

## *Approved*

*DPC meeting 9/18  
26<sup>th</sup> September 2018*

### **THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

Minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting of 2018 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2018 at 9.30 am.

---

**Present:**

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

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

The Hon Steven Linares (MCMYS)  
*(Minister for Culture, Media, Youth & Sport)*

Mr H Montado (HM)  
*(Chief Technical Officer)*

Mr G Matto (GM)  
*(Technical Services Department)*

Mrs C Montado (CAM)  
*(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)*

Mr Kevin De Los Santos (KS)  
*(Land Property Services)*

Mr Charles Perez (CP)  
*(Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History Society)*

Mr C Viagas (CV)

Mrs Janet Howitt (JH)  
*(Environmental Safety Group)*

Mr V O'Reilly (VOR)  
*(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 9/18  
26<sup>th</sup> September 2018

The Hon Dr J Cortes  
(Minister for Education, Heritage, Environment & Climate  
Change)

Dr K Bensusan  
(Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History Society)

**564/18 – Approval of Minutes**

The minutes for of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of 2018 held on 4<sup>th</sup> September 2018 were deferred to be approved via round robin.

**Major Developments**

**565/18 – O/15538/18 – 47 Line Wall Road and 15 and 17 College Lane – Proposed demolition of existing building and construction of an eight storey block of apartments.**

This application had previously been discussed at the July meeting but had been deferred due to inconsistencies with the address posted on notices. The applicants had to re-advertise with the correct addresses in order for the application to be considered.

In 2008 the Commission refused an application for a 10 storey building. A 7 storey building was approved in 2009 but the planning permit expired in July 2016. The proposed building would be 26.4 metres tall, including the roof stair core. Initially 10 storeys were proposed but this had subsequently been reduced to 8 storeys. The ground floor would have a retail unit, 30 motorcycle parking bays, bicycle racks and pedestrian entrance. The 1<sup>st</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> floors had 5 apartments per floor and the 6-7<sup>th</sup> floors had 5 apartments with the exterior treated differently to the lower part. Encroaching windows on the south elevation were noted.

DTP reported that a design statement and an archaeological desk based assessment had been submitted.

Objections had been received and had been circulated to members of the Commission. Mr Lee Everest (LE) was the first to address the Commission. LE had brought handouts to circulate to members of the Commission but these were not accepted as objectors have 21 days to submit both their objections and any supporting documents.

LE was representing the residents of 16 College Lane, in his view the applicants were depicting a false impression of history and considered that there were charming Georgian buildings in College Lane. Adding that conserving and enhancing the current building would be for the public good. LE commented that it was Gibraltar's unique history that attracted tourism and the building should be in the style of Gibraltar's old town. He mentioned that there was an example in Governor's Parade of a dilapidated building which had been restored. LE presented an alternative design which was smaller in size and massing.

The second objector was Mr Douglas Mottershead (DM) who resides at 24 College Lane. DM had informed Town Planning that the proposed building contravened Part K of the Building Control Regulations which refers to ventilation. The Chairman informed him that the Commission did not represent Building Control.

DM asked the Commission that if planning permission was given to the developers whether that meant that they had the right to demolish the current building.

The Chairman told DM that permission for demolition would be given at Full Planning in any case and asked DM to inform the Commission on what architectural grounds he objected to the

*Approved*  
*DPC meeting 9/18*  
*26<sup>th</sup> September 2018*

application.

DM continued that he objected on loss of natural light and privacy issues as his window was 2 metres away from proposed windows and that the proposal did not fit with the character of the Old Town.

The third objector to address the Commission was Mr Dilip Tailor (DT) who had collected 1355 signatures in a petition which objected to the demolition of the current building and construction of a modern building of that height in its place. He also mentioned that a building of that height would throw College Lane into darkness and residents of the area already had issues with parking which would only be exacerbated by the construction of the proposed building. DT added that residents wanted assurances that if the building was demolished another would be constructed in its place, not left halfway as had previously happened at the Risso Bakery site.

The Chairman asked DT whether he was a resident and had objected to the previous scheme proposed.

DT replied that he was not aware and had not seen any notices.

The Chairman responded that there had been public participation, notices had been put in place and DM had also objected to that scheme.

