

Approved

DPC meeting 1/19
15th January 2019

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 1st Meeting of 2019 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 15th January 2019 at 9.30 am.

Present:

Mr P Origo (Chairman)
(Town Planner)

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

The Hon Dr J Cortes (MEHEC)
(Minister for Education, Health, the Environment, Energy
and 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 (KDS)
(Land Property Services)

Mr C Viagas (CV)

Mrs Janet Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)

Mr M Cooper (MC)
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

In Attendance:

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

Mr. Robert Borge
(Minute Secretary)

Apologies:

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

Approved

DPC meeting 1/19
15th January 2019

1/19 – Approval of Minutes

The Minutes for the 12th meeting held on 12th December 2018 would be circulated for approval via Round Robin.

Major Developments

2/19 – F/15897/18 – Forbes, Ex Ready Mix Site, Devil's Tower Road – Proposed mixed-use multi-storey development.

3/19 – O/15947/18 – Forbes Car Park, Forbes Road – Proposed construction of platform for car parking.

Application F/15897/18 was for a 15 storey building which had been granted Outline Planning Permission in August 2018. The site is currently a surfaced car park. This residential building would also have a basement car parking level, gymnasium, cafeteria and offices. Some revisions had been made since Outline. The basement parking deck would be open to the public and the access ramp would now be at the Northeast corner. Parking spaces had also been reconfigured and been reduced from 26 to 24. The shortfall of spaces would be covered by the parking proposed in application O/15947/18.

The repositioning of the access ramp now opens directly onto the new roundabout at Devil's Tower Road (DTR) and would improve highway safety. DTP considered that the repositioning of the access ramp helped create an open façade. At ground level there would be a cafeteria with access to an open terrace on the 1st floor. The office space meant to be on 1st floor would now be a gymnasium. There had been minor changes to the car parking layout on the 2nd and 3rd floors and electrical charging points and disabled parking bays were provided. The parking would be accessed by a ramp from the rear. There would be screen planting around the perimeter of the parking decks. The floor layout from floors 3 to 14 remained largely unchanged. The 14th floor had been reconfigured; previously it comprised 3 x 4 bedroom apartments but would now be made up of 10 x studios and 1 2-bedroom apartment. In total there would now be 82 residential apartments instead of 73 as previously proposed.

There were also some changes to the fenestration; the external treatment to the elevations had also changed slightly. The building would have a green roof with an Air-Conditioning (A/C) plant screened at roof level. The building would also have high performance glazing and natural stone cladding. Technical Services Department (TSD) were in discussions with the developer concerning turning circles.

The Commission had previously approved the reduction in number of parking spaces provided at this development and that there would not be any parking spaces provided for studio apartments. However, there was a condition set at Outline Planning for the developer to re-provide all lost public parking. The current plan provides a total of 76 parking spaces; 24 public spaces at basement parking, 52 for residents including 4 disabled spaces and spaces for motorcycles. The shortfall of spaces for public use was being made up in a separate application (O/15947/18).

There was also a condition at Outline concerning the plot ratio whereby a maximum of 80% of the plot area should be built on. Subsequently in June 18 the developer requested that this be reconsidered and the Commission agreed to reconsider the issue at the time that the full

Approved

DPC meeting 1/19

15th January 2019

application was considered based on the overall merits of the development. The developer stated that only 78% of the plot was to be developed as they included the ramp access to the parking. DTP stated that the department did not necessarily agree with this calculation primarily as it includes the vehicular entrance and ramp. Notwithstanding, it was considered that the changes made to the ground floor had introduced more of a sense of openness at ground floor. He also added that other applications which exceed the plot ratio had been approved previously by the Commission. DTP suggested that if the Commission wanted to re-introduce a strict application of the 80% limit an appropriate time would be when the new legislation is commenced.

DTP detailed different studies which had been submitted by the applicant. A preliminary rockfall assessment had been carried out and TSD had no in principle objections but a more detailed assessment with trajectory models was to be submitted. A sunlight study had also been done and it was determined that they met the requirements for a suburban area but there would be a reduction in sunlight directly east and west of the building. The applicant had submitted comments that the building had been designed to minimise the impact on neighbouring buildings and even a smaller building would also affect these buildings. A wind study had also been undertaken which determined the building would not have any significant effects. Placement of bird/bat boxes needed to be confirmed with Department of Environment, Energy and Climate Change (DoEECC). A Desk Based Assessment (DBA) had been submitted and an Archaeological Watching Brief (AWB) was required during construction.

