

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 6th Meeting of 2017 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 14th June 2017 at 9.30 am.

Present:

Mr P Origo (Chairman) (TP)
(Town Planner)

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

The Hon Mr S Linares (MSCHY)
(Minister for Sports, Culture, Heritage and Youth)

Mr E Hermida (EH)
(Technical Services Department)

Mr G Matto (GM)
(Technical Services Department)

Mr I Balestrino (IB)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

Mr J Collado (JC)
(Land Property Services)

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

Mr C Viagas (CV)

Mrs J Howitt (JH)
(Environmental Safety Group)

Mr M Cooper
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

In Attendance:

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

Mr. Robert Borge
(Minute Secretary)

Apologies:

The Hon. Dr John Cortes (MHEC)
(Minister for Health, the Environment, Energy and
Climate Change)

Approved

*DPC meeting 06/17
14th June 2017*

Mr H Montado
(Chief Technical Officer)

Mrs C Montado
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

The Chairman informed that the Minutes of the 5th meeting had not been completed. The draft minutes would be circulated for approval via 'round robin'.

Matters Arising

None

Major Developments

324/17 - F/14864/17 - Europarking, Europort Avenue - Proposed redevelopment of site comprising 366 residential units in three towers with associated retail and commercial space, car and motorcycle parking, and public realm.

DTP briefed the Commission on this full Planning Application which follows from an Outline Application which had been previously approved which was granted in September 2015 for the construction of 3 towers consisting of 366 residential units, offices and retail.

Dominic Harvey from AKS Limited and Jonathan Manser were invited to address the Commission.

Mr Manser informed the Commission that the number of towers had been reduced from 4 towers to 3 and some further changes had been made to the design. He also mentioned that revised traffic, sunlight and energy use studies had been carried out. Mr Manser also specified that a wind model study had also been carried out which determined that the towers did not have an adverse effect on wind to either themselves or the surrounding areas. Mr Manser described the project as environmentally sustainable.

The ground floor of the project would consist of commercial units inside as well as outside. Some aspects of the project had been changed from the original outline presented in 2015. The northeast corner would now be made up of offices rather than parking at 1st floor making the frontage more "alive". The western side of the podium level had been cut back and one of the towers had been turned 180 degrees. A podium floor level had been removed therefore reducing the height of the podium by 3.5 to a 4m high podium. 370 car parking spaces as well as 400 moped spaces would be available. There would be landscaping carried out in the middle of the buildings, ground and podium level. Plant species used would be those which are native to the Mediterranean and do not need a lot of irrigation. The buildings would all have adequate disability access.

The Chairman then asked the Commission if they had any questions for Mr Manser.

KB asked whether the green roof which was present in the outline application plan had been omitted as it did not seem to be included on the slides shown.

Mr Manser replied that the green roof had not been omitted from the plan and that they were going to include photovoltaic panels. Mr Manser stated that it had only been the previous week when it had been confirmed to them that they would be able to feed back into the electrical grid.

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

The Chairman asked why it had not been included in the proposal.

Mr Manser replied that they had assumed that they were not able to feed back any surplus electricity generated by the photovoltaic panels into the electrical grid. The extent of photovoltaic panels would be worked up in more detail and this would then enable them to determine the extent of green roof.

JH mentioned that she was unable to find the environmental report online, for which there had been extensive consultation, and had been made aware that members of the public could not access it either.

Both Mr Harvey and DTP replied that the Sustainability Report should be online.

JH said that there was a plethora of documents online which were confusing to the public.

The Chairman replied that if the members of the public had any objections/questions they should contact Town Planning.

DTP mentioned that the website did have an option for people to report any problems with the site.

JH then explained that after reviewing the landscaping report she considered the effect on the streetscape to be harsh.

Mr Manser replied that they had incorporated mobility impaired access and stairs into the plans and that this would be incorporated with landscaping plans which showing reasonable amounts of planting of semi and mature plants.

JH asked Mr Manser whether they were taking consideration of the residents in the area, especially as there were further objections which had been made.

