

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18

30th October 2018

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 10th Meeting of 2018 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 30th October 2018 at 9.30 am.

Present:

Mr P Origo (Chairman)
(Town Planner)

The Hon Samantha Sacramento (MHE)
(Minister for Housing & Equality)

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 Alfred Brittenden (AB)
(Land Property Services)

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

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:

The Hon Dr J Garcia
(Deputy Chief Minister)

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18

30th October 2018

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

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18
30th October 2018

600/18 – Approval of Minutes

The Minutes for of the 8th meeting of 2018 held on 4th September 2018 were approved with the amendments proposed by JH. The Minutes for the 9th meeting of 2018 held on 26th September 2018 were deferred as they had not yet been drafted.

Matters Arising

601/18 – REF 1225 – DPC Policies – Proposed protocols in preparation for implementation of new Town Planning Act.

This item was on the agenda at the last meeting held on 26th September 2018 where it was decided that the proposed protocols would be circulated to all members via Round Robin as DCM and MEHEC were not present at the meeting.

Two of the points circulated were uncontroversial but there were differing views on another point. Members agreed that notices should be placed on sites and should also be forwarded to Management Companies managing the property. The sub committee would also have powers to require notification of other affected parties if appropriate. They also agreed that there should be a minimum of five days for public participation for all applications. However, the Subcommittee would now have the power to decide when details on some applications should not be published, such as in the case of those which could affect national security.

The third point which some members did not agree with concerned delegating authority to the Subcommittee to determine whether proposed minor amendments to applications already approved by the Commission could be dealt with as a Minor amendment application. Some members felt that these amendments should come to the Commission. DTP clarified that the delegated power was only in respect of whether an amendment could be submitted as a Minor Amendment application or whether it should be a standard planning application. Minor amendment applications were only intended for very minor alterations and any amendments which would change an approved scheme substantially or saw its appearance adversely affected would need to be submitted as a new standard planning application.

MEHEC commented that this would be a dynamic process and that if the Commission considered the Subcommittee were not making the right decisions then it could always require that instead these decisions come back to the Commission.

The Chairman noted that these amendments would be included in the Agenda and that this should be tested over the next few months.

Major Developments

602/18 – O/15377/18 – 1 Engineer Lane – Proposed demolition of existing Continental Hotel and construction of a seven storey block comprising 22 apartments.

The applicants, Mr Colin McLundy (CML), Michael McKillop Smith (MMS) and Mr Stephen Blaney (SB), addressed the Commission to give a presentation and describe their proposal. Both, this application and application O/15664/18 – Rialto Cinema Building, relate to two sites which are

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18
30th October 2018

logistically linked.

CML commenced stating that the developer had a long standing relationship with Gibraltar and had made a significant investment in both these sites. He wished to bring back some life into these sites which had been left derelict. Some changes had been made to this application since it had been presented to the Commission at the meeting held on 25th April 2018. The Commission felt that the proposed building was too modern and did not fit in with the streetscape.

CML explained that the original building at 1 Engineer Lane consisted of a ground floor plus two further storeys. The original building had been lost under additional changes and amendments that had been made over the years and had a moderate historical value. CML also mentioned that they had incorporated arches into the design of the building making it similar to buildings in Turnbull's Lane.

Concerning the Rialto site CML commented that the building was greatly deteriorated but there were some items that would be retained. Namely, the main façade, cast iron pillars, cast iron staircase and tiles would be integrated into the new design. The main façade of the building would be retained and two extra storeys would be constructed but be setback. A central courtyard would also be incorporated, as there used to be in the 1800's. CML added that the buildings would have a minimal visual impact on the upper town vista as they will be behind the current skyline. He also mentioned that they would make a 3D record of the building.

Mr David Faria (DF) was invited to explain his objections for application O/15377/18 – Continental Hotel. DF was representing 21, 23 and 25 Turnbull's Lane and clarified that he considered that demolition should only be allowed if it was truly justified. He added that this was a very busy area and seeing as Turnbull's Lane was a narrow street, works could block access for essential services. He considered that there were no similar buildings in the area and that this building should be kept. DF also mentioned that he did not want this to become a similar situation to that of the Risso Bakery site which was demolished and five years later nothing has been developed. DF added that the building should be set back from the current building line to allow further public access to the narrow streets that surround the site. No parking was being provided either; he mentioned that with taller buildings there would be more residents and more vehicles. He said the developers had not presented any solutions to this problem.

