundary lines.

Mr Collado said that this is a private venture and that the viability of the project is in selling the ground floor. He said that they are looking to have affordable rates in the region of 8m² for £100.

The Commission did not have any further questions and thanked Messrs Collado, Revagliatte and Falero.

JH said that not enough information has been provided on the appearance of the building and traffic implications.

The Commission deferred this application so that the applicant can incorporate the comments made by the Commission into the design.

128/15 – BA13430 – 8th Floor, International Commercial Centre, Main Street – Proposed conversion of the 8th floor car parking level into 7 apartment with terraces and associated works

DTP told the Commission that 72 car parking spaces will be converted into 7 dwellings. The apartments will range from 2 bedrooms to 5 bedrooms. DTP said that each dwelling will have two allocated parking spaces. He said that at present there are 405 parking spaces; of these 72 will be lost and 12 will be allocated to the dwellings. 165 of the parking spaces are currently rented out and 156 are available to the public. DTP said that the 7 dwellings will have terrace areas at the front of the building. The apartments will have flat roofs with brise soleils and timber elements will be added to the façade. Glazing will also be introduced on the north elevation to enclose the arches. DTP also said that the architect has indicated that the external staircase will be in keeping with the building and not an eyesore.

DTP advised that TSD has raised concerns about the scale of loss of parking and requested confirmation from the applicant that this will not have an adverse effect on public parking.

DTP said that there are no planning objections as although there will be a change in the appearance of the building this will not be significant bearing in mind the scale of the building.

The Chairman said that the building was designed as multiuse and that there is already a caretaker's flat within the building.

JH highlighted that there has been no mention of the sustainability profile of this development. She said that fumes might not be an issue as the car park is ventilated but that there will be some element of pollution. The Chairman said that the residential development will require an Energy Performance Certificate.

The Commission approved this application but agreed that the design for the external staircase to the rear of the building should be improved.

129/15 – BA13431 – Les Olives, 2B Gardiners Road – Application to construct extension to existing building and new store with terrace above.

DTP explained that the proposal is to create a store underneath the terrace at basement level. He said that minor internal alterations will be done on the second floor and a pergola introduced to the terrace area. DTP advised that this project is similar to one that has taken place on the same level of this road.

DTP said that LPS has not raised any objections. He also said that TSD has referred to their standard conditions and that the Department of Environment has not commented yet. DTP confirmed that the proposal does not involve the loss of any trees.

JH asked whether they should maintain the green area which exists between the buildings. The Chairman said that this would be up to the Commission but that a similar proposal was allowed in the adjacent property. JH suggested that perhaps they could have a green area on their terrace but the Chairman said that this cannot be controlled by the Commission.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

MSCHY asked why it is not possible for the Commission to insist that they must have plants on the terrace. DTP said that the Commission can condition landscaping but not plant pots, as this cannot be controlled.

The Commission approved this application on the condition that the applicant incorporates a permanent landscaped area on the terrace.

130/15 – BA13445 – Clifton Mews Car Park, Europa Road – Application to construct 5 individual car ports

DTP said that the 5 car ports would be located in the courtyard. He said that although there are more parking spaces, the application is for only 5 car ports to be constructed at present. DTP said that these would be modern structures with curved roofs made of PVC transparent materials. DTP said that there are no planning objections but that any future applications would have to follow the same design.

The Commission approved this application.

131/15 – BA13446 – 9/11 Corral Road – Proposed installation of new roof above existing roof

DTP said that the proposed new roof abuts West Place of Arms which is a listed monument. However, he said that although the Development Plan seeks to remove obstructions from listed monuments, this one is already obstructed by the building. DTP said that the reason for the proposal is due to the building suffering water ingress.

DTP advised that LPS and TSD have not raised any objections. He said that the Department of Environment requires measures for the control of dust during works.

DTP also said that the Heritage Trust and the Ministry for Heritage have been liaising with the applicant and that although they had initial reservations, they have now agreed with the designs as the new roof only affects part of the original wall and where it does affect the monument, existing holes will be used.