Mr Moses Hassan (MH) was the fourth objector. He explained that at the previous meeting where this development was discussed counter representations had been made stating that the right to light was not a planning issue. MH said that the Development Plan states that redevelopments will not have an impact on surrounding properties and the right to light must be taken into consideration. He claimed that the goalposts were being changed every time an application was submitted. MH stated that the maximum height should be allowed with a substantial setback on the last two storeys in order to not affect the uses of surrounding residents. He explained that the building should be setback on all facades.

DTP reported to the Commission that the current building had been radically altered since its construction although some historical features had been retained on the façade facing College Lane. The building proposed was similar in height to the proposal which had been previously approved by the Commission. DTP recommended that an access hatch for the roof was preferable to a stair core and that as the previous application, include a setback on College Lane.

DTP mentioned that there were some concerns on the amount of glazing and bronze cladding proposed as it would not fit with the location of this building. Encroaching windows on the south elevation should be omitted, although the applicant had made numerous amendments due to some of the objections. DTP also commented that a daylight/sunlight study and a wind study should be carried out. Car Parking would also be an issue but had been waived previously by the Commission. As the previous proposal had been approved, DTP recommended approval of this application with a condition to retain the façade on College Lane.

DTP stated that there were concerns with the proposed glazing and bronze cladding which it was considered did not sit appropriately in the context. Additionally, it was considered that both top two storeys should be progressively set back. He also referred to the encroaching windows on the

**Approved**  
*DPC meeting 9/18*  
*26<sup>th</sup> September 2018*

south elevation which should be omitted.

The Chairman asked the Commission whether they would like to begin by discussing the demolition of the current building.

CAM replied that the Heritage Trust objected to the demolition of the building and that a building of this style and height should be allowed within the Old Town. She added that a modern building like the one proposed was an erosion of the vernacular found in the Old Town. Most of the current building is still original, it could be restored and the internal layout could be redirected.

MCMYS commented that valid representations had been made by the objectors and the building should be restored back to its original form as it has some historical value, and any additional floors should be setback. He added that parking requirements should not have been waived and were waived by the previous Commission.

CV agreed with MCMYS's statement but parking should be provided elsewhere as he preferred to see a commercial unit rather than a garage on the ground floor.

The Chairman stated that as the Commission did not approve of the demolition of the building the application was unanimously refused for the reasons expressed by the Commission.

**566/18 – O/15710/18 – 29-35 Engineer Lane – Proposed constructed of building containing 59 residential apartments, 2 commercial units and ancillary areas.**

An 8 storey hotel had previously been approved for this site in 2014. An application for an extension had been refused in September 2015 and in August 2018 an application for an 8 storey building consisting of 52 serviced apartments had been approved. The applicant now wished to have 59 residential apartments, 2 commercial units and ancillary areas. The apartments would consist of 5 2-bedroom apartments and the rest would be studios. The Cafeteria had been relocated to the front of the building with a covered terrace. The 5<sup>th</sup> floor façade had been amended to continue the same facade treatment as the floors below, whilst the change in façade treatment occurred at the 6<sup>th</sup> floor where there was a setback. The applicant had also rearranged the internal design of the building and was including balconies on the eastern façade. The swimming pool on the roof had also been reoriented. The façade treatment had moved away from the original neo-classical treatment to a cleaner smooth render finish.

Ministry for Heritage had commented that a Desk Based Assessment (DBA) and an Archaeological Watching Brief (AWB) should be carried out if approved but recommended refusal as the proposal did not fit into the landscape.

DTP reported that the building volume was the same as had been previously approved. The number of parking spaces provided would be less than required but this has been allowed previously for buildings in the City Centre and for studio apartments. A higher number of parking spaces could create additional traffic. However, the developer would be making provisions for motorcycles and bicycles. DTP recommended approval of this application.

Mr Stephen Martinez (SM) and Mr Craig Fortunato (CF) addressed the Commission to inform them that although the previous scheme had been approved they had taken the Commission's

## Approved

DPC meeting 9/18  
26<sup>th</sup> September 2018

comments on board and had made the necessary changes, keeping within the original volume of the building. They had redressed the setback and were also providing space for 20 public bins. They would be providing 59 bicycle racks, 1 per apartment. CF added that they were trying to encourage people to move away from using private vehicles.

JH asked what environmental measures they would be implementing.

SM replied that they would be using Photovoltaic (PV) panels.

CF commented that the site had been vacant for too long and were hoping to start by March 2019.

