

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 11th Meeting of 2018 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 20th November 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 Kevin De Los Santos (KDS)
(Land Property Services)

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

Mr C Viagas (CV)

Mrs Janet Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)

Mr Viv O'Reilly (VO)
(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 11/18

20th November 2018

Mr M Cooper (MC)

(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

665/18 – Approval of Minutes

The Minutes for the 9th meeting held on 26th September 2018 were approved.

Other Developments

666/18 – F/15395/18 1380/16 – Jetty No.2, North Mole, Port of Gibraltar – Proposed installation of additional storage tanks within existing tank farm and concrete bund.

DTP explained that this application referred to MH Bland's Tank farm at the port. The tank farm stores lubricant oils for the marine industry. The Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion had been circulated to all members previous to the meeting.

The site area is 40 sqm and is within the existing boundary of the farm. There would be four extra tanks incorporated which would also store lubricant oils. The new tanks would be use the same pipework and safety systems as the existing tanks. The capacity of the tank farms would increase to 600,000 litres from 480,000 litres.

DTP reported that the fuel farm had been granted full planning permission in 2013 following a full EIA that revealed that there were not significant effects with the construction or operations but instead environmental improvements in the operations side.

The following topics were included in the screening exercise for the current application:

- Navigation – There would not be an overall increase in bunker movements. Lubricant oils would be distributed by bunker. These tanks would be used to take over another company's bunkering.
- Transport – There would be less frequent deliveries of lubricant oils due to the higher capacity of the tank farm.
- Air Quality – Carbon filters were due to be fitted to the new tanks.
- Noise and Vibration – No significant increase. Most likely, there would be a reduction due to less movement of portable tanks.
- Ecology – No impact and a Construction Environment Management Plan would mitigate the risk of effects on the marine environment.
- Landscape and Visual – New tanks would be assimilated into the current landscape.
- Ground Conditions and Water Quality – Tanks would be located within the bunding wall and existing measures would be adhered to.
- Flood Risk – No significant risk identified.
- Archaeology and Cultural Heritage – No impact.

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

- Waste Management – Waste would be managed within MH Bland’s current waste management framework.
- Cumulative Impact – There was no potential for cumulative impact identified.

DTP concluded that the Town Planner’s opinion was that there would not be any significant environmental impact and there was no need for an EIA. The Environmental Screening Opinion would be submitted to the Minister for Infrastructure and Planning as he would have to issue a final direction whether an EIA was required. If the Minister agreed, then the application would be tabled at the DPC for a decision on whether to grant planning permission.

The Chairman added that the new EIA directive required greater monitoring and that this would be done by the Environmental Agency as the principal authority with competence for the matters raised with environmental issues in the EIA. They would be continually assessing the tank farm. The Chairman also mentioned that current operations at the tank farm had not been found to be deficient.

JH commented that although she was glad to read the Town Planner’s opinion she noted that there were no references to concerns raised initially by the Environmental Safety Group. She added that she had attended site visits and meetings with the applicant and stressed that it was still a dynamic situation. JH remarked that after she had visited the site she had concerns as there had been a significant increase in Intermediate Bulk Containers (ICBs) in the area and was surprised that this site will continue to have ICBs even once the extra tanks are built.

The Chairman replied that the operational requirements with environmental issues were controlled by the Environmental Agency.

JH mentioned that the Agency had not raised the issue of unbunded ICBs onsite and there had been a commitment made by the applicant that their new bunkering vessel will decrease the number of ICBs by 70-80%. As there would still be ICBs on site the port would be asked to provide a space for bunding remaining ICBs. JH asked for this to be included in the Screening Opinion.

The Chairman asked the Commission whether they approved this extra requirement and if they were in agreement with the Screening Opinion.

The Commission agreed unanimously.

667/18 – F/15748 – 8 George’s Lane – Proposed change of use from store to micro gin distillery and associated internal alterations.

This application was to make alterations to a store on the ground floor of 8 George’s Lane and convert it to a micro gin distillery. An objection was received and counter representations were made which were circulated to members.

