Approved DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018 THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 1st Meeting of 2018 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 24th January 2018 at 9.30 am.

Present:	Mr P Origo (Chairman) (Town Planner)
	The Hon S Linares (MSCHY) (Minister for Sports, Culture, Heritage and Youth)
	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)
	Mr Charles Perez (CP) (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 (Deputy Chief Minister)

Approved DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

Mr Keith Bensusan (Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History Society)

Mr M Cooper (Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

1/18 – Approval of Minutes

The minutes for of the 12th meeting of 2017 held on 31st October 2017, the 13th meeting of 2017 held on 28th November 2017 and the minutes of the 14th meeting of 2017 held on 15th December 2017 were approved.

Matters Arising

<u>2/18 – F/15154/17 – Western Arm Terminal, North Mole – Proposed installation of a high level</u> pipeline to connect the existing tank to the western arm depot.

This application was previously considered at the December meeting but the Commission required further information on whether:

- 1. A Vapour Recovery System was going to be installed.
- 2. A survey had been carried out to determine if the pipeline could not be installed underground
- 3. The applicant had any long term plans for the redevelopment of the site.

The applicant confirmed that the tank would store non-volatile Marine Diesel Oil and vapour was not likely to accumulate in the tank head space. It was industry standard practice to have free atmospheric vented tanks. Notwithstanding, the applicant would install a Pressure Vacuum Valve meaning venting would only occur during fifteen hours a month when refuelling of the tank. Pressure Vacuum Valves are standard for petrol filling station tanks and is what is used in all petrol stations in Gibraltar. The Ministry of Defence (MOD) had confirmed that there were pipes underground which would conflict with the proposed underground route for their pipes. The MOD also confirmed that the pipes were known to be in poor condition and disturbance could lead to a risk of contamination. The Captain of the Port had commented that the Port Authority preferred for the pipeline to be fitted over ground.

The applicant's longer term plans for the redevelopment of the site still had to be confirmed but reported that the bridge had been designed for a wide range of future scenarios. The phase 2 development was being discussed with Government and was largely dependent on fluidity at the frontier after Brexit as a less fluid frontier would make it more important to be able to import by sea.

Technical Services Department maintained their objections to implementing the pipeline over ground as they considered that it would have a negative visual impact due to its proximity to the Cruise Terminal.

DTP informed the Commission that the applicant was applying for a COMAH licence from the Environmental Agency. MEHEC commented that the proposed works could not proceed without the licence and it was still in process of being granted.

JH stated that although the applicant had informed her that there would not be any fumes when the tanks were being filled the release of any fumes was still of concern to her. She added that there were all sorts of abatement technologies available which could be used by the applicant.

JH added that there was a precedence with the Tank Farm where best available technology had been called for and applicant had complied -stating we should not expect lower standards from

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

other operators

MEHEC concurred with JH's comments, adding that the best available technology should be applied.

The Chairman recommend that the Commission follow JH and MEHEC's recommendations and should consider approving the application with the condition that the best available technology should be used.

The Commission voted on this application as follows:

In favour: 10 Against: Nil Abstentions: 1

This application was approved by the Commission unanimously with the condition to use the best available technology in respect of Vapour Recovery.

Major Developments

<u>3/18 – F/15203/17G – Laguna Site Complex – Proposed construction of new Saint Anne's and Notre Dame Schools.</u>

GoG Project

The architect for this project, Mr David Orfila, was invited to address and inform the Commission on this proposal.

The site is divided into five zones: Notre Dame First School, St. Anne's Middle School, Adventure Playground, Gymnasium and Parking. The new buildings would comprise a part 3, part 4 storey building toward the south and a part 4 part 5 storey building to the north. The Gymnasium and communal sports hall would be located adjacent to Sir Winston Churchill Avenue.

The ground floor of the complex would house approximately 200 parking spaces with a secondary access point into the school and space for drop offs. The main entrance to the schools would be via a staircase at the Winston Churchill Avenue junction. Access to the car park would be via Sir Winston Churchill Avenue and exit via Trigger Road which is within Laguna Estate.

At podium level there would be entry points for both Notre Dame First School and St. Anne's Middle School. Adventure Playground would also be found at this level. Each school has been designed to house 500 pupils. Notre Dame school would be two floors in height and St. Anne's would be three floors. A green area/playing area would be found at roof level of each school.

JH asked Mr Orfila whether renewable energy and water collection would be used as well as incorporating as many green areas as possible.

