

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the 9th Meeting of 2016 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 28th September 2016 at 10.00 am.

Present:

Mr P Origo (Chairman)
(Town Planner)

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

The Hon S Linares (MSCHY)
(Minister for Sport, Culture, Heritage & Youth)

Mr E Hermida (EM)
(Chief Executive Technical Services Department)

Mr G Matto (GM)
(Technical Services Department)

Mr I Ballestrino (IB)
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

Mr J Collado (JC)
(Land Property Services)

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

Mr T Scott (TS)
(Environmental Safety Group)

Mr W Gavito (WG)
(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)

Mr C Viagas (CV)

In Attendance:

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

Mrs. Miriam Brittenden
(Minute Secretary)

Approved

*DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016*

Apologies:

The Hon Dr J Cortes
(Minister for Environment & Health)

Mr H Montado
(Chief Technical Officer)

Mrs D Smith
(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)

Mrs J Howitt
(Environmental Safety Group)

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

Approval of Minutes

682/16 – Approval of Minutes of the 8th meeting of 2016 held on 31st August 2016

The Commission approved the Minutes of the 8th DPC meeting of 2016 held on 31st August 2016.

Matters Arising

683/16 – F/14235/16 – 22-24 Willis’s Road - Proposed extension and refurbishment of property.

DTP briefed the Commission on this full application which was deferred in July 2016 as the Commission had concerns with the proposals. The Applicant had submitted revised plans and proposed several changes, which were as follows:

Block One: The lateral extension over the patio area had been removed. The proposal is for the refurbishment and internal alteration of the existing building. The original proposed full storey extension at roof level has been omitted from the scheme and it is now proposed to construct a small extension and create a roof terrace, which is accessed by an external staircase.

Block Two: One of the ground floor balconies had been omitted and the first floor extension’s windows had been removed from the scheme. The top floor extension would be set back by 500mm from the front of the building.

DTP explained that the proposal included the retention of six windows, instead of the original proposal to convert them into French windows and three sets of these have had their balconies removed from the revised scheme. The shiplap cladding would be replaced with render finish and painted to match the rest of the building. The external ladders have been removed from the scheme. The roof would be replaced with white sandwich roof panels and the tower to the right of the building would be retained. The proposed balconies and external ladders on the south elevation had been removed from the scheme

Other changes included the windows on the east elevation, where they proposed to introduce an elongated window and a minor change to the entrance door. The Applicant had also removed the proposed windows and glass blocks from the internal east elevation.

DTP stated that the Housing Department had withdrawn their previous objections as they had sold the adjacent property. The Ministry of Heritage objected to the revisions as they changed the character of the building and made specific reference to the proposed introduction of balconies. They also objected to the conversion of the windows, shutters and doors into aluminium replacements.

DTP stated that the Town Planning Department welcomed the omission of some of the balconies and the conversion of windows to doors and also welcomed the removal of the external ladders. He also advised the Commission that the resident from the adjacent property had no objection to a proposed reduced number of overflying balconies.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

DTP added that the white sandwich roofing was unusual and recommended a darker colour scheme, which would be more in keeping with the buildings in the area. He also recommended that the proposed extension be set-back 1m instead of the proposed 500mm to make a distinction between the modern extension and the original building.

There were also issues with the mix of window types being proposed and recommended that on the west, east and south elevations (but not the internal east elevation) windows should be of the casement type and be of a timber or composite materials to maintain the character of the old town. It was also recommended that the façade should be repainted rather than left in its current plain rendered state. .

The Commission concurred with the comments received and approved the scheme subject to the conditions proposed.

Major Developments

684/16 - F/14473/16G - Land reclaimed from the sea at the end of North Mole Road -Proposed reinforcement works to existing concrete caissons that form the pier to be provided within the new LNG storage facility site.

DTP briefed the Commission on this application and said that the proposal is to jet-grout the caissons used in the reclaimed ground where the LNG storage tanks would be located to reinforce these in the event of seismic activity.

The Agents for the application addressed the Commission, Mr. David Veale & Mr Emanuele Gesù and Ms. N Crawford, environmental consultant was available via Skype.

TP briefed the Commission by stating that this was a screening opinion required by the Town Planners in accordance with the Town Planning Environmental Impact Regulations 2000. The screening report was submitted by Environmental Resource Management, Agents for the HM Government of Gibraltar.

He noted that the proposal was for works at the reclamation on the North Mole to jet-grout and improves the soil beneath the caissons, to make them more stable and substitute the foundation columns with the jet-grouting. He added that this proposal would increase safety integrity to the proposed tanks and should deter any displacements of foundations following extreme seismic activities.

He added that the purpose for the screening was to consider significant likely environmental effects, which included:

Transport: The level of operation and construction expectancy would be relatively low so as not to cause significant environmental effects on local receptors. The impact of construction traffic would be temporary and the route would be agreed with in advance with Highways Authorities.