Mr Harvey replied that a lot of changes that had been made to the original plan were to address the objections that had been received.

Mr Manser also said that the most significant change was the reduction in height of the podium.

GM expressed concerns about the distance between the building and the surrounding buildings. He asked Mr Manser to elaborate for not having moved the buildings further inward in order to keep the distance assured from the surrounding buildings to 12 metres, instead of 5 metres as is now proposed.

Mr Manser replied that he was unsure of where the 12 metre figure came from but clarified that the distance between Chilton Court and the podium would be 9 metres and 8 metres from Eurotowers. However, at one point there would be 5 metre proximity from the podium to Eurotowers.

GM asked Mr Manser to please show it on the plan.

The Chairman asked Mr Manser what was the shortest distance (from the new development) to

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

the two towers within the Eurotowers buildings. He replied that the distance was about 5 metres.

The Chairman commented that those were living accommodation.

Mr Harvey replied that this had been taken into consideration.

The Chairman commented that he would like clarification, for the benefit of the public, on the distance between living accommodation and the new development to which Mr Harvey replied that the distance between buildings was about 6m.

Mr Harvey replied that the distance between Eurotowers and West One was 10 metres.

GM asked how tall were the proposed buildings as the storeys as the site wasn't massive area and the towers seemed very tall.

Mr Manser responded that the buildings would be 21 storeys high.

GM commented that the surrounding buildings were 12 storeys high.

Mr Manser replied that the floor to floor height of each storey was less than that of the surrounding buildings.

GM asked why they had been designed that way.

Mr Manser commented that it was simply not needed.

Mr Harvey noted that West One was the same height with a difference of about a few millimetres.

The Chairman pointed out that GM wished to know how tall in metres would the three towers be.

DTP replied that they shall be 22 storeys high at a height of 68.9 meters and as a comparison, Atlantic Suites stood at 65 meters high.

Mr Manser commented that the proposed buildings were 4 meters taller but would also have a further 4 storeys in comparison to Atlantic Suites. He further explained that the 3 rounded towers would have an impact on sunlight in the area and this was inevitable, but that the design had tried to minimise such impact.

GM asked Mr Manser to explain the sample window size used in the daylight study and the level of impact it would have on the surrounding buildings.

Mr Manser replied that studies had been done and some would be more impacted than others. He also commented that all windows met British Standards.

GM noted that the impact would be greater on surrounding buildings than on the project itself.

JH seconded GM's comments.

Approved
DPC meeting 06/17
14th June 2017

Mr Manser said that this would be of benefit to everyone who would walk through the site and would be a positive contribution to the area.

CV mentioned to the Chairman that the Commission was going into a debate over something that had already been discussed when the Outline Planning application had been presented previously.

GM replied that there was a significant departure from the Outline Planning application to the scheme presented.

DCM said that procedure had already been agreed at the Outline Planning stage and the changes requested had been incorporated. DCM also asked how many parking spaces were available.

Mr Manser replied that there would be 376 car parking spaces and 420 moped parking spaces available which would meet the requirements for the West One development and residents of Eurotowers. There would also be spaces to service the commercial areas. He also mentioned that there were 20 less parking spaces than presented at the Outline Planning stage.

DCM asked what were the terms for those who bought flats as an investment, would there be one space allocated per flat?

Mr Manser replied that a management company would assign and manage the parking spaces.

DCM asked whether they would be allocated to a flat or would they be allocated on a first come, first serve basis.

Mr Manser replied that they had still not decided how the parking spaces would be allocated but he assumed that if there were any spaces left over they would be left to members of the public.

DCM commented that it was preferable to have parking spaces allocated on a first come, first serve basis in case some flats were bought as an investment and nobody resided in the flat then that parking space could still be used by the public.

A discussion ensued on car parking numbers with DTP clarifying the difference between what the requirement was and what was being proposed. He also confirmed that a reduced parking provision had been accepted at outline stage.

Mr Manser explained that the developers were aware that there was a shortfall of parking spaces but they considered that studio apartment residents were more likely to have motorbikes rather than cars and 420 motorbike spaces would be available.