The Commission unanimously approved this application as submitted with conditions including archaeological watching brief and provision of swifts nests.

### Other Developments

**567/18 - O/13998/16 - 73-77 Catalan Bay - Proposed refurbishment and extensions to existing building. & 568/18 - F/15087/17 - 69-70 Catalan Village - Proposed construction of a three storey apartment block and refurbishment of existing cottage.**

Both of these applications were considered concurrently together as they were adjacent sites.

**567/18 - O/13998/16 - 73-77 Catalan Bay - Proposed refurbishment and extensions to existing building**

The application for 73-77 Catalan Bay had previously been deferred in February and September 2017 to allow revisions to be made to reduce the height, retain the existing building and improve on the external treatment. The current proposal retains the existing structures including the large lean to roof and part of the pitched roof. The rear structures would be demolished and a new 3 storey extension built and a flat roof above. The ground floor would provide for 3 retail units and access to the apartments above. There would be a slight setback on the northern façade in relation to the adjacent cottage. On the first floor there will be small terraces on the south-west and north-east corners. On the second the applicant wishes to remove the pitched roof and build two roof terraces, a balcony to the north-east and incorporate Velux roof lights to the lower east pitched roof. The majority of the existing building would be retained. There were no objections received from the public.

DTP reported that the improvements and retention of most of the original building were welcomed. The applicant would be building up to the boundary of the adjacent building which had implications for the design of the adjacent proposal which had windows on this boundary. DTP recommended that the applicant incorporate an access hatch instead of a stair core.

MHE commented that most buildings in Catalan Bay belong to Government and were in the process of being refurbished and the applicant should bear this in mind.

None of the members of the Commission objected to this application so application O/13998/16 - 73-77 Catalan Bay was approved unanimously.

**568/18 - F/15087/17 - 69-70 Catalan Village - Proposed construction of a three storey**

## *Approved*

*DPC meeting 9/18  
26<sup>th</sup> September 2018*

### **apartment block and refurbishment of existing cottage.**

Application F/15087/17 for 69-70 Catalan Bay was for the refurbishment of an existing rundown 2 storey cottage and the construction of a 3 storey apartment block. In September 2017 an outline application was approved to redevelop the cottage and construct a 3 storey building with a stair core. A full application for a 4 storey proposal was deferred by the DPC in October 2017 to allow the applicant to revise it in line with the outline permission for a 3 storey building

This application now incorporates a basement, retention and refurbishment of the cottage and a 3 storey building with terraces and balconies. The new building would have a green roof. The building would be pulled back to stay within the applicants own site. The 3 storey building would be behind the cottage.

Objections were received concerning the windows on the north elevation as these would be encroaching on neighbouring properties and the stair core would overlook a neighbour's terrace. These objections were on grounds of loss of privacy. These objections were circulated to members of the Commission. Counter representations were received stating that semi opaque glazing would be used; they would increase the height of glass screens and reduce the height of the parapet wall.

DTP reported that there were no objections in principle to the application but agreed with the objections relating to the stair core. Seeing as application O/13998/16 had been approved the applicant would have to make some amendments and change the internal configuration as pedestrian access to the building would now be blocked because of the approval of application F/15087/17. DTP suggested that the application be deferred and once amendments were made to be passed onto the Sub Committee for approval.

The Chairman clarified that the cottage was accessed via an alleyway and that the access should be changed to the southern part of the building.

The Commission agreed to defer this application with amendments to be approved by the Sub Committee.

### **569/18 – F/14272/16 – Casemates Square (Part) – Proposed repositioning of the cityscape sign, removal of two trees, new landscaping and the repositioning of the plaque.**

This application was for the public area in front of SuperDry in Casemates square, adjacent to Burger King. This area currently has 5 trees on site and a CityScape map which the applicant wished to relocate to 1 Main Street. The applicant also wished to remove 2 of the 5 Ficus trees and plant 10 new trees and install planters, benches, bollard lights and a new lamp post. The Telephone Boxes would remain on site.

Department of Environment, Heritage and Climate Change (DOEHCC) commented that the Ficus trees were mature and this area was a landscaped feature of town. They did not feel that the Palm trees proposed by the applicant were an adequate substitution. DOEHCC recommended refusal to cutting down of the trees and instead the existing trees should be managed.