Ecology: All Consultees concurred that the transportation of materials for the jet-grouting operation should not be significant so as not to affect the marine mammals and species in the local environment.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

Noise: There would be a 24/7 duration of jet-grouting work to ensure the quality of the columns which was estimated to last two months. The potential impact would be from the additional traffic and jet-grouting and is reported to not exceed the noise from the Waterport Power Station which is 300m away from the site. Appropriate mitigation procedure would be proposed to ensure that the noise impact is monitored through the Environmental Agency.

Air quality: The jet-grouting activity would be less than piling and would not change the environmental impact as determined in the Environmental Statement. A Dust Management Plan would be implemented.

Visual impact: The view across the townscape would not be significant. The impact would affect the cruise liner visitors due to the size and nature of the vessels. As part of the process, the port Authority and the Tourism Agency would liaise with the Applicant to ensure that the operations are carried out when Gibraltar received less cruise ships.

Shipping: No other shipping activities would be affected during the operations.

Heritage: The usual desk assessment would be required as part of the process.

TP commented that the Consultee responses had been positive and the ESG had required an Environmental Impact to be carried out and their comments had been circulated to Agents.

TP recommended that the Applicant should liaise with the Heritage Trust and Archeological Officer and stakeholders to ensure that the issues reported were adhered to. He also commented that the Commission needed to consider relaxing the normal conditions on the issue of operational noise which would be on a 24/7 basis, considering that there were residents and other businesses operating in the vicinity of the proposed LNG tanks.

TS commented that the ESG welcomed the proposed works but had concerns over the recent seismic activities in the area. They remained concerned over the noise factor and that traffic generated during the works would be significant. They appreciated the introduction of the Traffic Plan Coordinator and the Community feedback mechanism for the noise factor.

TP recommended the Commission ensure the Traffic Plan Coordinator protocols were in place and contacts made easily available and asked the Commission for their approval on the relaxation of the hours of operation.

JC asked the Application to give a detailed description of the process of jet-grouting.

Mr. David Veale & Mr Emanuele Gesù addressed the Commission and explained that the jet-grouting system was to target the underlying natural seabed soil where the tanks would be built upon, which was a sandy silt material which would liquefy under very extreme earthquake conditions and lose its strength. The proposed jet-grouting was similar to a very weak form of concrete, which would be introduced into the sand and would give the seabed enough strength to withstand earthquake motion.

The jet grouting process would involve the drilling of the seabed with a conventional drilling system and the grout would be introduced into the hole using a high pressure pump. This would

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

be made progressively along a line of overlapping holes along the line of the mole to provide a solid wall.

TP asked the Applicant on the issue of noise, Mr Veale explained that the pump would be enclosed to reduce the level of noise and it is expected that noise levels would be within the permitted levels

TP also asked the Applicant whether they had a backup plan if the works were to become too noisy, to which Mr. Veale explained that they would construct additional barrier around the plant to contain the noise.

TS asked the Commission to ensure that the sound was monitored regularly and the Applicant confirmed that they would be working closely with the ESG and the pertinent Authorities to ensure that the noise was within the set legal limits.

JC asked the Applicant on the estimated duration of the works and the Applicant stated that it was envisaged to take two months. He explained that the process needed to be unremitting to ensure that the columns overlapped to provide a continuous wall. He stated that as the material hardened, the overlap needed to be made quickly to ensure that the materials did not solidify.

He also added that the proposal was to build two lines of staggered columns and two pumps would be used simultaneously, one on each side.

GM asked the Applicant whether they would be using local resources to provide the cement to ensure 24/7 provision of materials. The Applicant stated that they would have sufficient materials stored on site and to avoid night time deliveries. He said that they would be working closely with the relevant Authorities, mainly the Royal Gibraltar Police and the Traffic Department to ensure that deliveries were made during the day.

TP asked the Commission to take a decision on the relaxation of noise and the support of the screening opinion to continue the process.

The Committee agreed with the Town Planner's Screening Opinion and approved the relaxation of with the standard noise condition provided that there was regular monitoring of the noise levels.

Other Developments

685/16 - BA12509 - 2&3 Kavanagh's Court - Proposed additional storey on south block of development.

DTP stated that this application was for the provision of an additional storey to be added to the south block of the development. The extension would be flat roofed and would be 3m in height and would connect the top level apartment to create a maisonette. The extension would be set back 1.2 to 2.9m in different areas; it would be surrounded by a glass balustrade and would continue the architectural theme of the current scheme. They also proposed to incorporate green walls on the north east and south elevations. The Applicant requested to address the Commission and objections had also been received.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

Mr. M Estella addressed the Commission on behalf of the developer and stated that they had consultations with the ESG and the Heritage Trust on site and they were briefed on the plans and green walls proposals. He added that there was an existing parapet wall which was 1.20m high and if the extension was approved, the resulting increase would be 1.10m/1.20m. The extension would be pulled back 3m to 1.19/50m on different areas and would be 3m to 4m and 4m to 5m from the existing buildings behind the development. The new proposal was to meet financial considerations as the development had been technically challenging and had increased the costs of the build.