Mr Orfila replied that green areas will be found at rooftop and podium levels. He added that they were currently looking at installing solar panels but there would be a limited ability at reusing

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

water.

CV asked whether there would be any ventilation in the car park.

Mr Orfila responded that there would be louvers around the perimeter of the car park providing natural ventilation.

The Chairman asked Mr Orfila whether plans for a green verge had been redesigned.

Mr Orfila stated that trees on the north section were not being removed and there would be trees around the site in order to soften the development.

CAM commented that the Heritage Trust would like an Archaeological Watching Brief to be carried out.

DTP reported that a Desk Based Assessment and an Archaeological Watching Brief were required and the Traffic Commission also required further information on crossings. DTP added that the Department for Environment, Energy and Climate Change (DoEECC) required further details on sustainability, sustainable travel modes and green/ brown roofing. DoEECC also required that Swift and Bat Boxes be implemented.

Following discussions between the architects and Town Planning the design for the sports hall has been amended. DTP recommended that provision be made for motorbikes and bicycles within the car park. DTP also recommended that consideration be given to treat the wall of the gymnasium, facing Winston Churchill Avenue with a green wall.

JH asked for clarification on access to the car park and how the drop off and pick up would work with the new changes. Also asked if the new traffic movements would affect traffic flow through the estate.

DTP responded that pick-up would be through the parking area but that if an alternative arrangement was implemented it would result in a loss of residential parking at Laguna Estate. The exit would be onto Trigge Road and then Winston Churchill Avenue.

The Commission unanimously agreed with DTP's recommendations.

<u>4/18 – O/15234/17 – 29/37 Engineer's Lane and adjacent Car Park – Proposed construction of building containing serviced apartments. 2 commercial units and ancillary areas.</u>

Mr Stephen Martinez, who was representing the applicants, was invited to address the Commission. Applications for this site have previously been submitted and rejected by the Commission. Mr Martinez described the scheme as sensitive and that the new building would provide residential serviced apartments. He also mentioned that the proposed scheme would improve the streetscape and inject new life into the area. At basement level there would be a gymnasium, boardroom and two small commercial units. The basement would be 2.6 metres below ground level. Mr Martinez added that this new scheme had a more traditional feel than previous more modern proposals. The roof terrace would have a pool that would be open to visitors and residents alike. Mr Martinez also mentioned that he had re-designed the previously proposed ground floor but may revert to housing a bin store and roundabout in order to enter the

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

parking.

CAM commented that she still considered that the old Risso Bakery could have been saved and the design proposed fits in with the area but may be too tall. She added that the old oven and any heritage items should be salvaged and integrated into this building. CAM also mentioned that an Archaeological Watching Brief should be carried out.

DTP reported on this proposal to construct an eight storey building consisting of 52 serviced apartments, 2 commercial units, gymnasium and 4 parking spaces within their licensed area. On the sixth floor there would be a terrace with a setback on Engineers Lane. The terrace on the 8th floor would be further set back and house a swimming pool and leisure area for residents and visitors.

DTP reported on the main changes being the change from a 50 bed hotel to 52 serviced apartments; omission of the port cochere; private bin store was no longer within the building; change in architectural style to a mixed neo-classical and contemporary treatment; curved balconies on NE corner and the change of the roof area from a plant area to terrace/pool.

The following comments were received by consultees:

- Ministry for Heritage Welcomed the revised application and considered that a 19th Century tiled wall on the southern boundary and an existing bread oven be integrated into the building. Also felt that the building should be no higher than 5 storeys and that the proposed wrought iron balconies were of a typically Spanish design and should be changed.
- DoEECC Details of green roof to be submitted as well as incorporation of Swift/Bat boxes and should make provision for the existing 16 public bins plus 4 bins required for the new development (they may be able to utilise the existing public recycling bins).

DTP stated that the building itself was similar in mass to the approved scheme but that the overall height had increased from 25.9m to 29.5m. It was felts that at 5th floor a further set back would avoid the clash of architectural styles. The curved balconies were not in keeping and the façade treatment to floors 1 to 4 would need reviewing. There was also an issue as to where plant would be located and the need for a loading bay.

DTP recommended that the height be limited to the previously approved 25.9m, the 5th floor introduce e asset back, façade details to be reviewed, plant location to be agreed, refuse provision be made for the development and re-provision of public facilities, detailed landscaping scheme to be provided, and provision of loading facilities

The Chairman commented that the applicant should redesign the ground floor to bring the cafeteria to the front of the building to add more life to the streetscape.