DTP reported that ten objections had been received and circulated to members of the Commission; including a petition by 33 residents of North view Terraces. One objector, Mrs Jane Grigg (JG) had requested to address the Commission. JG informed the Commission that she had been a resident at Northview Terraces (BVT) for 25 years and stated that this building would be out of place next to her building. She expressed concerns over placing car parking next to bedrooms at NVT due to the car fumes. JG also described how she had repaired cracks on her wall and had fixed her roof due to rockfalls. She feared that construction of this building would affect the structure of NVT. She added that she would have liked a second opinion on the reports submitted by the applicant and that there had not been a study on the effect of toxic fumes from the car parking decks looking onto neighbour's bedrooms. JG also mentioned that there would be too many tower blocks on DTR and that the building would exceed 90% of the plot.

Mr Jack Noble (JN) who was representing the developer was asked to address the Commission to make his counter representations. JN informed the Commission that they had gone through all conditions and objections which were presented at Outline and had considered the massing and car parking together for the area as a whole when it came to the plot ratio, and would also be providing further parking for the public. He stated that they had taken due care and had considered how to best deliver this project considering the current residents, minimising disruption to the surrounding building. They would be micro piling as it was also a tight site.

JH commented that if the building were smaller it would not be such a tight site, as ESG had objected to the scale of the building.

JN replied that they would not be building up to the edge of the site and had taken some steps to reduce the massing of the building. Such as opening the frontage of the building, keeping the ground floor open and the changes made to the north-east corner. JN also explained that the site was tight due to the topography of the site and its location.

JH asked JN if developer had been in touch with residents in area. Answer was no.

Approved

DPC meeting 1/19

15th January 2019

JH commented that when Ocean Village Spa was being constructed the developer consulted with various stakeholders AND the adjacent school – St Anne’s Middle School, both before and during construction because of the probable impacts likely to occur on the school’s buildings from their development. Given this previous good practice JH urged for the same communication to be set in place between affected residents and Forbes developers.

JN replied that he agreed and believed his client would be communicating with residents of the neighbouring properties.

MEHEC stated that he had concerns regarding the capacity of the sewage system and fumes coming from the car park and wanted some further clarification on these two points.

JN replied that during the initial building design they were aware of restrictions and how they would need to connect to the current sewage system but as far as they were aware the infrastructure would work. He added that there were a number of elements concerning the car park. They would be screening the car park to prevent pollution outwards and a mechanical system would be in place to ventilate the fumes. Screens and planters would be placed down the façade.

The Chairman noted that there had been a comment submitted by the applicant’s lawyers concerning the distance from NVT which would be 7 metres. The Chairman requested further clarification on this regarding from where the measurements were being taken from.

JN stated that there would be some offsets from the ground and podium level. NVT would be 7 metres away from NVT, specifically about 6.5m and 6.72m on some floors. The eastern façade would be 4.76m away from the neighbouring building.

DTP reported that the following comments had been submitted by consultees:

- DoEECC – Energy strategy needed to be submitted. Air source heat pump should be incorporated into the design, as should nesting boxes. Piling needed to be agreed due to the proximity of groundwater bodies. Samples of groundwater would need to be shared with the department and landscaping details to be submitted.
- Ministry for Heritage (MH) – AWB required and time given for recording and possible excavation.
- World Heritage Organisation (WHO) – same as MH.
- TSD – Were in discussions with the developer and stated that the applicant should consult with AquaGib concerning sewage.
- Director of Civil Aviation (CA) – had submitted standard comments.

DTP commented that the form, mass and height of the building was in line with what had been approved at Outline and noted that change to the vehicular access had the effect of opening up the ground floor. DTP commented that the more open nature of the ground floor façade and the fact that the Commission had allowed other developments in excess of the 80% plot ratio meant that it proposed plot ratio should be accepted. He welcomed the proposed planting screens for the car parking levels but suggested more could be done, such as adding louvres which could physically deflect the fumes away from adjacent buildings. DTP mentioned that the wind and light studies had been carried out to acceptable industry standards but that it was difficult to, meet BRE standards in this urban location and that even a smaller building on this site would affect

Approved

DPC meeting 1/19

15th January 2019

neighbouring buildings. He added that noise during construction should be limited to Monday to Friday 08:00 – 18:00 and on Saturdays from 10:00 -14:00, with no noisy works on Sundays and public holidays, stating that this should be set as a condition. No details of any illumination scheme had been submitted and that if any were proposed these would need to be approved. DTP recommended approval of this application with further conditions on screening the car park deck, car parking to be provided for the public and a construction management plan to be submitted prior to works commencing.