CAM confirmed that they had visited the site and that part of the bastion has already been cut off and a parapet wall constructed.

The Commission approved this application.

132/15 – BA13451 – 60 Devil’s Tower Road – Proposed construction of a three storey building comprising 3 floors, car parking/storage with the addition of double height ground floor storage units and a new shop on the North-East elevation

DTP told the Commission that outline planning permission was granted in December 2013. He said that some changes have been made to the design and that the application for full planning permission is for a 3 storey building with a shop unit on the Devil’s Tower Road façade and storage to the rear. DTP said that there will be a mezzanine floor above the shop and that on the first level there will be a showroom and offices. The upper level will be used as a machine and plant room. DTP said that the architecture will have a contemporary approach with rain screen

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

cladding. DTP also said that the building will be reduced slightly in height and that they have moved away from the idea of providing car parking and individual storage.

DTP said that they have carried out a rock fall assessment as requested and that TSD is satisfied with the results and no remedial works are required.

DTP also said that the Commission conditioned them to having vehicles driving out forwards onto the road but that the Traffic Commission has approved Articulated Lorries reversing in whilst directed by qualified personnel.

DTP said that the Department of Environment has commented on their standard conditions including dust control, energy performance, refuse collection, 5% landscaping and solar panels.

DTP also said that the Heritage Trust requires an Archeological Watching Brief to be carried out. He also said that the Ministry for Heritage and LPS have not raised any objections.

The Traffic Commission has not raised any objections.

JH said that the Commission went on site and saw how busy the road is. She questioned how lorries will manage reversing out of the site unless they stop traffic. The Chairman said that they will have to stop traffic at least twice daily.

JC said that there are ongoing issues on this site and that a solution to vehicular traffic in and out of the premises will not be found unless they redesign the whole building.

The Chairman said that vehicles are already reversing out of the site and have been doing so for years.

JH said that this road is due to become the main road into Gibraltar and that it will be very dangerous to reverse onto the road.

The Chairman said that Highways and the Traffic Commission have approved this but that if they then see that it does not work in practice, they will put a stop to it and an alternative would have to be found.

MEH suggested that the Commission could suggest that they unload elsewhere and use smaller lorries to deliver the goods to their premises. It was suggested that they could use the designated Articulated Lorry parking by Cemetery Road. The Commission concurred.

The Commission approved this application and requested the Chairman to write to the Traffic Commission expressing its concerns about the access arrangements for delivery vehicles.

133/15 – BA13453 – Buffadero Training Area – Proposed construction of communication facility, including tower and supporting infrastructure

DTP said that this application is to construct a new WHS Tower which houses communication facilities. He said that the existing tower will be dismantled. DTP said that the tower would be within a Special Area of Conservation.

DTP told the Commission that the existing tower has to be accessed externally whilst the new tower will have an internal staircase. DTP said that the proposed tower will cause limited visual impact from a few locations on Europa Road. He said that the MOD could try to address this and mitigate impact.

DTP said that TSD, the Ministry for Heritage and the Director of Civil Aviation have not raised any objections.

The Heritage Trust has said that the height is not insignificant but that they will not object to the proposal given that it is within the site of the existing tower. They have requested that an Archeological Watching Brief is carried out.

MEH highlighted that if trenching is required, an assessment should be carried out beforehand.

The Commission approved this application.

134/15 – BA13463 – 84/90 Main Street – Proposed internal and external alterations to Barclays Bank

DTP told the Commission that the marble cladding on the first floor level will be removed. He said that they will be introducing a shop front, reinstating balconies and reconstructing an internal staircase.

DTP said that the Heritage Trust felt that the existing windows should be changed and original ones reinstated. They also felt that the balconies should be removed.

CAM said that the proposal complies with policy in reinstating some original features but that they are not retaining all features.

The architect, Mr David Richardson, told the Commission that the building has two freeholds and as Barclays Bank is leaving, they have reinstating obligations under their lease. He said that the balconies are currently falling off and that the roof has asbestos. Mr Richardson said that the whole building currently has Crittal Windows hence why they have chosen to use the same but double glazed. He also said that the premises are up for sale and that the other part of the building is being sold as a project.