The Commission voted on this application as follows:

Approve: 10 Against: 1

CAM commented that she was not in agreement that the previous building had been demolished but did feel that this new proposal was an improvement to previous applications submitted.

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

The application was approved subject to the recommended conditions including consideration of relocating the café to the front of the building.

Other Developments

<u>5/18 – REF. 1380-17 – Cepsa Petrol Filling Station, British Lines Road – Consideration of Town</u> <u>Planner's EIA Screening Opinion.</u>

DTP reported that this was a request for a Screening opinion by the Town Planner on whether the proposed the Cepsa Petrol Station to be located on a site adjacent to the airport required an EIA. DTP summarised the Town Planner's Screening opinion which concluded that subject to various studies to be undertaken at the planning application stage there were unlikely to be any significant environmental effects and an EIA was not required.

DTP also commented that a DBA and AWB were required for any construction below ground. There was no risk no risk of flooding or of any waste effects but an adequate waste management plan should be implemented during construction.

The Chairman commented that an EIA was not required for a petrol station within a city as under EU Directives a petrol station is not classified as a refinery and would still have to go through the normal planning process.

JH stated that an assessment on how the new petrol station could affect traffic flow should be carried out- also that as per the ESG submission to Town planner that the Blast wall to be built between the petrol station and RAF Airfield site should be extended to act as barrier between the petrol station and airport terminal.

MEHEC commented that car charging points should be incorporated into the petrol station and that the proposed station is in close proximity to a well-used by the DoEECC for monitoring groundwater. If the well were to be affected by the proposal then the applicant would need to provide an alternative well accessible by the DOEECC.

The Commission agreed with the Town Planner's Screening Opinion.

<u>6/18 – F/14995/17 – 16 Europa Mews, Europa Road – Proposed construction of single storey</u> pergola hut.

MSCHY recused himself as he is the applicant's neighbour.

This retrospective application had previously been deferred in October 2017 in order to allow the applicant to submit landscaping proposals to screen the hut and to submit details of a Geotechnical survey.

The applicant had planted twelve Tamarisk trees to screen the pergola hut but these already had a lean because of the wind in the area. At the moment they provided little screening.

DTP reported that DoEECC commented that Tamarisk's would be a good screening tree and 2 metre high trees were right for planting at this time of year.

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

A montage presented by the applicant's agent was displayed showing a wall around the pergola hut to screen it further. The agent, Mr Daniel Rios, stated that his client wished to have approval in principle before carrying out a Geotechnical survey.

DTP reported that the Technical services Department had no objection to the DPC agreeing the principle of the development and then a geotechnical assessment be undertaken which would need to be approved by Technical services Department prior to the issue of permission, and which would also have to set out any cliff works that may be required.

DTP commented that if the Commission were to consider in-principle first that a deadline of say six to eight weeks for a survey to be submitted should be imposed. He also commented that it needs to be ,made clear to the applicant that if the geotechnical study required cliff works to be undertaken then these details would need to be considered by the DPC and that it was possible that they might not be acceptable.

CP stated that Tamarisk trees may not be suitable for the area due to the westerly wind. The trees may survive but had reservations whether they would screen the hut adequately.

MEHEC commented that if the stone wall proposed was extended further it could look like a continuation of the cliff. MEHEC added that he did not like retrospective applications.

JH added that the Commission should not be pushed into a corner.

The Chairman asked the Commission whether they wished to recommend the applicant to submit further details of screening with the stone wall, supplemented with more vegetation.

The application was deferred by the Commission and the applicant as required to submit details of an extended wall to assist in screening the hut together with the requested geotechnical assessment.

<u>7/18 – O/15135/17 – 5 Cheshire House, Buena Vista – Proposed single storey extension to the roof of building.</u>

The applicant's agent, Mr Paul Passano, addressed the Commission to inform them on this application to construct a single storey extension over a late 19th/early 20th Century single storey dwelling. Mr Passano commented that the ground floor would remain as the entrance to the building with a stair core to the upper floor. The west façade is the most prominent. Neighbours have constructed extensions to connect both buildings. Mr Passano proposed that the extension would be set back by 1.5 metres, with a glass façade to minimise the visual impact of the extension. Mr Passano stated that there was a precedent to allow extensions in the area which showed the difference between old and new architectural styles.

JH asked Mr Passano what the reason was for the extension.

Mr Passano replied that the applicants wished to provide a unit for family who is helping them out at home. He added that he and his clients understood that the site had heritage value.

