

**APPROVED**

*DPC meeting 6/13*

*23/5/13*

**THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

Minutes of the 6<sup>th</sup> Meeting of 2013 of the Development and Planning Commission held at the Charles Hunt Room, John Mackintosh Hall, on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2013 at 09.30 am.

---

- Present:** Mr P Origo (Chairman)  
*(Town Planner)*
- The Hon Dr J Garcia (DCM)  
*(Deputy Chief Minister)*
- The Hon Dr J Cortes (MEH)  
*(Minister for Environment & Health)*
- Dr K Bensusan (KB)  
*(Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History Society)*
- Mrs J Howitt (JH)  
*(Environmental Safety Group)*
- Mrs C Montado (CAM)  
*(Gibraltar Heritage Trust)*
- Mr J Collado (JC)  
*(Land Property Services Ltd)*
- Mr J Mason (JM)  
*(Rep Commander British Forces, Gibraltar)*
- In Attendance:** Mr P Naughton-Rumbo (DTP)  
*(Deputy Town Planner)*
- Miss K Lima  
*(Minute Secretary)*
- Apologies:** Mr G Matto (GM)  
*(Senior Architect)*
- Mr M Gil (MG)  
*(Chief Technical Officer)*
- Mr C Viagas (CV)  
*(Heritage & Cultural Agency)*

**Approval of Minutes**

**211/13 – Approval of Minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting of 2013, held on 25<sup>th</sup> April 2013**

JC requested an amendment to Minute 151/13 on page 8 to read as follows:

‘JC said that if it goes ahead, the project should aim to retain a water feature in the area, hence providing a smaller area for parking. The Chairman said that from a Planning perspective they do not agree with the need for parking.’

The Minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of 2013 held on 25<sup>th</sup> April 2013 were approved by the Commission.

**Matters Arising**

**212/13 – Ref1198/006/13 – Bus Shelters, various sites – Proposed advertisements**

DTP presented four different schemes to the Commission. He said that from a Planning point of view, the Commission should not allow advertisements on the bus shelter outside the entrance to Ocean Village on Waterport Road since the bus stop alone obstructs the view of cars exiting from Ocean Village.

JH asked whether the design presented for the bus stop outside Casemates covers only a third of the shelter. DTP said that the consultants for the bus company have confirmed that they have measured it to be one third of the surface area of the bus shelter.

The Chairman asked if the Commission wanted to go down the road of vetting every advert to ensure that they meet the criteria. In particular, the requirement to keep to the 1/3 limit. He expressed concern that following such an approach would be overly time consuming. He reported that the Government had given their assurance that the bus drivers were under strict instruction to stop at all bus shelters, even if there are no people waiting in the shelter and if they do not, drivers can be reported. He added that DPC’s role is to ensure that visibility is not impaired and that the advert is appropriate.

KB said that he was under the impression that the Commission had approved a third of the bus stop.

MEH said that he did not favour the design for the Casemates bus shelter and that he had proposed a third of the shelter but was expecting something more discreet.

JC said that he was concerned that the bus shelters will increasingly look less like bus shelters and that in some cases the adhesive has already been vandalized. He said that the less these are covered the better.

The general consensus was that adverts should be reduced to a third of the shelter and only in a designated area.

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 6/13*  
23/5/13

DTP presented ten other schemes to the Commission, who felt that too much surface area is being covered by adverts.

JC said that the bus shelters will end up looking like billboards and that this is simply a revenue raising measure.

DCM suggested that the DPC select the ones which they deem appropriate and use these as examples for the rest. He said that his understanding is that this is a way of increasing revenue for the Bus Company.

JH asked who regulates the advert content. The Chairman said that these are vetted by the Ministry for Tourism and that the Subcommittee will then approve them. As necessary, the Subcommittee will present to the DPC for approval those they may not agree to.

The Commission agreed that the designs for The Landings and The Cuban adverts should be used as templates and that adverts should preferably only be placed on the side panels. The Commission also agreed that adverts should not be placed on the bus shelter outside Ocean Village.

**213/13 – BA12378 – 3-5 Cannon Lane – Proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> floor extension onto terrace and internal alterations**

DTP informed the Commission that the applicant has submitted revised designs in which the extension onto the terrace has been changed to a more solid construction with traditional openings. An elongated window previously proposed has also been removed. DTP recommended approval.