DCM commented that he did not want to see empty parking spaces; he wanted to ensure there was effective management of parking spaces available.

MSCHY recommended that a car parking space be sold with every apartment.

DCM asked that effective management of parking spaces should be made available.

Mr Manser agreed with DCM's recommendation.

Approved
DPC meeting 06/17
14th June 2017

The Chairman asked about the Accessibility Audit seeing as access to the podium would be via a spiral staircase.

Mr Manser replied that the spiral staircase would be adjacent to a lift giving access to the podium.

The Chairman also asked whether the podium would still be accessible to members of the public, to which Mr Manser replied that it would.

After both Mr Manser and Mr Harvey had finished their presentation and answered the Commission's questions DTP went on to report on this proposal.

DTP reported that 4 objections had been received from residents in the area and referred members to the copies of these, together with the counter representations, circulated with their Agenda. In summary the main areas of concern were:

1. Distance between the buildings.
2. Loss of natural light.
3. Loss of privacy, views and open spaces.
4. Noise levels and dust during construction.
5. Orientation of the buildings.

DTP also reported that counter representations had been made by the applicant:

1. Proximity – the applicants had removed the eastern podium and cut back the western podium and rotated Block D to place a vertical core on the west side.
2. Loss of existing Car Park – the principle of this had been agreed with approval of the outline application.
3. They will manage any disruption during construction.
4. Daylight Study had been carried out – some of the windows sampled would be impacted and would be below the recommended levels of the BRE Guidelines.

DTP also mentioned there was a clause on the Eurotowers lease that there was no right to light, even though it is not really a matter for the Commission.

Comments had been received from other departments. Department for the Environment, Heritage and Climate Change (DEHCC) welcomed the sustainability of the project as well as the landscaping. They also proposed that the development aim for an A rating on energy performance. The developers would also be providing for Swifts and Bats nests. Civil Aviation had no objection to the height of the buildings and also mentioned that cranes and the building should be lit up accordingly. Ministry for Traffic commented that there should be a cycle lane

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

incorporated into the service road running from West One to Europort Avenue.

DTP reported that the architecture was very similar to what had been presented previously at the Outline Planning stage and that changes to the podium levels were welcomed. He also mentioned that a Transport Assessment had been carried out and there was no significant impact on existing and proposed traffic, issues with Daylight had been raised by affected residents. DTP explained that some of the windows sampled were office windows and that they were not as sensitive to light as residential windows. Some of the windows were 20% below the recommended levels. In terms of landscaping, DTP believed that the scheme was comprehensive and also mentioned that vertical planting at the parking levels would be incorporated. The development would also include brise soleil, solar glazing, water harvesting and PV panels as part of its sustainability measures. DTP mentioned that the developers should also consider heat pump boilers. Seeing as the proposal was similar to that detailed at the Outline stage DTP recommended approval with conditions including;

1. Incorporation of a cycle lane.
2. Sustainability measures to ensure that they are provided.
3. Landscaping and provision of Swift and Bat boxes.
4. Directional signage within the site and adjoining West One.
5. Charging Points for electric cars at parking bays.
6. Green/brown roofing.
7. A CEMP during construction works.

JH asked about the location of the refuse/recycling bins as there is a significant amount of noise pollution reported at other developments when refuse is being collected.

Mr Manser replied that refuse/recycling points would be located at the ground floor level of each tower.

JH explained that noise pollution may not have been considered but was in favour that recycling facilities would be provided.

The commission decided to take the vote with the following result:

In favour:	8
Against:	2
Abstain:	1

Other Developments

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

325/17 – BA12720 – Gibraltar Port Authority, Windmill Hill road, Windmill Hill – Consideration of revised proposals to provide a new access ramp from the car park to Windmill Hill road level and proposed new sewer connection.