CAM said that it would be better to reintroduce timber or composite material Sash Windows. Mr Richardson said that the balconies on the other side of the property are not being replaced and that this will mean that there will be different windows on each side.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

CAM asked whether the balconies are necessary or whether they could have a railing balcony instead. Mr Richardson said that his instructions are to change on the basis of like for like.

CAM commended the architect as the documentation provided is very clear.

The Commission suggested that the applicant should consider removing the balconies.

The Commission approved the application with the condition that the balconies should not be replaced and the original windows restored.

135/15 – BA13470 – 292 Main Street – Proposed internal alterations and creation of ‘takeaway’ service hatch onto Main Street

DTP told the Commission that this matter has been brought to the DPC due to the applicant wanting to introduce a takeaway service hatch. He said that there is no issue with the proposed internal rearrangements but that the Subcommittee felt that the Commission should consider whether they want to allow the serving of customers directly in front of the premises. DTP said that this might set a precedent and that there might be a conflict of customers queuing in front of the premises and service vehicles trying to get through a narrow stretch of road. DTP said that there are also tables and chairs opposite the premises.

The Commission welcomed the applicant Mr Charlie Sanguinetti.

Mr Sanguinetti told the Commission that the main idea of the service hatch is to service the tables outside and that it will be manned by waiters. He said that they had thought about using it to serve customers as a takeaway very early in the morning before they open the full restaurant inside but that it will not be a full takeaway service and they do not envisage huge queues.

The Chairman said that they would still have to allow access to customers who want to use the toilet. He said that the biggest issue is that there is not enough space for people to stand to one side if vehicles are driving past.

MEH suggested pushing the counter further back into the premises.

MSCHY highlighted that this application would not set a precedent as there are already other establishments that serve customers from a counter on to Main Street. The Chairman said that the difference with these premises is that the demarcated pavement is narrow.

CV suggested that if it is allowed and then becomes an issue, the Commission can address this later on. DTP advised that once permission is granted and cannot easily be revoked.

The Commission approved this application.

136/15 – Ref 1196 – Unit 2, Public Market – Pizzeria – Application for tables and chairs licence

DTP told the Commission that the Building Control Officer requested guidance from the Commission on this matter. He said that the Building Control Officer has recommended that permission is not granted for tables and chairs to be placed directly in front of the entrance to the market. The only suitable area would be next to the market entrance but there is public seating and an office in that area. DTP said that he does not have any information on the bicycle parking which is located in the same area but is not currently in use.

The Chairman said that tables and chairs licences are revocable every month; hence, if permission is granted and then there are problems, the licence could be revoked.

DTP highlighted that the applicant does not have a toilet within their premises and therefore the Environmental Agency would usually not allow tables and chairs. However, he said that there are public toilets opposite the premises which could be used.

CAM said that they should not be allowed to enclose the area. The Chairman said that they will be conditioned to umbrellas without advertisements.

The Commission approved this application subject to access into the market not being obstructed and no enclosure.

137/15 – Ref 1196 – Al Madina Express, 20 Watergardens – Application for tables and chairs licence

DTP advised that the previous occupiers had a licence for tables and chairs. He said that the premises do not have toilets for public use but that Building Control has indicated that there are similar situations elsewhere.

The Commission approved this application.

138/15 – Ref 1537 – Europa Pass Battery, Europa Road – Policy decision required on external changes to western façade of complex

DTP said that this is an ex-MOD property sold via tender. He said that the Commission previously decided not to grant permission to changes to the west façade until a design guide was provided. DTP said that a design guide includes:

- Reduction of parapet wall by 500mm and inclusion of glazing with a stainless steel balustrade above;
- Curtain glazing to balconies;
- Construction of balcony on first floor and alteration of window proportions.

DTP said that there are no planning objections and recommended approval of the design guide.

JC asked whether the applicant has provided information on the structural validity of the timber columns as purchasers were advised to look into this. The Chairman said that the Government structural engineer looked into this and that no issues were found. However, he said that each individual would have to ensure that there are no problems and their proposal brought to the Commission for consideration.