An objection from the owners of the shop at 1 Main Street was received stating that it would

## Approved

DPC meeting 9/18  
26<sup>th</sup> September 2018

block access to their shop. This objection had been circulated to members of the Commission.

DTP reported that this was an important landscaped area and was an attractive feature. Some management of the trees could be done by raising the crowns. This would improve visibility of the storefront. The Cityscape map was currently well sited, very visible and located in a public area. The proposed location adjacent to the shop at no 1 Main street could lead to people congregating around the map and hindering access and visibility of the shop. DTP recommended refusal of this application.

The Commission unanimously refused this application.

### **570/18 - F/15620/18 - 24 Casemates Square - Proposed construction of glazed external structure.**

This application was adjacent to the area that was the subject of the previous application. The applicant wished to enclose part of their Tables and Chairs area with a single storey conservatory with decorative aluminium framing and glazed bi-folding doors with translucent polycarbonate roof sheeting.

DTP reported that a previous application for a conservatory had been deferred in June 2016 due to concerns with structures in a licensed area and the effect on the trees. That application had been overtaken by the current application.

GHT had commented that the proposal would have a negative effect on the open feeling of the historic square and would set a precedent.

DTP reported that the site forms part of the public open area of the square and it was considered that the proposal would erode the open space. He noted that the trees were a welcome concentration of greenery within the square which otherwise only had individual trees dotted around the perimeter. The proposal would result in a permanent structure which would reduce circulation space when major events take place at Casemates. DTP recommended refusal of this application.

The Commission unanimously refused this application.

### **571/18 - F/15621/18 - Podium Level, Plata Villa, St. Joseph's Road - Proposed construction of an apartment above the existing car lift structure at podium level.**

The developer of Plata Villa was applying to add an additional single storey apartment over the car lift area. The apartment would have a total area of 46 sqm and would have a balcony with glass balustrading. An additional parking space would be provided for this apartment.

Mr Alan Carrara (AC) addressed the Commission to inform them of his objections. He explained how he had purchased a property for his mother in building 7 which would be 3 meters away from this apartment. He claimed that this structure would block light from entering his mother's home. AC added that the access to building 7 would be narrower and his mother had mobility issues. He had been led to believe that the area directly in front of the house would be a landscaped area. AC believed that Plata Villa Management would be taking away this public amenity. He added that

## Approved

DPC meeting 9/18  
26<sup>th</sup> September 2018

the addition of this apartment would be out of character with the estate and would lower the value of his mother's apartment. AC told the Commission that he had signed the deeds as his mother's legal guardian.

Simon Vaughan (SV) who represented the developer made counter representations and explained that the apartment would be 3 meters away from a staircase and 3.7 meters away from the building. The new apartment would only affect the view from a kitchen and not the living accommodation.

JH commented that a lot of green areas were lost when this site was developed and it had been agreed upon that the developers would introduce green areas into this development.

SV replied that this new apartment would have a green roof and that it was the management's responsibility to maintain these areas.

The Chairman asked SV what the reason was for this new apartment.

SV explained that as a developer the reality was that Brexit had hit this development and by constructing this apartment it would help to cover some of the costs incurred.

DTP reported that there had been a second objection claiming that the area was overdeveloped, the scale of the apartment was unsympathetic to the estate and the addition did not improve the overall design. The objector also mentioned that the developer had committed himself to landscape Witham's Cemetery. The developer had submitted counter representations claiming they had been working on Witham's Cemetery. These objections had been circulated to members.

DTP reported that works were still ongoing at Witham's Cemetery in conjunction with the GHT who were apparently happy with progress; there were no issues with the design and welcomed the inclusion of a green roof. However, this would be a loss of open space for residents. The new apartment would impact the view but it was in fact a non-habitable room. DTP did not believe it was so adverse as to recommend refusal of this application.

The Chairman asked the Commission whether they accepted the proposal, taking into consideration that the previous open space was accessible. He further added that as Town Planner the construction of the apartment resulted in the loss of an amenity and in his opinion preferred for it to continue being an open space.

Some members concurred with the Chairman's comments.

Members voted as follows:

Approve: Nil  
Refuse: 6  
Abstentions: 4

The Commission refused this application on the grounds that the Commission preferred to maintain to the approved scheme as was envisaged in the planning permit being the creation of an open space to be used as a residential community amenity by the new residents of this completed

development.