MEH said that he had received comments from the Ministry for Heritage who say that they have not had the opportunity to see the plans. MEH suggested approval subject to the Ministry for Heritage seeing the plans.

The Commission approved this application subject to comments from the Ministry for Heritage.

**214/13 – BA12429 – Calpe Road – Proposed centralized refuse cubicle – GOG Project**

DTP presented revised plans in which the capacity of the bin store had been reduced.

MEH said that discussions were held between the residents and the Ministry of Environment and that they had agreed to the revised plans together.

The Commission did not have any comments on planning grounds.

**215/13 – Ref1195 – 3b Rosia Parade – Proposed removal of Aleppo Pine**

DTP reminded the Commission that they had previously suggested that the applicant remove a section of the wall surrounding his property to alleviate the problem with the leaning Aleppo Pine but that the applicant was not in agreement with this. The option of moving the wall further

*APPROVED*  
*DPC meeting 6/13*  
*23/5/13*

out onto the public highway was also explored but DTP said that this was objected to by the Highways Section of Technical Services Department (TSD) and LPS.

The Commission welcomed the applicant, Mr Farrell.

Mr Farrell said that the tree in question is 30 years old and that it is receiving nutrition from his garden. He said that he was not in agreement with removing a section of the wall as a section would need to be taken right to the bottom of the wall, resulting in loss of privacy. He said that the wall is bowing and leaning. Mr Farrell also said that his garage door abuts the tree and that it will not be useable in the long term due to the fragility of the wall.

JH asked Mr Farrell whether he has received technical support from Government. Mr Farrell said that he has not but that a private structural engineer has looked at the problem.

Mr Farrell said that the idea of moving the wall forward has been rejected but that this would have been a viable solution. He said that the pavement would still be wide enough according to standards.

MEH said that he would be liaising with the Highways Section to determine their reasons for objection. MEH asked Mr Farrell if he would be willing to plant one new mature tree in front of his property if approval is given to move the wall. He said that he understood that Mr Farrell had planted trees in the garden at the rear of his property but said that this tree can be seen from the public highway so the trees at the rear of the property would not compensate for its loss.

The Chairman asked Mr Farrell whether he could rebuild the wall within his property. Mr Farrell said that he hadn't considered this option and questioned who would take care of the tree in that case. He also said that the base of the tree is lifting the floor of his property.

KB said that several tree assessments have been carried out. He said that the roots are not expected to grow considerably and that the tree will not lean much further. However, he said that its girth is expected to grow.

JC asked Mr Farrell whether he had considered replacing the wall with fencing. Mr Farrell and the Chairman both highlighted that this would affect the character of the area.

DCM ask Mr Farrell if he would be prepared to plant one or two new trees in the front garden of the property if the Commission approve the removal of this tree. Mr Farrell agreed.

JH said that as a resident of the area she thought that these trees give character to the area and that its removal might create a precedent.

KB agreed to assist Mr Farrell in planning mature trees.

MEH said that he will be speaking to the Highways Section but that perhaps if it needs to be removed, two new trees could be planted prior to its removal.

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 6/13*  
23/5/13

DTP said that 1.2 metres clearance would be left for the pavement if the wall is moved forward. He said that TSD objected in principle as there would be an encroachment on to the public highway and that LPS supported their view. He said that ultimately the decision would be Government's.

JC clarified that they did not object but rather agreed with TSD.

DCM asked Mr Farrell whether he will have future problems with his gate if the wall is moved forward and the tree remains in situ. Mr Farrell said that he was not certain but that he would accept the potential of having issues with the gate in the future.

DCM said that HMGOG will revisit the decision. It was agreed that this matter should not be referred again to the DPC. If Government allows encroachment then the wall would be built in front of the tree, if not, then the tree could be removed subject to replanting two mature trees in the front garden.

**215/13 – BA12999 – 83 Catalan Bay – Proposed conversion of store into bedsits**

DTP told the Commission that the applicant has requested that the DPC reconsider their previous decision in which they rejected this application. He said that the proposal is to create three bedsits which will be used as holiday accommodation. The applicant organised a site visit, to which three members attended. The frontage of the properties will be totally glazed and they will each have a mezzanine level. DTP also said that if approved the Commission could impose a condition whereby the apartments cannot be used as permanent homes.