He explained that the building pulled in upwards from floor to floor to create more air and light to the area. Unless the site was viewed from above the visual impact was not very significant. They would also be incorporating swift boxes and solar paneling into the development.

As regards the objections received, he stated that the extension was to be pulled back as much as possible and would be a single floor.

CV commented that the proposed extension would be constructed on a terraced area to improve the amenities and asked how would the extension be accessed and maintained. Mr. Estella clarified that the access would be internal.

The Chairman commented that there had been constant changes and revisions to the development scheme which affected local residents from the area and asked the Applicant to explain the reasons for this. Mr. Estella stated that not all revisions had been to increase the height, but because the construction had been very challenging; having to have spent months digging into various levels of terrain and solid rock to get the parking available underground. He added that the revisions had been made due to the technical nature of the build and the increased levels of expense in construction.

GM stated the topography of the area would be changed as it was generally cascading down in to the city centre. The proposal would cause more darkness and change the topography of the area. Mr. Estella commented that the buildings step up and down, mentioning that Lease Place, which was located a lower level but was significantly higher than the rest of the buildings. He added that the architectural design fitted in with the character of the area and believed the impact would be minimal.

Mr. Estella confirmed that 100% of the footprint would be built up but it would have a 1m of planters and open spaces in a patio area at podium level and green areas in the lower areas and a pool area on top of one of the buildings.

There being no further questions the Commission thanked Mr Estella.

The Chairman welcomed one of the objectors to address the Commission. Mr. Lees, resident of 12 Morello's Ramp located behind the new development, addressed the Commission with his objections. He stated that his building was 200 years old, constructed in a freehold granted in 1790. He stated that the development was higher than the originally proposed development in 2012, which had been refused by the Commission, in his opinion for the right reasons.

He stated that, two years later, a taller and larger development had been approved and now again a revised proposal had been presented to further increase the height. He added that when several residents in the area made enquiries as regards to the height of the development, they were given

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

several different heights. The south block was now two floors higher than the levels he was told originally by the architect, who visited his home to take some measurements.

He added that the proposed new works were for financial reasons and believed that this was urban exploitation. He stated that he had been living in his home for 35 years; put a lot of work and money towards his home and now this development decreased the value of his home.

He mentioned that the neighbour's home and others in the area that had been buried behind the development and there had been a significant loss of light. This issue had affected many other homes in the area which had significantly devalued their property.

He ended by saying that how could a proposed development, which was turned down in 2010 be seeking an increase in height. The original proposal had been to replace the original building and the proposed development was now higher than the original building. They had endured nearly three years of digging into the solid rock and this had adversely affected the people living in the area. He believed that the Commission should take into consideration the people living in the area before allowing such development and have regard for the people not just cars and money.

The Commission thanked Mr Lees.

DTP confirmed five objection letters had been received. The reasons for objection were loss of light, loss of views, overall height of the development, incremental growth over time, loss of privacy and the visual impact on the surrounding homes.

The counter representations were that the existing roof would in any event be used by the top floor resident and therefore there would be no additional loss of privacy arising from the proposal. The built area was less than 50% and would have minimal visual impact. The overall scheme was a sensitively designed and they have allowed for angled views by stepping the rear elevations and brought in elements of an open air scheme by incorporating an internal courtyard.

DTP reported that TSD raised architectural concerns regarding the excessive height of the residential apartments.

The main issue for the Commission to consider was whether they considered the new proposal to be excessive on what was already a large building or whether the proposed extension would have a minimal impact.

The Commission took a vote on the proposed scheme as submitted, with the following outcome:

Against:	3
In favour:	3
Abstain:	5

The Chairman had a casting vote and voted in favour of the scheme and the proposal was approved.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

686/16 - F/14295/16G - Windmill Hill Signal Station, Buffadero Training Area - Proposed four storey high communications facility on brown-field site.

DTP explained that this Application was submitted by the Ministry of Defence, for the relocation of the existing services, to erect a new 15.1m tower on the Northern part of the facility. Additionally, he reported that the proposal included the construction of a new road and minor works, including a raised platform to accommodate plant and equipment. There had been an outline Application in March 2015 but the current proposal differed in terms of the scale and mass of the tower which was greater than with a more solid appearance. The proposed tarmac road, concrete paths, step and raised platform was to improve access and upgrade communication facilities. DTP advised that the new tower was required due to access problems with the existing tower. The existing tower needs to be accessed from externally.

DTP informed the Commission that the Application needed to be screened for Appropriate Assessment as it was located in a special area of conservation. The procedure had been undertaken by the Department of the Environment which concluded that there was no need for an assessment for this project as development was contained within the station's site area which had limited ecological value. However, the Department of Environment wished to emphasise the need for the MOD to ensure that works are carried out with due diligence when transporting and handling materials and specifically to prevent dumping outside the site boundary.