The store would be converted into small scale gin distillery. Gin would not be served to members of the public but would be open to small organised tours where visitors could taste the gin and purchase bottles. The applicant wished to fill in the rear basement of the property and would be removing part of the front step to create ramped access. An extraction system would be installed

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

over the front door.

Peter Millhouse (PM) addressed the Commission. He informed them that they would be producing handcrafted gin. It would be distilled using atmospheric pressure which would not have any risk of explosion.

PM explained that they would be importing alcohol and distilling gin using botanicals. They would also be branding the gin on the premises. The distiller was pre-ordered awaiting approval to be delivered to Gibraltar. He explained further that the Department of Environment, Heritage and Climate Change (DoEHCC) had enquired whether they required specialised bins, which they would not. They would produce 100 litres of grey water, 10 kg of compost and where possible would recycle any wastage. PM added that they were working with companies in London and were hoping to have a gin festival. He stated that they would not be using Campion as a botanical as it is a protected species and were working with Alameda Gardens in order to grow their own botanicals.

The Chairman commented that there was an objection submitted by a neighbour and wished to know more about how the site would be managed to mitigate the concerns raised.

PM replied that customers would be able to book a tour which would last an hour for a maximum of 25 people at a time. The door would open half an hour before. The tour would consist of a multimedia display on the history of gin, shown the premises and explain how gin is made. Customers would be able to take a bottle of gin with them but not be able to drink on the premises. The distillery would only make about 100 bottles a day. DM added that next door there was a party shop and the increase in foot traffic would be beneficial to George's Lane. He also mentioned that they had a restriction on what hours they could operate and would close by 7pm.

GM asked whether they were intending on having toilets as he had not seen them on the plan.

PM responded that the landlady did not allow them to have toilets but customers could use the toilets belonging to the bar opposite them.

The Chairman asked for a reason and PM replied that the current toilets on site had been locked up.

GM commented that a toilet is an integral part of a building's use and asked whether they would be able to proceed with their proposal, noting that a toilet was required for every 25 people who congregate.

DTP reported that there were no issues with the physical alterations except for signage which would need to be approved. He considered that this would be more a tourist attraction rather than a bar and any disturbance would be monitored. DTP stated that the Commission could grant Planning Permission and the issue regarding the toilet was an issue for Building Control and the applicant needed to understand that a toilet was needed to get a Certificate of Fitness. DTP recommended approval with the condition that consuming alcohol on the premises be prohibited to avoid the possibility of the premises being changed to a bar in the future without the need for planning permission.

The Commission voted to allow the change of use for these premises as follows:

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

In favour: 10
Against: 1

The Commission approved this application.

668/18 - O/15750/18 - Lancashire House, 8 John Snow Close - Proposed alterations and additions to existing building and construction of new building components and extensions.

This application was to make alterations and additions to a 2 storey detached house which had been built in the late 1950's. The house was set in a terraced site with a pool at the rear and is in front of Mount Barbary and adjacent to The Aloes. An application had previously been submitted in 2015 for demolition of the existing building and construction of a new five storey building; The Commission refused that application but was willing to entertain revisions to the proposal.

DTP explained that objections had been submitted and circulated to all members and there were some legal issues regarding entry via John Snow Close.

The applicant was proposing to retain the existing building and construct a three storey extension. At lower ground level there would be a covered car parking area, the main entrance to the dwelling and a double height veranda. The existing roof and chimney would be removed and a pool and green roof would be constructed. There would be loss of some shrubs and planters which would be replaced with mature trees; this had been approved by DoEHCC. The building would have a series of mono-pitched roofs, varying in angles and would be of a contemporary design. The design for the extension was modern, it would have natural stone cladding and steel columns.

DTP explained that if the application went on to the full planning stage a tree survey would be required. He added that the proposed development when viewed from a distance would be seen in the context of Mount Barbary behind and The New Aloes to the south, both large contemporary buildings.

Currently there is a legal dispute over property boundaries and access to the property. Mrs Gemma Vazquez (GV), representing the objector, Mr Gregory Butcher, was asked to address the Commission. She noted that her client felt that there was inadequate parking for this site due to the inability for vehicular access and this was fundamental in any application as stated by the Gibraltar Development Plan. She mentioned that there would only be one space at the bottom of the lane and the property dispute had been referred to Land Property Services. GV added that this application should be deferred as it would be best to not add a third party to this dispute and that the application should be considered once it is known for sure whether there is adequate parking or not.