JC highlighted that it is necessary to check whether the pathway behind the Village Inn restaurant is public before designing the entrance to one of the properties through here.

JH and KB said that the area is more spacious than it appears on the photographs shown.

The Chairman said that the apartments would be subject to Building Control approval and that he thought they would bring back life to the area reminiscent of the old Catalan Bay Village with its narrow alleyways.

CAM said that the adjacent buildings are derelict and that this development will improve the area.

DTP confirmed that there will not be any visual impact from the beach.

The Commission approved this application although access to one of the apartments needed to be cleared.

## **Major Developments**

### **216/13 – BA12509 – 2 and 3 Kavannah’s Court – Proposed redevelopment comprising 9 apartments, 2 maisonettes and garage**

DTP told the Commission that this is a full planning application following outline planning approval in January 2013. One change to the scheme is the relocation of the bin store to the opposite side of the road. The development will provide 10 residential units, 16 parking spaces and roof gardens. Photovoltaic cells have been incorporated in the roof designs.

DTP said that the DPC had requested at outline planning stage that they consider pitched roofs. The architect however, feels that a flat roof is appropriate as there are others in the area.

The Heritage Trust has commented on the proposed contemporary fenestration saying that it should be of a more traditional style.

DTP said that there are no objections on planning grounds and that the applicant has complied with conditions set by the Commission, for example the introduction of swift nests.

MEH informed the Commission that the Ministry for Heritage has requested that an Archeological Watching Brief is carried out and have stated that if permission is granted it should be subject to an energy assessment being submitted.

The Commission approved this application subject to an archaeological watching brief and the use of traditional window proportions on the west elevation instead of the elongated vertical windows as shown in the plans.

## **Other Developments**

### **217/13 – BA10256 – New Aloes, Europa Road – Proposed villa**

DTP informed the Commission that the applicant has submitted a revised scheme to include extended decking, a viewing platform, pool and gazebo. The proposal also includes the removal of a garage to improve access to the area and a stone wall to surround the extended sloping area. The applicant is also proposing to plant new trees and have said that they would relocate the viewing platform if this cannot be constructed without having to lop existing trees. DTP said that works were started prior to obtaining DPC approval but that these have been stopped.

MEH expressed his concern that it will be necessary to remove wooded area in order to build the extension but noted that the applicant has confirmed that they will not be removing any trees.

DTP said that none of the trees will be lost and that the applicant has confirmed that they will be planting 3 to 5 metre high trees. DTP also said that a condition of the permit is that the applicant has to plant at least ten trees.

The Chairman questioned where they are going to plant the ten trees and why they have not done so to date.

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 6/13*  
23/5/13

DCM asked DTP what explanation had been given for having commenced works without approval. DTP said that they had contractors on-site and used this as an opportunity to commence.

The Chairman questioned that if it seems from the photos that there will be trees in front of the proposed viewing platform why would they want a viewing platform? He said that he would be inclined to approve the pool but nothing beneath it.

MEH said that had planting already commenced, the Commission would be more confident that trees will not be lost.

CAM said that the stone wall around the boundary of the property should be in keeping with other walls in the area.

JC said that he did not agree with the suggestion to not allow decking.

DTP suggested allowing decking but refusing permission to create a viewing platform.

The Chairman suggested that the Commission could ask the applicant to begin planting new trees and to revert to the Commission once this is done, so that the decision on whether to allow decking or not is reconsidered. The Commission concurred with this suggestion.

The Commission approved the proposal to construct a pool and the gazebo on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor but refused the proposal to include decking in the area beneath the pool. The area beneath should remain natural and the planting of new trees should commence. The viewing platform would be reconsidered once all these matters had fallen into place.

**218/13 – BA11279 – 47 Line Wall Road – Proposed office development**

DTP told the Commission that this application is for the renewal of a permit granted in February 2010, for the demolition of the building at 47 Line Wall Road and development of an office building. DTP reminded the Commission that approval was given for demolition and construction of a seven storey building of contemporary architectural style.

The Chairman said that given the time which has elapsed since approval was granted, the policy is to bring these applications before the Commission for their approval. The relevant authorities have also been consulted.

The Commission welcomed the applicant Mr Ronnie Nathan.