CAM mentioned that seeing as public parking should be provided whether they should consider application O/15947/18 before taking a decision on this application.

DTP explained that application O/15947/18 was to construct a car pack deck and reconfigure the entrance to the existing car park via Forbes Road which would be handed back to Government on completion. This parking would provide a total of 31 spaces with 25 spaces on the top level.

DTP reported that the WHO had confirmed that there would be no direct impact on the WHS but that there is a potential for archaeological remains to be found at the site. TSD had commented that there may be some geotechnical issues but did not have any in-principle objections. A rockfall assessment would need to be submitted for approval by TSD.

MEHEC commented that he had been reassured concerning rockfalls but the additional platform would need to be some distance between the structure and the cliff face.

DTP mentioned that the current fence line is about 3 to 4 metres from the cliff face and the car park structure would be positioned a similar distance from the rock face.

CAM commented that it would be preferable that this structure was not enclosed in future.

The Commission approved this application (O/15947/18) unanimously.

After considering and approving application O/15947/18 the Commission considered application F/15897/18.

JH commented that although this time they had only heard from one objector she represented many people in the area. For various reasons stated in the first round of application for this project JH stated she would not be voting in favour of this application.

The Commission voted as follows:

In favour: 8

Against:1

Abstentions: 1

The Commission approved this application with conditions as set out by DTP.

Other Developments

Approved
DPC meeting 1/19
15th January 2019

4/19 – F/15651/18 – Units G02 and G03 West One, Europort Road – Proposed installation of moveable glass screens to pergolas.

DTP explained to the Commission that the applicant had not carried out the works as per the scheme approved in October 2018. The application had been approved for screens to be installed limited to 2 meters in height.

Works had started and it had been noted that a different system was being installed. The Department advised the applicant of this but they chose to continue with the works at their own risk and that revised plans would be submitted to regularise the situation.

DTP reported that the approved scheme was for glass screens to be placed in front of the existing pergola structure, the upper half of the screens could be raised and a condition as included to limit the height to 2m. The main entrance was to remain completely open; there were no additional structures to the pergola and no top rails to the screens. Instead what has been built are screens set within solid frames, additional uprights added, the main entrance is not open but now enclosed by doors, a top rail has been built in and transparent vinyl ‘windows’ added to ‘plug’ the gap between the top rail and underside of pergola. DTP commented that when considering the original application, the Commission had made clear that it did not want to see the complete enclosure of the pergola.

The following comments had been submitted by consultees:

- TSD – There should be no further accretions and the open walkway should be preserved.
- AquaGib – Due to the enclosure of the pergola they cannot access a manhole on site and access is required at all times. Alternatively, assets could be relocated at the cost of the applicant.

DTP explained that the works carried out were not what had been approved and effectively resulted in the full enclosure of the pergola to create a ‘conservatory’ type area. DTP commented that the Commission did not originally want to see a full enclosure and that the retractable screens had been approved as a compromise to protect patrons from the wind with as little visual impact as possible. The works carried out resulting in the full enclosure would set a precedent for other operators to do the same resulting in a series of ‘conservatory’ type structures which, it was considered, would detract from the overall character of the street and building.

After some discussion the Commission voted on whether they approved this amendment submitted by the applicant.

The Chairman asked the Commission whether they were in favour of the applicant having to comply with the previously approved scheme.

The Commission voted as follows:

In favour: 7
Against: Nil
Abstentions: 3

Approved

DPC meeting 1/19
15th January 2019

The proposed amendment was refused.

5/19 – F/15787/18 – 10 Catalan Gardens, Sir Herbert Miles Road – Retrospective application for the installation of a pergola.

This application was for the installation of a pergola within the applicant's rear garden. Objections and counter representations had been received and circulated to all members of the Commission. DTP explained that the pergola was 7m long, 6m wide and 2.3m in height.

Ms Ruth Massias-Greenberg (RMG) addressed the Commission and was representing the objector. RMG stated that the pergola was not in-keeping with the rest of Catalan Gardens and had a negative visual impact. She explained that her client had previously been given permission for a pool and to construct a boundary wall between her property and the applicant's property, but had run out of funds. Her client felt that the pergola now prevented her from constructing the boundary wall because the edge of the pergola sits on where the boundary wall should be. RMG added that it was important to build the wall, because the gap between the wall and the pool needs to be adequate for her husband to access the pool.