The Chairman asked why it had not been resolved if it had gone through the 21 day notice period.

GV replied that her client had tried to resolve the matter on numerous occasions and that her client had tried to settle other issues with the applicant in the past.

The Chairman asked whether there was a physical restriction to cars moving up and down the hill or was there a just an imaginary boundary line.

GV replied that there was a line on the ground which determined the boundary.

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

The Chairman asked what the nature of the dispute was.

GV responded that it related to the location of her client's property boundary. She added that on 28th August 2018 Verralls had contacted her client via letter, stating that "if your client would legally like to assert exclusive unburdened title in so far as vehicular access is concerned it should do so forthwith in a legally material manner". GV explained that her client had previously tried to assist concerning a garage built in 2015 which needed access through her client's property. Her client is now trying to reassert ownership of his land.

The Chairman replied that considering a landlord's dispute was not within the Commission's remit, adding that they could be judicially reviewed.

GV replied that the building as proposed would not have adequate parking facilities as vehicles could not access the site without encroaching on her client's land.

The Chairman responded that the Commission could give approval but Landlord's consent was not for the Commission to consider.

GV replied that she was not asking the Commission to resolve this issue but rather that the issue not be further exacerbated.

KDS commented that the issues raised were landlord issues and they needed to be raised in other forums. He also mentioned that six weeks ago there was vehicular access to the property and there had always been vehicular access to the properties and that there were other solutions to the problem, not just those presented.

GV claimed that there had been vehicular access by the good grace of her client and after receiving the letter on behalf of the applicant's lawyers he was trying to reassert ownership of his land.

The Chairman commented that her client was asking the Commission to deny a building being constructed because there was no vehicular access but essentially a person could walk to their house from a garage that they already own.

GV replied that there was only one parking space for a building that size and parking issues in the area would only be exacerbated. According to the Development Plan adequate parking should be provided. She further explained that a garage had been built in 2015 (for John Snow House) and cars were now being forced to go onto her client's land in order to access the garage.

The Chairman responded that the matter concerning whether there was adequate parking was for the Commission to decide.

Mr Barry Brindle (BB), the applicant, was allowed to address the Commission. He explained that he had met with Mr Greg Butcher to discuss how to gain access. He added that Mr Butcher had made an offer to buy the house. BB stated that even if the boundary dispute remained as is, he had a solution which was to move back the garage belonging to Mr Richard Labrador, at his cost, so that there would then be sufficient room for vehicles without having to use Mr Butcher's land.

The Chairman replied that he would need to submit a new application for that and serve a Section

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

21 notice to Mr Labrador.

DTP reported that the Ministry for Heritage (MH) had requested an Archaeological Watching Brief (AWB) and Technical Services Department (TSD) had architectural objections to the proposal as the existing building would be obliterated.

An objection had also been received from the owner of John Snow House as this proposal would bring the front of the house forward and would be overlooking their property.

DTP welcomed the retention of the original building but felt that the additions would overpower the existing building and there needed to be a revision to the design so that the existing building could be better appreciated. There seemed to be a solution to the access issue dependent on the Commission's decision. Even though there would only be one parking space available the Commission could still consider the proposal but DTP recommend that the application be deferred in order to allow the applicant to redesign the development to be more sympathetic to the original building.

MEHEC commented that seeing as the Commission rejected the previous application because the original building was to be demolished, this application should also be rejected as it engulfs the original building.

CV asked what the history of this site was seeing as The Aloes and Mount Barbary had been allowed.

MEHEC replied that because there are big buildings in the area it did not mean the Commission should exacerbate the issue.

DTP added that the previous application had been refused due to the loss of the original building. The heritage value of this building was mainly due to the fact that it was representative of this period of Gibraltar's military history.

KDS commented that the issue at hand was not that the applicant wished to expand on the site but rather that the applicant should expand tastefully and recommended that the applicant should come back with a revised scheme.