Mr Nathan said that they obtained planning consent in February 2010; a low period in the finances of the community and the world, and hence struggled to obtain the finances which they required for their project. He said that they were also looking for tenants. Mr Nathan said that they have now obtained the necessary finance and found a local company who are interested in occupying part of the building as their head office. He said that they would be ready to start

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 6/13*  
23/5/13

construction in three months once they have Building Control approval, dealt with sustainability and environmental matters, and gone through the tendering process with contractors.

Mr Nathan confirmed that there are two residential tenants and one commercial tenant still in the building. He said that one of the residential tenants has found suitable accommodation elsewhere and that the other one will be moving in with family in the U.K. The Commercial tenant will be moving in a month's time.

The Commission thanked Mr Nathan and welcomed Mr Douglas Mottershead representing 3 objectors.

Mr Mottershead told the Commission that he represents three objectors who also objected to the original application. He said that they object to the demolition of a historical building but that their main objection is on the grounds of right to light. Mr Mottershead said that his property's windows face College Lane, directly onto the new development. He said that College Lane only has a width of 2.2 metres and that the proposed building is more than double the height of the existing one. He added that for three levels the new building would obstruct light and said that his windows have existed for more than 20 years and therefore, he legally has a right to light. Mr Mottershead added that he will be seeking an injunction if the application is approved to try and stop the development. He said that he has consulted an engineer and legal professional and that in their opinion he has a legal case.

JC highlighted that the DPC cannot consider the legal aspects of right to light and said that simply because the building is going to be higher than the existing one, does not mean that Mr Mottershead's property will be losing light. Mr Mottershead said that they also objected to the effect that the new development will have on wind funneling in College Lane.

The Chairman told the Commission that the applicant has produced a wind survey and felt that he should allow the architect to provide an explanation for the benefit of the Commission. The Chairman also said that although Mr Mottershead's original representations had been considered in a non-public meeting they were extensively discussed and had resulted in the DPC requiring the applicant to produce a wind study. In the end the DPC had conditioned the application with the need to set back the building along College Lane, to include roof gardens and the overall height was capped in line with the Haven (now Treasury Building). Although there had also been strong representations from the Heritage Trust, the previous DPC had not found the current building to have architectural merits and demolition was allowed.

Mr Patrick Murphy (applicant's architect) told the Commission that the building at 47 Line Wall Road is old but in an appalling state. He said that the current building is 15 metres high and the new one will be 22.5 metres high and set back on the third floor. He also said that the width of College Lane varies at different points and that setting back the new building will improve the width conditions of College Lane. With regards to the wind study, the architect said that two had been produced. The first on a taller building had been rejected as there was an increase in wind during a westerly air flow. As a result, the building height was reduced and a new wind study shows that there is just a slight increase during a westerly air flow. He said that two mitigating factors include mature planting on the western corner of the building and planting on the set back



**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 6/13*  
23/5/13

terrace; this would reduce wind conditions and actually improve it half way down College Lane. The architect added that his studies also show that a small increase in wind conditions would be beneficial during the summer months.

JC asked the architect whether they had engaged in conversations with the objectors. The architect said that the only contact which they had had was through the Commission.

JH highlighted that it is known that the sewers in the area are under strain and questioned whether this development will further aggravate the situation. The Chairman said that he could not advise on this but that adjustments would have to be made by TSD if necessary.

MEH said that the developer had improved on their original scheme and encouraged the parties involved to work together.

CAM said that the Heritage Trust was never happy with demolition. She added that there have been many changes in policy in the past few years and that if this were a new application, the Trust would be louder on it.

The Commission approved this application but encouraged the developer to meet with the objectors and attempt to come to sensible architectural balances.

**219/13 – BA11623 – 2 Camp Bay – Proposed demolition and reconstruction with 2 storey building as restaurant/bar**

DTP reminded the Commission that in February 2013 they declined an application to renew outline planning permission in respect of this application, which expired in September 2012. The proposal is to demolish the current single storey kiosk and construct a 2 storey restaurant/bar. DTP said that previous comments from members were mainly on the implication of this development on open vistas in the area and to the fact that TSD had commented on the area being subject to overtopping and the need for a study to be conducted to prove the safety of the area.

The Commission welcomed the applicant Mr George Parody.