**572/18 - O/15649/18 - 4 George's Lane - Proposed two storey extension as well as refurbishment of common areas of building including installation of lift in courtyard.**

This applicant wished to construct a 2 storey extension consisting of two 4 bedroom apartments which would be setback from the main building line. Terraces would be filled in and the existing structure atop the building would be demolished. A lift would be installed with access to all levels and a spiral staircase would be installed in the patio. The extension would have a flat green roof with an access hatch. A swimming pool would also be installed and solar panels would be included. A design statement was submitted and there are also buildings of similar heights in the area.

The following comments were received:

DoEHCC – Swift/Bat survey and boxes required.

GHT – An AWB should be carried out whilst installing the lift; there are original paving still in place on the ground floor which should be retained.

MH – A photo record and AWB is required and shutters and windows should be retained.

TSD – Should reduce the extension by one storey.

An objection was received by the resident of the ground floor apartment due to the installation of the spiral staircase and the proposed lift. The objector claimed that the lift would block a window and that the spiral staircase was within their property. The objection was circulated to all members of the Commission.

The applicant made counter representations stating that they were in discussions with the objector to sort out their issue. They also claimed that the visual impact of the extension was negligible.

DTP recommended approval of this application adding that the lift and stair core would have to be omitted from the planning permit until the issue with the objector has been resolved.

The Chairman noted that the fire exit was not a planning issue but a Building Control issue and considered that the Commission should follow DTP's recommendations.

The Commission approved this application with conditions that permission may not be given for the lift and stair core until the issue had been resolved with the objector; the original flagstones to be retained, and archaeological watching brief and provision of bat and swift nests

**573/18 - F/15651/18 - Café Truth, Units G02 and G03 West One, Europort Road - Proposed installation of moveable glass screen to pergolas.**

**574/18 - F/15752/18 - Lunch box, 3001 Eurotowers - Proposed installation of moveable glass planters around the pergola area.**

The applicant for F/15651/18 had originally applied to enclose their licensed area for tables and chairs outside their establishment but these are meant to be al-fresco eating areas and following

## Approved

DPC meeting 9/18  
26<sup>th</sup> September 2018

discussions with Town planning had revised their proposals. The revised proposal was for glass screens that can be raised or lowered. The vertical sliding panels could be raised to the full height of the pergola which would mean that it would effectively become an enclosure.

DTP considered that application F/15752/18 should also be considered as both businesses are in the same vicinity and the Commission may prefer a homogenous design. Additionally, he advised that a third application had been received (but not ready for this meeting) which was applying for permission for the principle of glass screens incorporating planters being provided to all cafes/restaurants within the Eurotowers complex.

TSD had objections to the original proposal to enclose but no comments had been received in relation to the revised proposal for the installation of glass screens.

DTP commented that the screens proposed by Café Truth should be limited in height, not extending more than 2 meters, to avoid the effect of enclosing completely the area below the pergolas.

JH commented that planters would be preferable in order to bring more greenery to the area.

The Commission decided to approve both schemes as submitted subject to the Café Truth proposal of vertical sliding screens to be limited to a maximum height of 2m.

### **575/18 – F/15697/18 – 304C Main Street – Proposed refurbishment of existing ground floor and extension of first floor and attic floor to an existing house.**

This application was for the refurbishment of 304C Main Street together with an extension and attic floor. There is an existing pool at the rear of the building and the site abuts grounds of The Convent. The applicant wished to remove the double pitched roof and add an additional storey and attic with two skylights to each roof aspect. The scheme had been revised after earlier discussions with Town Planning. Two new openings to the Main street elevation would be added, an existing opening enlarged and the timber shutters replaced with aluminium. On the rear elevation four windows were to be replaced with two larger openings, terraces would be added with glass balustrades and Solar Panels would be placed on the mono pitched roof.

DTP reported that permission had been granted for a pool in 2009 and in 2012 permission was granted for reroofing and internal alterations.

The Convent had objected to the proposed development.

The applicant, Mr Johan Fernandez (JF), approached the Commission to further detail his application. He explained that the balcony would overlook the Convent's garden. JF said that under Section 22 of the Town Planning Act (TPA) he should have been handed the Convent's objections in writing and as he had not received them their objections should not be taken into account.