MEHEC said the application should be rejected as the views of the Commission were being disregarded.

The Commission decided to vote on whether the application should be approved as submitted as follows:

In favour: Nil

Against: 8

Abstentions: 2

This application was refused by the Commission.

669/18 - O/15762/18 - 25 Main Street - Proposed extension and conversion of upper floors of building into eight apartments and installation of new lift.

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

The applicant was proposing to install a new lift on the ground floor of this property and convert the first and second floor into 4 one bedroom apartments on each floor. They would also construct a new 3rd floor with 2 one bedroom apartments. Windows would be incorporated into the façade and windows would also be installed at the rear which would look onto a light well. The fourth floor would be set back accommodating 2 apartments with a terrace in front.

The new 3rd floor would continue the façade treatment of the original buildings and fenestration would be aligned to that below. The 4th floor had different fenestration but is set well back from the front façade.

The following comments were received from consultees:

- DoEHCC – Standard comments were received as well as in relation to Bat/Swift boxes.
- Heritage Trust (HT) – Some features should be retained, such as tiles and entrance flagstones.
- MH – AWB required.

DTP reported that the design was sympathetic to the current building but that the fourth floor façade was bland and that consideration should be given to the addition of architectural detailing to add interest. DTP recommended approval with conditions on redesigning the façade for the fourth floor, green roof, plant screening to be implemented and agreement on window design.

MEHEC commented that Bat/Swift boxes should be incorporated into the design and not added on later.

The Commission approved this application unanimously.

670/18 - O/15772/18 - 70-72 Devil's Tower Road – Proposed two storey extension to car park.

Gedime Motors wished to construct a two storey extension to their car park. This extension would increase the number of spaces to 42. The ground floor frontage would match the current frontage of the showroom. The car park would be serviced by car lifts. The first floor frontage would consist of an open louvered wall which would continue up to the second floor. The top floor would be covered by a roof canopy.

The following comments were received by consultees:

- DoEHCC – Required further landscaping details.
- World Heritage Organisation & MH – Both required an AWB.
- TSD – Expressed concerns over access to the parking and required a Traffic Survey.
- Traffic Commission (TC) – Access arrangements would need to be approved by TSD to ensure that there were no tailbacks on devil's Tower Road.

DTP reported that this parking was intended for use by the dealership and the design related well with the showroom. He recommended approval of this application with conditions regarding traffic movements being approved, further submission of landscaping details and an AWB being conducted.

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

The Chairman mentioned that the planter trough would need to have its own irrigation system.

The Commission approved this application unanimously.

671/18 - F/15776/18 - 7 Bell Lane - Retrospective application for change of use of unit to takeaway, associated internal alterations and installation of signage.

This retrospective application was for the change of use of the premises to a takeaway. The extraction system installed would be a triple filter system with a vent to the window. An objection had been submitted regarding odour and potential fire risks. The objection had been circulated to all members. The applicant had submitted counter representations that the Fire Brigade and Environmental Agency were satisfied that all fire prevention and odour issues had been satisfied. The extraction system would eliminate any odour issues.

DTP explained that Planning Policy allowed for the change of use in such areas provided that there were no significant effects. Mitigation had been proposed for the odour issue in the form of triple filter system and that the GFRS had not raised any objections. DTP therefore recommended approval.

The Commission approved this application unanimously.

672/18 - F/15784/18 - Mons Calpe Mews, Waterport Road/North Mole Road - Proposed installation of gate enclosures at different entry points to podium level of residential estate.

This application was to install gates to enclose Mons Calpe Mews. It had been referred by the Subcommittee since when the original application for this development had been discussed at DPC Government had indicated that the development would not be gated. In the circumstances the sub committee did not consider it had the powers to determine the application.

The west vehicular entrance would have a vehicular gate installed and a small gate would be installed for pedestrians. The south entrance would also be gated and fencing along the perimeter would also be installed. The east entrance is a pedestrian access which would also be gated. TC submitted comments stating that the gates for the vehicular access should be inward opening.

DTP reported that the final design for the fences and gates would need to be approved.