Mr Parody told the Commission that his application dates back to July 2007. He said that their old lease placed stringent conditions on them. He said that he had to prove to the DPC that his project was viable and Government would always have the last say on whether it proceeded or not. Mr Parody said that lease negotiations began in October 2011 and that an agreement was not reached until October 2012. He said that it was necessary for Government and himself to agree on a premium before proceeding. Mr Parody agreed that the issue of overtopping has to be assessed and said that if he can't prove that the area is safe, his project cannot proceed. He added that he therefore, requires more time to ascertain whether his project is viable. Mr Parody said that circumstances have conditioned the timeframe of his project and confirmed that no work will be carried out without complying with the conditions of the permit and undertaking a full study relating to overtopping.

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 6/13*  
23/5/13

Mr Parody also told the Commission that in 2007 the area was affected by a storm surge but that the concrete wall surrounding his kiosk was unaffected. This he said proves that there is some element of overtopping but not extensive. He added that the designs have been altered as per comments made by the DPC and that this development will improve the area especially at night.

DCM asked Mr Parody to confirm that he is committed to undertaking an overtopping survey. Mr Parody said that they will definitely meet this condition.

MEH asked the Chairman to clarify what were the main issues expressed by the Commission at the previous meeting. The Chairman said that their main concerns were the issue of overtopping, infrastructure and how it will affect the views from the area. The Chairman also said that the architecture which is currently being presented is better than that previously proposed.

MEH recalled that one concern was the view of the sea from the promenade and the view from Parson's Lodge. Mr Parody referred to other restaurants located in other beaches in Gibraltar which obstruct the view of the sea from the road.

The Chairman said that the application was open to public comment and that no comments have been received.

DCM said that what is being proposed is better than what currently exists.

JH expressed her concern with regards to pedestrians and vehicles in the area. Mr Parody said that the premises will be away from the road.

JC said that he was more concerned with the architecture than the views, adding that that he would like to see more glass. Mr Parody said that they have improved on their original design and that he personally thought that the building adds character to the area. The Chairman said that the exterior could be glass throughout.

The Commission approved the extension of the outline planning permit for the period of one year on the condition that the applicant's architect meets with the Town Planners to discuss revisions to the design to incorporate more glass.

**220/13 – BA11867 – 3/5 Charles V Ramp – Proposed refurbishment to 2<sup>nd</sup> floor apartment and additional storey**

DTP told the Commission that the applicant has submitted an amended scheme which includes the division of the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor apartment into two apartments and changes to fenestration. An original window will be kept open and an additional window will be included on the south elevation. The design of the windows on the west elevation were being changed to a modern style.

DTP said that the neighbour who resides in the property to the South has objected due to overlooking, loss of privacy and the need to place scaffolding in his patio. DTP said that the latter point is not a matter for the Commission.

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 6/13*  
23/5/13

DTP also said that counter-representations have been received from the applicant who claims that the new windows will face a blank wall and that the glass will be obscured resulting in no loss of privacy. The applicant has also said that he is willing to move the window further eastwards.

DTP recommended from a Planning point of view that the windows on the West elevation should follow a more traditional design as previously approved. He said that there are no planning objections, particularly if approved subject to moving the window further eastwards.

The Chairman asked DTP whether the Commission previously approved new windows. DTP said that the Commission approved one new window on the south elevation but that the applicant is now adding one more.

JC said that privacy issues should be sorted amongst the parties involved. He said that if they want to legally object they could obtain an injunction.

The Commission approved the additional window on the south elevation subject to it being relocated eastwards and to have opaque glazing. The proposed change to the windows on the west elevation was not approved and therefore these were to be as per the previously approved scheme.

**221/13 – BA12499 – 7 Admiral’s Place – Proposed interior and exterior alterations**

DTP reminded the Commission that this application involved interior alterations and the introduction of skylights. The sub-committee of the DPC had approved this application with the condition that the skylights follow the standard design within Admiral’s Place and limited it to only two skylights.

DTP said that following the sub-committee’s decision, the Management Company submitted representations as they realised that the proposal included exterior alterations rather than just internal alterations.

DTP said that the sub-committee recommends approval subject to the conditions stated above.