CAM commented that there was a difference between this application and others as other properties also had vaulted ceilings.

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

Mr Passano responded that there would be minimal impact and it would be reversible.

KS stated that the applicants would require permission from the estate's management company.

Mr Passano replied that his clients were aware that they would require some approval.

The Chairman mentioned that an objection from a neighbour had been received.

Mr Passano replied that his proposal was similar to surrounding extensions and that neighbours have also constructed extensions on the rear of the building.

JH asked whether any renewable energy was being proposed.

Mr Passano responded that they were looking into using solar thermal energy and that the applicant wishes to make it as energy efficient as possible.

The Commission thanked Mr Passano.

DTP reported that the west elevation of the extension would be predominantly glazed, with the east elevation being a rendered façade with various window units. He added that Town Planning had discussed setting back the east elevation with the applicants but they had decided to not revise the design. The applicants had proposed two different options for the west facade. One would consist of a framed structure with no overhang, the second had an overhang.

DTP stated that the building could be seen from various areas and that there were other examples of modern extensions on historic buildings in the area such as the Dementia Day Care Centre, Buena Vista and at the University of Gibraltar. He commented that in the main the extensions were set back. He also commented that the proposal would set a precedent for other extensions on the roof of the building for the neighbouring units.

The following comments were received from consultees:

- DoEECC Made standard comments including green/brown roofing.
- Heritage Trust The design would alter the silhouette of the building and objected to the proposal.
- Ministry for Heritage Objected as the extension would alter the character of the building.
- Technical Services Objected to the proposal as it would alter the character of the building and the applicants should look into other options.

An objection had been received to the application stating that the extension would change the building's character and that the roof is owned by the management company not the applicant. DTP commented that he believed that there would be some impact on the building's character but that similar extensions had been permitted on surrounding buildings. Experience of the Development Appeals Tribunal was that they would give a lot of weight to precedents if the application was to be refused and an appeal lodged. DTP added that if the applicants set back the east elevation the visual impact would be further reduced and put this forward as a recommendation. In relation to the two options for the west façade the overhang was preferred but that instead of a solid overhang consideration should be given to a 'lighter' structure such as a

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

brise soleil that would add visual interest and from a distance would be more recessive and less visible.

DTP recommended approval of the application subject to the conditions referred to.

MSCHY commented that the Commission should not consider the application until approval was given by the estate's management company.

The Chairman responded that planning decisions are not dependent on landlords or management companies' approval. However, landlords and management companies do have the opportunity to veto any approved proposals going ahead. The Chairman added that the Commission is obliged to consider applications submitted.

The Chairman asked the Commission to vote on whether they wished to approve the construction of the extension with a further setback on the east elevation and brise soleil to the west facade.

The Commission voted as follows:

Approve: 2 Refusal: 6 Abstentions: 3

This application was refused on the basis that:

The proposal would be out of character with what is considered a building of heritage value, would lead to pressure for other extensions either side of the proposal resulting in an incremental rather than holistic design solution and would have a negative impact on the appearance of the building including its profile when viewed from a distance.

<u>8/18 – F/15217/17 – Pelham House, Buena Vista Estate – Proposed extension to balconies on front façade of building.</u>

This application was to extend the balconies on the front façade of Pelham House and replace timber with glass balustrading. DTP reported that this was one of four blocks; each block consists of three storeys over ground floor parking. The proposal was to construct extended balconies on each level are supported by columns, existing timber balustrading would be removed and the new balconies would have glass balustrading. The installation of glass curtains at the rear of the building and small extensions within recessed balconies at the rear had previously been approved in July 2017. Permission had also previously been granted for the enclosure of car ports create garages.

The following comments were received from consultees:

- DoEECC Lost planter should be replaced with further landscaping.
- Technical Services Objected to the proposal as the blocks within the estate should be uniform.

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

DTP referred members to copies of objections that had been circulated with their agenda. An objection had been received on behalf of residents at Currey House, although there was a separate letter from a resident of Currey House confirming that they did not object. They stated that the uniformity of the estate will be lost.

DTP reported that Buena Vista Estate had a particular architectural character but some changes have been allowed. He commented that the proposed extensions to the balconies would erode the original design concept and would jar with the other blocks. The original design concept was for a staggered building line with projecting elements (the balconies) and a homogenous treatment across all blocks. The proposal would introduce a dominant structure on the front elevation resulting in the loss of the architectural character. There would also be a loss of the building form and the front facade would be dominated by balconies and columns. This would be totally out of keeping with the other blocks and if approved would set a precedent for the other blocks. This would compound the effect of dominance and loss of the staggered form. DTP recommended that the original design concept should be respected and recommended refusal.