The Chairman explained that some developments within the old town have previously been granted permission waiving parking requirements.

DF further added that he had not seen the Structural Engineer's Report online but he considered that some could not take any weight horizontally. He agreed that Turnbull's Lane needed to be redeveloped but that this area characterises the old Gibraltar and these two developments did not fit in with this site.

Mr Bruno Goutaland Rosset De Greysier (BGRG) also addressed the Commission. He resides at 17/19 Turnbull's Lane. BGRG explained that along with other residents, he had spent a lot of money to restore the building whilst keeping the façade. He stated that the Continental Hotel was a mistake as it did not fit the style of buildings in Main Street. He felt the proposal did not match either. BGRG added that he did not understand the developer's proposal to add extra floors to the proposal for the Rialto building. However, he was not against the redevelopment of the site but felt they should consider a different design more in keeping with the area.

DTP then reported on the proposal and explained that the developer had changed the proportion

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18

30th October 2018

of the fenestrations, introduced traditional arched openings, stone cladding and keystones for the Continental Hotel proposal since its deferment in April. The same treatment would be used for Turnbull's Lane. The fifth and sixth floor would be setback, but the fifth floor would include a balcony. A roof hatch would be used for access to the roof, where there would also be photovoltaic (PV) panels. DTP reported that the developers had taken a lighter approach to the corner of the building by introducing slimmer balconies to connect both facades of the building. The number of balconies on the façade facing Turnbull's Lane had also been reduced.

According to a Desk Based Assessment (DBA) the building had been constructed sometime between 1750 and 1860 and was a building from the Georgian era. The glass feature inside the building may be from the 1800's although following recent discussions and site visits this was now considered questionable. The footprint has remained unchanged. DTP explained that the building has undergone unsympathetic alterations. A digital record and construction management plan would be required so that any heritage assets may be retained.

Comments had been received from Ministry of Heritage stating that the proposal did not take the character of Turnbull's Lane and Engineers' Lane into account and that an Archaeological Watching Brief (AWB) should be in place.

DTP commented that demolition had been granted previously. If the Commission considered demolition of the building acceptable he recommended that the sixth floor should be setback further to minimise the visual impact.

MHE remarked that she had been swayed by objectors' comments regarding Urban Renewal and considered that this was an opportunity to remedy the mistakes which had been made with this particular site. She added that the building should be in-keeping with the surrounding area and which would provide some harmony within this intersection of lanes.

KB agreed with MHE's comments, asking why was the building six storeys tall when the Development Plan states buildings in town should not be higher than five storeys.

JH agreed with KB's comments concerning the height of the building.

DTP replied that the developers had submitted a design statement justifying their proposal to construct up to six storeys as there was a seven storey building in Turnbull's Lane and this building would not be significantly taller than other buildings in the area.

MEHEC felt that glass balconies did not fit with the Main Street area and that firm guarantees were required from the developer that once demolished this would not end up being an empty site. He added that Swift boxes should be integrated into the building and not be incorporated as an add-on later.

CAM commented that the DBA was of a high value and that the developers had tracked and documented the building well but that better progression was needed for the façade of the building. She added that she did not feel the sharp corner improved the street scape.

JH asked what the timing would be and whether both developments would be constructed together.

The Chairman replied that the development would not be allowed to go ahead until Full Planning

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18

30th October 2018

permission was given and would need to decide whether approval for demolition was given first.

CV commented that the Continental Hotel was a mistake of the past and was not against demolishing the building. He added that he would not like a copy of a Georgian building.

The Chairman asked the Commission whether they would approve demolition of the Continental Hotel.

CAM replied that she could not object to demolition on heritage grounds.

The Chairman commented that he considered the current building could be modified without demolition such as has been done with three buildings along Cornwall's Lane.

GM replied that the form follows the function; if it had another use then it may require another façade.

The Chairman replied that the three buildings he was referring to had been gutted and were multi-use.

CML approached the Commission to explain that he considered this a prominent site and a missed opportunity to not build on this site. He added that they were trying to create a rhythm and regenerate the area.