DTP briefed the Commission on revisions to this Planning Application. They now wished to connect the new drainage to the existing drainage system which involved connecting to a manhole in the lower car park. The pipe could be run underground along an unsurfaced path, but then they would need to attach a pipe to the exterior of the listed wall to connect to the site. They were also proposing the construction of a footpath from the site to the lower car park. The footpath was originally to be concrete but following discussions the applicant had now agreed to utilise permeable surfacing which was welcomed.

CV asked DTP whether the pipe could be buried.

MSCHY also asked whether it could be placed lower down.

IB commented that the pipe would be going up.

DTP explained that they preferred to use gravity in order to not use a pump and that the pipe would be buried under the footpath and come out by the wall. The applicant did not want to bury the top section due to the expense of digging up.

IB explained that the previous proposal was to include a pump but there would be maintenance issues.

DTP suggested that recommendations should be made for a permeable footpath to be used instead of a concrete footpath which was originally proposed, and that no pipes should be fitted externally to the listed wall but instead buried. .

The Commission concurred with the comments made.

326/17 – BA13206 – Buena Vista Barracks 40 Europa Road – Proposed construction of 11 dwellings and conversion of the existing Buena Vista Stone Barracks into one or two dwellings, along with associated infrastructure.

331/17 – F/14907/17 – Outbuilding for the Stone Block, Buena Vista Park Villas – conversion of the existing outbuildings of the stone block to part office and part housekeeper accommodation.

DTP commented that both of these applications should be considered together by the Commission as they were both at Buena Vista. He briefed the Commission that application BA13206 was originally submitted in November 2016 but was deferred pending some changes requested by the Commission at the time. DTP explained that permission had been given for 1 or 2 dwellings and that it was now going to be 1 dwelling. Application F/14907/17 is to fit out the outside building into caretaker/office building.

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

The living room roof extension has been removed from the previous plans submitted. A stair core and lift would be built in order to access to the roof as well as a second hatch for further access. Photovoltaic panels and water heating solar panels would also be incorporated onto the roof. The applicant also wishes to build a glazed pavilion in the south-east corner of the site. This would comprise a sunroom/living room and set back by 1 metre from the listed walls. The natural pool included in the previous plan has been replaced with an infinity pool, decking area, landscaping, changing rooms and pergolas.

A sustainability report was produced for this application and they would be using both Photovoltaic and Solar panels, natural ventilation would be used for the main building, as well as LED lighting. The building would receive a B grade energy performance certificate. The applicant had also changed the shape of the proposed skylight in order to accommodate the Commission's previous comments. The skylight would light up the interior of the building naturally.

The applicant has been in discussions with the Heritage Trust and has decided to retain the embrasures and a gun emplacement located within the property. The applicant would fit glass balustrades for safety purposes. Swift boxes would also be incorporated.

Comments had been received from DEHCC asking that a green/brown roof be incorporated into the development and that they would need to approve plant species to be planted.

DTP reported to the Commission that he welcomed the omission of the proposed living room extension as well as the preservation of items which were of heritage value. DTP also mentioned that he had no objection to the proposed pavilion but recommended that it be set back by 1 or 2 metres in order to reduce the visual impact, particularly when viewed from the south along Europa Road. He also questioned the viability of a green/brown roof in this case if the photovoltaics were to be laid horizontally DTP recommended approval of both applications with the condition to set back the pavilion and also mentioned that some of the works proposed may need a Heritage permit.

KB commented that this proposal would have a significant visual impact on the stone block. JH concurred with KB.

DTP advised the Commission to bear in mind that they had previously approved two different types of roof structures..

MSCHY commented that it seemed to him that too many things were being added to the project and that there is no public access to the site, even though he understood that it was a clause in the lease restricting public access, he expressed that he believed that the Commission should have some leeway.

The Chairman invited Andy Brion (AB), the architect from AKS, to approach the Commission in order to explain some of the changes which had been made to the original proposal.

AB explained that they had removed the roof extension which seemed a major concern when the proposal had last been presented to the Commission. However, they wanted to use the north light to light up the interior of the building and ventilation to reduce the use of air conditioning. AB also mentioned that the solar panels could be changed and that lift access to the roof was to transport necessary equipment up to the roof a such as to be able to maintain the solar panels and the skylight.