The Commission approved the proposed design guide.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

Minor Works and other Works – not within scope of delegated powers

139/15 – BA12776 – Aerial Farm, Devil’s Tower Road – Request for relaxation under Part K of the Gibraltar Building Regulations regarding ventilation scheme of bedrooms in Seashell House – HMGOG Project

The Commission approved this application.

140/15 – BA13400 – 16/18 Withams Road – Proposed replacement of existing balcony and re-rendering of façade on all elevations and repaint

The Commission approved this application.

141/15 – BA13439 – St Paul’s Church, Varyl Begg Estate – Application to construct two extensions to building and refurbishment of existing interior

The Commission approved this application.

142/15 – BA13458 – Victoria Stadium, Bayside Road – Proposed installation of floodlights in hockey pitch facility – HMGOG Project

The Commission approved this application.

143/15 – BA13477 – Unit 4, Calpe Barracks, 3 Calpe Road – Proposed conversion of loft into bedroom and en-suite

The Commission approved this application.

144/15 – HM Naval Base, Tower Road – Proposed installation of MOD Armoury and Pass Office within existing building – HMGOG Project

CAM requested that the Heritage Trust be allowed to liaise with the applicant on the detailing of this project. She said that in principle they would not object to the proposal as the building is being used and being retained.

The Chairman suggested that the Heritage Trust liaise with the Government officer responsible for this project.

The Commission approved this application.

The meeting was adjourned until 2.00pm.

The meeting was reconvened at 2.00pm.

Major Development

145/15 – BA13471 – Marina Bay – Proposed super yacht berthing facilities and rental apartments constructed on stilts

The Chairman advised that the Commission will not be taking a decision or discussing this application at this meeting.

DTP told the Commission that Outline Planning Permission has previously been granted for a residential development in this area. He said that the previous proposal was for a building which would be up to 5 storeys high but that as a result of comments received all buildings have been reduced to 3 storeys. DTP said that the applicant, one supporter and three objectors have requested the opportunity to address the Commission.

The Commission welcomed the applicant Mr Greg Butcher.

Mr Butcher told the Commission that diversification of economy and accommodation is needed. He said that he is following Government's lead in this project as Government has removed tax for yachts and duty on marine fuel. He said that this mirrors the online gaming industries where companies came to Gibraltar as tax was removed. However, he said that at present Gibraltar does not have a superyacht facility, hence why they are not coming to Gibraltar. Mr Butcher said that La Linea de La Concepcion is a competitor as they have a facility for 69 superyachts and have said that they will compete to take Gibraltar's cruise industry. He also said that at present Montenegro also has a facility and their economy is twice Gibraltar's economy. Mr Butcher also said that many of these yachts travel to the Caribbean which means that Gibraltar has a natural advantage in terms of location.

Mr Butcher said that the DPC has approved two different developments for this location but that he has changed plans due to Government's interest in superyachts and having reviewed the Development Plan in detail. Mr Butcher said that the World Trade Centre is being constructed and that it will attract inward investment with around 1700 people working there. He said that most of these will be high earners that will require rental accommodation in Gibraltar; hence why he has incorporated rental apartments to his proposal.

Mr Butcher said that infrastructure costs will be approximately £7-10 million. He said that in terms of size, this proposal is the same as the one previously approved by the Commission except that the superyacht facility has been introduced. Mr Butcher said that the facility extends 700ft out to sea. Mr Butcher also said that the DPC when considering his previous application placed considerable conditions on his project including traffic and environmental conditions. He said that they have amended their proposal to satisfy all of these conditions.

Mr Butcher said that there will be a 25% increase in berthing area and that the Sunborn will take over any short stay apartments that remain available. He said that landscaping will be introduced to soften the area and public access will be improved. Mr Butcher said that this proposal does not require an EIA and that a report on this has been provided to this effect. He said that the proposal meets the requirements of the Development Plan. Mr Butcher also said that the apartments change the view slightly but that so do other developments.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

Mr Butcher told the Commission that people have been signing objection notices even before the application was submitted. He said that since they placed all of the information on their website, 796 people have visited it. He said that they also held a conference on the project and has since received 350 letters of support. Mr Butcher said that they will be changing the view of the marina but that the change is insignificant compared to the positive changes that this development will bring to the economy. He said that the information attached to the objections is incorrect.