The architect, Mr Francis Trico (FT), addressed the Commission and explained that there would be an intercom at the south ramp entrance.

The Chairman asked for the reasoning behind Mons Calpe Mews becoming a gated community.

Ms Stacey Napoli, representing the management, explained that there was a problem of general access by non-residents and that the equipment in the children's park had been damaged by non-residents. It was not possible to fence off the park as this would involve fixtures piercing the podium membrane which would cause water ingress problems. She added that there were also the issues of dog-fouling, cases of bullying, students from the new schools potentially coming into the estate and complaints from elderly residents at Seamaster Lodge complaining about noise.

The Commission considered that the reasons given justified the proposal and approved this

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

application unanimously.

A fifteen minute break was held at 11:20.

673/18 – F/15794/18 – The Arches, Castle Road – Proposed conversion of store unit and electrical room into new studio apartment.

674/18 – F/15795/18 – The Arches, Castle Road – Proposed conversion of vacant retail unit into two apartments.

Both of these applications were considered together by the Commission as they were both within the same site.

DTP explained that permission had been granted previously to convert a retail unit on the lower ground level into an apartment. This store unit was located to the rear and the proposal was to carry out internal alterations including installation of windows at the rear which would overlook into ventilation well. The store is not entirely visible from street level and the entrance is a doorway located behind a set of stairs.

The retail unit concerning application F/15795/18 is directly above the store concerning F/15794/18. The applicant wishes to convert the retail unit into a studio and a two-bedroom apartment, with external glass balustrade to the terrace parapet and a small window installed to face the covered terrace, as well as incorporating new doorways.

Originally, this development had 41 residential units and 41 parking spaces. There is still another phase to be constructed but was now under different owners. A further 8 additional units have been allowed since approval of the original scheme without further parking spaces being added. The applicant submitted a letter stating that no interest has been received regarding the retail unit.

DTP reported that the retail unit was included in order to create some activity and interest and Town Planning considered it to be an important and integral part of the project and as such should be retained.

DTP recommended approval of application F/15794/18, to which the Commission unanimously agreed.

In respect of the proposal for F/1595/18 the Chairman commented that a resident on the ground floor whose entrance is directly off the covered public walkway is likely in the future to press for the closing off of the walkway due to disturbance issues. In his opinion this would constitute another reason to refuse application F/15795/18 as the public walkway was an important part of the original concept.

The Commission approved application F/15794/18 with the condition that location of the storage units be provided.

Application F/15795/18 was refused by the Commission as it considered that the loss of the intended commercial unit was not acceptable.

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

675/18 – F/15801/18 – 8 Parkview house – Proposed lift conversion including installation of square dormer windows to front and rear of property.

A design statement had been submitted by Anne Lundin (AL), who was representing her client, to support the installation of square dormer windows on the east and west elevations of 8 Parkview House and this had been circulated previously to members.

She explained that due to restrictive land space in Gibraltar her client was looking to maximise the habitable space of their apartment. Her client was open to installing skylights instead but preferred to install dormer windows. AL added that the building did not have any heritage value, was outside the city walls and would not look out of context as there was nothing in the vicinity to compare it to. She further explained that the building lent itself to have dormer windows installed all at once or in stages and that her client had bought the property with the intention to make it into a home, making use of the attic space.

The Chairman asked whether she could assimilate the dormer windows to match the existing tiling on the roof of the building.

AL replied that it was possible and would provide samples before installing the dormer windows.

CAM commented that dormer windows were a Victorian feature and although was not against the proposal felt that skylights were preferable as they would not affect the roof profile.

KDS noted that the area belonged to the Management Company.

The Chairman remarked that if Section 21 notice would have been served the other upper residents may have written in supporting the applications and if approved others may follow.

MHE commented that there were two issues to consider. Firstly, the loft does not belong to the applicant so this application should have been submitted by the Management Company. Secondly, she considered that there should be consistency and all the upper residents would need to install the dormer windows as there building was very visible due to its location.

KDS mentioned that it did not have to be approved by the residents of the four top floor apartments but by residents of all sixteen apartments in the building who constitute the Management Company. He added that if notice had been served to the Management Company then the applicant had complied adequately.