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

DTP asked AB to explain the skylight and why it wasn't flush as members of the Commission had raised some concerns. AB explained that the problem would be the amount of heat the building would produce and the use of the skylight would reduce the amount of electricity used as it would allow natural light in.

The Chairman explained to the Commission that he understood the Commission's concerns about the heritage value of the building but they must consider that they also want environmentally friendly buildings.

The Chairman asked the Commission whether they wished to approve the revision to the plans for the Stone Block. The revised plans were not approved by the Commission unanimously.

The Chairman then asked the Commission if they wished to approve the plans for the pavilion and landscaping. The application was deferred by the Commission and the applicant was invited to revise plans for the pavilion by increasing the set back by 1 or 2 metres.

11.35 Break - Meeting resumed at 11.45

327/17 - O/14525/16 - Vacant Open Flat Roof Area above Vaults No. 11 to No. 12 Chatham Counter Guard, Fish Market Lane - Proposed reopening of access to roof in Vault No. 12 Chatham Counter Guard and installation of pergolas, tables and chairs and hard and soft landscaping on unused open rooftop terrace above Vaults No. 11 to No. 12 Chatham Counter Guard only.

DTP briefed the Commission on this revised Outline application which had previously been considered in November 2016. The applicants wish to re-open roof access in order to add a terrace area to their business. When last presented there were concerns over adding structures onto listed walls and setting a precedent on the use of listed walls. On this revised Outline application two options were presented to the Commission. The first option incorporates a pergola over the seating area directly above the Vaults used by the applicants. They would also be placing glass panels over the gun embrasures and a glass balustrade around the perimeter. A maximum of 60 people would be allowed to access the roof top terrace. The second option would incorporate a glazed stair core housing to allow access to the terrace without a pergola. The applicants have been in discussions with the Fire Brigade and the incorporation of a fire shutter internally at ground level between the two units would mean that an alternative fire escape from the roof would no longer be required.

DTP referred members to the objections that had been received from tenants of other premises, copies of which had been circulated. Some of The objections raised had already been discussed when the Outline plan had been proposed in November.

DTP reported to the Commission that he had concerns with both options due to the adding of structures to the listed walls. DTP had proposed to the applicant that one possible option was to have a low level housing over the spiral staircase with a sliding roof. The applicant had indicated

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

to DTP that they were amenable to looking into this. DTP added that if approval was given it would be recommended to not allow any further structures, apart from tables, chairs and sun umbrellas, to be added to the terrace.

CV commented that a possible solution would be a glass enclosure similar to the one found at King's Bastion Leisure Centre.

DTP replied that the alternative proposal put to the applicant would have minimal visual impact and not visible from Queensway or Chatham Counterguard.

IB commented that the Heritage Trust was not against the use of city walls for leisure purposes but the only concern he had was that the structure did not exceed the parapet walls.

The Chairman asked the Commission whether they had any objections to the proposal.

GM commented that from a technical perspective in order to improve security the glass balustrade should be increased from 1.1 metres to 1.3 metres.

IB also commented that he believed the flooring to be used was decking in order to protect the listed walls.

The Chairman informed him that when it comes to the full planning stage the Heritage Trust can impose stricter conditions on the applicant.

The proposal was approved unanimously by the Commission.

328/17 - F/14831/17 - Units 7 & 8 Ocean Heights - Proposed sub-division of unit to provide refurbishment of shop premises and new restaurant/takeaway.

DTP briefed the Commission on this application to divide a unit at Ocean Heights into a shop and a takeaway. This application had originally been presented to the Sub-committee but an objection had been received from the freeholder. The Environmental Agency had advised the applicant that a flue would need to be added reaching the top of the building for extraction purposes. Other solutions were being discussed with the Environmental Agency. Chatham Management had objections based on the mess, noise, obstruction of a window and odours which would occur if this proposal went ahead. Counter representations were received from the applicant and their lawyers. DTP referred Members to copies of the objections and counter representations. The applicant claimed that the window obstructed was not a residential window but a storeroom; they also mentioned that other premises were also used as takeaways and use extractors. DTP considered that it would be difficult to justify a refusal on possible mess/nuisance especially as many similar applications have been approved by the Commission. DTP recommended approval subject to an acceptable extraction system being agreed with the Environmental Agency.