DTP explained that there were provisions in the TPA to consult with relevant authorities and had consulted with The Convent as an internal consultee and not under section 22. DTP confirmed that The Convent had objected to the proposal on the basis of invasion of privacy and possible

## Approved

DPC meeting 9/18  
26<sup>th</sup> September 2018

security issues. Although The Convent's objections had not been copied to the applicant a summary of its contents had been provided.

The Chairman asked JF if he wished to have his application deferred if he considered that he had not been considered adequately.

JF addressed the issues of privacy and security and circulated a number of photographs which he argued proved that these were not issues.

MHE commented that while she agreed that there were some procedural issues which needed to be looked into, she was not comfortable if The Convent had raised some security issues and recommended that this application be deferred in order to investigate further. She was further concerned that the applicant had used his Government work email address to correspond with the Town Planning department as this could be mistaken as being the position of the Government. JF replied that he had simply replied to an email that he had received at his work email address. MHE thought it would be prudent to defer the application so that the applicant could consider this issue.

The Chairman concurred with MHE's comments and asked the Commission to defer this application as legalities were involved which needed to be checked out together with the procedural matters. The Commission agreed and the application was deferred.

### **576/18 – F/15716/18 – The New Aloes, 6 John Snow Close – Proposed construction of a lap pool extension to the existing swimming pool.**

The applicant wished to construct a 10 m x 4 m lap pool as an extension to his existing pool. The lap pool would have a natural stone finish and cantilevered over an existing landscaped area.

DoEHCC commented that there should be no further encroachments over the landscaped area.

DTP reported that there would be a minimal loss of open space and it would have a minimal visual impact. He added that an ecological survey was required and the finish to the pool had to be agreed upon.

The Commission approved this application unanimously.

### **577/18 – O/15717/18 – Main Street – Proposed installation of LCD digital advertising displays within Casemates and along Main Street to replace existing concrete anti-terror barriers.**

The applicant wished to replace the concrete barriers currently in place in Main Street. An example and concept design was shown to the Commission. The advertising displays would have a concrete base but would be moveable. They would have digital displays and could also be used for anti-terrorism purposes.

DTP informed the Commission that in 2013 permission had been granted to for smaller LCD screens included lifesaving equipment, as well as tourist information and other useful information. DTP also reminded the Commission that applications to place advertising on the existing barriers had been refused in January and May of 2018.

*Approved*  
DPC meeting 9/18  
26<sup>th</sup> September 2018

Ministry for Heritage had commented that the proposal would be less effective as barriers and that Main street is very congested. Too many of these units would have an adverse effect on the character of the area.

Ministry for Infrastructure and Planning (MIP) commented that the current barriers were temporary and would be replaced.

TSD had objected as there was sufficient advertising in Main Street

The applicant told the Commission that the purpose of their application was to get feedback and their goal was to use these advertising displays to act as anti-terrorism measures and to promote Gibraltar. These displays would also allow for first aid boxes. They would be placed on lockable rails which would allow for them to be moved and rotated. The applicant would also be in charge of maintenance.

MCMYS commented that certain criteria would need to be looked into; location, maintenance and mobility in order to consider whether this proposal was viable. He added that MIP was already looking into suitable replacements for the concrete blocks.

CAM said that there was a place for the proposed displays but did not feel Main Street was the correct location.

DTP informed the Commission that this proposal was a more elegant solution than those presented previously but that approval may set a precedent for too much advertising in Main Street. As mentioned previously Government was already looking into replacing the concrete barriers and so recommended refusal of this application.

The Commission refused this application unanimously.

**578/18 - F/15738/18 - 17-21 Cannon Lane - Proposed refurbishment and alterations to existing premises including change of use of upper floors from office to residential use and introducing an additional floor.**

The applicant wished to refurbish the upper floors of 17-21 Cannon Lane from offices to 12 studio apartments and build a single storey extension. Minor external alterations would be made to the rear façade; new windows would be installed and Juliet balconies would be introduced to the east elevation. The additional storey would consist of a 3-bedroom apartment with an open terrace. A stair core would go all the way to the top of the building. The applicant would not be providing any parking.

An objection was received by residents of Artillery House stating that the new windows would affect their privacy and the extension would result in a loss of natural light. These objections were circulated to all members. The existing windows overlook a garden area with mature trees. The new windows overlooking Artillery House will have translucent glazing.

DTP reported that the extension was sympathetic and the translucent glazing would solve the objector's issue. DTP recommended approval of this application subject to the windows on the

**Approved**  
DPC meeting 9/18  
26<sup>th</sup> September 2018

south-east boundary being translucent.