DTP reported that boxed dormer windows would disrupt the roof profile and if all residents installed them it would virtually cover the whole property. However, at least in that case the Commission's concerns with the symmetry of the building would be addressed. He added that this building was highly visible from both the east and west and that on the east it was overlooked from elevated public vantage points on the boulevard. DTP considered that the windows proposed were large and intrusive and there was no guarantee that other residents would implement the dormer windows. DTP mentioned that skylights were a possible alternative and would have a less significant visual impact although it would reduce the area of the loft where sufficient headroom could be achieved. He recommended deferring the application in order to allow the applicant to consider the replacement of the dormer windows with skylights and to amend the design accordingly.

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

The Commission decided to refuse this application unanimously but was open to the applicant submitting a new application with skylights instead of dormer windows.

676/18 - O/15834/18 - Sandpits Car Park, 11 St. Joseph's Road - Proposed construction of 3 x external private car parking bays to be accessed from Sandpits Car Park.

This application was for the construction of three parking bays within a small triangular area at Sandpits Car Park. There are currently two trees on site which would not be affected by the development. DoEHCC submitted comments stating there should be a one metre clearance between the trees and concrete slab of the new parking area.

The visual impact of this development was negligible but constituted the loss of small area of undeveloped land. No objections had been received and DTP recommended approval of this application with the condition that a clearance of one metre between the trees and concrete slab should be maintained.

The Chairman recommended that tree guards be installed and the ground surface should be permeable.

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

677/18 - A/15773/18 - U-Mee, Suite 303, Eurotowers - Retrospective application for installation of fascia signage.

This application had been referred by the Subcommittee and recommended for refusal. The applicant had installed fascia signage without permission and had since apologised. There was an issue with the profile of the signage in that the profile of the installed sign was semi-circular which was not in-keeping with what had been permitted elsewhere within the development. Signage in this area has been limited to the glazed facades and in some cases additional sign had been permitted on the column separating the glazed frontages.

AL once again addressed the Commission as she was also representing this applicant. She apologised on behalf of her client and explained that the design was simple incorporating the corporation's pink letter-types and had a bell form which protruded outwards. AL further commented that signage is about branding and the question about taste should be left to each individual business and not the collective.

MHE commented that she had concerns as the profile was not in-keeping with other signs and mentioned that other businesses in the area had 3D signs which were flat and the applicant could consider installing this type of signage.

The Chairman explained that the signage for this business was too continuous and also covered the masonry of the building.

AL replied that the signage was not connected but another two businesses also had signage which had similar signage.

The Chairman responded that the applicant should remove the middle sign and could just have

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

the individual letters instead thereby exposing the rendered background. He recommended that it be redesigned and considered by the Subcommittee.

DTP explained that the intention is to keep a consistent design for signage within the area. The profile of this signage was different to other businesses in the area.

The Commission refused this application.

Minor Works – not within scope of delegated powers

678/18 – F/15761/18 – 24 Medview Terrace – Proposed loft conversion and extension to property.

The Commission approved the application.

679/18 – F/15875/18G – Tovey’s Cottage, 6 Queen’s Road – Proposed refurbishment of property to create an office and interpretation/conservation centre.

JH asked for further information concerning the refurbishment of this property.

MEHEC explained that it was simply a change of use from residential to an interpretation centre and involved the general refurbishment of the existing building.

The Commission had no objections.

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

680/18 – Lucas Irossi Motors Site, Waterport Road – Proposed 18 storey building comprising commercial use at ground and first floors and residential above.

Consideration of proposed glass balustrade finishes to discharge condition 12 of Supplemental Planning Permit No. 2419C.

681/18 – BA13707 - The Anchorage, Rosia Road – Proposed construction of swimming pool.

Consideration of request to renew Planning Permit No. 4955.

682/18 – F/15087/17 – 69-70 Catalan Village – Proposed construction of a three storey apartment block and refurbishment of existing cottage.

Consideration of revised plans to comply with Commission’s recommendations on application

683/18 – F/15157/17 – 144/146/148 Main Street – Proposed renewal of façade.