JH asked whether the management company at Ocean Heights objected to the proposal.

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

The Chairman replied that Chatham Management was also the management company in charge of Ocean Heights and had the last say, if they did not wish to allow this proposal to go forward they could refuse to grant them the lease.

The proposal was approved unanimously by the Commission subject to the recommended conditions.

329/17 - F/14867/17 - 11/13 Cumberland Road - Proposed redevelopment of building and conversion into 7 apartments and stores.

This application was deferred as additional notices had to be sent.

330/17 - F/14880/17 - 117 Main Street - Proposed four storey office building with refurbished Main Street façade and stair lobby plus installation of internal lift.

DTP briefed the Commission on this application to refurbish the existing building at 117 Main Street including the building's façade and stair lobby, adding an internal lift. The building also has 2 internal courtyards. DTP commented that the Commission has previously approved similar schemes. The two stores found at ground level would be retained, as well as various Heritage features found in the building, such as stained glass windows and tiling found in the courtyard. The applicant also wishes to add a 3rd floor extension for office use, together with a terrace. The 3rd floor would be set back by 1 metre, adding a glass balustrade. Feedback was received from various departments. Department for the Environment commented that they should include a green/brown roof, a renewable energy assessment should be carried out, installation of solar panels, rainwater harvesting and that a Swift and Bats survey should also be carried out. The Heritage Trust welcomed the retention of items of heritage value and is working with the applicants.

One objection letter was received and DTP referred members to the copy circulated with their agenda.. The objector was concerned with the height of the building and that the building would be out of character with the old town. Counter representations were made by the applicant as they have addressed the issue by setting back the 3rd floor extension in order to minimise the visual impact from Main Street.

DTP described the scheme as contemporary and welcomed the regeneration as the building is quite dilapidated. DTP also mentioned that as the roof was being used as a terrace it may not be feasible to impose a green/brown roof. DTP recommended approval of this application although a sustainability report still needed to be approved and conditions would need to be imposed relating to the green/brown roof and for the applicant to discuss with Heritage what items would be retained. DTP also mentioned that the applicant wishes to have flexibility on the ground floor level to use the space as they wished.

The Chairman commented that he considered that the glass balustrade did not fit with the streetscene; a more traditional balustrade would be more in keeping and would also give the applicant a higher degree of privacy. He also mentioned that the building had been vacant for 15 years and welcomed the renewal and rehabilitation of the building.

IB commented that the Heritage Trust also welcomed the renewal of the building and was pleased with the working relationship that was maintained by the Trust and the applicant.

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

MSCHY commended the applicant's proposal to retain the original tiling and commented that they should look into any other artefacts of heritage value which could be kept.

Discussion followed on whether a green/brown roof should be a requirement. It was agreed that the requirement should be for the terrace to be a usable area more akin to a roof garden.

This application was approved unanimously by the Commission with the specific condition that the glass balustrade was not approved and instead railings should be incorporated, with or without masonry pillars and that the terrace incorporate an appropriate roof garden

332/17 - F/14918/17 - 6-12 Cannon Lane - Proposed five storey retail/office building comprising open plan retail space at ground and first floor level and office space at second, third & fourth floor levels.

DTP briefed the Commission on this full planning application to build a part five and part six storeys building following Outline planning permission given in October 2016. The applicant wishes to build a retail and office building, retaining the existing façade. They wish to demolish internally in order to open up the retail space on the ground floor and add an entrance from Cannon Lane. The applicant wishes to keep the kitchen found on the ground floor for potential infrastructure and any extraction would be to the roof area. From the 1st to the 4th floor the area would be open plan. The 5th floor would be a terrace area which would be accessible via a stairs. There was a reduction in the amount of landscaping from these plans to the amount found in the outline plan due to including an alternative means of escape. Solar panels would be installed over the stair cores. DTP also commented that there had been an increase in height by 300mm due to the original drawings being based on an incorrect topographical survey. The windows of the retained façade appeared to be moved upwards by one metre to achieve the desired floor to ceiling height. Timber shutters and windows would be used.