Mr Butcher claimed that attracting superyachts to Gibraltar will bring in money to local businesses. He said that up to 45 delivery trucks go down to one superyacht a day and that in total there are around 100 vehicles travelling through the marina per day, most of which are taxis.

The Chairman asked Mr Butcher how many berths they will be providing. Mr Butcher said that they are looking to provide berths for 10 superyachts. He said that they need to take into account the Obstacle Limitation Surface set by the MOD but that the residential development does not affect the berthing facilities. Mr Butcher added that the area of water on which they will be developing is hardly used at present due to the wave effect arising from an error in the original design of the marina.

CAM highlighted that there are a considerable number of delivery trucks to one single yacht and that having facilities for 10 yachts and residential units will significantly increase traffic. She said that the pier will become a main access road and that this will affect its use and character. Mr Butcher said that the number of vehicles quoted includes deliveries to the Sunborn and bars and restaurants. He said that this has been going on since the marina opened.

JH said that traffic was a concern since the project was first presented to the Commission. Mr Butcher said that there was a concern but that these have been unfounded.

The Chairman asked how they will control individuals from accessing the pier with their vehicles. Mr Butcher said that they will install a barrier system. He also said that they will be providing enough space for two way access so that cars do not have to reverse out. Mr Butcher also said that they will be introducing planting which will help to slow down traffic.

DTP asked whether the yachts which they expect to attract will be new yachts registering in Gibraltar. Mr Butcher said that there is a shortage of berths in the Mediterranean and therefore manufacturers' book berths in advance; he said that they would aim to work with them. He also said that they will try to get boats that are already registered as they would be attracted to Gibraltar by the fact that they would be in a non VAT zone.

JH asked whether Mr Butcher would consider reconsidering building apartments and focus on the superyachts. She said that there might be a risk that they might not be attracted to Gibraltar but that it is important to maintain the openness of the marina. Mr Butcher said that he has produced an Environmental Screening Report which shows that there would not be any effect on the use of the area. The Chairman confirmed that this report will be circulated with his.

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

Mr Butcher highlighted that there is a shortage of accommodation in Gibraltar and that no private buildings have been built in the last 7 years. Mr Butcher said that the main connection is that one pays for the other.

DTP questioned whether the rental residential units will eventually become permanent dwellings if the idea of short term rental does not work. He said that if these eventually become permanent homes, it will be difficult to control parking issues. Mr Butcher said that the private rental market usually does not have a high car parking use. He said that 40 car parking spaces will be provided just across the road and that people who rent for longer can use the new car park if permission is granted for this. Mr Butcher also highlighted that the new traffic plan encourages walking, bus and bicycles, and that by not providing parking people will be encouraged to walk or use other means of transport.

DTP told Mr Butcher that in his previous scheme one of his arguments was that they had to provide parking to sell the properties. Mr Butcher said that they would not be able to sell the properties without parking, hence why they are being marketed as non-owner occupation.

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

The Commission welcomed Mr John Gaggero (Port Agent).

Mr Gaggero told the Commission that he supports this project. He said that 415 yacht calls were registered in 2014 as having filled with fuel in Gibraltar. He said that the majority of vessels do not use port agents and therefore these would not be reflected in the statistics. He said that this project can bring substantial benefits to Gibraltar and that Gibraltar is in a good location to become the port of choice for yacht transfers. However, he said that La Linea is developing their marina to try to compete with Gibraltar and get the larger market. Mr Gaggero said that the current facilities in Gibraltar are woeful and limited in size. He said that there is scope for development and that the benefits from attracting yachts will have positive effects on supermarkets, local retailers, etc. He also said that the exposure for Gibraltar will also be beneficial in terms of the Finance Centre and that it will attract investment. Mr Gaggero said that marinas are usually financed by real estate and businesses situated around them.