CV commented that he was not displeased with the proposal but he understood that there should be some consistency between all buildings within the estate.

MEHEC remarked that a mismatch of the buildings should be avoided.

KS mentioned that two blocks are to be sold.

Mr Andrew Neish who was representing the residents of Pelham House commented that he had submitted images of the current state of the timber slats which were dilapidated. He added that glass balustrading has been used in other places and that the balconies could possibly be staggered.

The Chairman replied that even if the balconies were set back the estate would still lose the staggered building line. The Chairman suggested that the application be deferred in order for the applicants to revise their designs for the balconies and to introduce set backs.

The application was deferred to enable the Applicant to provide alternative designs for the balconies.

<u>9/18 - O/15239/17 - The Rotunda, Ragged Staff Wharf, Queensway - Proposed conversion of an area at ground level (The Rotunda) below the podium garden area, into a wine bar with external seating.</u>

The applicants, Mr John McKillop-Smith and Mr Freddie Vazquez, addressed the Commission about this application involving the conversion of the area into a wine bar. The applicant stated that the proposed external seating would be in the central area, which has been poached by neighbouring restaurants.

Objections had been submitted by ten residents and three commercial units in the area. Mr Vazquez stated that the objections were generic in nature, the ten residents are not clustered around the area and the three commercial units were only objecting because of the loss of the internal space of The Rotunda. Mr Vazquez added that they were not proposing to alter the structure, only close the entrance and side arches. Mr Vazquez also said that The Rotunda was

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

not a public amenity and was routinely used by the neighbouring restaurants as a store room and that the alleged fire exits were not being used as such. The area being used by the neighbouring restaurants is not within their licensed remit. The external seating area would be made up of twenty tables and they would be directly in front of The Rotunda and at the water's edge. They would not be serving any food, and may only open during the summer months.

The Chairman asked the applicants about the restaurants losing the fire escapes they currently have through The Rotunda.

Mr McKillop Smith replied that the owner had no objection for the restaurants to use a panic bolt.

DTP commented that The Rotunda was a valid access point for Rendez-Vous and The Landings and this proposal would block those doors.

Mr McKillop Smith replied that both restaurants never use the access points.

DTP reported that limited details had been submitted on the proposed business but within the development plan the area was considered mixed use. The Head Lessor did not have any objections to the proposal. The objectors generally stated that an amenity would be lost and The Rotunda is not a commercial area. The neighbouring restaurants claimed their fire exits would be blocked and that increased external seating would be detrimental to their businesses.

DTP reported that in general terms the use is acceptable in terms of the usage of the general area and there was not a use that would be specifically contrary to the policy. However, he expressed concerns that the proposal would block up access to and from the two properties.

The Commission agreed that the principle of the use was acceptable but that the issue of blocking the accesses from the two adjacent restaurants would need to be resolved first.

The application was approved unanimously subject to the issue of access being resolved and no outline permission would be issued until that matter was settled.

<u>10/18 – F/15251/17 – 4 King's Street – Proposed change of use of existing retail unit to gym</u> and associated internal and external refurbishment.

This application was for 4 King's Street to undergo some internal and external refurbishments to convert the property from a retail unit to a small gymnasium, with changing facilities at the rear.

Mr Manuel Ostheider addressed the Commission to explain that his intention was to convert the property into a boutique fitness studio as part of a German franchise. He stated he wished to extend the length of the window as he considered it to be his main marketing tool and that he did not intend to lose the current character of the window. Mr Ostheider claimed the Landlord had confirmed that the brickwork under the window was not original.

Ministry for Heritage and Heritage Trust had commented that they objected to lowering the window. CAM mentioned that she considered the brickwork to be original. Technical Services commented that the plans did not work. GM added that there was no physical

barrier between the changing rooms and the window.

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

DTP reported that there was a policy in place which discourage the change of use of retail to nonretail but precedents for this type of change of did exist and the applicant also intended to sell sports and fitness products. The rationale for the policy was to maintain the vitality of shopping streets and it was considered that the proposed use would not detract from this as it would attract customers to the premises. As there were objections to changing the original length of the windows DTP recommended that this part of the application should not be approved.

The Commission unanimously approved this application with the exception of the proposal to extend height of the window which was not approved.