Comments had been received from the Heritage Trust and Department for the Environment. The Heritage Trust asked whether a desk based archaeological assessment had been carried out as there may be significant archaeological implications as the site backs on to (and may even have been within) the church property. They also commented that the fenestration should be traditional in character as well as the original windows, doors, shutters and any architectural details be reused if possible. The DEHCC commented that they should include a green/brown roof and to clarify what renewable energy sources would be used. They further commented that a swift/bats survey should also be carried out.

DTP reported that Town Planning welcomed the regeneration of the building as well as the retention of the façade as per the outline plan but commented that the window openings should not be moved. He also mentioned that the height of the buildings would be unacceptable as the lift core would have a significant visual impact on the bell tower of the Cathedral. DTP proposed that the roof terrace be used for maintenance only. DTP concurred with the comments made by the Heritage Trust that a desk based archaeological assessment should be carried out due to its proximity to the Cathedral. He also commented that the height shown on this proposal was substantially different to what was proposed at the outline planning stage and that should be addressed before permission is granted.

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

KB asked whether permissions given at outline stage could be retrospectively withdrawn due to design errors being present.

DTP replied that as the outline scheme had been approved, although there was an error, the applicant would need to stick to what had been approved.

The Chairman commented that the Commission had the right to change its mind based on the new information given.

CV commented that the outline meant that the concept had been approved.

The Chairman welcomed the architect, Robert Matto from WRSM architects, to address the Commission.

Mr Matto explained to the Commission that the issue with relative heights was due to the measurements received from the client being incorrect. In reality the difference in height is only an increase of 300mm. The increase is due to the floor to ceiling height required by the client.

IB commented that there was a significant difference perceived from one design to another.

DTP replied that the design presented at this stage shows that there would be a more significant visual impact which was a matter of concern.

GM commented that from an architectural perspective the concern is that the Cathedral bell tower which is a significant urban feature and the Commission does not want to diminish its importance.

The Chairman commented that the building's lift core would not be seen from Main Street and view of the bell tower would only be seen from the east.

CV asked Mr Matto whether the tower would be set back like the roof terrace, to which Mr Matto responded that it would not.

The Chairman asked Mr Matto why the fenestration needs to change in order to suit the infrastructure.

Mr Matto explained that due to the change in floor to ceiling height the windows needed to be moved upwards to suit the new heights. If they were kept where they currently are they would start 250mm from the floor.

GM replied that it would change the urban landscape and the public's perception.

The Chairman mentioned that when the Old Bank building opposite was renovated the applicant's did not need to change the windows on any of the floors and that the applicant should look for a solution.

Mr James Gordon, the applicant, requested to address the Commission. He commented that the building referred to by the Chairman had high ceilings on the 1st floor.

The Chairman replied that they may need to realign the inside of the building to match the façade.

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

Mr Gordon commented that he understood the concerns of the Commission regarding the Cathedral bell tower but that it was surrounded by tall buildings and the view was already obstructed. He also considered that the landscape needs to change if Gibraltar is to progress.

CV replied that he should reconsider the new height of the windows and they looked out of proportion.

Mr Matto responded that the band was a lot wider on the designs with the correct height than the original designs proposed.

The Chairman replied that from the Commission's stance the replacing of the windows on the elevations should not change and they would need to find alternative solutions. The Chairman recommended that this application be deferred to allow the architects to reappraise the scheme following the Commission's deliberations.

The Commission decided that this application should be deferred in order for solutions to be found which met the Commission's criteria.

Minor Works - not within scope of delegated powers

(All applications within this section are recommended for approval unless otherwise stated).

333/17 - BA12586 - 4 Ordnance Wharf Queensway - Consideration of application for relaxation of Building Regulations.