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

The Commission welcomed two objectors, Mr and Mrs Nice.

Mr Nice told the Commission that they are residents of Neptune House. He said that he was a Fire Engineer trained in industrial risk in the USA and later formed his company FBC in London which dealt with fires and smoke evacuation. Mr Nice said that in his opinion it is dangerous to build residential apartments on piers. He referred to a report on historical piers and to fires which have occurred on some of these. Mr Nice said that nobody ever sleeps on piers. He said that it is a controlled environment and that there is no legislation for accommodation on piers as no one puts accommodation on them. Mr Nice said that there would only be one exit from the buildings and that this exit would be amongst other buildings. He said that if there were to be a fire on any

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

of these buildings it would be a façade fire and that although these types of fires constitute only around 3% of fires, they are the ones that cause the most damage. Mr Nice said that superyachts store up to 400,000 litres of fuel and that although they are usually very safe if one catches fire the result would be catastrophic for the residential accommodation. He said that air would flow beneath the buildings and that although he has carried out a lot of evacuation modelling, this situation is difficult to analyse.

The Chairman asked Mr Nice whether they are opposed to both the superyachts and the residential units. Mr Nice said that they are not opposed to the proposal for superyacht berthing facilities.

Mr Nice said that the CFB is very concerned about this proposal. The Chairman said that the proposal will go through the Building Control process and that the CFB has direct responsibility and input in this.

Mrs Nice highlighted that she did not think that the financial part of the proposal has anything to do with her but that the developer has portrayed that the superyacht facilities are not possible without the residential buildings. She said that it is concerning that the crew salaries is the largest expenditure of a superyacht but that they would not contribute to tax payment in Gibraltar. With regards to maintenance and repairs, Mrs Nice said that yachts can be registered in Gibraltar and obtain their fuel in Gibraltar but that this does not mean that they have to repair the yachts in Gibraltar. She also said that vessels in transit would be able to purchase everything duty free and that they will not necessarily have to purchase their vessel insurance or food in Gibraltar. Mrs Nice said that she objects to the figures provided by Mr Butcher to justify this development in terms of its economic benefit to Gibraltar

In terms of traffic, Mrs Nice said that even if the apartments are short term rental, occupiers will hire cars. She also said that facilities for 10 superyachts will increase traffic in the area. She said that there will be a conflict between people and cars and provided a video showing cars entering the area at present.

The Chairman said that the video provided shows evidence of private cars driving into the area.

Mrs Nice also referred to loss of views and said that the development will not only affect the views of residents of Marina Bay but also views from the entrance of Ocean Village. Mrs Nice said that the development will affect the sense of openness and amenity of the area.

Mrs Nice summarised her objections saying that they are based on the danger of fire, economic value, traffic, parking, use of amenity and effects of long term residential units in the area.

The Commission did not have any questions and thanked Mr and Mrs Nice.

The Commission welcomed another objector, Mr Richard Hamm.

Mr Hamm told the Commission that he also lives in Marina Bay. He said that he has sent emails objecting to the proposal and that most of the issues he raised have been addressed by the other

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

objectors. Mr Hamm said that Marina Bay is being overdeveloped. He said that he is worried about access and parking problems. He also referred to the ongoing dispute of ownership of the road between Ocean Village and Tradewinds. Mr Hamm said that he likes the idea of introducing berthing facilities for superyachts but is concerned about the proposal to develop residential buildings for rental. He said that the apartments should be built elsewhere and not in the middle of the marina as it will remove iconic views from Gibraltarians.

The Commission did not have any questions and thanked Mr Hamm.

The lawyer representing Tradewinds approached the Commission and said that his client has objected to the proposal. He highlighted that the applicant had been allowed to address the Commission for over an hour when in the notice issued it states that the applicant is usually allowed 3 minutes. He asked the Commission to allow him to address them on behalf of his applicant.

The applicant's lawyer also requested permission to address the Commission in view that one of the objectors' lawyer was raising objections.