SB added that they were attempting to address this space where the streets converge. He described the elevation as tall and slim and was trying to add something different and of interest to this corner of Main Street.

The Chairman replied that this was an Outline Application and the developers could still design a more fitting style but the Commission should consider whether they would approve demolition. He added that DTP did recommend that the sixth floor be setback further.

The Commission approved this application with the condition that it be redesigned including that the 6th floor incorporate a further set back.

603/18 - O/15664/18 - Rialto Cinema Building, 24 Turnbull's Lane - Proposed demolition of existing building and construction of an eight storey block comprising 58 apartments.

DTP informed the Commission that there were still some residents living at 24 Turnbull's Lane. He also mentioned that the developers were proposing to demolish most of the building but retaining the façade and any original tiling. The new building would be partly five storey at the front and eight storeys at the rear. At the rear the building would be three storeys above the street level. The building would be setback as from the fourth floor. Any additional fenestration would be aligned with current fenestrations. A total of 58 apartments would be constructed, together with a gymnasium, bike store and storage. All floors would be residential and have Juliet balconies looking onto the courtyard. A light-well will be included on the northern boundary to respect encroaching windows. The building would have a flat roof with a stair-core for access to services and PV panels.

In 2011 a bigger development was presented to the Commission which would have encompassed all three sites.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18
30th October 2018

Ms Anne Rose (AR) who was representing her client, Ms Maribel Chellaram, was the first objector to address the Commission. Ms Chellaram owns the neighbouring property; land issues submitted by the objector had been circulated to members of the Commission.

She added that according to the Development Plan the height should not be above five floors unless it was justified. With regards to demolition there were safety issues and wondered what impact demolition would have on her client's building. AR also mentioned buildings eight storeys high would have an impact on neighbouring buildings. The difference between both buildings would be about eleven meters.

The Chairman asked AR whether her client would give permission for the developers to access her property to make any necessary assessments.

AR replied that if the redevelopment was to go ahead then her client would allow access to her building for health and safety purposes. AR also mentioned that there were windows looking onto her client's property.

DTP sought clarification on whether that there would be any windows on the façade that abuts her client's property as the revised scheme seems to have omitted these.

AR replied that there were windows which would be blocked up by the light-well.

CML interjected that they would be redesigning the light-well.

The Chairman informed AR that her objections would be taken on board.

Mr Ulrich Luttig (UL) from 15/5 Lynch's Lane was asked to address the Commission to describe his objections. He commented that if the building is built up to the height proposed he would not have any daylight. UL explained that the distance from the boundary wall to his living room window would only be 1.8 meters. He added that the value of his property would decrease. He also stated that the buildings were from 1893 and there could potentially be some structural damage and health risks due to some roofs containing asbestos. He further commented that buildings within the Old Town should not be taller than five storeys and that there were other ways to refurbish and renovate old buildings which should be considered by the developers.

Mr David Faria (DF) once again addressed the Commission. He stated that there was a change of use for this proposal from commercial to residential and that commercial use should remain on the ground floor. He added that a demolition plan with vehicular access clearly noted should be submitted as access to Turnbull's Lane was very difficult. DF also stated that the height should not be more than five storeys as stated in the Development Plan. He felt that the developers' statement that there was a seven storey building in the vicinity did not justify the proposed height of the building.

CML replied to UL's objection stating that they would look into alleviating his situation and were looking into moving the stairs which would reduce the height in front of his residence. He added that the height at the rear of the building was 30 meters and were looking at working with both sites.

The Chairman asked how many apartments were occupied.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18
30th October 2018

CML replied that seven apartments out of the fourteen were occupied.

JH asked who would be responsible for current residents.

CML responded that the developer would be responsible for moving them out and then moving them back in.

The Chairman asked whether they had been informed and whether these were rent controlled apartments.

CML replied that all current residents had been informed and that they were rent controlled apartments.

MMS commented that they had come up with a Conservation Management Plan and were considering their neighbours, the site and heritage items on site.

CAM commented that she considered the DBA submitted by the developer to be of a good standard and asked whether they considered the tenements to be so far gone that they could not be kept.

CMC said that the two tenement buildings did not make for comfortable living and the existing layout did not allow for that; there was only a small light well between both buildings.

JH commented that this building was iconic and had a lot of history which should be catalogued if it were to be demolished.