334/17 - F/14886/17 - 36 Merlot House, Vineyards - Proposed glass curtains to existing terrace.

335/17 - F/14930/17 - Europort 9, Europort Road - Proposed ground floor office extension.

Applications Granted by Sub Committee under delegated powers (For Information Only)

NB: In most cases approvals will have been granted subject to conditions.

336/17 - BA13053 - Eastern Beach Road Pavement, Northern End of Eastern Beach - Request to renew planning permit for kiosk.

337/17 - BA13210 - 15 Governor's Parade - Consideration of amended plans to convert single dwelling into three x 1 bedroom apartments.

338/17 - BA13214 - Europlaza, Harbour Views Road - Consideration of amended plans for the location of two approved gates.

339/17 - F/14045/16 - 173 Main Street - Consideration of amendments to shop front including awning, roller shutter and façade treatment.

340/17 - F/14176/16 - 34 Devil's Tower Road - Consideration of amended plans increasing

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

height of building by 1.5m from 48.0m to 49.5m to accommodate sprinkler system requirements from detailed structural and service design that has been undertaken.

341/17 - F/14756/17 - Leanse Place, 50 Town Range - Consideration of request to replace facade windows on a like-for-like basis.

342/17 - F/14821/17 - 205 Viking Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews North - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

343/17 - F/14828/17 - 1A Line Wall Road - Consideration of pavement and parking arrangement plan following recommendations from Traffic Commission.

344/17 - F/14859/17 - Unit 5.02 World Trade Centre, Bayside Road - Proposed internal alterations.

345/17 - F/14882/17 - 3 Halifax Court, Harbour Views - Proposed internal alterations and enlargement of balcony door opening.

346/17 - F/14892/17 - 101 Viking Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

347/17 - F/14893/17 - 341 Block 3 Water Gardens - Retrospective application for internal alterations.

348/17 - F/14894/17 - Coaling Island Marina - Proposed construction of a new office and toilet / shower facility and installation of new proposed lockers on quayside.

349/17 - F/14895/17 - 3 Castle Steps - Proposed replacement of pergola.

350/17 - F/14896/17 - 10 Europa Mews, Europa Road - Proposed internal alterations.

351/17 - F/14898/17 - Flat 1, 10 Demaya's Ramp - Proposed internal alterations.

352/17 - F/14901/17 - 508 Ocean Heights, Montagu Place - Proposed subdivision of 1 x two bedroom apartment into 1 x studio and 1 x one bedroom apartment.

353/17 - F14904/17 - 31 Cormorant Wharf - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

354/17 - F/14905/17 - 16 Europa Pass Battery, Europa Pass - Proposed installation of glass balustrading to external terraces on west facing facade.

355/17 - F/14910/17 - 6 Ashbourne Ramp, Buena Vista Estate - Proposed internal alterations and repositioning and replacement of external rear windows.

356/17 - F/14914/17 - 523 Seashell House, Beach View Terraces - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

357/17 - F/14915/17 - 8 Express Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

Approved

DPC meeting 06/17

14th June 2017

358/17 - F/14917/17 - 22 Rosia Court, 21-23 Rosia Road - Proposed loft conversion to include a master bedroom/ensuite and rear extension over existing kitchen to include a bathroom.

359/17 - F/14931/17 - 29 Limonium House, West View Park - Proposed installation of glass curtains.

360/17 - A/14926/17 - Various lamp posts around Gibraltar and outside Post Office, Main Street - Installation of lamp post banners and banner on Main Street to advertise Holifest Light & Colours Festival.

361/17 - REF 1196 - North Square, Wellington Front - Consideration of request by Lions Club for tables and chairs.

362/17 - Any other business.

JH raised the issue of hoarding at the site where the Risso Bakery, Engineer Lane, used to be. JH had noted that the part of the hoarding had fallen and the applicant was not looking after the site. JH notified the Environmental Agency about the issue.

DCM responded that it was now the business of the private landlord to raise the issue with the Department for the Environment.

363/17 - Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on 13th July 2017.