DTP summarised that there were no major issues with the proposal, but recommended that the MOD meet with the department for the choice of colour and finish of the tower to minimise its visual impact.

The Chairman enquired whether a green wall would be feasible. KB commented that the weather conditions in the area would make the green wall very difficult to maintain.

Subject to these comments the Commission had no objections to the scheme.

687/16 - F/14385/16 - Unit 4 - International House, Bell Lane - Proposed construction of single storey extension on part of existing flat roof and conversion of part of plant room to provide a two bedroom apartment.

DTP explained that this was an application involving the construction of a single storey extension on the roof top of International House, adjacent to the Cornwall's Centre. He explained that the proposal involved extending an existing structure which accommodated internal circulation and plant room. The proposal was to extend this room to accommodate a two bedroom apartment, set back 1.2m from the Bell Lane frontage.

DTP informed the Commission that the proposal included two windows on the boundary wall to Cornwall's Centre, but also noted that the owner of the building the Applicant was the owner of Cornwall's Centre and would have no issue with the encroaching windows. He also added that no parking provision was provided with the Application.

DTP added that no objections, no comments, nor comments were received from the public participation. He added that there would be minimal visual impact on the town area. He added

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

that the proposal had received the standard comments, including the bat and swift box survey and the installation of nesting boxes.

He added that further to the comments made, they would recommend approval of the proposed scheme and added that the Applicant provide additional plans relating to the proposed colour scheme, materials and also suggested the incorporation of renewable energy technology or green roof.

KB commented that the swift survey had to be undertaken during the swift breeding season and before the works. This season was during March to October and recommended that the roof be removed and reinstated before the breeding season.

The Commission agreed with the comments made and the application was approved subject to the usual recommendations.

688/16 -O/14407/16 - 6 Europa View Terrace, Europa Road - Proposed loft access and roof terrace.

DTP explained that this was an outline planning application to provide an internal staircase from the 1st floor into the attic and to create a recessed roof terraced area within the roof space. This scheme would provide the Applicant with a 9m² terraced area with an opening in the existing pitch roof with sliding aluminium doors.

DTP stated that there had not been any significant comments from the Consultees to report on other than that from the Department of the Environment, which commented on the swift and bat survey and to incorporate nests.

DTP added that the Applicant had stated that there had been a precedent with a similar proposal on Governor's street. On this issue the Department feels that the precedent that the Applicant made reference to was different to the current proposal. In particular it considered that its urban context made it much less visible, it was an independent building and not part of an extensive roofscape.

The Department stated that the issue with this proposal was that it was continuous roof scape and would impact on the character of the building. They had received Applications for Calpe Barracks, which is a similar building, for dormer windows and skylights, but the Commission refused these on heritage and architectural grounds.

DTP added that this proposal had a negative impact on the character and appearance of the building, contrary to the policy and would lead to precedent in similar proposals and the decision was consistent with other proposals refused in the past.

The Commission concurred with the recommendations made and the proposal was subsequently not approved.

689/16 - F/14414/16 - The Square, 2/1 Casemates Square - Proposed replacement of existing conservatory with larger conservatory.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

DTP explained that this was an Application for the replacement of an existing conservatory at the Square Café to be replaced with an extended conservatory. The proposed new conservatory with folding glass doors and a polycarbonate roof would not be higher than the existing structure.

The proposed structure would extend to cover the existing area of tables and chairs to the right of the business and would also cover two arched opening from the Watergate House building. He also commented that the tables and chairs in the outside area were not within the existing tables and chairs licensed area.

DTP commented that as regards to the departmental comments received, LPS were awaiting landlords view on the matter. Technical Services had architectural objections and felt that a rectangular option would be more in keeping with the architecture than the proposed stepped canopy.

DTP summed up by saying that the concept of Casemates Square was alfresco dining and there were various issues concerning enclosing tables and chairs areas. The cafeteria had an existing covered area which covered the licenced table and chairs area. He added that the department considered it reasonable to replace the existing conservatory, but expressed concerns on the proposed covered extension. It was considered that the extension of the conservatory would result in a more built up appearance rather than 'al fresco' seating area. This would add visual clutter to the area and particularly Watergate House where access was already obstructed and the proposal would add to this.

DTP summed up by saying that the department recommended the replacement of the existing structure, limited to the existing footprint and height of the conservatory. The extension should not be approved and the additional tables and chairs area should be regularised.

The Committee approved the proposed extension with the condition that the new structure retain the same footprint, height and have the same angle as the existing structure.

TS (ESG) - expressed his apologies and left the DPS meeting at 11.47

690/16 - O/14442/16 - 6-12 Cannon Lane - Proposed construction of 5 storey mixed used building comprising open plan retail space at ground and first floor and office accommodation at second, third and fourth floors.