<u>11/18 - F/15263/17G - Clay Pigeon shooting Club, 1 Europa Advance Road - Proposed</u> <u>demolition and construction of new clay pigeon shooting sports complex.</u>

DTP reported on this application to demolish the current Clay Pigeon Shooting Club in order to construct a new complex over three levels. The shooting area could be found on the ground level, together with two timber clad towers. Viewing platforms would be found on the level underneath and above. The architectural treatment to the complex would consist of significant glazing and limestone cladding. The viewing terraces would have boundary railings and a glass balustrade.

DTP reported on the comments received from the World Heritage Site office which stated that the complex would be the first development within the boundary of the world heritage site and would be putting its universal value at risk. The site's world heritage status could be placed on the World Heritage Site in Danger List or it could be removed completely. It considered that construction of the complex would have an adverse visual impact on the integrity of the World Heritage and on key significant views from the east, , as well as increase noise pollution and pollution on the sea bed. The proposed complex would also affect the view from the UNESCO site viewing platform. The development should be subject to a Heritage Impact assessment which must address impacts on the sites' Outstanding Universal Value and attributes, its physical appearance and setting. This would need to be done by a suitable expert.

Heritage Trust commented that the proposal would have a negative impact due to its massing and would need a Heritage license.

The Ministry for Heritage objected to the proposal due to it being within the world heritage site, adding that Europa Advance Battery was also included within the site.

DTP summarised that the site lies within the World Heritage Site (WHS) and is a listed monument. He understood that the reason for the development is due to the need to upgrade the existing facility for the 2019 Island Games and that as part of that disabled access was a fundamental requirement.

DTP reported that there were serious concerns with the visual impact on the WHS and with the impact of the shooting activity on the site. He suggested that as an alternative temporary improvement could be considered specifically for the Games and that the site could be re-sited elsewhere in the longer term. If that was not accepted then DTP commented that the south façade presented an extensive mass and that consideration should be given to reducing the width of the flank wall to reduce the impact of the massing and scale. The need for the two towers should also be reconsidered as these introduced significant vertical elements and that the

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

suspended walkway would have a significant impact and further consideration needed to be given to reducing the impact, possibly with some additional landscaping.

CP asked for Government to reconsider and propose a new site for the Clay Pigeon Shooting Club as it would constitute a risk on the site's UNESCO world heritage status.

JH and CAM seconded CP's comment.

MEHEC commented that there were still a number of environmental assessments to be carried out and the clay discs would be bio-degradable, as well as no longer using lead shots. MEHEC added that as Minister for Heritage he would not allow this site to be delisted and would work with those concerned in order to find a solution.

<u>12/18 – F/15268/17G – St. Bernard's Hospital, Harbour Views Road – Proposed installation of two disabled lifts at the front of the Hospital.</u>

DTP reported on this application to install two disabled lifts in front of St. Bernard's Hospital. Both lifts would have louvered panels and solar responsive glass on the lift enclosure. A bicycle rack would be lost.

DTP commented that the Commission had previously recommended to the applicant, in previous applications, to address the issue of the unbalanced nature of the main entrance. The applicant had stated that there was no other alternative but to install the lifts at their proposed location. DTP recommended that the application be approved with the condition to relocate the cycle parking.

The Commission unanimously agreed the proposal subject to reproviding the cycle parking facilities and a bench.

<u>13/18 – F/15280/17G – Bishop Canilla House, Bishop Caruana Road – Proposed refurbishment</u> of existing building, including re-roofing, replacement of skylight element, enclosure of external balconies, new fenestration and new external insulation and render to facades.

Bishop Canilla House is a four storey house for the elderly which has water ingress and requires refurbishment. The proposed refurbishment includes re-roofing the building, adding insulation to all facades, installing double glazed windows, replacing the skylight, and enclosing the balconies. Three different colour schemes were proposed: grey and white, salmon, grey and white and aqua green, grey and white.

DTP commented that the refurbishment was welcome but there were concerns about enclosing the balconies as it would result in the loss of interest to the facades. DTP recommended that the finishes be discussed with Town Planning, and recommended the grey and white colour scheme be chosen as it would fit in with surrounding buildings.

GM commented that the main reason for water ingress was due to the balcony being at the same floor level as the flats.

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

MEHEC remarked that he felt that elderly residents enjoyed using their balconies and enclosing them may not be in favour.

The Chairman replied that the agents claimed to have consulted the tenants.

JH commented that some residents had mobility issues and due to scaffolding erected during construction they may not be able to park mobility scooters outside. JH added that two of the lifts have been removed as a larger one to be installed; only one is to be used. She also stated that the applicant should be made aware that the Commission recommended keeping the balconies.