The Chairman did not allow any further discussion as the meeting had already lasted two hours and all scheduled presentations had been completed. The Chairman informed that the application would be considered at the next meeting.

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

146/15 – BA11650 – 14 Lind House, Europa Road – Retrospective request to remove tree

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

147/15 – BA12586 – 4 Ordinance Wharf, Queensway Quay – Amendment to application introducing additional doors and window to West elevation and internal modifications

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

148/15 – BA12740 – Flat 4, 73 Irish Town – Request to replace existing internal windows to UPVC framed ones

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

149/15 – BA13274 – Rock Cottage, South Barrack Road – Amendments to windows to front elevation and minor internal alterations and discharge details of solar panels

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

150/15 – BA13420 – Plot 63, 45 Garrod Road – Subdivision of one workshop into two, converting a window opening into a door and providing an additional fire exit

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

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

151/15 – BA13426 – 69 Main Street – Revised plans received displaying roller shutter placed internally and revised external finishes

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

152/15 – BA13436 – 5 John Mackintosh Square – Conversion of former bar into barber shop

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

153/15 – BA13440 – Unit 2C, Second Floor, Leisure Island Business Centre – Subdivision of unit into two offices

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

154/15 – BA13441 – Flat 3, 46 Main Street – Subdivision of property into two apartments and internal alterations

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

155/15 – BA13444 – Star Bar, 12 Parliament Lane – Proposed refurbishment of façade and installation of awning

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

156/15 – BA13448 – Unit 4, 1A Pitman's Alley – Application for change of use of premises from office to radio station with installation of antenna on roof

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

157/15 – BA13449 – 317 Main Street – Proposed renovation to include extension to the rear and new doorway to Main Street – Follows on from outline planning permission

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

158/15 – BA13452 – Unit 3, Europa Pass Battery, Europa Road – Proposed alterations and refurbishment

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

159/15 – BA13455 – Cloister Building, Market Lane – New lift and shaft to replace existing

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

160/15 – BA13456 – 7 North Front – Proposed construction of replacement shed

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

161/15 – BA13459 – 9 & 10 Bright Cottage, Charles V Ramp – Internal modifications and refurbishment

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

162/15 – BA13460 – 4 Buena Vista Mews, Buena Vista Road – Proposed minor internal alterations

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

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

163/15 – BA13461 – 2 Honeysuckle House, Waterport Terraces – Proposed replacement of hallway window with a door for access to well area

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

164/15 – BA13462 – 6B Gardiner’s Road – Proposed minor internal alterations

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

165/15 – BA13464 – Unit 30 & 31 New Harbours – Creating an opening linking two adjacent units

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

166/15 – BA13465 – 12/1 City Mill Lane – Retrospective application for change of use from offices to spa

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

167/15 – BA13467 – 24 The Square, Marina Bay – Proposed external and internal alterations to apartment

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

168/15 – BA13472 – 55/57 Main Street – Proposed alterations to rear of shop premises

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

169/15 – BA13484 – 23 Silene House, West View Park – Application to install glass curtains

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

170/15 – BA13485 – Vault 7, Chatham Counterguard – Application to convert unit into bar/restaurant

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

171/15 – BA13486 – 4 Flat Bastion Road – Retrospective application for minor internal alterations

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

172/15 – BA13487 – Unit 1, Majestic Ocean Plaza – Change of use from beauty salon to estate agents

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

173/15 – Ref 1198/009/15 – Finlayson’s Kiosk, Casemates Square – Sandwich board

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

174/15 – Ref 1198/012/15 – Wasabi – 16 City Mill Lane – Sandwich board

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

175/15 – Ref 1198/022/13 – 53A Irish Town – Consideration of alternative signage

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

Approved
DPC meeting 3/15
26/3/15

176/15 – Ref N/002/15 – Dr Giraldi Home – Application to remove rubber fig tree

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

177/15 – Ref N/003/15 – Courtyard, Joshua Hassan House – Application to remove weeping fig tree

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

Any other business

178/15 – Next meeting

The next DPC meeting will be held on Wednesday 22nd April 2015 at 9:30a.m.