DTP commented that this was an outline planning application for the construction of a 5 storey, mixed use building in Cannon Lane. The proposal comprised open-plan retail space on the ground floor of 230 m², 185 m² office space on the floor above, and a range of around 185/ to 196 m² on the floors above.

DTP added that the existing buildings has been vacant for several years and comprises two and three storey vernacular buildings and one of the properties had an internal patio. The proposal was to demolish the internals of both buildings, whilst retaining the original façade. The proposal also included a roof terrace with planting, seating area, pergola and mechanical plant.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

DTP welcomed the applicant's representative Mr. R Matto from WRSM and Mr. J Gordon, who wished to address the Commission.

Mr. Matto briefed the Commission by stating that the proposed site was opposite the Cannon Hotel and was a former restaurant café which had been vacated around 9 years ago and a hair salon on the corner, which had been recently vacated. He added that both businesses were located on the ground floor and the upper floors were vacant and in a very poor and dilapidated condition internally. The existing roof covering consisted of asbestos corrugated sheets and the rest has been covered with a poor quality waterproof roof lining, which had resulted in severe water penetration issues.

He commented that the external façade, on Cannon Lane was in better condition and still displayed some of the original features and character of vernacular buildings, typical of that period and architectural style.

Mr. Matto stated that subsequent to the site meeting with DPC members, it was noted that due to the severe water penetration issue, most of the original internal timber elements, masonry structures and metal features had been damaged. The internal supporting wall structures were dilapidated and load bearing walls show significant issues with damp. He confirmed that certain original features, such as, the marble and stone tiles on the ground floor and ironwork would be salvaged by the developer.

The upper levels would be dedicated to modern office suites, with the latest services and ancillary accommodation. The building footprint would provide two staircases, one which would be an alternative emergency escape route and full DDA accessibility throughout.

He added that the developer proposed to preserve the building's character and value, retaining and restoring original features, in accordance with the Town Planning requirements and guidelines. The developer would provide, at street level, contemporary shop front windows, framed in the original vernacular feature arches. The dilapidated internal walls and structures would be replaced with more open plan spaces and internal walls would be of high quality modern construction materials to comply with building regulations and best energy compliance practices.

The proposed new 3rd and 4th floor extensions would be set back by 1m and would have a contemporary design, with window openings fully aligned with the original windows of the building below. The massing of the proposal was sympathetic and reduced the impact to the scale as much as possible with the careful use of material, colours and shutters. Green and shaded areas would be incorporated in the roof terraced area.

He added that they had consulted with Aquagib, Gibtelecom, GEA and the Environmental Agency to address the unsightly meter cabinet and the refuse collection which would be relocated within the building.

He added that the developer viewed this project as a good opportunity for urban regeneration to provide a positive contribution to the local architectural streetscape as well as attracting commercial opportunities to the side lanes off Main Street.

CV welcomed the proposal and commended the developer and the design team for the proposal to retain the original façade and keep salvageable features. He expressed his approval of the scheme.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

IB stated that he wanted to make a condition that the balustrades to the internal patio are salvaged and preferably re-used within the scheme. He added that they could be used as a feature in the roof garden.

DTP stated that the application had been subject to public participation and there had only been one letter of objection. The main points raised were that the building was in relatively good condition and did not merit demolition. There was a lack of evidence for demand for retail and office spaces and the loss of residential accommodation did not meet the needs of the local area. The development would result in an unacceptable disturbance to the area, it would be out of character and would have a negative visual impact.

The applicant's counter representations were that the existing buildings were in a very poor condition and there was a demand for their proposed uses.

DTP added that the Applicant had submitted a structural report, which stated that there were many structural issues with the building. A major structural crack between the two buildings had been identified and both buildings were in a very poor condition. The financial viability report concluded that the proposed project was financially viable whereas a simple redevelopment incorporating the internal layout would not be.

Ministry for Heritage objected to the design of the extension and considered the lift shaft to be an intrusive element. If it was to be approved they would require a desk based assessment and an archeological brief watch and asked to be consulted on the design of the doors, windows and shutters. The DOE had standard conditions including the swift and bat survey provision.

From a planning perspective the proposal to retain the façade and original features of both buildings was welcomed as it retained the character of the area.

DTP stressed that they had some concerns on the height of the building, but the setback element would address the issue to some extent. As regards to the windows and shutters they would need to be replaced on a like for like basis.

DTP also stated that they had concerns on the lift structure, which was a very dominant vertical feature and expressed that it could have a negative visual impact on the Bell Tower of the Cathedral, which was a listed building. Another issue related to the demolition given that the Gibraltar Development Plan advised that there was a presumption against demolition where a building contributes towards the character of the Old Town.