Consideration of proposed colour scheme and replacement of additional windows to discharge Condition 1 of Supplemental Planning Permit No. 6332A.

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

684/18 – F/15203/17G – Laguna Site Complex – Proposed construction of new Saint Anne’s and Notre Dame Schools.

Consideration of proposals to remove and relocate four additional trees on site.

GoG Project

685/18 – F/15493/18 – Unit 4.0.4 Eurotowers – Proposed alterations & conversion of commercial premises plus store to food premises plus store and toilets.

Consideration of revised proposals for upper floor layout to vary Condition 1 of Planning Permit No. 6794.

686/18 – F/15778/18 – 1 and 2 Orchid House, The Clifton’s – Proposed replacement of nine north facing timber sash windows with PVC windows to match existing.

Consideration of window sample to discharge Condition 2 of Planning Permit No. 6803.

687/18 – F/15800/18 – 2 Windmill Hill Road – Proposed construction of swimming pool.

688/18 – F/15809/18 – Flat 2, Quay 27, King’s Wharf – Proposed internal alterations to residential apartment and installation of two small bathroom windows to supplement mechanical ventilation.

689/18 – F/15811/18 – Royal Ocean Plaza Car Park, Ocean Village – Proposed security improvements to car park and reconfiguration of access stairs.

690/18 – F/15817/18 – Unit 2, 312 Main Street – Proposed refurbishment and internal alterations.

691/18 – F/15820/18 – 8/5 Buena Vista Road – Proposed construction of porch roof.

692/18 – F/15825/18 – 32 Gibraltar Heights, Bishop Rapallo Ramp – Proposed replacement of windows and installation of balcony divider screen.

693/18 – F/15832/18 – West One, Europort Road – Proposed installation of bike racks.

694/18 – F/15839/18 – 530 Water Gardens, Waterport Wharf – Proposed internal alterations.

695/18 – F/15840/18G – 104 Main Street – Proposed installation of ATM.

GoG Project

696/18 – F/15841/18 – 1701, 1702, 1703 and 1704, Imperial Ocean Plaza – Proposed internal alterations to the seventeenth floor to the four apartments.

697/18 – F/15842/18 – 702 and 703 Imperial amalgamation of flats.

698/18 – F/15845/18 – 1507 and 1508 Ocean Spa Plaza – Proposed internal alterations.

Approved

DPC meeting 11/18
20th November 2018

699/18 – F/15851/18G – WWII Tunnels, Hay’s Level, Willis’ Road – Proposed installation of sign.

700/18 – F/15853/18 – 602 Seashell House, Beach View Terraces – Proposed installation of glass curtains.

701/18 – F/15855/18 – 507 Seamaster Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews – Proposed installation of glass curtains.

702/18 – F/15859/18 – 4 Cornwall’s Place – Proposed internal alterations and change of signage.

703/18 – F/15862/18 – 3 Electra Flats, 26 Scud Hill – Proposed internal alterations.

704/18 – F/15863/18 – 9 Elm Tree Lodge, Montagu Gardens, Queensway – Proposed internal alterations.

705/18 – F/15899/18 – 15 Buena Vista Park, 40 Europa Road – Proposed change of the balustrades and raising the west boundary wall to level with the adjoining south boundary wall.

706/18 – A/15818/18 – Base Training Club, 31D Halifax Road – Proposed installation of sign.

707/18 – A/15838/18 – Winston Churchill Avenue Bridge – Proposed installation of banner sign to promote Gibraltar International Magic Festival.

708/18 – N/15785/18 – North Mole, Port of Gibraltar – Proposed relocation and/or removal of two Tamarisks.

This tree application sought to relocate two large and mature Tamarisks which are growing in an area where services are located and which may not be able to be uprooted without damaging large cables that run through the area. The application was approved on the basis that the two Tamarisks are dug out and transplanted elsewhere in the same site, at a different location. The approval of the application was also conditional on the basis that should the transplanted Tamarisk’s perish the applicant would have to replace these trees with mature specimens.

709/18 – Any other business.

None

710/18 – Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on 12th December 2018.