The Chairman responded that all comments made would be passed on to the applicant.

<u>14/18 - O/15290/17 - The Cornwall's Centre, Bell Lane/Cornwall's Parade - Proposed</u> <u>extension to ground floor commercial units.</u>

This outline application was seeking approval to extend commercial units on the ground floor of the Cornwall's Centre. The Commission had previously refused two applications by the applicants to extend the commercial units and make alterations in order to accommodate a wellness centre and a gymnasium. The applicants no longer wished to include a gymnasium and had scaled back the extensions.

The applicants were seeking to add a further 90 sqm floor space and would be blocking up three arches in the courtyard with glazed panels. However, the open courtyard and access corridor would remain.

DTP reported that no objections had been received for this application. He added that the applicants have listened to the Commission's previous concerns. The applicant would be using materials sympathetic to the courtyard and undergo landscaping in order to minimise the visual impact. DTP recommended approval of this application subject to the use of sympathetic materials, additional landscaping to the courtyard and terrace and details of signage.

JH objected to further filling in the courtyard.

The Commission voted on this application as follows:

In favour: 8 Against: Nil Abstentions: 3

This application was approved by the Commission subject to the recommended conditions.

<u>15/18 – A/15223/17 – Casemates Square to Main Street – Proposed installation of signs on 18 x concrete blockades to advertise local businesses.</u>

This application was to place vinyl advertising panels on concrete blocks currently placed in Main

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

Street.

The applicant, Mr Andrew Rothwell was invited to address the Commission. He explained that he owns the online A-Z business directory and had the idea to place vinyl advertising panels. Mr Rothwell said that he had received unanimous support from some businesses.

An objection had been received from the Chamber of Commerce stating that the panels would give an untidy appearance to Casemates and Main Street. Mr Rothwell said that he had considered placing flower pots on the blocks with advertisements placed within a gold frame. He claimed that the businesses unanimously approved his design.

MEHEC asked Mr Rothwell whether he had cleared this with the Ministry for Traffic and Transport as there were plans to replace these blocks. Mr Rothwell said he had not.

Mr Edward MacQuisten, representing the Chamber of Commerce, was invited to explain his objections to Mr Rothwell's proposal. He stated that he was objecting on the grounds that this would lead to a proliferation of advertisements and referred to the wording of the Gibraltar Development Plan. Mr MacQuisten added that the Chamber of Commerce was one of the driving forces for the pedestrianisation of Main Street which gave traders the confidence to invest in their premises. The proposal for signs on 18 blocks was considered to be excessive and unnecessary. He also said that members of the Chamber of Commerce also felt that this proposal was obtrusive.

DTP reported that whilst the blocks are unattractive it was understood that they were temporary and a more permanent solution, that is more in keeping, would be provided. He also considered that the proposed signage was not in-keeping with the old town and would encourage the proliferation of advertisements in Main Street. DTP added that approval of this application could potentially encourage more signage proposals on sites which are unrelated to the business that they are advertising. Planning policy was for signage to normally be restricted to the premises to which it relates DTP recommended refusal of this application.

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

Minor Works - not within scope of delegated powers

<u>16/18 – F/15237/17G – Mediterranean Rowing Club and Calpe Rowing Club, 4 and 6 Europort</u> <u>road – Proposed sea front decking.</u>

The Commission agreed this application.

<u>17/18 – F/15267/17 – Former Police Barracks – Proposed conversion of original retail and cistern areas into three new studio apartments.</u>

The Commission approved this application.

<u>18/18 – F/15281/17G – Gibraltar Air Terminal – Proposed installation of a wind tree on the pavement in front of the air terminal.</u>

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

The Commission agreed this application.

<u>19/18 – D/15288/17 – North Mole Power Station, Mons Calpe Road – Proposed demolition of half height concrete block-work boundary wall.</u>

The Commission approved this application.

<u>20/18 - D/15289/17G - Waterport Wharf - Proposed demolition of one and two storey</u> <u>steel/masonry/concrete and concrete framed buildings.</u>

The Commission agreed this application.

21/18 - D/15305/17G - Building 509, Spyglass - Proposed demolition of single storey building.

MOD Project

The Commission agreed this application.

22/18 - D/15306/17G - Building 515, Spyglass - Proposed demolition of derelict toilet block.

MOD Project

The Commission agreed this application.

<u>23/18 – D/15307/17G – Building 514, Spyglass – Proposed demolition of derelict toilet block.</u>

MOD Project

The Commission agreed this application.