As regards the viability of the project, the submitted report indicates that there was a demand for commercial units in town and less demand for residential accommodation. He added that the applications for demolition, should be supported by studies justifying financial viability and the need for demolition for structural reasons, which the Applicant had addressed in the reports submitted.

The contemporary features of the extension are considered to fall within the guidelines of the Development Plan and they had made use of the set-back feature and aligned the fenestrations. The Applicant has complied with the regulations and guide lines in general.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

CV agreed with the Town Planning Comments and supported the contemporary design of the extension as set within the Town Planning guidelines. He had no issues with the proposed demolition.

MSCHY disagreed with points made by CV by stating that the old and new can be contrasting, but there is no reason why there can be no shutter on the new extension. But stressed that his main concern is the vertical lift shaft and asked the developer to mitigate the design concept to make it less obtrusive.

The Application was approved subject to the conditions discussed by the Commission.

691/16 - F/14452/16 - North Tower Roof, Royal Ocean Plaza - Proposed installation of microwave point to point links.

DTP commented that this Application was for the installation of telecommunication equipment comprising microwave point to point links on Royal Ocean Plaza rooftop. The Applicant, Eazytelecom, was relocating to Ocean Village and their main server would be located in Royal Ocean Plaza, and therefore all their telecommunication systems needed to be fed into this building. He explained that this was not an antennae, it was a system linking various sites to the server location and was a crucial element of their infrastructure.

He added that it would involve the installation of microwave masts on 2 locations on the roof of the Royal Ocean Plaza building. The proposal had been through the normal consultees, including the Gibraltar Regulatory Authority, responsible for licencing this type of equipment and they had no objections and confirmed emission levels would be checked once installed.

The relevant building owner has been advised and they have no objections to the proposal. It was recommended that the application be approved.

This Application was approved unanimously.

692/16 - F/14388/16 - 23 Seashell House, Beach View Terraces - Proposed installation of timber fence around patio.

DTP commented that this Application was for a proposed alteration of the previously approved design for the installation of timber fencing on podium level flats at the Beach View Terraces. He reported that the proposal sought to amend the design due to an issue with the suppliers and to address concerns with the suitability of the originally approved design, in respect of the wind load.

DTP stated that the new proposal was not very different from the original design. However, the panels had been changed from vertical paneling to a horizontal boarding, incorporating gaps between the boards to reduce the wind load on the walls. The overall height of the wall and fence would be 2m high from the floor and the colour of the fence would be stained to match the existing pergola within the development.

No objections had been received from the Consultees and it was recommended for approval..

The Commission approved this application unanimously.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

693/16 - F/14353/16 - Roof Top, Midtown Car Park - Proposed cell antenna site and point to point microwave link.

DTP informed the Commission that this Application was linked to the previous one as it was for the same applicant. The proposal was for the installation of 3 mobile antennae and a microwave link to the Royal Ocean Plaza building. The installation would replace a similar installation currently at Atlantic Suites.

DTP recommended approval of the scheme.

The Commission concurred with comments received and approved this Application.

694/16 - F/14470/16- Nelsons View, Rosia Road - Proposed installation of awnings on balconies.

DTP informed the Commission that this was an Application in Nelsons View to install awnings on balconies. DTP went on to explain that this was an in-principle Application from the Management Company and because this was the first Application it has been brought to the Commission rather than decided by the Subcommittee.

DTP stated that the proposal was to install two small supporting columns fixed on either side of the balcony walls and this would prevent penetrating the external surface of the building, which would affect the water proofing. The proposed colour scheme was cream and blue.

DTP went on to inform the Commission that there were no issues from a Planning perspective and recommended approval of the proposed scheme. If the proposals were approved, individual owners would need to submit Applications, in line with the approved scheme, to be approved by the Subcommittee.

The Chairman asked whether the awning was retractable within a housing system, which would impact the overall visual impact. If so, the housing system would have to be the same colour. DTP commented that no details had been submitted on this and would recommend the housing system to be white in colour.

The Commission considered the overall views and approved the application subject to conditions mentioned. The proposed awnings should be cream and blue in colour, with a white housing system.

695/16 - BA11821 - Trends, 84/90 Main Street - Consideration of proposed signage.

DTP stated that that this proposal was to fix six projecting advertising signs on the old Barclays' Bank building, which was being converted into a department store. Three of the proposed signs would be located on Tuckey's Lane and the other three signs on Main Street. The measurements were 2.5m by 0.55m and would be projecting from the first floor of the building. A further two fascia signs would be located on the frontage of the Tuckey's Lane and Main Street frontages.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

DTP summarised that the normal policy was to limit the upper floor advertising, which needed to be located below the windowsill level of the first floor window. In this case the department considered this an exception as it was a department store, with one occupier and there would be not be multiple business trying to advertise on the upper levels. He added that they considered that the signs were not excessive in number and were sympathetically designed.