The Chairman added that there were ironmongery items which were considered especially grand for Gibraltar's architectural standards; these items were still in place and the developer should consider keeping these and -configure them to suit their development.

JH also mentioned that such a beautiful courtyard should be made open to the public.

CMC replied that the site should have been saved 25 years ago and the whole time he had been in Gibraltar the site had always been a store and the public had never had access to it.

DTP went on to report that MH had submitted comments recommending the retention of the façade and that any heritage items should be safeguarded. They also commented that a photo record must be made and an AWB implemented.

He mentioned that after the DBA and various site visits it was clear that there were some heritage assets on site which could be salvaged but due to damp and lack of maintenance some assets had been damaged.

DTP stated that a previous Outline Application had been approved but did not have any information from a DBA as has been submitted with this application. DTP added that if this application was approved the applicants were willing to make some changes. DTP also mentioned that the height and massing proposed was acceptable as it has been allowed for the building adjacent. However, he added that Town Planning was not convinced that there was sufficient justification for the demolition of the building.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18
30th October 2018

The Chairman added that as planners they were not against the scheme but felt that there could be some public commercial use incorporated into the ground floor such has been seen in other proposals thereby enjoying its vernacular character.

CAM commented that there were some elements which were past restoration but the first couple of tenements could be retained.

MEHEC commented that he had some concerns about the height and the implication it would have on neighbours as this building had two fronts, one on Turnbull's Lane and the other on Lynch's Lane. He added that such a large development in town which would make significant profit should give something back to the public.

CV stated that the developers could make use of some of the heritage structures, for example the columns could be used in the courtyard but that they were considering on keeping residences which were made for 19th Century living.

The Chairman replied that some residents were living satisfactorily and the developers should consider removing the old cinema roof and recreating a new courtyard which would bring in some natural daylight. He added that some Victorian buildings have been remodelled and rehabilitated which is something the developers should consider.

SB addressed the Commission to explain that some elements could be retained but the rear of the site was sterile and nothing could be done with it. He added that the courtyard could be used as a public space.

MEHEC said that he was glad that the developers were listening to the Commission's comments and suggested deferring the application to allow them to make the necessary changes.

The Commission agreed with MEHEC's comments and the application was deferred.

A fifteen minute break was held at 11:45.

604/18 - F/15668/18 - Signal Hill Upper Rock Cable Car Station and Grand Parade Lower Cable Car Station and Upper Rock Intermediate Towers - Proposed demolition of existing upper and lower cable car stations and three intermediate towers and replace with new station buildings and two intermediate towers and installation of new cable car system.

DTP summarised that this application was to construct replacements for both the Upper and Lower Cable Car stations, towers and replace the cables and cabins. The Lower station would be three storeys tall, 3 metres higher than the current station and have an increased footprint. The treatment would be made up of reinforced concrete with aluminium and steel and a copper roof. The increased footprint would result in the loss of twenty two parking spaces. The Apes Den Tower would also be replaced; it would be the same height as the current tower but with a larger footprint which would cause a loss of 140 sq. m of open space.

The Upper Rock Cable Car Station would be a five storey building with -1 level being used for storage, Ground and level 1 for tourist arrival, level 2 for functions and an informative history

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18

30th October 2018

display, level 3 for a souvenir shop and a restaurant with panoramic views with roof terrace on level 4. The new station would have an enlarged footprint 290 sq. m larger than the existing. Each new car can hold 80 persons compared to the current 30. Both stations would have access for disabled persons. The WW2 ammunition store on the ground level would be protected and restored and opened to the public although how this would be managed was still to be determined.

In order to minimise the visual impact, the upper station had been designed to have an organic terraced building form which would emulate the Rock. Two of the four storeys would have a multi-faceted façade with planters, vegetation and triangular windows. This would be an area where the macaques would be free to roam and feed. The lower station would have PV panels, landscaping, green roof and mesh for lighting and ventilation. The upper station would also harvest rain water.

During construction a temporary ropeway system would be used to transport materials from Black Strap Cove to the upper station. DTP mentioned that the loss of parking at Grand Parade would be eased somewhat by the demolition of Tiny Tots nursery which was a Government application which was also on the current agenda for consideration.

All objections to this application had been circulated to members of the Commission beforehand.