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

24/18 – BA13637 – Police Barracks, Castle Road – Proposed refurbishment and re-conditioning of Historic Building Complex with part demolition and extension to house new residential complex and public open areas.

Consideration of enclosures for air conditioning units to be placed on rooftops on penthouses to discharge Condition 11 of Supplemental Planning Permit 4833A.

<u>25/18 – F/13880/15 – Sunnybrae, 8 Willis's Road – Proposed extension to building and internal</u> modifications.

Consideration of revised plans to change approved glass balustrades on north and south elevations at roof terrace to brick walls to discharge condition 5 of Planning Permit No. 5281A.

26/18 – 10-14 John Mackintosh Square – Proposed external front façade alteration.

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

Consideration of revised façade treatment to discharge conditions 2 and 3 of Planning Permit No. 5936.

<u>27/18 – F/15027/17 – 206 Seagull Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews – Proposed installation of glass</u> <u>curtains.</u>

<u>28/18 – F/15085/17 – 202 Arabian Riviera, Grand Ocean Plaza – Proposed installation of glass</u> <u>curtains.</u>

<u>29/18 – F/15187/17 – 19 Laguna Bar, Laguna Estate – Proposed extension for use as kitchen</u> and refurbishment of property including new signage and external pergola.

<u>30/18 – F/15191/17 – Garden Area, 5 South Barrack Road – Proposed construction of garden</u> terrace and removal of trees.

<u>31/18 – F/15206/17 – 308 Express Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews – Proposed internal alterations.</u>

<u>32/18 – F/15213/17 – 55 Line Wall Road – Proposed replacement of two existing chillers.</u>

<u>33/18 – F/15228/17 – 902 Sand Dune House, Beach View Terraces – Proposed installation of glass curtains.</u>

<u>34/18 – F/15231/17 – 15 Cornwall's Lane – Proposed change of use of ground floor apartment</u> to office.

<u>35/18 – F/15232/17 – Unit 3, Lathbury Industrial Park – Proposed installation of mezzanine.</u>

<u>36/18 – F/15246/17G – 11 Inundation House, Laguna Estate – Proposed internal alterations.</u>

GoG Project

<u>37/18 – F/15249/17 – 30 Parliament Lane – Proposed installation of replacement awning.</u>

<u>38/18 - F/15253/17 - 4.06, 4.08 & 4.12 World Trade Centre, 6 Bayside Road - Proposed internal alterations.</u>

<u>39/18 – F/15254/17G – Rear yard Area of Eurotowers – Proposed construction of new GEA</u> substation for use of West One.

GoG Project

GM informed the Commission that residents from Eurotowers were infuriated due to the loss of a green area which would now become a substation. GM added that the substation was being pushed onto land which was out of the developer's demise.

MEHEC replied that he would look into it and attempt to ear mark an area if there is space to plant further trees.

<u>40/18 – F/15262/17 – 504 World Trade Centre, 6 Bayside Road – Proposed internal alterations.</u>

DPC meeting 1/18 24th January 2018

<u>41/18 – F/15269/17 – 1A Cumberland road – Proposed extension of use class of unit to include</u> <u>B2 general industrial.</u>

<u>42/18 – F/15273/17 – Former Police Barracks – Proposed new access door and ventilation to existing cistern.</u>

43/18 - F/15279/17 - 15 Cornwall's Lane - Proposed extension to top floor apartment.

<u>44/18 – F/15283/17 – 413 Neptune House, Marina Bay – Proposed replacement of existing</u> windows from single glazed to double glazed to match approved design within building.

<u>45/18 - A/15093/17 - BP Petrol Filling Station, 13 Winston Churchill Avenue - Proposed</u> replacement ATM surround.

<u>46/18 – A/15212/17 – NatWest, 17 Main Street – Proposed installation of replacement fascia</u> sign, projecting sign and ATM surround.

47/18 - REF. 1305 - Marina Court, 20 Glacis Road - Proposed repainting of building.

<u>48/18 – Any other business</u>

49/18 - City Hall, John Mackintosh Square

GM advised the Commission that Government will be repainting the existing building and reinstating the shutters.

50/18 - The Sanctuary, Engineer Road

JH was concerned with the visual impact of this development and questioned whether the approved landscaping proposals have been implemented.

CP questioned whether trees at the rear which were to be retained have actually been retained.

The Chairman would provide an update on the status of the development.

51/18 - Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on 20th February 2018.