One of the proposed signs was what might be considered brand advertising for 'Springfield' and 'Woman's secret'. The normal policy was to restrict brand advertising, but noted that in this instance, as the proposal was to advertise essentially 'a shop within a shop', the department recommend approval of this proposal.

The Commission approved this application unanimously.

696/16 - REF: 1196 - Tables and chairs - Control of tables and chairs in Casemates Square.

DTP explained to the Commission that this was regarding the licensed tables and chairs in Casemates Square. He added that in discussion with the Minister for Planning and interested parties, the proposal was to reevaluate and try to control the licensed areas by allowing the individual users to place low-level screens on the corners of their areas to define their licensed areas.

He mentioned that the screens would have to bear advertising from their business and the idea was to make them as uniform as possible and define where the screens need to be indicated. He also proposed that the Building Control would have to indicate the official licensed area to ensure that the licensed areas were regulated.

DTP said that screens had been refused in the past, but stressed that the control of tables and chairs is becoming a major problem and this solution would be useful to control the situation.

DCM commented that the screens should be the same format and colour. DTP stated that they have discussed this and agreed that it would be very difficult to agree on one design and to enforce this. They concluded that just as long as the screens were within the same parameters, such as height and distance between them it would be acceptable and the screens would advertise the business only and not products on offer.

CV also commented that this should also apply to the parasols used in the area, which should not have any product propaganda. TP commented that this is a pending Government issue which needed to be discussed.

MSCHY agreed with the screens and also insisted that there should be markings on the floor to define the licensed areas and also that businesses should have the appropriate storage space to be able to store the tables, chairs, parasols and screens, when they are required to be removed completely from Casemates Square due to events.

IB recommended brass studs on the floor could be used to ensure that the screens are placed within the licensed areas. He also added that this could also apply to all tables and chairs licensed areas, not only Casemates Square.

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

The Chairman commented that this was a Government proposal and it would be provided by the Government.

The proposal was approved subject to the recommendations made by the Commission.

Minor and other works - not within scope of delegated powers

697/16 - BA12964 - 9 Poca Roca, Upper Rock - Proposed alterations / replacement of former dwelling (bungalow) on same footprint as before.

The Commission approved the renewal of this permission.

698/16 - BA13596 - 5E Gardiners Tower, Gardiner's Road - Proposed additional storey with external terrace.

The Commission approved the application.

699/16 - F/14398/16 - 6 Kings Street - Proposed construction of an additional storey.

The Commission approved the application.

700/16 - D/14424/16 - Ford Garage, Waterport Wharf Road - Proposed demolition of existing building on site.

The Commission approved the application.

701/16 - F/14436/16 - 37 Admiral's Place, Naval Hospital Road - Proposed construction of single storey extension.

The Commission approved the application.

702/16 - N/14369/16 - Edinburgh Estate - proposed felling of Weeping Fig tree.

The Commission approved the application.

Applications granted permission by subcommittee under delegated powers (For Information Only)

703/16 - BA10724 - World Trade Centre, 6 Bayside Road - Consideration of paving sample. The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee

704/16 - BA12318 - 3a Rosia Parade - Consideration of sample for roof tiles.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

705/16 - BA13483 - 11 Bomb House Lane - Consideration of minor modifications submitted with 'As Built' drawings.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee

706/16 - BA13256 - 5 Europa Pass Battery, Europa Road - Consideration of minor amendments to approved scheme including installation of spiral staircase in void to access roof terrace.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee

707/16 - F/13910/16 - 28 Lower Castle Road - Consideration of amendments to approved scheme including minor internal and external alterations installation of internal lift shaft.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee

708/16 - F/14047/16 - 12 Europa Pass Battery, Europa Road - Proposed minor works to balcony and new basement store including access.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee

709/16 - F/14327/16G - World Trade Centre, Bayside Road - Proposed installation of square pillar box.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

710/16 - F/14355/16 - 16/1 Main Street - Proposed subdivision of existing three bedroom flat to a two bedroom flat with commercial offices/storage.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

711/16 - F/14394/15 - 1001 Viking Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed internal alterations.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

712/16 - F/14399/16 - Suites 12/13, Block 5, Watergardens - Consideration of revised plans for internal reconfiguration for refurbishment of unit.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

713/16 - F/14400/16 - Capurro, 20 Line Wall Road - Consideration of amended plans for minor internal alterations to approved layout.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

714/16 - F/14402/16 - 3 Viking Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed internal alterations and installation of air conditioning unit on balcony.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

715/16 - F/14403/16 - 703 Viking Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed internal alterations.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

716/16 - F/14404/16 - 1st Floor, Waterport Place, Europort Avenue - Proposed internal alterations.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

Approved

*DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016*

717/16 - F/14405/16 - Units 3.2 and 3.3, 3rd Floor, Waterport Place Europort Avenue - Proposed internal alterations.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

718/16 - F/14406/16 - Units 4.1 and 4.3, 4th Floor, Waterport Place Europort Avenue - Proposed internal alterations.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