The Chairman asked why she considered these to be planning issues.

RMG replied that her client had the planning permit first and she had already started her project.

The Chairman replied that his view was that both the pergola and boundary wall could be constructed and it was a matter for the two parties coming to an agreement with respect to the boundary wall only because the pergola had been realigned and limited within the Applicant's property.

The applicant, Mr Frederick Pitto (FP) addressed the Commission to make his counter representations. FP explained that within the vicinity of Catalan Gardens there were a further 7/8 pergolas and that they had permission from the management company. He also said that the objector had complained about a loss of sunlight and the pergola does not affect her property at all. FP also explained that they had adjusted the size of the pergola and it now sits completely within his property. He added that the boundary wall the objector wanted to construct had not been discussed with him.

DTP reported that this pergola was a common feature within Catalan Gardens and was a timber construction. The pergola could not be seen from the highway and had been setback from the edge of the garden so there was no visual impact. According to the applicant the pergola sits within the applicant's property and any dispute about the boundary location is a matter for the two parties. DTP added that the pergola did not affect the objector's privacy, the 'thatch' type roof is commonly used on pergolas and that the application site is to the south of the objector's property so overshadowing would not be an issue. DTP recommended approval of this application.

The Commission approved this application unanimously.

6/19 – F/15789/18 – Eurotowers, Europort Avenue – Proposed construction of a single storey kiosk.

Approved

DPC meeting 1/19
15th January 2019

This application was for the construction of a single storey kiosk at Eurotowers. The kiosk would have a total area of 9 sqm, be 3 meters tall and 3.6 meters wide. It would have white timber cladding and openable hatches. The Commission had previously considered an application for virtually the same proposal. Employees would have access to common toilets at Eurotowers.

DTP reported on the relevant planning history saying that in November 2015 an application for external refurbishment of the external areas of Eurotowers including proposed pergola zones in front of each commercial unit had been approved. In March 2018 the Commission had refused an application for a virtually identical kiosk as it could set a precedent, would add clutter to the streetscape and detract from the external refurbishments and would be in the public thoroughfare. The main difference with this application was the colour of the kiosk.

TSD had submitted an objection as there should not be any further accretions on the public thoroughfare.

DTP recommended refusal as there had been no material changes compared to the previous application other than to change the colour from brown to white. The previous objections remained being precedent, previous decisions of DPC to refuse kiosks, cluttering of streetscene, detrimental to recent external improvements. DTP added that the applicant should be encouraged to utilise a dedicated retail premises for this use.

Anna Cherepakhova (AC) from Bentley Investments was invited to address the Commission. She explained that when they applied previously there had been comments that the kiosk would not integrate with Eurotowers' façade so they had changed them to white vinyl, the same colour as the building's balconies. AC mentioned that they had also carried out a traffic study and they would have 5.5 metres free space in front of the kiosk, which would not impede pedestrian flow. She explained the idea had come about after seeing these kiosks in major cities which are much busier. They were trying to offer a healthier alternative for those who worked in the area.

CAM asked whether they would be applying for a tables and chairs licence as AC had also mentioned bar stools.

AC replied that they would only have bar stools in case anyone wants to sit.

After some deliberation the Commission voted as follows:

In favour: 3
Against: 5
Abstentions: 2

The application was refused for the reasons given.

7/19 - F/15914/18 - 78 Queensway - Proposed refurbishment of existing warehouse building into car showroom and workshop building with interpretation centre.

This application was for the third phase of this development and followed on from Outline approval. There had been no substantial changes made from the previously approved scheme with some amendment to the layout of the ground and 1st floors with increased parking on the

Approved

DPC meeting 1/19

15th January 2019

upper level. Landscaping for this site had been approved at phase two.

The existing outbuilding was to be retained. The lower part of the building facade was to be glazed, and the upper floor would have a white metallic façade. During construction there would be a need for 5-10 vehicles per day for personnel and 4-6 vehicles per day for construction materials. Energy efficient measures would be implemented such as Photo-voltaic (PV) panels; water harvesting and the building would be insulated. The applicant predicted that they would have a 'B' rating when it came to energy efficiency. Bird/Bat nests would be provided once DoEECC confirmed the location.