The applicants, Mr John Gaggero (JG) from MH Bland and Ms Nicky Wood (NW) from Engain Limited, were allowed to address the Commission.

JG explained that the cables were currently due a refit and despite a refurbishment of the stations it did not meet their requirements. The number of passengers on the Cable Car has doubled and during high periods passengers experience waiting times of up to 1 ½ hours. He added that they were also looking at future proofing the business.

JG clarified that the lower station would have a movable central platform which would minimise disruption and the required size for the station. The new station would have ramps and lifts and would allow for goods to be transported to the top station which would reduce the amount of traffic in the Upper Rock. He also explained that using environmentally friendly measures they would be feeding energy back into the grid.

With more cruises calling into Gibraltar more passengers visit the Cable Car as part of a tour; the top station could be full in under an hour. There were also accessibility issues which needed to be fixed at both stations. The new stations would also provide facilities for staff and washrooms on all levels. JG added that they would be preserving heritage assets on site such as the tunnels and ammunition stores.

NW had conducted an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The EIA had been circulated to all members. She explained that the scope of the EIA was to assess the effects construction and operation would have on archaeology, environment, heritage and traffic and transportation. The EIA was a 6/7 month long process and after some additional queries an addendum had been submitted.

JH commented that the submissions for this application were very detailed but she had concerns about mass tourism and the quality of the experience adding that a management plan was required for the increase of persons visiting the nature reserve.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18
30th October 2018

KB added that this was a key issue for the nature reserve and a plan was required urgently.

NW replied that a plan would have to be in place before this project took off.

MEHEC commented that the current sewerage system in the Upper Rock was very old and asked whether it had the capacity to handle so many people, adding that installation of a new sewerage line could have an impact on the environment.

JG replied that the existing sewerage system was in extremely good condition although some points did require some work. He added that macerators and filters would be installed at the top stations and some works would be carried out.

JH noted that there was a project submitted by Government for Grand Parade and that it would be ideal for both projects to happen concurrently. With there being parking problems in the area the increase in size would help tourists queuing but would exacerbate traffic problems. JH also commented that she was taken aback by the swathes of established vegetation that will be lost by constructing both the mid tower and the upper station.

NW responded that she understood that the Upper Rock was a special area of conservation governed by European Law and was looking into maintaining vegetation. She added that they had looked into constructing up to the minimum height that would be practical. NW also mentioned that the stations had not been upgraded in the past fifty years. A lot of effort had gone into this design to bring them into the modern era.

JG added that they could not install without the platforms and the stations were the width that they needed to be, further adding that these stations were for the future. They had attempted to work with the existing stations, especially to fix the accessibility issues, but it seemed impossible.

The Chairman asked whether the revamped cable car station would create extra employment.

JG replied that there would be an extra shift added which could be about twenty additional persons.

CAM commented that although they were incorporating heritage assets into the scheme more mitigation measures were required at the top station, especially in the current area of the restaurant. CAM asked whether there were any plans to improve access to Lower Signal Road within the area of the top station.

JG replied that the matter was being discussed.

GM asked for clarification on the triangular panels proposed for the façade of the top station. Some panels would be made of stone cladding.

JG replied that there would be a lattice structure under the cladding which was made to mimic the rock. There would be space between them for seeds and other vegetation to grow. He added that DoEHCC would recommend what trees could be planted.

GM asked what activities would be occurring behind the cladded panels.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18

30th October 2018

JG replied that those floors would house the plant, storage areas, souvenir shop and offices.

The architect for this proposal addressed the Commission to explain that the façade would be hiding three storeys which would be staggered and had been excavated for the current station. They were bringing them forward and covering them.

Mr Daniel Feetham (DF) and Mr Darren Martinez (DM) were representing the Gibraltar Taxi Association who objected to this proposal. DF explained that they objected on the following grounds:

1. The effect this proposal would have on the environment.
2. The onus was on the developer to show the impact.
3. The Commission has to be satisfied that there is no significant impact.
4. There are significant effects and questioned whether adequate mitigation measures have been proposed.
5. Not enough work had been done on the EIA.

DF further added that according to the Gibraltar Development Plan Criteria Policy T.3. There should not be any effect on a protected area and that this development would come under Z92 – non-residential. He added that the 2 towers would have an area of 150 sqm which was a significant enlargement and that the developer needed to do this to increase the number of service users which was the reverse of what the Development Plan states.