MEH told the Commission that the Ministry for Heritage has commented saying that since the buildings are Georgian in style, the skylights should be replaced with Georgian style windows. The Chairman commented that this issue had been discussed previously by the Commission and that the Commission’s view was that dormers would have a greater visual impact than skylights.

The Commission approved this application subject to the skylights complying with the standard design and limiting the number of skylights to two.

**222/13 – BA12511 – 5b Library Ramp – Proposed conversion of terrace into additional office premises**

DTP said that the proposal is to build a single storey extension with fenestration to match existing. There are no planning objections.

The Commission approved this application.

**223/13 – BA12518 – 8A Mount Road – Proposed swimming pool**

DTP told the Commission that the proposal is to construct a swimming pool with decked area. He said that some excavation to provide the base of the pool is necessary but that the pool will be mainly above ground. It will be difficult to see the pool from the road since it will be located in an elevated area of Mount Road. DTP said that works had started without permission but have been halted.

JH asked whether the Town Planning Department has a way of penalising people who commence works without permission. DTP said that at the moment they have to criminally convict them first but that this is being addressed in the new Act.

JH said that she abstained on the principle that works started without permission.

The Commission approved this application.

**224/13 – BA12545 – Devil’s Tongue Battery – Proposed gazebo with canopy**

DTP told the Commission that the current canopy is not in a good state and that the premises suffer from vandalism. He explained that the design is a free standing gazebo with a pitched roof. The structure will not be attached to any part of the wall and will have polycarbonate roofing which will be either translucent or obscure.

DTP added that Devil’s Tongue is a listed monument and that the Ministry for Heritage and the Heritage Trust has been consulted in terms of the design. They both agree that a garden centre is not compatible with the monument and would prefer if it were relocated elsewhere. The Ministry for Heritage also wants to check details of flag stones, foundation columns and fixtures. They have also said that they would prefer if the gazebo does not rise over the wall and that the tenant should be responsible for the upkeep of the monument.

The Chairman said that he was concerned about the visual impact as it will be higher than the existing canopy and visible externally.

JC asked why they cannot just replace what they have. DTP say that reasons given for the proposed design are security, vandalism, cats entering the premises and keeping the area weather proof.

DCM suggested that it might be beneficial to request a photo montage.

DTP said that he could ask the applicant whether it would be possible for them to keep within the walls so that it is not visible externally. JC said that it would be difficult to keep it water tight if it is lower and that perhaps a clear glass structure would be better.

MEH said that the only issue which he has with this application is how it will be seen from the road.

The Commission requested that the applicant submit revised designs and a photomontage.

**225/13 – BA12550 – 9/2 South Barrack Road – Proposed windows to terrace and installation of louvers over (moveable)**

DTP told the Commission that the existing terrace has decorative block work and is open to the air. The proposal would include the removal of the decorative blocks and insertion of windows. He said that works had commenced but were stopped. One objection has been received from a neighbour who is concerned that these works might lead to water penetration into his property. DTP said that these were matters to be resolved between the parties and there are no planning objections.

The Commission approved this application.

**226/13 – BA12559 – 1c/1 Maida Vale, Engineer Road – Proposed single storey rear extension**

DTP told the Commission that outline planning permission for a two storey rear extension was granted but that the applicant has now revised the scheme into a one storey extension. DTP recommended approval.

The Commission approved this application.

**227/13 – BA12575 – 8 Rodger’s Road – Proposed refurbishment, additional storey and replacement of garage**

DTP told the Commission that this application involves internal rearrangements, the enclosure of a west facing terrace, an additional storey and the introduction of windows on the east elevation. The elevation onto Rodger’s Road will be in keeping with the traditional character of the property and a fence will be installed on the garden boundary wall for privacy. The west elevation of the additional storey will have a glass balustrade and a glazed terrace area but this elevation is difficult to see from any point. A single storey garage will also be demolished and reconstructed. DTP also said that two small trees will be lost but that there have not been objections from GOHNS or the Ministry of Environment. There are no planning objections. DCM welcomed the removal of the corrugated sheeted garage with a new build.

The Commission approved this application.

**228/13 – BA12593 – Lathbury Barracks – Proposed 2 storey building housing pistol club facilities including indoor/outdoor ranges and storage units – GOG project**

DTP said that the ground floor will be used as storage for commercial premises, the first floor will house the Pistol Club facilities and the second floor will have a cafeteria and spectator stand overlooking the shooting range. The building will be constructed with clean lines and rendered finishes to keep the character simple.