DoEECC had commented that no works should be carried out between February and June without prior permission. MH and GHT had been discussing directly with the developer and they had no in principle objections.

DTP recommended approval of this application.

CAM commended this application adding that rail lines which are on site should be kept.

MEHEC mentioned that he was aware that there were some challenges to converting old buildings but the applicant should aim for an 'A' rating.

CV clarified that software on new buildings does not account for recycling an old building when it comes to rating energy efficiency.

Mr Martin Figueras, on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Commission on the issue of the energy efficiency rating. He explained that it was very difficult to achieve an A rating because they were converting a large voluminous building. The Commission acknowledged the difficulty of this.

The Commission approved this application unanimously subject to the conditions discussed by DTP and with an additional condition to retain the rail lines referred to by CAM.

8/19 - F/15922/18 - Harley Davidson Club, Retrenchment Block, Lathbury Barracks - Proposed construction of a single storey garage.

The single storey garage proposed would be to the rear of, and in the grounds of Lathbury retrenchment Block and next to part of the defensive wall at Lathbury Barracks. The site is currently used to hold refuse cubicles. The Harley Davidson Club currently has a unit at this site.

The pedestrian entrance to the unit would be on the south side with vehicular access on the east side. The building is sited very close to the historic wall. Approximately within 40cm. The garage would have a flat roof and the facades would be a mix of rendered concrete and have aluminium cladding.

The refuse facility would have to be relocated.

DoEECC had commented that no site for relocation had been proposed. MH commented that there would be no direct effect on the historical buildings but the garage would have a negative effect on the character of the building and area and was not compatible with its surroundings.

Approved

DPC meeting 1/19

15th January 2019

DTP explained that the wall was not listed but was from the 18th Century and did have some heritage value. He added that the proposed garage did have the appearance of an industrial building. The area had been refurbished sensitively and approval could set a precedent for other clubs in the area to ask for more space. However, the garage would be largely hidden away from sight.

DTP recommended that this application be approved with conditions set to firstly, find an area for relocation of the refuse cubicles and secondly, set back the garage 1 metre away from the wall to allow for future wall and building maintenance. DTP also mentioned that the applicant should seek alternative external treatments to those proposed.

CAM commented that the garage was too close to the wall and in future they may want to construct a further storey.

JH mentioned that this area provides a walk through from the new Lathbury Sport Complex and parking for the Upper Rock and that therefore the building would be highly visible and that they should not compound the problem of unsightly buildings any further.

DCM commented that a more attractive and sensitive proposal should be submitted.

MEHEC noted that before considering approval they should know where the refuse will be relocated too as it will have an impact on wherever it is moved.

The Chairman asked whether the Commission wished to approve this application as submitted.

DTP commented that there the Commission should take a view on whether the principle of building was acceptable at the site before asking the applicant to modify the external treatment as otherwise they may modify it and then the Commission might refuse it on the principle.

The Chairman asked for a vote on those in favour of the construction of a building on this site with an approved architectural scheme.

The Commission voted as follows:

In favour: 3

Against: 7

This application was refused.

Minor and Other Works – not within scope of delegated powers

9/19 – F/15783/18 – 11 Genista House – Proposed construction of external structure in existing open terrace.

The Commission approved this application.

10/19 – F/15835/18 – 6 Ellerton Ramp, Buena Vista Estate – Proposed conversion works to basement area and construction of new swimming pool and other associated works.

Approved

DPC meeting 1/19
15th January 2019

DTP reported that this application had been included in the agenda in error and that it had been determined by the sub committee.

11/19 - F/15953/18 - 4 Marina Views, Glacis Road - Proposed internal alterations and installation of curtain glazing to exterior terrace.

The Commission approved this application.

12/19 - D/15977/19 - 1 St Joseph's Road - Proposed demolition of single storey warehouse/stores.

The Commission approved this application.

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

13/19 - BA10830 - Lucas Imossi Motors Site, Waterport Circle - Proposed 18 storey building comprising commercial use at ground and first floors and residential above, with the option for locating a sub-police station at ground floor, and residential above.

Consideration of proposed building name signage to discharge condition 15 of Supplemental Planning Permit No. 2419C.

14/19 - F/15493/18 - Unit 4.0.4. Block Eurotowers - Proposed alterations and conversion of commercial premises plus store to food premises plus store and toilets.

Consideration of revised plans for additional internal alterations to discharge Condition 1 of Planning Permit No. 6749A.