DF stated that in Paragraph 3.9 of the EIA it said that the amount of users would increase to 600,000. He considered it fanciful for the developer to state that this would not have a significant impact on the environment as they would stay at the top station. He added that the flora, macaques and other species introduced to the Nature Reserve would be impacted if there were more people walking in the Upper Rock.

He also mentioned that a management plan and a waste management plan should be planned in advance of a decision being taken by the Commission. DF explained that a sewerage pipe is fixed to Charles V Wall and on occasion there is significant overflow which the residents at Devil's Gap could attest to. He considered that not enough had been done on the impact that this development would have on the environment.

DTP reported that the following comments had been received from consultees:

- Ministry of Defence (MOD) – Site clearance would be needed before works commenced.
- Traffic Commission (TC) – Objected to the loss of twenty two parking spaces at Grand Parade.

In his assessment DTP noted that there was a need to upgrade the current cable car system and recognised the economic and tourism impact this would have. The implementation of the green roof was welcome and the mass, scale and height was acceptable. Although there was a loss of parking spaces there were other benefits, mainly economic and further tourism. He also mentioned that the Cable Car was a sustainable mode of transport. DTP added that the top station would have a greater impact on the environment but the developers had tried to integrate the station into its surroundings through the design. He also acknowledged the positive benefit the proposed events space could have, that the loss of open space in the context of the Upper

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18

30th October 2018

Rock would be minimal and that there were improvements in accessibility being proposed. Due to the increase in visitors an integrated Visitor Management Plan (VMP) was necessary. DTP recommended approval of this application with conditions including landscaping, archaeology, geotechnical, ecological surveys, various management and other plans and lighting assessment.

JH commented that she still felt that her concerns were very serious; there was a need to control the amount of people in the Nature Reserve.

KB added that the VMP was his main concern.

CV commented that there was indeed a need to upgrade both stations and felt the top station really worked with the Rock's topography.

CAM noted that it was an attractive scheme and they did require an upgrade but wanted to know what measures would be in place for the impact on the number of tourists visiting the Upper Rock.

MEHEC commented that size of the top station had improved but that storage was not a good reason to justify the increased footprint. MEHEC clarified that the macaques would not be at that location all the time and it was not their attraction. He feared that this development would create a disturbance and that they may end up being displaced; moving towards Town or Catalan Bay. MEHEC also mentioned that he had not seen the report with regards to sewerage and as the pipe was attached to Moorish Wall a Heritage Licence was needed. MEHEC recommended that the VMP was submitted prior to the development being built and that the developers should take note of the Nature Protection Act. Adding that any structure built on the Upper Rock requires a further licence and economic reasons will not be considered.

JG responded that only 15% of customers go into the Nature Reserve, over the year that would be on average an increase of eighty two people a day which he considered to be very manageable.

NW added that in her experience VMP's were written up once consent had been given for a project to go ahead.

The Chairman commented that he considered this to be passing the responsibility onto the local authority.

JG added that they would also have a macaque management plan in place as they are important to them and admitted that there had been an issue with sewage this past year but had been assured by a UK company that there would not be any problems.

MEHEC commented that the discussion concerning the VMP was not a replacement for an adequate study. He also mentioned that in view that he had to take further decisions regarding the Nature Protection Act and other regulations he wished to recuse himself from making a decision on this application.

MHE noted that valid objections had been made and that she was also concerned with the management of visitors and considered it might be best to postpone making a decision on this application.

CV added that he was not comfortable making a decision until there was more information regarding the impact this development would have on the Upper Rock overall.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18
30th October 2018

DTP remarked that the EIA had been complied fully.

The Commission agreed to defer this application in order for the developer to submit a VMP.

The rest of the items on the agenda were carried forward to the next meeting.

Other Developments

605/18 - F/15748/18 - 8 George's Lane - Proposed change of use from store to micro gin distillery and associated internal alterations.

Carried forward.

606/18 - O/15750/18 - Lancashire House, 8 John Snow Close - Proposed alterations and additions to existing building and construction of new building components and extensions.

Carried forward.