719/16 - F/14410/16 - 21 Seashell House, Beach View Terraces - Proposed installation of wooden fence on existing terrace wall and double wooden gate as per approved design.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

720/16 - F/14412/16 - 16 Cornwall's Lane - Proposed refurbishment of unit and conversion into barbers.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

721/16 - F/14418/16 - Unit 2.3, 2nd Floor, Waterport Place, Europort Avenue - Proposed internal alterations.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

722/16 - F/14419/16 - 6/6 Gavino's Passage - Subdivision of a four bedroom flat into a three bedroom flat and two studio apartments.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

723/16 - F/14420/16 - Flat 12, 20/22 George's Lane - Subdivision of a two bedroom apartment into two one-bedroom apartments.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

724/16 - F/14248/16 - 193 Main Street - Proposed installation of two retractable awnings.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

725/16 - F/14432/16 - 601 Viking Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed internal alterations.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

726/16 - F/14444/16 - 706 Viking Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed internal alterations.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

727/16 - F/14445/16 - 1A Cumberland Road -- 1A Cumberland Road - Proposed refurbishment of existing store/office.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

728/16 - F/14447/16 - 4 Sunrise View, 17 Eastern Beach Road - Proposed replacement of windows and doors.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

729/16 - F/14454/16 - 4 Marigold House, Waterport Terraces, North Mole Road - Proposed

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

installation of wooden fence on outside wall in front of main entrance to maisonette.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

730/16 - F/14455/16 - 135 Main Street - Proposed refurbishment of shop premises.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

731/16 - F/14459/16 - New Harbours Deck, New Harbours - Proposed trench works to install GEA ducting between manholes and feeder pillar crossing the vehicular entrance at New Harbours.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

732/16 - F/14460/16 - 307 Viking Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed internal alterations.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

733/16 - F/14462/16 - 5 Hawthorn Lodge, Montague Gardens - Proposed internal alterations.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

734/16 - F/14463/16 - 402 Seagull Lodge, Mons Calpe Mews - Proposed internal alterations.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

735/16 - F/14466/16 - 75 The Anchorage, Rosia Road - Retrospective application for the installation of pergola.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

736/16 - A/13956/16 - Midtown Project - Relocation of approved advertising hoardings from southern perimeter to eastern perimeter along Reclamation Road.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

737/16 - A/14417/16 - Abacus Financial Services, 5 Crutchett's Ramp - Consideration of revised plans for proposed installation of fascia sign at first floor of building.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

738/16 - A/14434/16 - Pancake Factory - Proposed sandwich board on the corner of Main Street and College Lane.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

739/16 - A/14435/16 - Quay 29 & 31 Kings Wharf, Queensway - Proposed installation of advertisements on hoarding surrounding construction site.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

740/16 - A/14441/16G - Post Office, Main Street and I.C.C Building, Main Street - Proposed installation of banners to advertise Literary Festival

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

741/16 - A/14451/16 - Europa Advance Road - Proposed installation of banners on lamp posts along Europa Advance Road to advertise launch of Unesco World Heritage Site.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

742/16 - A/14465/16 - Former Casino, Europa Road - Proposed erection of temporary

Approved
DPC meeting 9/16
28th September 2016

hoarding/netting to protect deteriorated building facade prior to submission of formal application.
The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

743/16 - A/14481/16 - Kings Bastion Leisure Centre, Line Wall Road - Proposed installation of banner to advertise Cancer Relief coffee morning.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

744/16 - D/14427/16G - (Asset no. 0303, 0722, 0725, 0708, 0449) Garages at Four Corners, Winston Churchill Avenue - Proposed demolition of single storey garages.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

745/16 - D/14428/16G - (Asset no. 0307 9/10) Western Beach, Four Corners, Winston Churchill Avenue - Proposed demolition of two storey brickwork construction reinforced concrete slab, columns and first floor slab with timber trusses.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

746/16 - D/14429/16G - (Asset no. 0005) Gardeners Shed, Four Corners, Winston Churchill Avenue - Proposed demolition of single storey blockwork construction timber flat roof.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

747/16 - N/14423/16 - 10 Sunnyside House, Naval Hospital Road - Proposed pollarding of Celtis Australis.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

748/16 - N/14426/16 - 10 Sunnyside House, Naval Hospital Road - Proposed removal of Olea Europaea (Olive Tree).

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

749/16 - REF:1196 - Beher, Unit G8, I.C.C - Consideration of request for tables and chairs.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

750/16 - REF:1196 - La Terrazita Tapas Bar, 5 Governor's Parade - Request to change name of business on the existing tables and chairs and sandwich boards licenses.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

751/16 - REF:1196 - Piece of Cake, 17 Turnbull's Lane - Request for tables and chairs area.

The Commission noted the approval granted by the Sub-committee.

752/16 - Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on 25th October 2016.