DTP recommended a green roof as has been the policy in other developments within this area.

The Commission accepted this recommendation.

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 6/13*  
23/5/13

**229/13 – Ref. 1529 – Buena Vista Estate – Balcony treatment**

DTP reminded the Commission that they previously decided that the timber balustrades on balconies should be retained. He said that residents are now requesting that the DPC allow a choice of either original timber or glazed balconies.

The Commission agreed to the residents' request

**Minor works – not within scope of delegated powers**

**230/13 – BA12479 – Cheshire Ramp, Buena Vista Estate – Proposed demolition of single storey garage and rock outcrop**

The Commission approved this application

**231/13 – BA12537 – 11 Bomb House Lane – Proposed demolition of single storey and two storey buildings**

The Commission approved this application.

**232/13 – BA12538 – 12/20 Armstrong Steps – Proposed extension to staircase and conversion of terrace to study**

The Commission approved this application.

**233/13 – BA12542 – 12 City Mill Lane – Propose change of use from residential to office accommodation on 1<sup>st</sup> floor**

The Commission approved this application.

**234/13 – BA12543 – 20 Line Wall Road – Proposed conversion of existing store into offices**

DTP recommended that as a condition of the permit the applicant be asked to paint at least part of the building.

The Chairman said that the applicant had in the past been prevented by the Highways Section of TSD from placing scaffolding to paint the building during weekdays to avoid traffic congestion.

The Commission approved this application with the condition that the applicant undertakes to paint the premises.

**235/13 – BA12544 – 11 Moorland House, Ordinance Wharf – Proposed glass curtains to terrace**

The Commission approved this application.

**236/13 – BA12549 – Unit 27, 2/2 Casemates Square – Proposed rear extension into service area**

DTP recommended that the proposed flue is boxed-in.

MEH recalled a previous application to place a ladder in the same area and said that it would be better to carry out any works simultaneously.

**APPROVED**

*DPC meeting 6/13*

23/5/13

The Commission approved the application subject to a satisfactory solution being designed for both the flue and staircase.

**237/13 – BA12553 – Villa 2, Gardiner’s Road – Proposed internal alterations and enclosure of terrace**

The Commission approved this application.

**238/13 – BA12554 – 19 Europa Road – Proposed demolition of garden shed**

The Commission approved this application.

**239/13 – BA12561 – Eastern Beach Road (North end) – Proposed kiosk**

The Commission approved this application.

**240/13 – BA12580 – Old Airport terminal, Winston Churchill Avenue – Proposed temporary portacains for use as bureau de change – GOG project**

The Commission approved this application.

**Applications granted permission by Sub-committee under delegated powers**

**241/13 – Ref 1198/012/13 – Gibraltar Museum – Proposed vinyl banner spanning Main Street**

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

**242/13 – BA12262 – 1 Chichester Ramp, Buena Vista Estate – Proposed conversion and refurbishment works to property**

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

**243/13 – BA12357 – The Sails, Communal Pool, Queensway Quay – Proposed revised submission for access to installation of spiral staircase**

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

**244/13 – BA12388 – Dutch Magazine – Proposed conversion into workshop**

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

**245/13 – BA12405 – Adjacent to Customs Building – Proposed installation of outdoor LCD display**

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

**246/13 – BA12431 – 6/3 South Barrack Ramp – Proposed new windows**

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

**247/13 – BA12440 – 412 Neptune House Marina Bay – Proposed removal of partition wall between kitchen and living room**

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

**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 6/13*  
23/5/13

**248/13 – BA12451 – 245 Block 2, Watergardens – Proposed extension and internal alterations**

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

**249/13 – BA12475 – 2 Rosia Cottages, Rosia Road – Proposed structural alterations**

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

**250/13 – BA12482 – Unit 19, Ocean Village Promenade – Proposed internal fit-out of existing bar to convert to new bar/ restaurant**

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

**251/13 – BA12485 – 13B Ocean Village – Proposed internal fit-out including layout alterations and external alterations**