607/18 - O/15762/18 - 25 Main Street - Proposed extension and conversion of upper floors of building into eight apartments and installation of new lift.

Carried forward.

608/18 - O/15772/18 - 70-72 Devil's Tower Road - Proposed two storey extension to car park.

Carried forward.

609/18 - F/15794/18 - The Arches, Castle Road - Proposed conversion of store unit and electrical room into new studio apartment.

Carried forward.

610/18 - F/15795/18 - The Arches, Castle Road - Proposed conversion of vacant retail unit into two apartments.

Carried forward.

611/18 - F/15801/18 - 8 Parkview House - Proposed loft conversion including installation of square dormer windows to front and rear of property.

Carried forward.

612/18 - A/15773/18 - U-Mee, Suite 303, Eurotowers - Retrospective application for installation of fascia signage.

Carried forward.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18
30th October 2018

Minor Works – not within scope of delegated powers

613/18 – F/15743/18 – Lathbury Barracks – Proposed addition of new metal roof above existing building.

Referred by Subcommittee with recommendation for approval subject to condition requiring installation of solar panels on roof.

MEHEC asked for the reason behind this application.

The Chairman informed him that the roof needed to undergo refurbishment due to water ingress.

The Commission approved the application unanimously.

614/18 – F/15822/18 – 3 Europa Pass Battery, Europa Road – Proposed minor external alterations including installation of retractable awning and shutters on west facing façade of property and installation of window to west facing external wall of basement.

The Commission approved the application unanimously.

615/18 – D/15806/18G – Tiny Tots Nursery, Grand Parade – Proposed demolition of single storey masonry building with corrugated roofing sheets.

GoG Project

The Commission raised no objections.

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

616/18 – O/14313/16 – 66/68 Devil's Tower Road – Proposed extension to building.

Request to extend validity of Supplemental Outline Planning Permit No.5640A.

617/18 – F/14662/16 – 1A Engineer Road – Proposed construction of 2 four storey houses and roof terrace with swimming pools, toilets and pergolas.

Consideration of revised plans for minor internal and external alterations to vary Condition 1 of Planning Permit No. 5907A.

618/18 – F/15057/17 – 190/192 Main Street – Proposed refurbishment and fit-out of commercial premises.

Consideration of request to install awnings in accordance with Condition 1 of Planning Permit No. 6215.

619/18 – F/15187/17 – 19 Laguna Bar, Laguna Estate – Proposed extension for use as kitchen and refurbishment.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18
30th October 2018

Consideration of changes to approved windows to discharge condition 5 and 6 of Planning Permit 6379.

620/18 – F/15536/18 – 24 The Sails, Queensway – Proposed installation of glass curtains.

621/18 – 3 Willis’s Passage – Proposed extension and refurbishments works to building.

Consideration of proposed grill on ground floor windows and removal of partition wall to vary Condition 1 of Planning Permit No. 6658.

622/18 – F/15641/18 – 20 Redwood Lodge, Montagu Gardens – Proposed internal alterations.

623/18 – F/15674/18 – 3 Edward House, The Cliftons, Europa Road – Proposed enclosure to existing external terrace to western side of building and associated works.

Consideration of sample for glazing material to be used for glass curtains.

624/18 – F/15704/18 – 9/10 Parkview House – Proposed external alterations to outside area to provide enclosure.

625/18 – F/15713/18 – 2 Sand Dune House, Beach View Terraces – Proposed installation of fence around patio.

626/18 – F/15728/18 – 283 Main Street and 1 Convent Place – Proposed extension of J.J.B. Amar’s restaurant to the adjacent vacant unit at 283 Main Street and 1 Convent Place.

627/18 – F/15733/18G – Level 4, Building 1, St. Bernard’s Hospital, Europort – Proposed internal alterations and repositioning of curtain walling to create new theatre 5 and alter existing theatre 3.

GoG Project

628/18 – F/15737/18 – 5 Crown Daisy House, Waterport Terraces – Proposed installation of awning.

629/18 – F/15744/18 – Mount View Terrace, Brympton – Proposed installation of glass curtains.

630/18 – F/15751/18 – 13 Parkview House, 21 Queensway – Proposed internal alterations.

631/18 – F/15755/18 – 15 Rosia Road – Retrospective application for the construction of two retaining walls.