15/19 - F/15754/18 - 12 Lancaster Road - Proposed internal refurbishment.

16/19 - F/15798/18 - 320, Block 3, Water Gardens - Proposed internal alterations.

17/19 - F/15812/18 - Unit 0.03. World Trade Centre, Bayside Road - Proposed internal alterations.

18/19 - F/15820/18 - 8/5 Buena Vista Road - Proposed construction of porch roof.

Consideration of materials for roof tiles to discharge Condition 2 of Planning Permit No. 6866.

19/19 - F/15846/18 - 1704 Ocean Spa Plaza, 10 Glacis Road - Proposed internal alterations.

20/19 - F/15852/18 - 603 Express Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

21/19 - F/15877/18 - Imperial Ocean Plaza - Proposed installation of photo-voltaic panels on the roof of the building.

22/19 - F/15892/18 - Suite 9.7.1 Europort - Proposed internal alterations.

Approved

DPC meeting 1/19
15th January 2019

23/19 - F/15896/18 - Bus Stop, Winston Churchill Avenue - Proposed erection of a free standing bus information display board.

24/19 - F/15902/18 - The Rock Hotel, 3 Europa Road - Proposed construction of new concrete roof slab over existing ground level walkway to rear of building.

25/19 - F/15911/18 - 86 Irish Town - Proposed internal alterations.

26/19 - F/15912/18 - 17 Ragged Staff Wharf, Queensway Quay - Proposed internal alterations.

27/19 - F/15915/18 - 30 Parliament Lane - Proposed internal alterations.

28/19 - F/15918/18 - 12/3 Tuckey's Lane - Proposed internal alterations.

29/19 - F/15924/18 - 9B Glacis Road - Temporary planning permission for use of unit as an open plan office and associated works.

30/19 - F/15925/18 - 616, Block 6, Water Gardens - Proposed internal alterations.

31/19 - F/15929/18 - 23 Willis' Road - Proposed minor external alterations including removal of front door porch, reduction in size of bathroom window and reinstatement of front door at original location.

32/19 - F/15930/18 - 816 Sand Dune House, Beach View Terraces - Proposed internal alterations.

33/19 - F/15934/18 - Unit F11 I.C.C. 2A Main Street - Proposed internal alterations and minor external changes alterations to shopfront.

34/19 - F/15938/18 - 411 Nelson's View, Rosia Road - Proposed internal alterations.

35/19 - A/15920/18 - Main Street - Proposed installation of banners to advertise Chinese New Year.

36/19 - A/15926/18 - 1/5 Irish Town - Proposed installation of banners to advertise Chinese New Year.

37/19 - A/15950/18 - Gib Oil, Winston Churchill Avenue - Proposed installation of signage to advertise car wash.

38/19 - N/15917/18 - 1 Rosia Lane - Proposed removal of Olea Europaea.

This tree application sought to remove a large and healthy Olea Europaea which is causing damage to an adjacent retaining wall. It is recommended that the applicant should investigate whether root barriers can be used to ensure that the tree doesn't damage a replacement wall. If they can, it is considered that the applicant should use root barriers and retain the tree. If the applicant cannot use root barriers, it is considered that the tree should be removed and replaced with two Nettle Celtis Australis on site.

Approved

DPC meeting 1/19

15th January 2019

39/19 – N/15939/18G – Office of The Governor, The Convent – Proposed removal of Jacaranda Mimosifolia.

GoG Project

This tree application sought to remove a medium sized Jacaranda Mimosifolia. Upon inspection it was found that the tree is dead and has not produced leaves in over a year. It was recommended that the tree should be removed and replaced with a tree of the contractor of the Convent's choosing.

40/19 – 1A College Lane – Proposed removal of Ficus Benjamina.

This tree application sought to remove a reasonably large Weeping Fig of average form that is causing serious damage to the very small planter with its roots on a frequently used street. It was considered that the tree should never have been planted in such a small planter and that the tree should be removed and replaced with planting that is suitable to the planter, such as a climber.

41/19 – 1425/15703/18 – 24 Crutchett's Ramp – Proposed colour scheme for building facades.

42/19 – Any other business.

- a) JH asked when the new Town Planning Act was to be commenced.

DTP reported that it had been planned to commence in January 2019 but had been delayed and no new date has been given.

- b) JH welcomed the fact that artificial plants planted outside the Tercentenary Hall at the stadium had now been replaced by real plants. The Commission applauded the change.

43/19 – Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on 11th February 2019.