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

**252/13 – BA12486 – 18A City Mill Lane – Proposed refurbishment**

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

**253/13 – BA12487 – Suite 48, Royal Ocean Plaza, Ocean Village – Proposed amendment to internal layout**

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

**254/13 – BA12490 – Rose Tree Cottage, North Pavilion Road – Proposed internal and external alterations – Proposed skylight**

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

**255/13 – BA12491 – 110/112 Main Street – Proposed creation of a fire escape route to rear of Peacocks**

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

**256/13 – BA12493 – 2/2 Serfaty's Passage – Proposed extension**

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

**257/13 – BA12494 – 31 Rosia Court – Proposed loft conversion and an extension to first floor level to the rear of the property**

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

**258/13 – BA12495 – 2 Cheshire Ramp, Buena Vista Estate – Proposed interior alterations**

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

**259/13 – BA12496 – 20 & 22 Eaton Park, Devil's Tower Road – Proposed minor works and refurbishment to existing laundry**

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

**260/13 – BA12508 – 50B Ocean Heights – Proposed conversion of one flat into two**

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



**APPROVED**  
*DPC meeting 6/13*  
23/5/13

**261/13 – BA12510 -1B Bishop Rapallo’s Ramp – Proposed boundary wall and widening of patio**

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

**262/13 – BA12515 – 243/6 Main Street – Proposed refurbishment**

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

**263/13 – BA12517 – 8 Carter House, Naval Hospital Road – Proposed internal alterations**

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

**264/13 – BA12520 – 7/2 Bishop Rapallo Ramp – Proposed conversion of window into Juliet Balcony and internal alterations to residential unit**

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

**265/13 – BA12521 – 7 Ellerton Ramp, Buena Vista Estate – Proposed interior and exterior alterations**

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

**266/13 – BA12522 – 6 Ellerton Ramp, Buena Vista Estate – Proposed internal alterations and alterations to fenestration, balcony boundary wall and extended terrace**

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

**267/13 – BA12524 – 31 Main Street – Proposed refurbishment**

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

**268/13 – BA12533 – 12 Bomb House Lane – Proposed internal alterations**

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

**269/13 – BA12541 – 18 Limonium House, Westview Park – Proposed glass curtains**

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

**270/13 – BA12562 – North Mole Road, Evacuation Memorial Roundabout – Proposed letter box – GOG Project**

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

**271/13 – BA12563 – Bus stop at junction Willis’ Road – Proposed letter box – GOG Project**

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

**272/13 – BA12564 – Bus stop at Naafi, Bleak House – Proposed letter box – GOG Project**

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

**273/13 – BA12566 – Central entrance Rosia Road, New Harbours – Proposed letter box – GOG Project**

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

**APPROVED**

*DPC meeting 6/13*

23/5/13

**274/13 – BA12567 – St Theresa’s, Devil’s Tower Road – Proposed letter box – GOG Project**

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

**275/13 – BA12568 – Outside RBS, Corral Road – Proposed letter box – GOG Project**

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

**276/13 – BA12568 – Bus stop opposite Brympton, Europa Road – Proposed letter box – GOG Project**

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

**277/13 – BA12570 – Catalan Bay Village – Proposed letter box – GOG Project**

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

**278/13 – BA12572 – Border, Winston Churchill Avenue – Proposed letter box – GOG Project**

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

**279/13 – BA12573 – Police HQ, New Mole House, Rosia Road – Proposed letter box – GOG Project**

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

**280/13 – BA12576 – North Front cemetery – Nature interpretation signs – GOG Project**

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

**Any Other Business**

**281/13 – Horsebarrack Court – Sandwich board proposal**

The Chairman told the Commission that an application for permission to place a sandwich board on the corner between Horsebarrack Lane and Main Street has been received. He said that the usual policy is that pubs, bars and restaurants can advertise only 20 metres away from their premises. He said that the applicant has stated that they have the support of the Ministry of Tourism.

JH asked who controls sandwich boards. The Chairman confirmed that the Town Planning Department controls these and that these are only allowed within the table and chairs area of premises.

MEH suggested that a solution might be to have one sign for all of the shops in the area. The Chairman said that there was one in the past but that it was never maintained and consequently removed.

The Commission refused this application as allowing this would create a precedent.

**282/13 – Next Meeting**

The Commission agreed to next meet on Friday 14<sup>th</sup> June at 09.30 am.