The Commission approved this application unanimously.

**579/18 – REF 1225 – DPC Policies – Proposed protocols in preparation for implementation of new Town Planning Act.**

Seeing as DCM and MEHEC were not present it would be best to circulate the proposed protocols via Round Robin and have all the members submit their comments on these protocols for the implementation of the new Town Planning Act.

**Minor and Other Works – not within scope of delegated powers**

**580/18 – F/15756/18G – Varyl Begg Estate – Proposed construction of temporary accommodation for the Varyl Begg Social Club.**

*GoG Project*

The Commission had no objections to the application.

**581/18 – F/15793/18 – Vacant Open Flat Roof Area over Chatham Counter Guard Vaults, No. 11 and No. 12 – Proposed reopening of access to roof in Vault No. 12 Chatham Counter Guard and hard and soft landscaping on unused open rooftop terrace above Vaults No. 11 to No. 12 Chatham Counter Guard only.**

KDS commented that the permit was given for an open roof area to be used for drinking and eating adding that he noted that a new ring beam was being proposed on the roof and that this was not acceptable. Nothing was permitted to be anchored to the existing roof structure.

The Chairman asked whether it was preferable to defer the decision in order to speak to the applicant.

KDS further replied that they preferred to speak to the Landlord.

The application was approved in principle subject to the Applicant approaching LPS and the heritage authorities' and them being satisfied with the proposed new ring beam over the roof. This being case the Application need not return back to the Commission but could be dealt with by the Subcommittee. If the issue's not resolved the application will be referred back to the Commission.

**582/18 - O/15777/18 - Studio B Apartments (24) West One, Europort Road -- Proposed installation of glass curtains on south facing and north facing elevations.**

The Commission approved this application

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

**Approved**  
DPC meeting 9/18  
26<sup>th</sup> September 2018

**583/18 – BA13545 – 6 Poca Roca – Proposed demolition of existing house and construction of new residence.**

*Consideration of request to renew Planning Permit No. 4824*

**584/18 – F/14867/17 – 11/13 Cumberland Road – Proposed redevelopment of building and conversion into 7 apartments and stores.**

*Consideration of amendments to keep balcony on upper floor opened to discharge Condition 1 of Planning Permit No. 6270.*

**585/18 – F/15532/18 – 5 Governor’s Lane – Proposed internal alterations and change of use.**

*Consideration of window details and request to change approved window material from aluminium to uPVC to discharge condition 3 of Planning Permit No. 6584.*

**586/18 – F/15655/18 – 8 Park View House, 21 Queensway – Proposed internal alterations.**

**587/18 – F/15674/18 – 3 Edward House, The Clifton’s – Proposed enclosure of existing external terrace to western side of building and associated works.**

**588/18 – F/15707/18 – 7A Ironside House, Glacis Estate – Proposed installation of air conditioning units.**

**589/18 – F/15726/18 – Unit G10, I.C.C., 2A Main Street – Proposed refurbishment of vacant unit into a restaurant/takeaway.**

*Consideration of proposed tables and chairs area.*

**590/18 – F/15736/18 – 7/9 Demaya’s Ramp – Proposed minor external alterations including regularisation of window openings and installation of railings.**

**591/18 – F/15739/18G – First Floor Charles Bruzon House – Proposed amendments to first floor parking level to accommodate disability scooters and installation of grills on first floor parking parapet.**

*GoG Project*

**592/18 – F/15745/18 – 605 Seamaster Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews – Proposed installation of glass curtains.**

**593/18 – F/15757/18 – 9 Europa Pass Battery – Proposed external alterations to west facing terrace including installation of awning.**

## **Approved**

DPC meeting 9/18  
26<sup>th</sup> September 2018

**594/18 - F/15760/18 - 223 Seashell House, Beach View Terraces - Proposed installation of glass curtains.**

**595/18 - D/15731/18 - Eurolife Building, 1 Corral Road - Proposed demolition of penthouse room, staircases and lift shaft.**

**596/18 - D/15768/18 - 6 Poca Roca, Upper Rock - Proposed demolition of existing dwelling.**

**597/18 - A/15770/18 - 94 Devil's Tower Road - Proposed advertising on site boundary hoarding.**

**598/18 - Any other business.**

**599/18 - Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2018.