632/18 – F/15758/18 – 13 St Peters Close, Sir Herbert Miles Road – Proposed internal alterations.

633/18 – F/15759/18 - 5.2.1. Block 4, Eurotowers – Proposed internal alterations.

634/18 – F/15763/18 – 3 Champion House, Waterport Terraces – Retrospective application for internal alterations and installation of external awning and wooden trellis.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18
30th October 2018

635/18 – F/15765/18G – North Mole Road – Proposed installation of electronic signage in port are for cruise passengers.

GoG Project

636/18 – F/15766/18 – 4 Lime Tree Lodge, Montagu Gardens – Proposed internal alterations.

637/18 – F/15767/18 – 14B Elliott’s Battery – Proposed replacement of two windows.

638/18 – F/15769/18 – 15 Rosia Road – Proposed new gabion retaining wall.

639/18 – F/15771/18G – Willis’s Road up to Poca Roca through Signal Road – Proposed installation of Gibelec infrastructure.

GoG Project

640/18 – F/15774/18 – 116/01C/1116 Main Street – Proposed change of use from office to residential and associated internal alterations.

641/18 – F/15775/18 – First Floor, Majestic Ocean Plaza – Proposed internal alterations.

642/18 – F15778/18 – 1 and 2 Orchid House, The Cliftons – Proposed replacement of nine north facing timber sash windows with uPVC sash windows.

643/18 – F/15782/18 – 15 Miami Court, Harbour Views – Proposed internal alterations.

644/18 – F/15788/18 – 25 Buttercup House, Waterport Terraces – Proposed internal alterations.

645/18 – F/15790/18 – 215 Portland House, Glacis Road – Proposed internal alterations.

646/18 – F/15791/18 – 1 Park View House, Queensway – Proposed demolition of existing partition and creation of a new external doorway.

647/18 – F/15799/18 – Unit 67 Harbours Deck, New Harbours – Proposed installation of window.

648/18 – F/15803/18 – 54 Ragged Staff Wharf, Queensway Quay – Proposed internal alterations.

649/18 – F/15807/18 – 20 Aloe House, Waterport Terraces – Proposed replacement of existing balcony door, with sliding door.

650/18 – F/15810/18 – Unit 5.20, World Trade Centre, Bayside Road – Proposed internal alterations.

651/18 – F/15814/18 – La Terraza, 19/1 Sir Herbert Miles Road, Catalan Bay – Proposed refurbishment of steps and balcony railings.

Approved

DPC meeting 10/18
30th October 2018

652/18 – F/15815/18 – Plot 12 Gardiner’s Road – Proposed resurfacing of parking area.

653/18 – F/15816/18 – 422 Cumberland Terraces, Cumberland Road – Proposed internal alterations.

654/18 – F/15819/18 – Europlaza, Harbour Views Road – Proposed external refurbishment.

655/18 – F/15823/18 – 7/10 Johnstone’s Passage – Proposed internal alterations.

656/18 – F/15826/18 – 1.0.10. Oleander Court, Sir William Jackson Grove – Retrospective application for internal alterations.

657/18 – F/15831/18 – 25B Elliott’s Battery – Retrospective application for installation of two replacement windows.

658/18 – D/15753/18 – Cormorant Camber, Boat Owner’s Marina, Coaling Island Road – Proposed demolition of concrete slipway ramp supported by steel posts on concrete foundations.

659/18 – A/15770/18 – 94 Devil’s Tower Road – Proposed hoarding sign.

660/18 – A/15802/18 – 29/35 Engineer Lane and adjacent car park – Proposed hoarding sign.

661/18 – A/15808/18 – Unit G8 I.C.C. 2A Main Street – Proposed installation of replacement fascia sign.

662/18 – N/15194/17 – 12 Morello’s Ramp – Proposed removal of Ficus Benjamina.

This tree application requested to remove a large Ficus Benjamina due to damage to a retaining wall. A structural engineer’s report was submitted to support the application which concluded that the damage to the retaining wall is the result of root action, and that the roots will in all likelihood continue to cause damage and that the tree should be removed. It was considered that the tree should be removed as per the engineer’s recommendation and be replaced with a Citrus Tree, which is not considered to cause the damage that a Ficus Benjamina causes.

663/18 – Any other business.

664/18 – Next Meeting

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